Perceptions of leadership effectiveness of traditional and participative organizations and supervisors.

Stuart Mitchell Silverman

University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

Recommended Citation
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/3036

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.
NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.
PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS
OF TRADITIONAL AND PARTICIPATIVE
ORGANIZATIONS AND SUPERVISORS

by
Stuart M. Silverman
BA (Hons) York University, 1993

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, Canada
1995
The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L’auteur conserve la propriété du droit d’auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-10962-3
© Stuart M. Silverman 1995
ABSTRACT

The present study assessed the effects of hierarchical (traditional) and participative organizational structures, and autocratic (traditional) and participative styles of supervisory leadership, on perceptions of job satisfaction, the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees, and productivity and overall success, in a hypothetical manufacturing organization. One hundred and seventy-two students at the University of Windsor responded to a questionnaire. The questionnaire depicted four scenarios in which the supervisor was portrayed to lead either autocratically or participatively, and the organizational structure was portrayed as either hierarchical or participative. As hypothesized, the results revealed that participative as opposed to traditional supervisors and work environments were perceived to engender higher job satisfaction and success. Also, the quality of employees' relationship with the supervisor was perceived to be higher when the supervisor led in a participative as opposed to a traditional style. Contrary to expectations, perceptions of success were not higher for traditional organizations, nor for traditional leaders. An unexpected finding was that the supervisor's leadership style was viewed as more important than the structure of the working environment for perceptions of the quality of the
relationship between the supervisor and employees, for perceptions of employees' job satisfaction, and for perceptions of organizational success. Contrary to predictions, the compatibility of the leadership style of the supervisor and the structure of the work environment was not perceived to be important for productivity and overall success.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Beginning in the early 1970s, a style of participative management was implemented by a small number of companies in the United States (Lawler, 1990). Participative management moves information, knowledge, rewards, and decision-making power to lower levels of the organization (Brown, 1990). It emphasizes training and personal growth (Lawler, 1990). Benefits of participative management are thought to include increased productivity and improved job satisfaction. Two significant offshoots of participative management are teamwork and employee self-management. Currently, these concepts have been combined to define a new entity known as self-managing work teams (SMWTs). Much of the literature concerning teamwork, employee self-management, and SMWTs has originated from two approaches - the leadership literature and the group literature. The leadership literature has asked, in different forms and contexts, which style of leadership - autocratic or participative - is more effective. Some of the findings have suggested that a participative style of leadership may improve job satisfaction (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 1992), while an autocratic style of leadership is more likely to result in
greater efficiency. The group literature has asked, in
different forms and contexts, whether a hierarchical
structure or a democratic work group structure is more
beneficial. Some research has suggested that higher output
is attained in the short term with a hierarchical structure
and task-specific jobs. However, it is also suggested that
participative/democratic group functioning may lead to
greater job satisfaction and improved performance (Buch,
1992; Pearce & Ravlin, 1987).

As noted above, participative management has been
studied from leadership and group perspectives. However, it
is the contention of this thesis that the leader and the
organization, as defined primarily by its structure, do not
function in isolation. The present study has combined
research from the leadership and group perspectives to
consider the interaction of the leadership style and the
structure of the organization as factors in work group
performance and satisfaction. More precisely, this study
assessed the perceived effectiveness of autocratic and
participative leaders in hierarchical and participatively
structured organizations. This study proposes that the
match between the leader and the type of organization is an
important factor above and beyond each independently. In
order to understand the relationship between leadership
style and organizational culture, structure, and work group
functioning it is necessary to begin with a discussion of
leadership, followed by a brief overview of work groups.

**History of Leadership Study**

The history of leadership study is not as simplistic and linear as is often portrayed (Rost, 1991). There is a tendency for leadership scholars to summarize the history of leadership study as a logical progression which incorporated new knowledge into subsequent theories, and discarded theories which were disproven.

The telling of the leadership story . . . is misleading because it gives the impression that our understanding of leadership is more sophisticated and advanced in the 1980s than it was in the 1950s and that we have certainly come a long way from our naivete of the 1930s. Such progress is simply not the case (Rost, 1991, p.19).

As well, the portrayal of leadership theories as distinct from one another is inaccurate. Each theory borrowed from the others, as Rost (1991) points out:

The group theories included traits in their explanations and prescriptions concerning group facilitation. The trait theories looked like great men caricatures in egalitarian dress. The behavioral theories were very group-and trait-oriented, and the contingency/situational theories merely added a third dimension to the two-dimensional behaviour theories, thus continuing to be a hodgepodge of group, trait, and behaviour explanations of previous theories. The excellence theories more or less integrate all the previous theories in a more elitist context . . . (p. 26-27).

The following discussion takes into consideration the overlap of theories. These approaches, however, are not considered as reigning theories of the times, but as 'fads'
which added different (although not necessarily better or progressive) perspectives to the study of leadership. The use of the term 'fad' suggests that there was an increased popularity of each approach to leadership study which quickly drew attention for a brief period of time, and then retreated in prominence. The time frames provided do not signify the lifespan of each approach, but its entry into the mainstream leadership literature.

A. Theories of Leadership

a) Great Man [sic] Theory

The first coherent theory in the study of leadership was the "Great Man [sic] Theory", proposed by Galton (1869, cited in Hollander & Offerman, 1993). According to this theory, people were born either with or without the characteristics needed to lead others. These characteristics were seen to be universal, fixed, and applicable across situations (Hollander & Offerman, 1993). The Great Man [sic] Theory actually falls under the rubric of trait theory (outlined below), as it was the traits, or characteristics, possessed by the individual that determined the effectiveness of leadership. The Great Man [sic] Theory appears not to be a theory at all, but a unique sub-theory which fits within the trait theories.

b) Trait Theory

During the 1940s and the 1950s, the trend in the field of leadership research was to identify those characteristics
or traits possessed by great leaders which differentiated them from a) their followers, and b) ineffective leaders. Great leaders were thought to be "exceptionally intelligent, unusually energetic, far above the norm in their ability to speak to followers, and so on" (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993, p. 87). However, when these characteristics were scrutinized scientifically, it was found that great leaders' advantages in such areas were either non-existent or barely significant (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993). According to Hollander and Offerman (1993), among the failings of the Great Man Theory and the Trait Theory were "an absence of consideration of the situation faced by the leader, including the followers to be led, and any concern with the quality of the leader's performance" (p. 63). The failings of the trait theories were valuable, however, for their lack of findings (Yetton, 1984). The trait theories were unable to determine what leadership is, but provided evidence that it is not a set of personality traits.

The trait theory of leadership fits with a traditional, Weberian style of organizational management, which is autocratic and task-focused. The traditional type of supervisor is revered as one whose exceptional traits lead to effectiveness in bureaucratic organizations due to an ability to use authority in order to increase productivity.

c) Leadership Behaviours

The 1950s and 1960s saw a rise in attention given to
the behaviours and skills that make leaders effective. The common link between the various theories in the behavioral approach is the belief that leadership ability is not genetically transmitted, but that individuals can become effective leaders by employing the behaviours of effective leadership (Smith & Peterson, 1988). The focus of the behavioral approach is to identify those behaviours.

Two types of leader behaviours were identified - task-centred behaviour and interpersonal relations-centred behaviour. Those who engaged in high levels of both types of behaviour were typically seen as leaders, although those who exhibited high levels of task-centred behaviour and only moderate amounts of relationship-centred behaviour were sometimes still designated as leaders (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993). Rarely designated as leaders were those low in task-centred behaviour and high in relationship-centred behaviour. And those who exhibited low amounts of either type of behaviour were never seen as leaders (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993). The relationship between leaders' behavioral style and effectiveness was found to be inconsistent and non-generalizable. Attempts to apply this theory to 'real life' settings in the form of supervisor training showed only short-term effects which were of little use. Finally, causality could not be ascertained, as behavioral style could be an outcome or a cause of the determinants of effective leadership (ie. performance,
satisfaction, etc; Vokes, 1992).

d) **Situational/Contingency Approaches**

The situational/contingency approach to leadership study provides the basic framework for the present study on the effectiveness of different styles of leadership (autocratic, participative) under different organizational structures (hierarchical, participative). The situational/contingency approach proposes that effective leadership behaviour matches the situation. This study takes this premise one step further by proposing that the leader's style of leadership *influences* the behaviour of followers. More precisely, this study considers the group's method of functioning to be dependent upon the style of leadership exhibited by the leader, regardless of the work structures implemented by the organization. For example, a group of employees in an organization which has implemented a team model cannot be expected to function as a participative team if its leader utilizes an individualistic, autocratic style of leadership. Similarly, employees of a participative leader will tend to function as a work team rather than as individuals even though they operate in an autocratic organization. In short, the functioning of the work team is considered to be determined by the leader's style more than the organizational structure.

During the 1960s and 1970s, situational, or contingency
models of leadership gained popularity in management and social psychological theorizing. Situational/contingency theories considered leadership effectiveness to be a joint function of leader qualities and situational demands, thereby making various leader qualities appropriate at different times, in various situations (Hollander & Offerman, 1993). However, "each theory holds different facets of leadership as paramount, and tends to underplay or entirely ignore facets which are central to other theories" (Vokes, 1992, p. 14). Three of the most popular theories will be described briefly in order to illustrate the variety within the situational/contingency approach.

Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) contingency model was the first contingency model to be recognized, and has prompted the most subsequent research. Using Fiedler's (1967) model, respondents rate the person in their lives with whom they think they could work least well. High LPC scores indicate a relationship orientation which is considered to be favourable. Low LPC ratings indicate task-orientedness, and are considered to be unfavourable. According to this model, leadership effectiveness is thought to be a function of the above orientations and three situational/contingencies: a) leader-member relations, b) task structure, and c) leader position power. In other words, both high and low-scoring LPC leaders can be effective, but each can perform most effectively under
different combinations of situational factors. For example, task-oriented leaders (low LPC) should perform best when the three contingencies are either all favourable or all unfavourable; and relationship-oriented leaders (high LPC) should perform most effectively when the favourableness of situations is mixed or intermediate. Another situational/contingency approach is the path-goal theory, proposed by House (1971).

The path-goal theory (House, 1971) is a contingency model that considers effective leaders as those who are able to select behaviours based on the environment which are most likely to motivate followers to strive to achieve group objectives. This model utilizes the distinction between task-oriented and relationship-oriented leaders, and bases effectiveness upon three situations or contingencies: a) the task; b) the characteristics of the subordinates; and c) the nature of the subordinates' group. Among the model's predictions is that relationship-oriented leaders will be more effective when subordinates experience low role ambiguity, and that task-oriented leaders will be more effective in situations of high role ambiguity and high job complexity (House & Dressler, 1974). Also, subordinates should respond more favourably to directive behaviour by a leader when the task is unstructured, and less favourably when the task is structured.

The emphasis of Vroom and Yetton's (1973) model is on
the leader's manipulation of follower involvement in
decision-making. Such decisions are based on situational
factors, including the importance of decision quality,
availability of information to the leader and followers,
clarity of the problem, and need for followers' acceptance
for implementation. This model classifies leaders'
decision-making styles into four groups. They are, in
increasing degrees of follower participation - autocratic,
consultative, group, and delegated leadership styles. It is
important to note that a minimal amount, or an absence of
employee participation is considered to be autocratic
leadership, and that increased follower participation is
considered to be a group style of leadership.

B. Theories of Organizational Styles of Leadership

The theories of organizational styles of leadership
differ from the general theories of leadership discussed
above, as the former deal explicitly with the interaction of
the leader and the group of followers, and their impact on
one another, and organizational style refers to the impact
on culture which applies to the organization as a whole.

a) Transactional Leadership

The basis of transactional leadership is social
exchange theory. According to transactional leadership
theory, social interaction is thought to be an exchange
where each person realizes costs and benefits. According to
Burns (1978), transactional leadership "occurs when one
person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature. . . " (p. 19). The interaction continues because the various parties find the social exchange to be mutually rewarding (Stogdill, 1981). Although a leadership act may have taken place, the leader and the follower are not bound together by a mutual enduring purpose (Burns, 1978). Transactional leaders "mostly consider how to marginally improve and maintain the quantity and quality of performance, how to substitute one goal for another, how to reduce resistance to particular actions, and how to implement decisions" (Bass, 1985, p. 27).

Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) distinguished between high and low levels of transactional leadership. Lower levels of transactional leadership are characterized by the leader's control of valued tangible resources, such as pay, vacation time, and other benefits, and of punishments and disciplinary measures. The more control a leader has over such resources, the more bargaining power he/she has. In lower-order transactions, the role of the transactional leader is to "clarify the roles followers must play and the task requirements followers must complete in order to reach their personal goals while fulfilling the mission of the organization" (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1989, p. 194)

Higher-order transactions involve the exchange of non-
concrete rewards, such as trust, commitment, and respect, in order to maintain adequate levels of performance by followers. With this type of exchange, leaders and followers are thought to be bound in an attempt to satisfy each other's needs.

Transactional leadership is generally the type of leadership which exists in traditional organizations. Each person is concerned with satisfying his/her own individual needs, and in doing so contribute to the operation of the organization.

b) Transformational (Transforming) Leadership

The concept of transformational leadership was first introduced by Burns (1978). Transformational leadership goes beyond higher-order transactional leadership in that individual transactions or exchanges are not as important as a sense of commitment and common purpose between the transformational leader and the followers. Rather than the leader and follower negotiating their actions, they work together in a relationship which values achievement of organizational goals. Through increased autonomy and power, followers are urged to take a greater stake in the outcomes of the organization. Organizational goals become individuals' goals. Transformational leadership "seeks to satisfy higher needs [eg. on Maslow's hierarchy of needs], and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual
stimulation and elevation . . . " (Burns, 1978, p. 4, brackets added). Through increased levels of involvement and commitment, it is possible to achieve higher levels of performance.

Bass (1985) found four factors associated with transformational leadership from subordinates' ratings of their transformational leaders: (1) charisma, in which the leader provides a sense of mission, vision, excitement, and pride. Charisma usually breeds respect for, and trust of the leader (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993); (2) inspiration, which involves setting high expectations, using symbols to focus efforts, expressing important purposes in simple ways, and communicating a vision to followers (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993); (3) intellectual stimulation, which entails challenging followers to think of new and improved ways to deal with problems and situations. Followers are kept aware of new developments and are consulted regarding strategies for change. They are also encouraged to develop their own task structure, and to solve problems on their own; and (4) individualized consideration, where the leader gives personal attention to followers, building a personal, considerate relationship with each individual, and focusing on each person's needs (Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1993). Zaleznik (1977, cited in Bass, 1990) found similar factors from clinical evidence, and Posner and Kouzes (1988) obtained similar results from case studies with managers.
Posner and Kouzes (1988) found that managers who described "a personal best [experience] as a leader" (p. 484) challenged the process by searching for new opportunities, and by experimenting and taking sensible risks; inspired a shared vision, enabled others to act by giving followers autonomy while stressing collaboration; modeled the way by setting an example for followers; and encouraged the heart by recognizing and complimenting hard work and contributions, and celebrating achievements.

Transformational leadership is at the other end of the spectrum from transactional leadership, in terms of employee participation, democracy, authority, and routinization of work. Traditional organizations' style of leadership is transactional, with leaders who are seen as possessing superior traits which ensure their effectiveness. In general, the philosophy behind SMWT organizations resembles transformational leadership.

The above provided a brief overview of the most recognized theories of leadership. Stogdill (1981) provides a more complete account of leadership theories, categorized by theoretical influences.

One of the criticisms of the study of leadership is that it has traditionally ignored the role of followers. The transactional and transformational theories of leadership have dealt with the role and the impact of followers more explicitly. The next section outlines the
importance of consideration of followers.

**Followership**

The limited followership literature deals almost exclusively with followers as individuals. The present research attempts to expand the focus of followership study by examining the leader's effect on the group dynamics of the followers. A group dynamics approach to followership is used here because it seems relevant to contemporary organizations with their interest in work groups and teams.

Leaders have typically been seen as actively "creating" leadership, while followers have either not been considered at all, or if considered, as passive objects or "empty vessels, waiting to be filled with the leader's inspiration" (Lee, 1993, p. 113). Leadership has been seen as something that leaders do to followers. The role of the follower is generally seen as so passive, unthinking, and sheeplike that it has taken on almost pejorative connotations in Western culture (Lee, 1993). According to Rost (1991), this stereotype originated during the industrial era, when followers were the "sweaty masses" who were separated from the elite, were not able to act intelligently without guidance and control, were unproductive unless they were directed by others, and were willing to let others (the elite) control their lives. This view of leadership and followership underlies the trait theory of leadership, in which effective leaders possess certain traits which render
them superior to the common follower. Traditional organizations, in espousing the trait theory, also subscribed to this type of thinking, which essentially ignores the importance of followers.

The above description of followers (as passive and sheeplike) is not applicable to modern perceptions of organizations, and describes almost the opposite of the role of the follower in self-managed work teams. The culture of self-managed work teams considers followers as respected members of the organization who have skills and intelligence that can be harnessed for the betterment of the organization. Followers in self-managed teams are expected to remain productive with minimal guidance, and become a more whole person through their work - not less of a person. Followers are seen as essential ingredients in the functioning of an organization. This view of followers and followership necessitates a different organizational culture and style of leadership than the autocratic style of traditional organizations.

In order to dissociate followers from the somewhat "negative" stereotype of passive reactors, several scholarly researchers and practitioners have adopted other more positive terms, such as constituents, participants, associates, and partners. The change in attitude about and toward followers came in part with the realization that leadership is not possible without followership. In order
for leaders to lead, there must be followers who are willing to follow. Also, effective followers have been found to exhibit many of the same characteristics as effective leaders (Kelley, 1989; Lee, 1993; Rost, 1991). According to stereotypes, a person who exhibits initiative, self-control, commitment, talent, honesty, credibility, and courage is thought of as a good leader (Kelley, 1989). However, that person would also be an exceptional follower. Kelley (1989) even considers the difference between effective leaders and effective followers not to be intelligence or character, but merely the role that each plays at a particular time or place. More concretely, followers who participate in the creation and maintenance of an organization's vision, who take responsibility for getting their jobs done, who take the initiative to fix problems or improve processes, and who question leaders when they think the leader may be wrong, exhibit many qualities of leadership (Lee, 1993).

This view of followers and effective followership is particularly relevant to the thesis of this study. A person may possess all the necessary qualities, characteristics, and abilities that would make him/her an effective leader, but without competent followers the chance for effective leadership to take place is drastically reduced.

This section has outlined two radically differing views of followership. The view of followers as passive, sheeplike, lazy and ineffectual without the guidance from
the leader, is typical of traditional organizations. Their style of management and leadership reflects this. In contrast, organizations with participative structures, such as those employing SMWTs, view followers as innately good, willing to work, and able to handle responsibility. The leadership needs in this type of organization are clearly different from those of traditional organizations. The effectiveness of certain types of leaders may be affected by those differences.

Some underlying assumptions in the traditional type of organization will be outlined, along with the responsibilities of the supervisor in such a setting. The same will be done for the SMWT organization and the team leader in order to compare their roles and to understand why the roles are constructed differently.

The Traditional Organization

The structure, values, and culture of the traditional organization are being described because they define the type of leadership practiced in the organization, which in turn defines the functioning and behaviour of employees.

The traditional organization is comprised of several levels of hierarchy, including line staff, supervisors, managers, vice-presidents, and presidents. Each step up in the hierarchy has more power and responsibility within the organization, which is reflected in higher salaries and prestige. Traditional organizations are generally
autocratic in their style of leadership, where superiors give instructions and subordinates accept them. Superiors are believed to have risen in the hierarchy in part due to their exceptional knowledge and performance, giving their authority credibility.

The goal of traditional organizations is to achieve increased efficiency, productivity, and profits. The main focus is 'the bottom line', and employee concerns are secondary. As noted above, followers are generally not held in very high esteem.

The Traditional Supervisor

The responsibilities of the traditional supervisor in a manufacturing environment are outlined in this section in order to exemplify the characteristics and abilities that one must possess to function in such a position. These responsibilities and the way they are structured demonstrate the autocratic style of leadership of traditional organizations.

The responsibilities of the traditional supervisor focus mainly on organizational and management tasks, including staffing, planning and setting objectives, organizing, controlling, communicating, counseling, evaluating performance, and leading.

A. Staffing

Staffing is the process of hiring new employees. In larger organizations the human resources department may take
almost complete responsibility for hiring new staff. However, for hiring to be most effective, the supervisor of the area in question would be involved. Minimally, the supervisor would assist the human resources department in creating an updated job description, which includes the level of performance and amount of education and experience required, and a description of the personal characteristics needed to perform the job effectively.

The human resources department usually does the primary screening of applicants, but the supervisor may be involved in the interview and selection processes. In smaller organizations without a personnel department, the supervisor must undertake the responsibilities that would be undertaken by the human resources department in larger organizations.

Once hired, it is the supervisor who usually trains the new employees, or at least oversees the training process.

B. Planning and Setting Objectives

Setting objectives or goals is the first step in planning, which is commonly held as the primary function of supervisors. It is the process of anticipating the future and determining the steps required to achieve the desired results (Warrick & Zawacki, 1984). More explicitly, "planning is deciding in advance what has to be done, why it has to be done, how it's to be done, how much it's going to cost, who's going to do it, where it's to be done, and when
it's to be done" (Kossen, 1981, p. 69).

Supervisors are generally responsible for short-term planning, which determines operations on a daily or weekly basis. However, they may also be involved in longer-term, or higher-level planning, which may include estimating future personnel needs, suggesting changes in production processes or plant layout, and developing safety programs, etc. (Kossen, 1981).

C. Organizing

Supervisors are generally responsible for organizing, which involves coordinating human, material, and financial resources and integrating activities and tasks into a system that maximizes outputs (Warrick & Zawacki, 1984). Human organization techniques include job rotation, where people rotate between jobs as a means of alleviating boredom and increasing workers' skills; job enlargement, where workers become responsible for a wider range of tasks in order to alleviate monotony; job enrichment, in which employees are given the opportunity to take on more responsibility, and may become involved in the layout of work, scheduling, and product improvement; and, a flexible working hours plan, where, within certain limits, employees can choose when to work their required number of hours (Warrick & Zawacki, 1984).

Supervisors also ensure that the material resources needed to carry out tasks are available when and where
employees need them. The supervisor coordinates the human and material resources according to the constraints of the financial resources allotted.

D. Controlling

Controlling involves the regular and systematic comparison of actual results with planned objectives in order to determine whether goals have been accomplished or if adjustments must be made (Kossen, 1981). Controlling can be preventive or corrective. Preventive controlling attempts to avoid deviations from goals before they occur, while corrective controlling corrects for deviations from goals once they have occurred.

Areas of control for which supervisors are typically responsible are inventory, production, cost, and safety. The responsibilities involved for each type of controlling will be described briefly in order to further outline the nature of the traditional supervisor's job.

a) Inventory Control

Inventory control is the supervisor's duty to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of materials available to meet production needs, while avoiding tying up capital resources in excessive amounts of inventories (Kossen, 1981). A proper balance should be obtained and maintained, although changing circumstances (e.g., addition or subtraction of employees in the department, or increased or decreased production needs) may require the revision of quantities
needed.

b) **Production Control**

Production control, which ensures that materials, machines, and labour remain well coordinated, is arguably the most important control process in a manufacturing organization. Production control is generally thought to function in five areas; planning, which asks whether plans involving materials, machines, and labour, are still feasible; routing, which deals with the sequence of operations; scheduling, which involves the timetables that show when specific operations will take place, and how long they will take to complete; dispatching, which is the attempt to carry out the established schedule; and inspection, which verifies whether scheduling and quality standards have been met (Kossen, 1981).

c) **Cost Control**

A supervisor's role in controlling costs involves promoting cost-consciousness among subordinates. This includes setting realistic and attainable goals for minimizing costs, outlining the steps necessary to achieve the objectives, and setting target date for achieving those objectives (Kossen, 1981).

d) **Safety Control**

Safety control is mostly a consciousness-raising procedure although implementing and teaching safer techniques, and enforcing established safety rules are also
part of controlling safety.

Controlling covers many areas of operation, and comprises a large part of the traditional supervisor's total responsibilities.

E. Communicating

Supervisors are not only concerned with their own interpersonal communication with their superiors, peers and subordinates, but are also concerned with organizational communication. "Organizational communication includes all of the formal ways an organization, department, or supervisor communicates with employees. Examples would be communicating through goals, policies, procedures, rules, the chain of command, meetings, memos, and bulletin boards" (Warrick & Zawacki, 1984, p. 283). To ensure greater effectiveness and efficiency, supervisors must be aware of, and follow, established procedures for communicating in the organization where such guidelines exist. Alternatively, it is the supervisor's responsibility to create his or her own system for upward, downward, and lateral communication, deciding which means of communication are most suitable for which types of communication.

F. Counselling

Although some larger organizations may provide counselling for employees through the human resources department, supervisors are often required to deal with employees' personal problems when they affect the employees'
performance, and often even when performance is unaffected. Supervisors may be asked for guidance with problems involving health, self-identity, marriage, financial difficulties, and drug and alcohol dependency (Kossen, 1981). Supervisors may recommend to employees that problems of a complex nature be handled by qualified professionals, such as psychiatrists or clinical psychologists. Sometimes, however, an employee may just need a sympathetic ear, and may turn to the supervisor for such support.

G. Evaluating Performance

Supervisors are generally responsible for conducting performance evaluations of their subordinates. Such evaluations may be carried out annually or semi-annually. Ideally, there would be four components to conducting evaluations. In the first, the supervisor would complete a written evaluation form for each subordinate. Second is the appraisal interview, in which the supervisor and the employee would have an opportunity to discuss the employee's evaluation. Next, the supervisor would assess the employee's reaction to the evaluation. And finally, the supervisor would guide the employee toward establishing new goals or improving future performance (Kossen, 1981).

H. Leading

Approaches to leadership may differ in infinite ways, depending on several factors, including the personality of the supervisor, the organizational culture, and the climate
within the organization, which can be thought of as the organizational equivalent of an individual's mood. Functions of leadership exercised by a supervisor may include disseminating technical expertise, motivating others, and setting a good example. For the supervisor, leadership remains a task, which is buried among other responsibilities. It is not seen as a function which guides all other aspects of the job and the organization.

Some of the basic responsibilities of supervisors have been reviewed in broad detail. Other supervisory responsibilities may have been omitted for the sake of brevity and parsimony. A more detailed scope of the functions and responsibilities of supervisors is beyond the scope of this introduction, and may be obtained from other sources. Nonetheless, it is apparent that the responsibilities of the traditional supervisor are forged from a hierarchical organizational structure, and support an autocratic style of leadership.

The SMWT Organization

The following description outlines a prototypical SMWT organization in which the organizational structure and culture supports the functioning of work teams at the operational level. Rarely in reality do SMWT initiatives encompass the entire organization, as described below. Often organizations will borrow aspects of the following model without changing the organizational culture or the
overall style of leadership. This topic will be discussed in greater detail below.

A. Philosophical Orientations

Self-managing work team organizations value democracy, equality, teamwork, cooperation, continual learning, commitment, and self-fulfilment.

With SMWTs, profits are not the main motive - getting the system working is. The assumption is that if the system is working, the profits will follow. Profits are thought of as by-products - they are not goals, but outcomes (Cox, 1990). As a result, SMWT organizations focus more on people and processes than on money. Although financial issues and profits remain important, the means (i.e. people and processes) to those ends are emphasized rather than the ends themselves.

Cause-and-effect thinking, characteristic of traditional organizations and supervisors, often does not provide satisfactory results - at least not in the long term. Often employee satisfaction and intrinsic motivation suffer in such organizations. With systems thinking the parts emerge in anticipation of the whole (Cox, 1990). Employees are (and feel) part of the whole system, and not just one isolated segment. Feelings of ownership and intrinsic motivation - which are basic goals of SMWT organizations - are thought to materialize with such a management philosophy.
The team is the only unit under consideration. The leader (or any other team member) should never blame specific individuals, or allow individuals to be blamed for shortcomings. Success or failure is a team event (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). If one individual fails to meet expectations, it is the fault of the entire team for not recognizing and correcting the predicament. Members of the team are mutually accountable (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

There are two perspectives which are critical to the successful functioning of a SMWT. First, group members must be willing to "unlearn[ing] deeply-ingrained, self-limiting assumptions about individualism, authority, and responsibility, that defeat cooperation..." (Weisbord, 1987, p. 297). Such assumptions and beliefs function counter to the philosophies that are central to SMWTs. To maintain old-fashioned beliefs about individualism and the autocratic nature of authority is to render ineffective the efforts of SMWT systems to change traditional ways of running an organization. Second, group members are taught the importance of "looking outward toward the wider social and business networks that shape their mutual effort. People need both perspectives - relationships and environment - to make sense of the workplace" (Weisbord, 1987, p. 297). Too narrow of a focus strips work of its relevance. The establishment of SMWTs attempts to preserve quality of working life, and seeks to conserve our culture's deepest
values (of autonomy, self-worth) against erosion by narrow economic and technocratic thinking (Weisbord, 1991).

A main philosophy of SMWTs is teamwork, whereby the focus is on the group as a whole, and not on individuals. The group is faced with tasks, and must decide - based on individuals' specific skills or strengths - how to allocate its resources (human and other) in order to successfully complete the tasks. One advantage of a group setting is that it can practice a small-scale division of labour, where each group member can work on what he/she does best (as compared to others in the group). The focus among group members is accomplishing the common task, which promotes cooperation instead of competition. "When employees become members of a self-managing group, they tend to define their work in terms of their value as contributors to the group's primary task rather than in relation to one specific job" (Manz & Sims, 1987, p. 106).

Cooperation in the team is essential, as the team works on projects in which each member contributes a part, and members are interdependent (Weisbord, 1991). Teammates helping one another to achieve a greater common goal is one of the most important aspects of SMWTs. Collaboration facilitates learning of information and skills. All members of the team should be givers and receivers of information, encouragement, and respect. There is no room in SMWTs for adversarial relationships. Such relationships serve only to
hinder the cooperativeness of the team, and ultimately to
decrease performance and production. With cooperation and
teamwork, people learn to accept themselves, to trust one
another, and to resolve their differences. Cooperation and
teamwork are central to success.

Authenticity is an important offshoot of interpersonal
skills. A value of SMWTs is that all members should be
genuine in their communication and in expressing their
feelings. Honesty helps to eliminate the office politics
that detract from productivity.

B. Organizational Structure

A typical hierarchical structure of a SMWT organization
has three and a half levels; the support team, coordinators,
team leaders and team members (Terms used and some
descriptions are from Manz & Sims, 1987).

a) Support Team

The support team is essentially what is known as upper
management in traditional organizations. Its
responsibilities include planning overall plant production
schedules, dealing with client firms, etc, and overseeing
the work of coordinators. "The support team generally plays
a supportive rather than directive role in the plant's

b) Coordinators

The next level down in the hierarchy is that of
coordinators, who may oversee the functioning of one or
several work teams. The role of this external leader may seem paradoxical, with its aim to lead groups which are self-managed. However, Manz and Sims (1987) found the role of the coordinator to be facilitation of the team's self-management through self-observation, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement.

Managers in traditional organizations (whose position can be seen as parallel to that of coordinators) have opposed the implementation of SMWTs because they perceive a loss of power to employees, and loss of worth to the organization (Manz, Keating & Donnellon, 1990). In short, these managers feared for their jobs, since their authority and decision-making power was being handed to workers. Such a fear by managers is justifiable, as a certain amount of their authority is transferred to workers. However, several organizations have shown that the implementation of SMWTs does not mean the end of the manager's job (Gerber, 1992). Managers should be assured outright that their employment is secure, as leadership complements management, and does not replace it (Kotter, 1990).

c) Team Leader

The next level down the hierarchy is the team leader. The team leader does the same physical work as the other team members and also has leadership responsibilities, which are the focus of this investigation. Some findings from previous research and theories are presented below.
d) Team Members

Finally, a half step down from the team leader are the team members. Teams are generally composed of 8 to 12 individuals. The team requires enough members (around 8) in order to possess diversified skills for effective collaboration, and to establish its own culture, including its methods of operation and ways of dealing with situations and problems. Too many members in a team (more than 12) becomes unwieldy for collaboration, and loses the intimacy required for effective team maintenance.

Members of SMWTs are expected to take on the additional responsibility of self-management. These activities may include the preparation of an annual budget, keeping records of hours worked, recording quality-control statistics, designing within-group job assignments, participating in assessment of fellow group members' job performance, scheduling, and dealing with equipment and process problems, as well as group member behavioral problems (Manz & Sims, 1987). Group meetings are held at least once per week for the purpose of addressing the above matters, or any other matters of importance.

Organizations with SMWTs usually try to downplay any status differentials. For example, there may be no reserved parking for upper management (ie. support team and coordinators). Uniforms or name tags, when worn, are worn by all employees, from management to team members, and name
tags would not specify one's position, nor would uniforms differ based on position. All employees are considered equally as important, despite differences in job or level on the organization's hierarchy.

The establishment of SMWTs theoretically improves productivity and employee satisfaction (Cohen & Ledford, 1994; Salem & Banner, 1992), with an essential element of success being the selection of appropriate team leaders.

**The Self-Managed Work Team Leader**

There is little academic research on the topic of SMWT leadership. As a result, the following descriptions of the SMWT leader's role are based mostly on applications in the field.

Team leaders serve to facilitate the process of group participation. Theoretically, fewer policing and directing tasks are required in organizations with SMWTs because team members are responsible for themselves. However, there is a corresponding need in SMWT organizations for an increase in developmental group facilitation skills (Fisher, 1993). These functions are often assumed to belong to the SMWT leader. Team leaders, then, are not supervisors who direct and control (e.g. pay or discipline) employees but who teach and support them (Fisher, 1993).

The team leader's role is too often referred to as a set of behaviours or styles without taking into account the things leaders care about, like their personal values and
vision, or a set of core beliefs that influence their actions (Fisher, 1993). These values and beliefs play an important role in effective team leadership, which is concerned with establishing the organization's culture, of which values and beliefs form a central part.

The following sections outline functions and abilities at which a team leader must be competent.

A. Interpersonal and Communication Skills

A key aspect of the team leader position is the use of interpersonal skills. These skills need not be innate but may be learned. The ability to credit people for their creative ideas, to clarify and confirm issues, to build on others' ideas, to provide constructive criticism, and to manage differences constructively are important skills for the team leader, reflecting the functions of the role.

An effective team leader has the ability to manage relationships within the team, between the team and the rest of the organization, and with those outside the organization. Team leaders occupy a central position in organizations, and their ability to communicate effectively ensures a smooth flow of information throughout the organization. Proper communication helps to avoid ambiguities. Through their interpersonal skills, team leaders can breathe life and energy into an organization.

An effective SMWT leader must ensure that feedback flows in all directions between him/her and the team and
among team members. The leader must not only be able to give feedback, but must also request it from others, encourage it, and listen when it comes. The team as a whole must learn to communicate effectively and to be responsive to others. The team should learn through the leader's example the importance of giving and receiving feedback. The leader must be accessible to the team, not only physically, but personally, in order to foster open and honest communication. The leader should endeavour to have a secure environment for people to be able to criticize if necessary, without fear. Only through constructive criticism, which is not mired by fears and insecurities, can continuous improvement be realized.

Candour is a quality required by SMWT leaders. Openness, along with trust and feedback help to ensure positive results. Trust is needed in order to provide the security needed for team members to be open in return. Such openness is more likely to occur with a leader who is non-judgmental, and whose functions do not include reprimanding employees. Trust among team members also makes criticism more credible (Cox, 1990) and less threatening. Candour provides an avenue for honest, direct criticism.

The team leader should make it a point to communicate sufficiently with all team members. To ensure coordination of activities, proper communication allows the team leader to keep track of all aspects of the process in order to make
revisions and necessary alterations. Effective communication also gives members a clear conception of their tasks and the direction in which the team is heading in order to view themselves as part of a team, and to guide the work being done. Misunderstandings can only lead to difficulties within the team and reduced productivity.

Another aspect of communication critical to the team leader is nonverbal communication. It is true that "actions speak louder than words", and the team leader must be aware of this. A simple smile or a nod by the leader to a team member may provide encouragement and a sense of appreciation, and the acknowledgement required to remain enthusiastic. However, the leader must be skilful at nonverbal communication in order to avoid excessive or too limited use of this powerful tool.

The way a leader behaves is also a form of communication. The leader must set an example for the team in all aspects of team functioning. Seemingly inconsequential acts performed by the leader, such as taking calls during team meetings or habitually eating lunch at his/her desk rather than with the team, will not only affect the team's perception of the leader, but its functioning and the way it views itself. Every act is a form of communication (Cox, 1990), and leaders must be sensitive to that fact.

Finally, the ability to listen is a critical part of
the communication exchange process (Cox, 1990). The leader should be able to listen and acknowledge other people's feelings, opinions, and attitudes as legitimate. In a SMWT the team leader's lack of power over other employees allows for a greater openness of expression. In essence, the team leader needs not only to listen in the literal sense, but in the figurative sense as well, by being open to suggestions and flexible.

Although communication is essential, there can also be an excess of communication. There is a balance of contact and withdrawal that must be obtained in order for communication to be more meaningful and for relationships not to become constrained. The team leader must ensure that the balance is maintained.

In summary, the team leader should always be aware and concerned about his/her impact on the team, and vice versa, and be able to learn from these exchanges. It is also important for the team leader to consider other people's feelings and opinions, and not just focus on his/her own. The whole area of interpersonal communication and relationships plays a significant role in how effective a team is in accomplishing its tasks on a daily basis.

B. Vision

A key element of SMWTs is a strong vision which guides all of the team's actions. Vision involves an understanding of where the team is now and where it is headed in the
future (Cox, 1990). It gives the team purpose and provides a basis for setting goals, aspirations, and expectations. Vision is an overarching, long-range goal that gives shape to immediate, short-term goals (Cox, 1990). The team's vision encompasses its values. What makes a work group into a team is its shared vision. Mere work in isolation from any meaning or purpose will breed boredom and a lack of commitment. Sharing a common purpose inspires the team to reach greater heights than the individual can achieve.

The role of the team leader is to pull people together with a common goal. However, the entire team, and not only the leader, must create the vision, lest the vision only belong to the leader and lack the commitment of the team. By having the entire team develop the vision, it will be understood and accepted. The democratic nature of SMWTs allows - even requires - this type of power dissemination, in order to foster intrinsic motivation. Once the team's vision is developed, the leader serves as its guardian, articulator, and sponsor (Cox, 1990). The leader should attempt to keep the team's purpose, goals, and approach relevant and meaningful in terms of the team's vision (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Moreover, the leader should help the team to clarify and commit to their vision (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

C. Orientation of Democracy - Empowering Employees

The SMWT is a democracy where each member has equal
input. The leader must recognize and uphold this value. In so doing, team leaders should not dictate, make decisions for their group, railroad decisions through, or just manage the attendance policy and vacation schedule (Fisher, 1993). Members of SMWTs, including the leader, have equal influence (Weisbord, 1991). Each member has the opportunity to influence the agenda. Decisions in SMWTs are often made by vote or consensus. Therefore matters will not always be managed or conducted the way the leader would like, and the leader must be willing to accept that. The leader must show a firm belief in the team's purpose and in the members individually and together as a team (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

SMWT leaders must know how to access power and how to impart it to employees. The leader is a facilitator and not a superior who holds more power than the rest of the team. Whereas the effective team leader imparts power to employees (and in so doing, theoretically increases the employees' intrinsic motivation and cooperation) an autocrat fears the loss of power because it is the only means by which he/she can obtain compliance.

The SMWT leader must embrace the notion that he/she is of no higher status than the rest of the team. A team leader with an inflated ego cannot function properly in the position (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). An autocratic leader will only breed resentment, feelings of inferiority, and
lower morale which negatively affect motivation, creativity, and productivity. The team leader must consider the welfare of the team above all else, especially his/her own welfare. Undesirable assignments should not be automatically delegated to others (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Rather, the leader should volunteer to do at least his/her share. Likewise, the leader should not keep the best opportunities, assignments, or credit for him/herself (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993), but should distribute these equally among team members. Finally, the leader should endeavour to provide the team with opportunities, rewarding assignments, and the credit that it deserves. Under no circumstances should the leader accept the credit for the accomplishments of the team. The team leader cannot just sit back and make decisions, but must do real work and contribute like every other member of the team (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). The team leader shares responsibility, which is different from delegating (Fisher, 1993). No task is too insignificant for the leader to do (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Cooperativeness and democracy in the team will help to generate commitment to the team and the organization and respect for the team and the team leader.

D. Coaching

The main components of coaching involve providing encouragement and feedback, along with sharing knowledge and experience. An effective coach has the ability and desire
to give constructive criticism and support for team members' efforts (Fisher, 1993). Effective SMWT leaders are able to inspire learning and creativity. The role of SMWT leaders is to help team members learn how to learn (Weisbord, 1991).

In a team or organization, encouragement should flow in four directions: upward, downward, across, and inward (Cox, 1990). The team leader should teach the team the value of, and the process used, for encouraging others. One successful method of encouragement is the use of positive reinforcement. Giving rewards proportional to the size of achievement is a way to motivate team members, but these rewards should not be seen as bribes. Rewards may be relatively small and inexpensive but meaningful, such as a compliment for a job well done.

A coach must teach the team and help members to work through difficulties. Such coaching relieves possible frustration which could lower morale and lead to reduced productivity. Repeated frustration may also lead to a lack of initiative, which underscores the need for an effective coach. A coach should also teach team members how to maximize their effectiveness by using their unique strengths to their advantage. Coaching does not mean providing all the answers for team members, but guiding them in the right direction.

E. (Sensible) Risk Taking

The team leader must be able to take sensible risks
which will benefit the team and the organization. Sensible risk taking requires being able to assess which benefits are attainable and how to pursue them. This, in turn, requires experience, creativity, and intuition. Risk taking also requires the courage and self-confidence to trust one's intuition and take the risk.

Along with the team leader's own risk taking, he/she should be able to create a climate for sensible risk taking among employees. Because the leader has equal status and authority as the rest of the team, team members are apt to feel more comfortable taking a risk. There is neither threat of punishment nor disapproval by an authority figure. Because all risks will not be successful, a climate which is tolerant of unsuccessful risks is essential. The factors upon which a risk is taken should be considered and evaluated in unsuccessful cases of risk taking, and improvements suggested. Sensible risks with negative outcomes cannot be denigrated. If the intention and the basis for a risk are sound, a negative outcome should not reflect negatively on the decision to take that risk.

F. Optimism

Team leaders must be optimistic. Optimism keeps morale high and encourages employees to function at their full capacity. Optimism is not just an amorphous state of mind. There are strategies which can improve and maintain optimism and morale. Team leaders should possess an optimistic state
of mind and be able to employ strategies which transfer this optimism to employees.

One of the strategies is to acknowledge what the team has attained, even when it falls somewhat below expectations. The leader should find ways to celebrate the team's victories, so that the efforts which led to success do not go unnoticed. This is more possible for a SMWT leader, whose concern is employee performance, than for a traditional supervisor, whose main concern is the 'bottom line'. Nevertheless, the team leader walks a fine line to ensure that the intensity of joy in victory is not less than that of sorrow in defeat (Cox, 1990). The team leader should ensure that this is the case, as the joy of success fuels future successes.

G. Sense of Humour

It is vital for any leader to have a sense of humour, as humour may be used very effectively for team bonding (Cox, 1990). A team without humour is tense, dull, and vapid. A leader's sense of humour can break down potential barriers between team members and the leader, and put everyone at ease.

H. Facilitation - Task Structuring

As work teams are self-managed, the main function of the team leader is to be a facilitator. This involves helping others to act on their unique strengths and refine their talents (Cox, 1990). Tremendous skills, experience,
and common sense exist in every workplace. However, they are often not capitalized upon, due to the style of management and/or the nature of the job itself. In traditional workplaces, however, jobs are often defined so narrowly that workers cannot use their brains or the training they have received (Weisbord, 1991). In SMWT environments jobs are less narrowly defined, thus giving workers a chance to excel. It is the duty of the team leader to pinpoint each member's strength(s) and capitalize on them. Team members must be able to use, develop, and be appreciated for their skills and resources.

The team leader should be able to strengthen the mix and level of skills, which include technical, functional, problem solving, decision making, interpersonal, and teamwork skills. Emphasis should also be put on developing the capability of the team. Building capability means developing the business, interpersonal, and technical abilities of the workforce far beyond the level considered adequate in traditional organizations (Fisher, 1993).

The leader should structure tasks that people can do for themselves (Weisbord, 1991). Challenge may be created by shifting assignment and role patterns (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). The leader should endeavour to remove possible crippling or demoralizing obstacles (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). The importance of ongoing learning should be valued and practised (Fisher, 1993).
I. Motivating Others

The team leader should have the ability to motivate people and keep morale high. An uninspired work team will not be successful. Tasks must be structured in a way that challenges workers. Individual or subgroup assignments that allow employees to excel while enjoying their work function to motivate team members. Another important part of energizing people is a focus on working toward goals. With clear cut goals which are challenging and attainable, workers can become more easily motivated. It is the leader's job to design these clear cut goals (part of task structuring) that are inherently motivating, or to make them seem fascinating.

In addition, in order to energize team members, the leader must be genuinely enthusiastic and motivated.

J. Enthusiasm - Vitality - Charisma

It is important for the team leader to be genuinely enthusiastic about the organization, the SMWT format, the team itself, and the work being done by the team. Vitality and charisma are needed to do good work, and to keep improving. Without enthusiasm, it is difficult to motivate team members and to create enthusiasm among them. The need for the leader to motivate team members was discussed above.

K. Setting an Example

The team leader should serve as an example of all facets of team existence, which include quality of work, interpersonal
abilities, leadership skills, business and technical savvy, morale and enthusiasm, and initiative. When a leader shows enthusiasm, courage, and a willingness to work hard, these qualities are more easily transferred to team members. Demonstrated values are more important than stated values (Fisher, 1993).

L. Initiative

Since work and work teams are self-managed, it is important for team members to take initiative. The increased level of employee autonomy must be accompanied by a responsibility for achievement in order to ensure productivity. Although ideally all members would take initiative, it is mainly the leader's responsibility to assess the potential for action (Weisbord, 1991) and to act on it accordingly. A main tenet of the SMWT philosophy is for team members to take more initiative. However, it is the leader's responsibility to ensure that this occurs. Aside from the leader him/herself taking initiative, the leader should be able to teach the skill of initiative-taking to team members.

M. Technical Expertise - Business Savvy

The team leader should possess an exceptional amount of technical expertise and business savvy. These aptitudes are essential for problem solving, task structuring, and to ensure the respect of team members. Technical expertise is also needed for the leader's coaching function. Business
savvy is needed in order to communicate with top management about business decisions, and to lead the team accordingly.

The functions of the SMWT leader and the traditional supervisor are drastically different. Some basic differences between the ideal SMWT leader and the traditional supervisor are outlined in Table 1.

As discussed briefly above, the description of the SMWT organization and team leader are idealistic. They described what a SMWT organization and team leader would resemble in theory. However, reality does not generally reflect theory in this case. What is typically found in actual organizations which have attempted to implement SMWTs is a traditional, hierarchical structure and culture with parts borrowed from applied SMWT theory.

**Background to the Current Study**

In recent years a participative style of management, and in particular, one employing SMWTs has become extremely popular (Smither, 1994). Often, organizations have 'jumped on the SMWT bandwagon' because of its popularity, and the supposed productivity and job satisfaction gains. For these reasons many organizations have attempted to implement SMWTs whether appropriate to the type of business or not. For example, in North America SMWTs are increasingly popular in manufacturing organizations such as in the automobile industry, following the Japanese examples even though the North American firms continue to use assembly-line modes of
Table 1

**Some Basic Differences Between SMWT Leaders and Traditional Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMWT Leader</th>
<th>Traditional Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspires learning and creative ideas</td>
<td>Ensures task is completed properly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates with team in creating a guiding vision</td>
<td>Creates goals and objectives for subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulls people together with a common goal</td>
<td>Creates individualized goals for subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares power with team members</td>
<td>Holds the power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages sensible risk taking and taking initiative</td>
<td>Ensures that prescribed processes are followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the team</td>
<td>Higher in the hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator who shares responsibilities</td>
<td>Authority who delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates team members with challenging tasks</td>
<td>Designs tasks for efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm to inspire other team members</td>
<td>Gets the job done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in all directions</td>
<td>One-way, top-down communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasizes feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
production. The question as to whether SMWTs are effective in an environment where tasks remain simple and repetitive has not been answered. This may be one of the reasons why many organizations which have implemented SMWTs have not achieved the increased productivity and improved employee satisfaction they had anticipated. It is possible that SMWTs may be better suited to types of work that are not so tightly regimented, such as research and development.

**Levels of Differentiation**

Differentiation between a traditional and a participative organization can be conceptualized as occurring at three different levels. The third is the upper management level. This is the most fundamental level of differentiation, which involves the implementation of the participative structure and the alteration of the organizational culture. The second level of differentiation involves the adoption of a participative style of leadership by the managers and first-level supervisors. The first level is the operational level whereby front-line participative employees work as teams with some degree of autonomy as compared to traditional workers who perform clearly defined tasks. It is the contention of this thesis that these levels are inherently inter-related. Without a change in the supervisor's leadership style, the functioning of employees cannot change. It is one belief that the functioning of employees is dependent upon the supervisor's
style of leadership, regardless of the work structures which were intended to be implemented by upper management. The implementation of participative initiatives may experience difficulty, or even fail, for several reasons - which may originate at any level of differentiation and affect each subsequent level.

The style of leadership which exists in an organization is a product of its organizational culture and overall style of management. Each organization is built upon principles and values which determine the way in which all areas and processes function within that organization. Those principles and values are the main ingredients of an organization's culture. When fundamental elements of an organization change, such as its style of leadership, the organizational culture will also be pressured to change, or will keep the leadership from being effective.

Consistent with this thesis is the research which suggests that SMWTs and other employee participation programs are not implemented in the interest of workplace democracy, but to accomplish specific corporate objectives (Magjuka & Baldwin, 1991, cited in Smither, 1994), and as a system of social control to benefit management (Grenier & Hogler, 1991). In such cases, failure of the initiative may be predicted, as the essential backing and support by top management is absent. Such practices are short-sighted, as the failure of such an initiative is likely to strain the
relationship between labour and management, especially if management is seen as the reason for failure. Without a change in organizational culture, which involves a complete reorganization, redefinition, and restructuring of the organization and its objectives, values, and methods of operation, failure of the SMWT initiative is certain. At this point, the contingency between leadership and culture becomes clearer. Key to the transformation of a culture (i.e. from traditional to participative) is leadership which pushes for, and supports such changes.

One of the greatest difficulties in implementing a SMWT style of management is the transition of the organization's style of leadership. In transforming an organization from a traditional management style to one employing SMWTs, there is a conflict between the status quo and the new style of leadership. The matter is further complicated by the nature of the change, in which there is generally a sense of loss of power by lower levels of management (Manz, Keating & Donnellon, 1990). Fearing their impending impotence and obsolescence, supervisors may work against the initiative by continuing with the status quo. The success of the operation may become undermined, as the strategies of each management style seem to be at opposite ends of a spectrum, and therefore have difficulty co-existing in the same organization.

A major difficulty in the implementation of SMWTs is
changing the way leaders lead. For example, the failure of quality circles (an early form of participation) may be attributed to the lack of support from middle management (Park & Golembiewski, 1991). Likewise, supervisory style was found to be an important predictor of outcomes in a study comparing a participative and a traditional organization (Munene & Azuka, 1991, abstract cited). Manz (1992) has asserted that the self-management which actually occurs in SMWTs is usually limited or even non-existent, due to management's inability or unwillingness to effectuate change.

Another possible explanation for the lack of success of SMWT initiatives is a lack of transformational leadership (Collins, Ross & Ross, 1989). Transformational leadership transcends traditional forms of leadership by focusing on achieving common goals and encouraging followers to accept a greater feeling of ownership of the organization and its processes. Transformational leadership, which is a style of leadership which is compatible with SMWTs, was discussed in greater detail above.

The lack of transformational leadership cited above seems to be due to a lack of training of managers and supervisors. Pasmore and Fagans (1992) have found that the participative process is not well understood, due to a lack of training and preparation by managers and employees. They found that the lack of training places limitations on the
success of participative initiatives. Lawler (1990) has cited the selection and development of managers as major weaknesses in the implementation of participative management structures. Laiken (1994) has discussed how management’s lack of training, along with employees’ lack of the necessary skills and experience with self-management has resulted in leaderless, directionless, and unsuccessful work teams.

Another reason why many SMWT initiatives are hypothesized to fail is because organizations will not change the entire organizational structure and culture to accommodate SMWTs. Instead, they will attempt to implement aspects of SMWT operation while maintaining a traditional structure and culture. Inherent in this type of setup are numerous contradictions. For example, upper management may support SMWTs for lower level employees, but be unwilling to change the hierarchical structure in the rest of the organization. As a result, two styles of management and organizational culture from opposite ends of the spectrum are expected to co-exist in the same organization.

Another source of contradiction in a traditional organization which implements only select aspects of a complete SMWT initiative are lower level supervisors or managers whose job is to manage self-managed teams. A conflict may occur between the supervisor who continues to manage from a traditional philosophy and work groups which
are supposed to have more freedom in decision-making and in the execution of their tasks. Similarly, the supervisor, unfamiliar with his/her new role and not wanting to overstep boundaries, may not provide the team with the necessary support. A conflict exists for team members due to the contradiction between the style of management of the leader and the theoretical team style. For example, the participative decision-making component of self-managed work teams will not exist in organizations which maintain a hierarchical structure. As a result, the autonomous nature of the work teams is compromised. Team members, however, are caught in the middle of diverging expectations - to be self-managing while lacking the authority to do so.

As a result of organizations implementing SMWTs with varying degrees of supervisor compatibility, four basic types, or prototypes, of work groups may be defined. These prototypes emerge from a two-by-two matrix. One dimension is the intended work group operation (also referred to as the organizational structure), defined at one end as traditional and at the other as participative. The second dimension is the leadership style of the supervisor, who supervises in an autocratic fashion or who has adopted a participative style (traditional or participative; see Table 2).

The Current Study

The current study addressed the realities which may exist in
Table 2

Matrix Depicting Four Work Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Organization</th>
<th>Leadership Style of Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>TOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>POTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contemporary manufacturing environments. Four types of working environments which correspond to the matrix are identified as potentially viable. The first is a traditionally structured organization with a traditional supervisor (TOTS). This type of scenario still exists in the majority of organizations.

The second type of working environment is a traditionally structured organization with a participative supervisor (TOPS). This type of working environment arises when a supervisor within a traditionally structured organization allows workers more autonomy in making work-related decisions. In this case, the supervisor has chosen to run his/her department with a more participative style than may be prescribed by the formal organizational hierarchy. The participation only at the lower levels in the hierarchy may also reflect an initiative which only attempted to implement some aspects of a complete SMWT initiative. Such a situation was described above, where SMWTs are implemented while the hierarchy and organizational culture remain unchanged. The contradictions and conflicts inherent in that type of situation were also outlined above.

The third type of working environment is a participatively structured organization with a traditional supervisor. This situation may arise when an organization attempted to implement a participative structure such as SMWTs, but failed to ensure that supervisors practiced
participative management. This may result from a lack of training, or resistance of the supervisor to relinquish power. In both of these cases supervisors continue to manage using traditional means when a participative management structure is supposed to be in place. Such an arrangement would make the success of the SMWT initiative unlikely, as employees' expectations of autonomy would not be implemented. This type of situation could easily breed a distrust of management, which would impact negatively on the organizational climate. (Organizational climate can be conceived of as the organizational equivalent of an individual's mood). Unfortunately, this scenario has become more popular as traditional organizations have half-heartedly 'jumped on the bandwagon' of participative workplaces without ensuring the proper training of supervisors and employees, and without altering the organizational culture. The conflicts and contradictions which arise in such cases were discussed above.

The fourth type of working environment shown in the matrix is a participative organization with a participative supervisor. This type of working environment most resembles a pure form of SMWT organization. This pure form of SMWT organization rarely exists in North America. The participative supervisor in the fourth quadrant of the matrix is depicted more like a team leader than a traditional supervisor.
The goal of this thesis was to assess the perceived effectiveness of the above types of work situations. Perceived effectiveness was operationalized in three areas; perceived overall success of the organization (SUCCESS), perceived employee satisfaction (SATISFACTION), and the perceived quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees (RELATIONSHIP).

Hypotheses and Exploratory Analyses

Participatory vs. Autocratic Style of Leadership

This hypothesis had two sub-hypotheses. The first predicted that the more open and personal style of participative supervisors would result in participative supervisors being rated as having a better relationship with employees than traditional supervisors.

The second sub-hypothesis resembled the first. The ability to affect their own work situations and possibly influence organizational decisions, along with their increased autonomy, led to the prediction that employees of participative supervisors would be perceived to be more satisfied with their jobs than employees of traditional style supervisors. This hypothesis considered the participativeness of the supervisor, and not the participative or traditional structure of the organization, to be the important factor in employees' satisfaction, as it is the supervisor's style of leadership which is considered to determine the functioning of employees, regardless of the
structure of the organization.

Combination of Supervisory Style and Structure of the Work Setting

This hypothesis was based upon the belief that respondents to the questionnaire would perceive the scenario with a participative supervisor in a participative organization (POPS) as the most favourable for employees. It builds upon the first hypothesis by predicting not only that participative supervisors would be preferred over traditional supervisors, but that a participative supervisor in a participative organization would be favoured compared to all other supervisors, including a participative supervisor in a traditional organization. This hypothesis had two parts.

a) The supervisor in scenario POPS (participative supervisors in a participative organization) would be perceived as having the best relationship with employees, as compared to the supervisors in each of the other scenarios.

b) The employees in scenario POPS would be perceived as having more job satisfaction than employees in each of the other scenarios.

Comparison of Incompatible Scenarios

This hypothesis addressed the perceived favourableness of the incompatible situations (TOPS and POTS). It is proposed that a traditional supervisor in a participative organization (POTS) would be perceived more negatively than
a participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS). The transgressions inherent in the former relationship seem to be more damaging to the organization than the latter. This is due to the nature of the style of management, where the former situation would involve an autocratic leader in a democratic environment, as opposed to a democratic leader in an autocratic environment.

It was hypothesized that the supervisor's relationship with employees, and employees' job satisfaction would each be perceived as more favourable in the incompatible scenario TOPS (traditional organization, participative supervisor) as compared to the incompatible scenario POTS (participative organization, traditional supervisor).

Effect of Compatibility on Perceptions of Success

The compatibility of the leadership style of a supervisor and the structure of the organization in which he/she works, may be expected to lead to greater efficiency of production due to a relative lack of confusion, contradiction, and conflict over leadership issues. The issue of compatibility may not usually be a factor, as organizations tend to hire supervisors and managers whose style is congruent with that of the organization. However, when an organization changes its structure, culture, and style of management, the issue of compatibility of leadership styles with existing supervisors becomes relevant.
Due to the conflicts and contradictions inherent in organizations where supervisors' leadership style is incompatible with the work team's intended mode of functioning, it is thought that productivity would be perceived to suffer. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is that organizations described in scenarios with supervisors whose leadership style was compatible with the structure of the organization [traditional organization/traditional supervisor (TOTS) and participative organization/participative supervisor (POPS)] would be perceived to be more effective in terms of productivity and overall success (SUCCESS) than organizations described in scenarios in which the supervisor's leadership style is incompatible with the organizational structure (TOPS and POTS). More precisely, this hypothesis had three parts:

a) For dependent variable SUCCESS, the organization described in scenario TOTS (compatible traditional) would be scored significantly higher than each of the organizations in scenarios TOPS and POTS (both incompatible).

b) The organization in scenario POPS (compatible participative) would be perceived as more successful than each of the organizations in scenarios TOPS and POTS (both incompatible).

c) Due to its focus on efficiency, the compatible organization in scenario TOTS would be perceived as more successful than the compatible organization in scenario
POPS.

Effect of Work Experience

Respondents' work experience was viewed as a possible factor which could affect perceptions of participative and traditional supervisors and organizations. This analysis explored how respondents' four potential types of work experience (management experience only, management and non-management experience, non-management experience only, or no work experience) would impact on their responses to the questionnaire.

Effect of Union Membership

Organizations do not exist in a vacuum. Factors such as unions often influence organizational functioning. Unions in North America have typically taken a position opposing participative management, with the view that participative management functions to exploit lower level employees by increasing their level of responsibility. Such a position may influence the attitudes of people who are or have been members of union, to one that is opposed to participative management. This analysis explored whether respondents' membership or non-membership in a union affected their responses to the questionnaire.

Effect of Willingness to Join a Union

It is often the case that employees do not have the choice to join a union or not to join a union. For numerous reasons an employee may not opt out of a union if given the
choice. In other cases, a union may not exist for one to join (or from which to opt out). Therefore simple union membership may not reveal much about respondents' attitudes toward participative management. Categorizing respondents by their willingness to join a union avoids possible difficulties of assessing responses based simply on union membership, by assessing respondents' choice to align themselves with union attitudes. This analysis explored whether respondents' willingness to join a union had a systematic effect on their responses to the questionnaire.

**Effect of Major Discipline of Study**

Students may acquire certain types of political attitudes from different fields of study, or from different departments within an academic institution. Alternatively, students may self-select themselves into their major fields of study in part based on the congruence of their political attitudes. Perhaps both influences are working simultaneously. In any case, attitudes toward traditional and participative styles of management may reveal systematic influences according to students' major discipline of study. This analysis explored whether responses to the questionnaire were systematically affected according to respondents' major discipline of university study.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Respondents

Respondents to the questionnaire were 172 students at the University of Windsor, in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. Respondents were recruited through several classes in the Department of Psychology and the Faculty of Business Administration. Three fields of study were represented by the majority of the respondents - Business (n=67), Psychology (n=32), and Engineering (n=22). However, respondents' major field of study spanned 25 different disciplines, including those who had not yet declared a major.

The respondents consisted of 88 males and 82 females, with two respondents not reported. Respondents ranged in age from 20 years to 61 years, with a mean of 25.54 years (sd=6.84). Four respondents did not report their age. Respondents' total years of work experience ranged from 0 to 43 years, with a mean of 8.42 years (sd=6.10). Eight respondents did not report their years of work experience. Respondents differed on the types of work experience they had: 12 had only management experience; 74 had both management and non-management experience; 81 had only non-management experience, and 2 had no work experience
whatsoever. Three respondents failed to report their types of work experience.

**Measures**

Respondents completed a questionnaire (see Appendix) designed to probe attitudes on three dependent variables toward four scenarios: a traditionally structured organization with a traditional supervisor (TOTS), a traditionally structured organization with a participative supervisor (TOPS), a participatively structured organization with a traditional supervisor (POTS), a participatively structured organization with a participative supervisor (POPS). Each scenario was presented on a separate page, and was accompanied by an identical set of 14 questions. The order of presentation of the scenarios within the booklets was randomized to avoid any systematic biases in responding. All questions were answered on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 representing "not at all", 4 representing "somewhat", and 7 representing "very much so".

There were 3 questions (Items 5, 13, and 14 - see Appendix) designed to assess respondents' perceptions of the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees (RELATIONSHIP). More precisely, the items probed respondents' perceptions of the extent to which employees "like", "truly respect", and "get along with" the supervisor.

There were 4 questions (Items 6, 7, 8, and 9) designed
to assess respondents' perceptions of achievement of productivity goals and overall success of the organization, and of the particular work groups under consideration (SUCCESS).

There were 3 questions (Items 10, 11, and 12) which were designed to assess respondents' perceptions of employees' job satisfaction (SATISFACTION). Specifically, items probed perceived rates of absenteeism and turnover, and questioned directly perceptions of job satisfaction.

The first four items for each scenario functioned as manipulation checks. These are described further in the Results section. Demographic information was collected on the sixth page of the questionnaire (see Appendix).

**Procedure**

Questionnaires were administered by the researcher in the respondents' classes. All questionnaires were completed during class time. In each class visited, after being introduced by the classroom teacher as a Master's student from the Department of Psychology of the University of Windsor who was collecting data for his Master's thesis, the researcher proceeded with the following greeting and set of instructions:

First of all, I'd like to clear up one thing. Although I'm from the Department of Psychology, don't worry, I'm not going to psychoanalyze you. This questionnaire deals with industrial/organizational psychology. There are no right or wrong answers. It's your opinions that are important. There are four scenarios that you'll be
answering questions about. The information provided for each scenario may seem limited, but do your best to give an opinion based on what's there. Participation is voluntary. The questionnaire should take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete, but take as much time as you need. If you choose to participate, please read the cover page carefully, and tear it off and keep it for future reference. Answer all questions individually and honestly. When you're finished, raise your hand and I'll collect the questionnaire from you. Are there any questions?...I'd like to thank you in advance for your time and cooperation, and I'd like to thank [name of professor] for allowing me to come in today.

Respondents were allowed as much time as necessary to complete the questionnaire. This generally took 10 to 15 minutes. No rewards were given for responding to the questionnaire. As described on the Statement of Informed Consent on the cover page of the questionnaire, returning the completed questionnaire to the researcher was considered as the respondent giving consent for participation.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Reliabilities

The reliabilities for the entire questionnaire, for each scenario, and for each dependent variable within each scenario, were tested in order to assess the questionnaire's internal consistency, that is, whether the items were homogeneous (Kerlinger, 1986), or measuring a common entity (Norusis, 1993). Reliability values reported are Cronbach alpha coefficients.

Cronbach's alpha may be interpreted as the correlation between a test or scale "and all other possible tests or scales containing the same number of items, which could be constructed from a hypothetical universe of items that measure the characteristic of interest" (Norusis, 1993, p. 147). Cronbach's alpha may also be interpreted as "the squared correlation between the score a person obtains on a particular scale (the observed score) and the score [that person] would have obtained if questioned on all of the possible items in the universe (the true score)" (Norusis, 1993, p. 147, emphases in original, brackets added).

Reliabilities are reported in Table 3. Cronbach's alpha for the entire questionnaire is .88.
Table 3
Cronbach Alpha Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED DEPENDENT VARIABLES</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 172
Manipulation Checks

Four manipulation checks were conducted for each scenario to ensure that the scenarios were perceived as portraying the intended situation. The manipulation checks assessed the perceptions of the compatibility of the leadership style of the supervisor and the structure of the organization, the person-orientedness as opposed to the task-orientedness of the supervisor, the supervisor's tendency to establish healthy relationships with employees, and the willingness of the organization to reward employees' creativity.

Identical manipulation checks were conducted for each scenario. Manipulation checks were questions 1-4 for each scenario (see Appendix).

Check of Compatibility

The first manipulation check assessed respondents' perceptions of the compatibility of the supervisor's management style with that of the organization. For the manipulation of compatibility to be considered successful, scenarios designed to portray compatible situations (TOTS and POPS) would each be perceived significantly more compatible than scenarios designed to portray incompatible situations (TOPS and POTS). Planned comparisons were tested using paired-samples t-tests with Bonferroni correction. Each of the planned comparisons was found to be statistically significant (TOTS>TOPS, t(1,171)=15.71,
\[ p < .001; \text{TOTS}\text{>POTS, } t(1,171)=9.77, p < .001; \text{POPS}\text{>TOPS, } t(1,171)=19.65, p < .001; \text{POPS}\text{>POTS, } t(1,171)=13.71, p < .001, \]

thus providing evidence that scenarios intended to be compatible were perceived as significantly more compatible than scenarios intended to be incompatible (see Tables 4 and 5).

Check of Perceptions of Supervisors' People-Orientedness

The second manipulation check assessed the descriptions of supervisors intended to be portrayed as traditional and participative. Respondents were asked to rate traditional and participative types of supervisors on their perceived orientation toward tasks as opposed to people. For this manipulation to be successful, supervisors portrayed as traditional would be perceived as significantly more task-oriented than would those portrayed as participative. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to test this manipulation. The main effect for SUPERVISOR was found to be statistically significant \([F(1,167)=201.57, p < .001]\) with traditional supervisors perceived to be more task-oriented than the participative supervisor.

Check of Perceptions of Healthy Relationship Development

The third manipulation check, like the second, assessed the quality of the scenarios' distinction between types of supervisors. This manipulation check was based on respondents' interpretations of the scenarios, which intended to convey that participative supervisors are more
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for
Ratings of Compatibility for Each Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTS</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPS</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTS</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the score, the greater the perceived compatibility
Table 5

Planned Comparison of Mean Ratings of Compatibility Paired-Samples t-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Comparison</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTS &gt; TOPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTS &gt; POTS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>9.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; TOPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>19.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; POTS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>13.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.
focused on developing healthy relationships with employees than are traditional supervisors. For each scenario, respondents were asked "To what extent do you think [the supervisor] is focused on developing healthy relationships with his employees?" (Item 3, see Appendix). A repeated measures ANOVA was employed to assess the manipulation. The main effect for SUPERVISOR was found to be significant ($\xi(1,168)=467.05, p<.001$) with means indicating that participative supervisors were perceived to be more focused on developing healthy relationships with employees than were traditional supervisors.

Check of Perceptions of Organizational Rewarding of Creativity

This manipulation check assessed the descriptions of the types of organization (traditional or participative). For this manipulation to be considered successful, the descriptions of the organizations would lead respondents to interpret participative organizations as more likely to reward creativity by lower-level employees. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to test this manipulation. The main effect for ORGANIZATION was significant, $\xi(1,163)=268.73, p<.001$, with means indicating that participative organizations were perceived to be more likely to reward creativity by lower level employees than were traditional organizations.
Summary of Manipulation Check Results

In summary, the manipulation checks employed to assess the quality of the descriptions within the scenarios were successful. Scenarios in which the type of supervisor was intended to be compatible with the type of organization (TOTS and POPS) were interpreted as significantly more compatible than scenarios in which the supervisor was intended to be incompatible with the type of organization (TOTS and POPS). As well, the descriptions of the supervisors were able to convey that traditional supervisors are more task-oriented than are participative supervisors, and that participative supervisors are more focused on developing healthy relationships with employees than are traditional supervisors. The descriptions of the organizations were able to convey that participative organizations are more likely to reward creativity by lower level employees than are traditional organizations.

Results for Hypotheses

Questionnaire items were aggregated into three dependent variables. For each dependent variable the items were averaged to produce a single score. Items 5, 13, and 14 were designed to assess perceptions of the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees (see Appendix). They were combined to produce the dependent variable which is referred to as RELATIONSHIP. Items 10, 11, and 12 were designed to measure perceptions of
employees' job satisfaction. This dependent variable is called SATISFACTION. Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 were designed to assess perceptions of overall success and the likelihood of meeting productivity goals. These perceptions were assessed for the specific group of employees under consideration and for the organization as a whole. This dependent variable is termed SUCCESS.

The correlations between the dependent variables (RELATIONSHIP, SATISFACTION, and SUCCESS) for the entire questionnaire are shown in Table 6. The mean intercorrelations of the three dependent variables for each scenario are reported in Table 7. Due to the fairly high correlations between the dependent variables, a MANOVA was conducted to analyze the data in lieu of separate ANOVAs, as the MANOVA takes such intercorrelations into account.

Participatory vs. Autocratic Style of Leadership

A two-way within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA with SUPERVISOR (traditional and participative) and ORGANIZATION (traditional and participative) as independent variables, and quality of the relationship between supervisor and employees (RELATIONSHIP), employee satisfaction (SATISFACTION), and overall success including productivity (SUCCESS) as dependent variables, was used to test both sub-hypotheses within Hypothesis 1 (see Table 8).

The first sub-hypothesis predicted a main effect for SUPERVISOR for the dependent variable RELATIONSHIP, with
Table 6

Correlations Across Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SATISFACTION</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SUCCESS</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001
N=172

Table 7

Mean Intercorrelations of RELATIONSHIP, SATISFACTION, and SUCCESS by Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Mean Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTS</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPS</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTS</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=172

Note. p<.001 for each correlation used to calculate mean
participative supervisors being rated as having a better relationship with employees than traditional supervisors. Univariate F values provided support for the main effect \([F(1, 171)=352.24, p<.001; \text{see Table 9}].\) The means show that RELATIONSHIP ratings were higher for participative supervisors (see Table 10).

The second sub-hypothesis predicted a significant main effect for SUPERVISOR for the dependent variable SATISFACTION, with employees of participative supervisors perceived to be more satisfied with their jobs than employees of traditional style supervisors. Evidence from the univariate F test supported this hypothesis, as the main effect for SUPERVISOR was significant for the dependent variable SATISFACTION \([F(1, 171)=278.36, p<.001] \) (see Table 9). Means showed that SATISFACTION ratings were higher for participative supervisors (see Table 10).

**Combination of Supervisory Style and Structure of Work Setting**

a) The first part of the hypothesis stated that the supervisor in scenario POPS (participative supervisors in a participative organization) would be perceived as "getting along with", and being liked and truly respected by, employees (RELATIONSHIP) more than the supervisors in each of the other scenarios. Planned comparisons were evaluated with paired-samples t-tests using Bonferroni F (see Table 11; Means and standard deviations for all dependent...
### Table 8

**MANOVA for Dependent Variables RELATIONSHIP, SATISFACTION, and SUCCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Hotelling's $T^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>27.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>123.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>8.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.001$

**df:** (3, 169)
Table 9

Univariate F-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>18.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>64.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>353.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>278.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>83.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>7.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>8.11**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

** p < .01

\textit{df}: (1, 171)
Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations for All Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Style of Supervisor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the score, the greater the perceived amount.

N=172
variables in all scenarios are in Table 10). In agreement with the hypothesis, the supervisor in scenario POPS (M=5.69) was rated significantly higher in RELATIONSHIP than the supervisors in scenarios TOTS, [M=3.51; M_{POPS}-M_{TOTS}=2.18; t(1,171)=17.47, p<.001], and POTS [M=3.70, M_{POPS}-M_{TOTS}=1.99; t(1,171)=15.62, p<.001]. However, the relationship between supervisors and employees in scenarios POPS (M=5.69) and TOPS (M=5.70) was not perceived as significantly different [M_{POPS}-M_{TOPS}=-.01; t(1,171)=-.14, p>.001]. The description of the supervisor in scenarios POPS and TOPS was identical (except for the initials used for identification - see questionnaire in Appendix) as both involve a participative supervisor. [This result suggests that there may be an over-riding effect of style of supervisor regardless of the type of organization.]

b) The second part of the hypothesis stated that employees in scenario POPS would be perceived as having more job satisfaction, less turnover, and less absenteeism (SATISFACTION) than employees in each of the other scenarios. Planned comparisons revealed similar results to those found for the first part of this hypothesis (see Table 11). Employees in scenario POPS (M=5.50) were perceived as having more job satisfaction than employees in scenarios TOTS [M=3.26, M_{POPS}-M_{TOTS}=2.24; t(1,171)=17.50, p<.001] and POTS [M=3.73, M_{POPS}-M_{POTS}=1.77; t(1,171)=13.31, p<.001]. There was no significant difference between employees' perceived
satisfaction in situations POPS and TOPS [M=5.35, M_{TOPS} - M_{POPS} = .15; t(1,171)=1.61, p>.10]. [As in Hypothesis 2a, the lack of a difference between scenarios POPS and TOPS may be attributed to the perception of greater influence on employees of type of supervisors than type of organization.]

Comparison of Incompatible Scenarios

It was hypothesized that the supervisor's ability to "get along with" employees, and employees' liking and true respect for the supervisor (RELATIONSHIP), and employees' job satisfaction, turnover and absenteeism rates (SATISFACTION) would be perceived as more favourable in scenario TOPS (traditional organization, participative supervisor), as compared to the scenario POTS (participative organization, traditional supervisor), each of which were intended to be incompatible. The planned comparison paired-samples t-test using Bonferroni corrected t supported the hypothesis for dependent variable RELATIONSHIP [M_{TOPS}=5.70, M_{POTS}=3.70, M_{TOPS} - M_{POTS} = 2.00; t(1,171)=15.34, p<.001]. The hypothesis was also supported for SATISFACTION [M_{TOPS}=5.35, M_{POTS}=3.73, M_{TOPS} - M_{POTS} = 1.62; t(1,171)=11.23, p<.001].

Employees of a participative supervisor in a traditional organization had more job satisfaction and a better relationship with their supervisor than employees of a traditional supervisor in a participative organization.

Effect of Compatibility on Perceptions of Success

The first hypothesis stated that organizations
Table 11

Planned Comparison Paired Samples t-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Comparison</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; TOTS</td>
<td>17.47*</td>
<td>17.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; TOPS</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; POTS</td>
<td>15.62*</td>
<td>13.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( df = 171 \) for all cases

\*p < .001
described in compatible scenarios (TOTS and POPS) would be perceived to be more effective in terms of productivity and overall success (SUCCESS) than organizations described in incompatible scenarios (TOPS and POTS). More precisely, this hypothesis had three parts;

a) The organization described in scenario TOTS (compatible) would be perceived as significantly more successful than each of the organizations in scenarios TOPS and POTS (both incompatible). Paired-samples t-tests with Bonferroni correction were conducted to test all planned comparisons in Hypothesis 4. Opposite to the hypothesis, the organization in scenario TOTS (M=4.44) was perceived as significantly less successful than each of the organizations in scenarios TOPS (M=5.08, M_{TOTS}-M_{TOPS}=.64; t(1,171)=-6.50, \(p<.001\)) and POTS (M=4.79, M_{TOTS}-M_{POTS}=-.35; t(1,171)=-4.03, \(p<.001\); see Table 12). Table 10 shows means and standard deviations for all dependent variables in all scenarios;

b) It was also hypothesized that the organization in scenario POPS (compatible) would be perceived as more successful than each of the organizations in scenarios TOPS and POTS (both incompatible). The hypotheses were supported by the data [POPS(M=5.74) > TOPS(M=5.08), M_{POPS}-M_{TOPS}=.66; t(1,171)=8.38, \(p<.001\); POPS(M=5.74) > POTS(M=4.79, M_{POPS}-M_{POTS}=.95; t(1,171)=8.94, \(p<.001\)]. The organization in the compatible scenario POPS was perceived as being more successful than the organizations in both incompatible
scenarios;

c) The organization in scenario TOTS (M=4.44) would be perceived as more successful than the organization in scenario POPS (M=5.74). The opposite was found to be significant [M_{TOTS}-M_{POPS}=-1.30; t(1,171)=-11.21, p<.001]. The organization in the compatible scenario TOTS was perceived to be less successful than the organization in the compatible scenario POPS.

Summary of Hypothesis Results

As predicted, participative supervisors were perceived as having a better relationship with employees than were traditional supervisors. As well, employees of participative supervisors were perceived as having more job satisfaction than employees of traditional supervisors.

It was hypothesized that the supervisor in scenario POPS would be perceived as having the best relationship with employees. This supervisor's RELATIONSHIP ratings were significantly higher than those for traditional supervisors in scenarios TOTS and POTS. However, no difference was found in RELATIONSHIP ratings between the participative supervisors in scenarios POPS and TOPS. These results essentially reiterate the main effect for SUPERVISOR discussed above. Identical results were found for a similar hypothesis involving SATISFACTION. Although expected to be perceived as having the most job satisfaction of all, employees in scenario POPS were perceived to be more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Comparison</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTS &gt; TOPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-6.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTS &gt; POTS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-4.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; TOPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS &gt; POTS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTS &gt; POPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-11.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .001$
satisfied than employees in scenario TOTS and POTS, but not more satisfied than employees in scenario TOPS. Again, these results reiterate those found for the main effect of SUPERVISOR for the dependent variable SATISFACTION. These results are comprehensible, as the descriptions of the participative supervisors in scenarios POPS and TOPS were identical (except for identification initials).

As hypothesized, it was found that employees of a participative supervisor in a traditional organization were perceived as having more job satisfaction and a better relationship with their supervisor than employees of a traditional supervisor in a participative organization.

The results of the fourth hypothesis indicated that, contrary to the hypothesis, the organization in scenario TOTS (compatible) was perceived as less successful and productive than the organizations in the incompatible scenarios TOPS and POTS. However, in agreement with the hypothesis, the organization described in compatible scenario POPS was perceived as being more successful and productive than both of the organizations in the incompatible scenarios. Among the compatible scenarios, the organization described in scenario TOTS was hypothesized to be perceived as more successful than the organization described in scenario POPS (and hence, it was hypothesized to be the most successful). The results indicated just the opposite - that the organization described in scenario TOTS
was perceived to be the least successful and productive of all, despite its concentration on efficiency.

**Effect of Work Experience**

This analysis explored how respondents' four potential types of past or present work experience (management experience only, management and non-management experience, only non-management experience, or no work experience) would impact on their responses to the questionnaire. Type of work experience was introduced into the MANOVA used for the first hypothesis as a between-subjects variable. None of the effects involving respondents' type of work experience was statistically significant at the .05 level.

Categories were then collapsed to compare respondents who had had management experience with respondents who had not had management experience. None of the collapsed analyses for type of work was significant.

**Effect of Union Membership**

This analysis explored whether respondents' membership or non-membership in a union affected their responses to the questionnaire. Respondents' past or present union membership (yes or no) was entered into the MANOVA from the first hypothesis as a between-subjects independent variable. None of the effects involving respondents' union membership was statistically significant.

**Effect of Willingness to Join a Union (JOINUNION)**

This analysis explored whether respondents' willingness
to join a union had a systematic effect on their responses to the questionnaire. Respondents' willingness to join a union (yes, uncertain, or no) was entered into the MANOVA from the first hypothesis as a between-subjects independent variable. All effects involving willingness to join a union were found to be non-significant, except for the interaction between respondents' willingness to join a union and the type of organizational structure \( F(6,322) = 2.33, p<.05; \) see Table 13]. Univariate \( F \) values revealed a significant effect for the dependent variable which assessed the perceptions of the relationship between the supervisor and employees (RELATIONSHIP) \( F(2,164) = 3.58, p<.05; \) see Table 14]. Means for the interaction are in Table 15.

Effect of Major Discipline of Study (MAJOR)

This analysis explored whether responses to the questionnaire were systematically affected according to respondents' major discipline of university study. Analyses were conducted only for respondents whose major was Psychology (\( n=32 \)), Business (\( n=67 \)), or Engineering (\( n=22 \)) as all other disciplines were represented by an insufficiently low number of respondents (\( n<6 \)). However, the three academic disciplines included in the analysis represent diverse areas of study.

Respondents' major discipline of study (Psychology, Business, or Engineering) was entered into the MANOVA used for the first hypothesis as a between-subjects independent
Table 13

MANOVA for Respondents' Willingness to Join a Union

(JOINUNION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Hotelling's $T^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOINUNION</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINUNION X ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINUNION X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINUNION X ORGANIZATION X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

$df = (6, 322)$
Table 14

Univariate F for the Interaction Effect of Respondents' Willingness to Join a Union (JOINUNION) X ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>2, 164</td>
<td>3.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>2, 164</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>2, 164</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 15
Means for the Interaction of Willingness to Join a Union (JOINUNION) X ORGANIZATION for the Dependent Variable RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Join a Union</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain(^b)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No(^c)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\): N=67
\(^b\): N=72
\(^c\): N=28
variable. The only significant effect involving major area of study was the three-way interaction of major, type of organizational structure, and type of supervisor \( F(6, 230) = 2.72, p < .05 \); see Table 16]. The univariate \( F \) values for the three-way interaction revealed a significant result for the dependent variable which assessed the perceptions of attainment of productivity goals and overall success of the supervisor's employees and of the entire organization (SUCCESS) [univariate \( F(2, 118) = 5.74, p < .005 \); see Table 17].

**Effect of Gender**

While there was no theoretical reason to expect differences between responses from male and female respondents the potential influence was nevertheless analyzed in a MANOVA. Gender of respondents was introduced into the MANOVA used for the first hypothesis as a between-subjects independent variable. A significant result was found for the main effect of respondent gender \( F(3, 166) = 4.28, p < .01 \); see Table 18]. Significant differences were found between the responses of the genders for dependent variables RELATIONSHIP [univariate \( F(1, 168) = 8.50, p < .005 \)] and SUCCESS [univariate \( F(1, 168) = 9.47, p < .005 \); see Table 19]. Overall, female respondents rated RELATIONSHIP and SUCCESS higher than did males (see Table 20 for means and standard deviations).
**Table 16**

**MANOVA for Major Discipline of Study (MAJOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Hotelling's $T^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR X ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR X ORGANIZATION X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$

$df=(6,230)$
Table 17

Univariate F for MAJOR X ORGANIZATION X SUPERVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>2, 118</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>2, 118</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>2, 118</td>
<td>5.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .005
Table 18

MANOVA for Gender of Respondent (GENDER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Hotelling's $T^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$

$df = (3, 166)$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>8.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESS</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>9.47*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .005
Table 20

Overall Means and Standard Deviations for RELATIONSHIP and SUCCESS, by Gender of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: N=88

b: N=82
Analysis of Perceived Compatibility of Incompatible Scenarios

From the data gathered for the Check of Compatibility, which assessed the compatibility of the supervisor with the organization, a paired-samples t-test was conducted comparing scenarios TOPS and POTS, each of which was intended to be incompatible. Results revealed that a traditional supervisor in a participative organization (POTS, $M=3.52$) was rated as significantly more compatible than a participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS, $M=2.61$, $M_{POTS}-M_{TOPS}=.91$; $t(1,171)=5.35$, $p<.001$; see Table 4 for means and standard deviations).

Interaction of Type of Organizational Structure and Type of Supervisor

From data gathered for the first hypothesis, the univariate F-tests from the repeated measures MANOVA revealed a significant interaction effect between SUPERVISOR and ORGANIZATION for dependent variables SATISFACTION and SUCCESS (see Table 9).

Relative Importance of the Supervisor and the Organization for Perceptions of Success

A comparison of the SUCCESS ratings for the scenario depicting a traditional supervisor in a participatively structured organization (POTS), with the scenario depicting a participative supervisor in a traditionally structured organization (TOPS), revealed higher ratings for the latter
scenario \( t(1,171) = 2.97, p < .005 \); see Table 10 for means].
The traditionally structured organization with the participative supervisor was perceived as more successful than the participatively structured organization with the traditional supervisor.

Comparisons between all other scenarios were performed for the fourth hypothesis. All comparisons were statistically significant (see Table 12). An examination of the means for all scenarios revealed higher ratings for those with a participative supervisor (see Table 10).

**Perceptions of Scenario TOTS**

As previously noted in the second hypothesis, employees in scenario POPS were perceived to be the most satisfied. Further examination of the data revealed that employees in scenario TOTS were perceived to be the least satisfied (see Table 21).
Table 21

Paired Samples t-Test for Dependent Variable

SATISFACTION Using Bonferroni Corrected t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTS, TOPS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-16.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTS, POTS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTS, POPS*</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-17.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: comparison TOTS, POPS was also reported in Table 11.

*p< .001
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Discussion of Hypotheses, Exploratory Analyses, 
and Other Notable Results

Participatory vs. Autocratic Style of Leadership

The results from this hypothesis support the notion 
that a participatory style of supervision is favoured over 
an autocratic style. These results indicated that 
respondents perceived that employees with a participative 
supervisor would have higher job satisfaction and a better 
relationship with their supervisor than would employees with 
a traditional supervisor, regardless of the type of work 
group setting.

By favouring participative over autocratic supervisors, 
regardless of whether the organization had instituted 
participative or autocratic work settings, respondents seem 
to have indicated that the supervisor's style of leadership 
can transcend the structure of the work environment. One 
interpretation of these findings is that respondents 
perceived actual worker participation to be influenced more 
by the leadership style of the supervisor than by the 
theoretical structure of the work setting. Thus, if a 
supervisor uses a participative leadership style, workers
will be solicited for feedback and allowed input into decisions. Settings where the supervisor uses an autocratic leadership style will result in top-down decision making, even if the organization has decreed a "work team" setup. The supervisor may be perceived as determining the functioning of the employees because the supervisor has more impact on employees than the theoretical structure or wishes of top management of the organization.

Nevertheless, the organization of the work force does appear to be a factor on employee satisfaction. Employees in participatively structured work settings were perceived to have higher job satisfaction than employees in traditional organizations, regardless of the style of the supervisor. These results seem to indicate that even if a supervisor leads in an autocratic manner, the participative structure of the organization will allow for greater job satisfaction than a totally traditional organization. The relative importance of the supervisor's leadership style and the organizational structure for job satisfaction is addressed in the next two hypotheses.

Combination of Supervisory Style and Structure of the Work Setting

Respondents were expected to favour participative supervisors and organizations over traditional ones. Therefore the combination of a participative supervisor in a participatively structured organization was expected to be
the most favoured scenario. This hypothesis proposed that the combination of the structure of the organization and the type of supervisor has a cumulative effect on job satisfaction. Whereas the first hypothesis predicted that employees with a participative supervisor would be perceived as having a better relationship with their supervisor, and more job satisfaction than employees with a traditional supervisor, this hypothesis predicted that employees with a participative supervisor in a participative organization would be perceived as having an even better relationship with their supervisor as well as the highest job satisfaction. This expectation was partially confirmed.

For both relationship with employees and employee satisfaction, the scenario with a participative supervisor in a participatively structured organization (POPS) was rated significantly higher than both scenarios with traditional supervisors (TOTS and POTS), but not higher than the scenario involving a participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS).

This finding reinforces one previous interpretation with regard to the over-riding influence of the supervisor on the actual degree of participation in a work setting. Thus, there was no difference in perceived quality of the relationship between employees and the supervisor, and in perceived employee satisfaction, when the supervisory style was the same (POPS and TOPS).
The results from this hypothesis - employees in a participative organization with a participative supervisor (POPS) were perceived as having more job satisfaction and a better relationship with their supervisor than employees of a traditional supervisor (TOTS, POTS), but no difference was found between scenarios with participative supervisors (POPS and TOPS) - essentially reiterate the results from the first hypothesis, which found significantly higher ratings for participative as compared to traditional supervisors, when considering employees' relationship with the supervisor and employee satisfaction. As found for the first hypothesis, the results indicated respondents' higher RELATIONSHIP and SATISFACTION ratings for scenarios in which the supervisor was participative as opposed to traditional, regardless of the work group structure.

The perceptions of job satisfaction and the quality of the relationship between employees and the supervisor were examined for each scenario separately. These results indicated that the scenarios in which employees were perceived to have the highest job satisfaction and the best relationship with the supervisor were those involving participative supervisors (TOPS and POPS). The least favoured scenarios were those portrayed with a traditional supervisor (TOTS and POTS; see Table 10 for means). Because the leadership style of the supervisor and not the work group structure was the factor which divided the scenarios
with the highest and lowest ratings of job satisfaction, the leadership style of the supervisor may be considered as more meaningful than the work group structure with regard to job satisfaction. As discussed earlier, the work group structure was not a factor in perceptions of the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees. **Comparison of Incompatible Scenarios**

This hypothesis predicted that employees in the incompatible scenario involving a participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS) would have a better relationship with their supervisor, and more job satisfaction, than employees in the incompatible scenario involving a traditional supervisor in a participative organization (POTS). This hypothesis was supported.

This hypothesis, in essence, directly assessed the perceived relative importance of the leadership style of the supervisor and the work group structure, when considering employees' job satisfaction. (The work group structure was found not to be a factor when considering employees' relationship with the supervisor; see Table 9). From the first hypothesis, employees were perceived to have greater job satisfaction with a participative style of supervision rather than a traditional style, regardless of the structure of the organization. However, employees in a participatively structured organization were perceived as having more job satisfaction than employees in a traditionally structured
organization, regardless of the leadership style of the supervisor. By comparing the scenario comprising a participative supervisor in a traditionally structured organization (TOPS) with a scenario which included a traditional supervisor in a participatively structured organization (POTS), it was possible to assess whether the participativeness of the supervisor, or the participative structure of the organization was of more consequence in respondents' perceptions of job satisfaction. Since the results favoured the participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS) over the traditional supervisor in a participative organization (POTS), it suggests that having a participative supervisor is more important for perceptions of employee satisfaction than having a participatively structured organization.

The results for this hypothesis can be interpreted in the context of the findings for the two previous hypotheses. As discussed for the first hypothesis, ratings of the relationship between employees and the supervisor and ratings of job satisfaction, were higher for scenarios with participative supervisors than for scenarios with traditional supervisors, regardless of whether the work environment was structured participatively or traditionally. The findings for the second hypothesis suggested that respondents were more influenced by the style of supervision than by the structure of the organization.
The third hypothesis was intended to compare two incompatible situations, that is, situations in which the style of the supervisor was mismatched with that of the work setting. However, when the findings are interpreted in the context of the first two hypotheses, it appears that this hypothesis only reinforced the previous finding, that the supervisory style has a determining influence on worker satisfaction and relationships. Therefore, the finding that the RELATIONSHIP and SATISFACTION ratings for scenario TOPS (participative supervisor) were higher than for scenario POTS (traditional supervisor) is entirely consistent.

One interpretation of these findings is that the leadership style of the supervisor may be more consequential than the structure of the organization. As noted previously, a participative supervisor may engender participation among the workforce, while an autocratic supervisor will not allow participation, even though the structure and directives of the organization mandate it. In other words, the supervisor was seen as having a greater impact on employees than the organization as a whole, and this is consistent with the anecdotal evidence about the introduction of work groups in environments where supervisors are not trained to function as participative leaders.

**Effect of Compatibility on Perceptions of Success**

This hypothesis proposed that scenarios in which the
style of supervision was compatible with the structure of the work environment would be perceived as more successful because of the relative lack of contradiction and confusion in the functioning of the organization.

The results from this hypothesis suggested that the compatibility of the organization and the supervisor did not influence perceptions of the organization's success. Since the organization described in the compatible scenario TOTS was perceived to be the least successful, and the organization in compatible scenario POPS was perceived to be the most successful, it is clear that the compatibility of the situation does not systematically affect perceptions of success. In other words, just because the supervisor's style of leadership is compatible with the structure of the organization does not mean that it will be more likely to be perceived as more or less successful than an organization depicted in a scenario with an incompatible supervisor.

Although the compatibility of the scenarios was not a relevant factor, the style of leadership practiced by the supervisor, and the structure of the organization were viewed as important when assessing the success of organizations (see Table 9). Results revealed that workers with participative supervisors were perceived as more successful than employees with traditional supervisors, regardless of the intended work group environment. Also, participatively structured organizations were perceived as
more successful than traditionally structured organizations, regardless of the leadership style of the supervisor (see Table 10 for means).

These results suggest that participative management is viewed as the best alternative in a manufacturing organization (as depicted in the vignettes), regardless of the nature of the organization's task. Clearly, respondents feel that employees are happier in an environment where they have autonomy and can take part in decision making. This may occur when there is a supervisor who encourages participation or in a setting where self-managed work teams have been established. It appears as if respondents are more positive when the supervisor encourages the participation than if the participation is merely dictated by the organization. Interestingly, however, the combination of a participative supervisor and participative setting is not perceived as more satisfactory than the participative supervisor alone.

Even though the traditional description may well be more efficient for an organization's production (such as the manufacturing organization depicted in the vignettes) the results suggest otherwise. Respondents to the questionnaire deemed this situation the least productive of all situations presented. For example, the organization depicted in scenario TOTS was perceived as least successful and productive, despite its theoretical focus on efficiency. It
is possible that respondents' reactions to the scenarios reflect the current trend which favours participative structures and devalues traditional authoritative structures (sometimes even when a traditional approach would be more feasible). These results have particular significance when one considers that the respondents are employees or future employees.

Summary of Hypotheses

The results revealed that respondents perceived participative as opposed to traditional supervisors and work environments to lead to higher job satisfaction and success. Also, the quality of employees' relationship with the supervisor was perceived to be higher when the supervisor led in a participative as opposed to a traditional style. Respondents viewed the supervisor's leadership style as more important than the structure of the working environment for perceptions of the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees and for perceptions of employees' job satisfaction. The compatibility of the leadership style of the supervisor and the structure of the work environment was not considered to be important for success.

Effect of Work Experience

The analysis which assessed the effect on responses of respondents' four types of previous or current work experience (management and non-management experience; only management experience; only non-management experience; or no
work experience) found no significant results. Even when the four categories were collapsed into two groups of respondents, that is, those who had had management experience versus those who had not, there were still no significant results.

It was thought that those with management experience might be less favourable toward participation by employees than those without management experience, as participation seems to involve a real or perceived loss of power for management. This was not supported by the results. Nevertheless, these findings do not preclude the possibility that differences would be found if upper, middle, and lower levels of management were considered separately, because each level of management may be affected differently by employee participation.

Previous research has found that one of the major factors which determines the success of quality circles is middle management's attitude toward the initiative (Park & Golembiewski, 1991). As discussed above, with the implementation of participative structures, and in particular SMW Ts, middle and lower management tends to have a perception of their loss of power and recognition, and the obsolescence of their skills (Manz et al., 1990). They would therefore be considered to oppose participative initiatives. Upper-level management does not have the same concerns as middle and lower levels management with regard to
participative initiatives, as their positions are not jeopardized as a result. Upper-level management would be expected to be more receptive to participation. For example, one study of 485 upper-level managers from 59 industrial companies revealed that they perceived a need for organizational change, and had a preference for participative programs. Furthermore, they expressed a willingness to support change toward a more participative organization, and showed an expectation of positive results (Collins, Ross & Ross, 1989). Other research has found that employees with the highest status across five occupational groups were most involved in an employee company ownership program, while the lower status employees were uninvolved or cynical about the program (Sagie, 1994). In light of the above findings, the lack of significant results for the analysis based on types of work experience may have been due to categorizations which were too inclusive to be able to differentiate between levels of management.

Effect of Union Membership

Unions in North America have typically taken a stance against participative workplaces, with the view that participation increases employees' responsibilities. Employee participation is typically seen by North American unions as a tactic used by management to get more from employees without necessarily increasing wages appropriately. This analysis explored the extent to which
respondents' past or present union membership may have influenced their opinions toward participation - perhaps to become more congruent with the stance taken by unions. No significant results were obtained.

Being a member of a union in North America may not ensure that one is aware of, or agrees with, the union's policies. In many organizations, employees do not have a choice to opt out of the established union. In other cases, there may not be enough support, or other reasons may prohibit the establishment of union backing. Therefore, simple union membership may not give insight as to respondents' views about participation in the workplace. The next exploratory analysis assessed the effect of respondents' willingness to join a union.

Effect of Willingness to Join a Union

The effect of respondents' willingness to join a union was explored in order to overcome the difficulties inherent in simply assessing union membership, as discussed above. Instead of exploring the effect that previous or current union membership had on respondents' attitudes toward participation in the workplace, as did the previous analysis, this analysis explored the effect of respondents' support of unions on their attitudes toward participative workplaces. The main difference between these two analyses involved the respondents' choice for union membership.

This analysis revealed one isolated significant result.
The interaction between respondents' willingness to join a union (yes, uncertain, and no) and the type of organizational structure (traditional and participative) for the dependent variable RELATIONSHIP was found to be significant. This significant result appears to be due to a low RELATIONSHIP score for traditional organizations, as rated by those who were unwilling to join a union (see Table 15).

The meaningfulness of this finding is somewhat tenuous because the nature of the relationship between the dependent variable which assesses the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and his employees, and the type of organizational structure, is unclear. This dependent variable would seem to be more relevant to the type of supervisor than to the type of organizational structure. And because there appears to be no systematic or meaningful interpretation of this result, one possible interpretation is to consider it a statistical artifact.

As unions in North America typically tend toward an anti-participation stance, to the extent that those respondents who would be willing to join a union also support this view of participation, they would have rated situations involving participation more negatively than would those respondents who were not willing to join a union. However, willingness to join a union in no way implies a negative attitude toward participation, and may
simply reflect support for other union activities (e.g. fighting for employees rights, higher wages, improved working conditions, etc.). This may explain the overall lack of interpretable significant results.

Effect of Major Discipline of Study

This analysis explored the effect of respondents' major discipline of university study on responses to the questionnaire. It was considered that people with similar types of interests and values would choose to study in similar disciplines. Or perhaps that different values are taught in the different disciplines. Both influences may be working simultaneously. In any case, students studying in the same discipline may hold similar interests and values. In this analysis, respondents' major discipline of study was used as a surrogate for grouping such values or interests.

This analysis attempted to assess the effects of respondents' major disciplines' influences in values and interests on respondents' perceptions of participative and traditional supervisors and organizations. Business, Psychology, and Engineering students' responses were used for this analysis. One significant result was obtained. The three-way interaction of respondents' major field of study (Business, Psychology, Engineering), the type of organizational structure (traditional, participative), and the type of supervisor (traditional, participative), for the dependent variable SUCCESS, was significant. Further
analyses of this interaction revealed no meaningful results beyond those previously examined. The significance of this interaction appears to be linked to the finding of differential ratings based on the gender of the participant. These results seem to be consistent with other gender-related studies showing female biases toward relationships. As Psychology majors are overwhelmingly female, and Business and Engineering students are mainly male, the significant result based on major field of study may be interpreted as a difference based upon participants' gender.

Effect of Gender

Differences in responses based on respondents' gender were tested. The results showed that when responses to the entire questionnaire were combined, female respondents gave higher RELATIONSHIP and SUCCESS ratings (i.e. main effects for gender of participant) than did male respondents. This finding, however, is of little relevance to the present study, as the differences in ratings were only apparent for the questionnaire overall. Differences in ratings between the genders were not significant for individual scenarios. These results may suggest, however, that female respondents have a more positive orientation toward supervisor-employee relationships and toward the organizations' potential for success.

Future research should attempt to replicate this analysis with more respondents and with other questions in
order to re-assess the lack of significant findings. The significant result obtained, however, may lead to future research which is based on differing attitudes between the genders. Such questions may add to the existing literature on gender differences. For example, do women's higher RELATIONSHIP ratings reflect a different way of looking at relationships? Do they reflect a different type of social adjustment than men have? Do they reflect a more positive attitude toward the workplace? Do women's higher SUCCESS ratings reflect a greater optimism toward the business enterprise? Or do they reflect a naivete? Where do such differences between the genders originate? These types of questions ask more about the differences between men and women than they do about participative and traditional styles of management.

**Perceived Compatibility of Incompatible Scenarios**

Results from the check of compatibility revealed that a situation involving a traditional supervisor in a participative organization (POTS) was rated as more compatible than one depicting a participative supervisor in a traditional organization (TOPS). One possible interpretation is that situations involving a traditional supervisor in a participative organization may be more common than those with a participative supervisor in a traditional organization. This familiarity may cause the former situation to seem more "normal", and thus judged as
more compatible. Future research may address the perceptions of incompatible situations, perhaps in comparison to ratings of desirability of the situations.

**Interaction of ORGANIZATION and SUPERVISOR**

The interaction of ORGANIZATION and SUPERVISOR was statistically significant for dependent variables SATISFACTION and SUCCESS. The interaction was not significant for dependent variable RELATIONSHIP (see Table 9). An examination of the means for each scenario suggests that this may be due to the irrelevance of the RELATIONSHIP variable to the ORGANIZATION effect.

Comparisons made in this study were *a priori*, therefore not requiring significant interaction effects (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). However, in order to make unplanned, post hoc comparisons, significant results must be obtained. Comparisons for which a significant interaction is necessary are discussed for the result involving the relative importance of the supervisor and the organization for perceptions of success, and for the result involving perceptions of scenario TOTS.

**Relative Importance of the Supervisor and the Organization for Perceptions of Success**

Organizations with participative supervisors were perceived as more successful than organizations with traditional supervisors, regardless of the structure of the organization. Also, participatively structured
organizations were perceived to be more successful than traditionally structured organizations, regardless of the leadership style of the supervisor (see Tables 8 and 9). Although in both cases a participative style was perceived to increase the chance for success, results revealed that having a participative supervisor was perceived as more consequential to success than having a traditional organizational structure.

Scenarios with a participative supervisor received higher SUCCESS ratings than scenarios with a participatively structured organization (see Table 10). Hence the greater relative importance of having a participative supervisor.

The comparison of perceptions of success for scenarios TOPS (participative supervisor in a traditionally structured organization) and POTS (traditional supervisor in a participatively structured organization) is, in essence, a comparison of the relative importance of the participative supervisor and the participative organizational structure. The perception of greater success for the former scenario may be interpreted as support for the position that the leadership style of the supervisor is more important for perceptions of success than is the structure of the organization.

As discussed above, the greater relative importance of the supervisor may be due to the supervisor's immediate influence on the workers. In other words, the style of
leadership exhibited by the supervisor (participative or autocratic) influences the manner in which employees carry out their duties, regardless of the organizational structure or the directives for participative leadership given by top management. For this reason, the supervisor's style of leadership may be considered more meaningful to perceptions of success than the organizational structure.

Perceptions of Scenario TOTS

Results revealed that employees of a traditional supervisor in a traditional organization (TOTS) were perceived to have the lowest job satisfaction of all scenarios. These results are consistent with the results from the fourth hypothesis, in which the traditional organization with a traditional supervisor (TOTS) was perceived to be the least productive and successful overall. Although the interaction of ORGANIZATION and SUPERVISOR did not reach statistical significance for dependent variable RELATIONSHIP ($p<.07$), an examination of the means (see Table 10) reveals the above trend.

Respondents' apparent bias in favour of participation might also indicate some bias against traditional styles of management. This bias would be consistent with the type of respondent, that is, the people who responded to the questionnaire were all university students who might be expected to endorse somewhat liberal views toward the workplace rather than a traditional hierarchical view. They
might also be expected to endorse the importance of workers having a meaningful role in decision making, as described in the participative scenarios.

Previous research has shown that employees who were interested in an employee participation program tended to be younger, more educated, and more concerned with job advancement than those who are uninterested in such a program (Miller & Prichard, 1992). Respondents in the current study would seem to fit the description of the subjects in the study cited above. Insofar as SMWTS can be considered in the same light as the employee participation program discussed in the Miller and Prichard (1992) research, the finding of support for SMWTS in the current research by young, educated, and (supposedly) advancement-oriented respondents corroborates with the earlier research.

In light of the mean age of respondents in the current research \((M=25.54)\), and since respondents were from several diverse fields of university study, the position in favour of participation in the management of organizations may reflect the collective attitude of a younger generation, as suggested by the literature.

**Implications**

Results of this study revealed a less positive attitude toward traditionally structured organizations with autocratic supervisors. An implication for organizations may be to allow more participation by employees, or to
reduce their authoritativeness where full participation is not feasible. To a certain extent, this process is already underway. Changes may be more readily implemented in certain types of organizations than others, with innovative, idea-oriented organizations in the first wave and mass production organizations the slowest to change. As this study indicated, even organizations perceived as assembly-line "widget" manufacturers are perceived more favourably when there is a participative culture.

This study also found that the leadership style of the supervisor had more influence on perceptions of job satisfaction, the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees, and organizational success, than did the structure of the work groups/organization. In light of these findings, traditional organizations may be able to improve employee satisfaction and the relationship between employees and supervisors, and possibly even success, by training supervisors to be more participative, without necessarily changing the structure of the organization. This may be accomplished through the implementation of participative initiatives, even those which do not imply a complete overhaul of the entire organization like the implementation of SMWTs. Examples of these are quality circles and participative decision-making initiatives. Relatively minor changes toward participation at the lower levels may lead to improved employee satisfaction and
greater creativity, and these could be realized even if alterations to the entire organization are not feasible.

In support of this view, research has indicated that employees may not desire more than "some say" in policy-oriented decisions, and may be satisfied with participation in decisions which are more directly related to their jobs (Liverpool, 1990). Therefore, a change in the philosophy of the entire organization may not only be unnecessary but minor changes may be effective and at the same time avoid the problem of imposing undesired responsibility upon employees. Further research is suggested to determine whether there are minimal or optimal degrees of decision making which create employee satisfaction.

**Limitations and Further Suggestions for Future Research**

The present research assessed the effects of hierarchical and participative organizational structures, and autocratic and participative styles of supervisory leadership, on perceptions of job satisfaction, the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and employees, and productivity and overall success, in a hypothetical manufacturing organization. Future research may assess these effects for different types of organizations, such as those involved in research and development, or those which provide services rather than produce products. Future research may also assess the perceived influence of different organizational structures and supervisory
leadership styles on other variables which are relevant to
the work situation (eg. quality of work, commitment).

One limitation of the present study was the use of
vignettes to assess attitudes toward different types of
organizations. The quality and accuracy of the vignettes
may be questionable. Results were based on perceptions of
brief, general vignettes, which was deliberate so as to
assess perceptions of scenarios and not reading skill.
However, the lack of details may or may not have provided
enough information for some respondents. Although the
manipulation checks were successful, a replication of this
study using more detailed scenarios may be useful.
Similarly, a study using employees in actual organizations
which correspond to the various scenarios would be ideal.
This would introduce greater realism and external validity
to the findings.

A factor of this study which may limit its
generalizability was the geographic location in which it was
conducted. The respondents were students at the University
of Windsor, in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. This city is
labour-intensive, and is generally pro-labour politically.
Although all respondents may not have grown up in this
environment, it is possible that the culture may be
pervasive in the coursework. By merely living in the city,
respondents may have been acculturated to this pro-labour
culture. A third possibility is that university
environments tend to be politically liberal, which may have affected results, and possibly limiting their generalizability. Thus, the respondents in this study gave responses which would have been similar to those of actual employees in the scenarios described, who would presumably take a pro-labour stance. A study of actual employee's responses would serve to clarify some of these speculations.

The sample size of 172 for this study seemed to be adequate to test the within-subjects effects. However, the findings for the exploratory between-subjects analyses were limited. These limited findings may have resulted from a relatively low number of subjects in each group, once they were divided according to each between-subjects effect. It is possible that no actual effects exist, but a replication of the study with more subjects in each experimental cell could lead to more definitive conclusions.

A factor which was not addressed in the current research was the gender of the supervisor. The supervisors described in the vignettes were all male. The use of descriptions of female supervisors may have had an impact on results. Previous research has found that women in organizations as well as in laboratory studies tended to use a more democratic or participative leadership style than did men, who used a more autocratic and directive style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Research similar to the current study, with the addition of supervisor gender as an independent variable
would seem to be valuable in order to elucidate differential perceptions based on the supervisor's gender. Such research would be timely, with an increasing number of women entering the supervisory and management ranks. Such research would also explore the interaction effect of supervisor gender and respondent gender.

The results obtained in this study were based on scenarios which described combinations of organizational structures and supervisory leadership styles, to which respondents were to make inferences as to their effectiveness. This study did not deal explicitly with intervening variables which moderate the relationship between participative and traditional work structures and their impact on the relationship between employees and supervisors, employee satisfaction, and the organizations' productivity and overall success. In other words, this study has documented perceived outcomes of the various scenarios without considering why they were perceived the way they were, other than as being a result of the given type of scenario.

The relationship between the implementation of participative structures and outcome variables such as productivity and work satisfaction is not simple (Abbott, 1987; Sagie, 1994). There appear to be several mediating factors which influence those relationships, such as the organizational climate, employees' receptivity to change,
employees' status in the organization, the difficulty of the job, the quality of the implementation process, middle management's attitude toward the initiative, union cooperation, role ambiguity, performance-reward expectancy, and the type of participative initiative itself (Cotton, Vollrath, Foggatt, & Lengnick-Hall, 1988; Orpen, 1992; Park & Golembiewski, 1991; Pasmore & Fagans, 1992; Shaubrooeck & Jennings, 1991; Smith & Brannick, 1990; Weiss & Cambone, 1994; Wichman, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). These mediating factors were not considered in the current research, in favour of a more general assessment. There are, however, so numerous an amount of intervening variables that it would be extremely difficult to control for each. As well, when considering actual organizations, each will vary in different ways on the different factors, making each situation in each organization unique. The mediating factors were not considered in this study and may have influenced responses in an unknown manner.

Indicative of the lack of attention paid to mediating variables is the generalized vocabulary used to denote dependent variables. For example, the current study assessed perceptions of the organizations' productivity and overall success, in general terms. Respondents were asked their perceptions of the organizations' and the work teams' "productivity" and "overall success". The use of such general terms may have confounded the results. Productivity
may be conceived in several ways, including the number of units produced per time period, units per amount of raw material, product quality, etc. Previous research has revealed that the implementation of quality circles resulted in an increase in quality of work, but no significant difference in the efficiency aspect of productivity (Buch & Raban, 1990).

Using general terms in the current research may have ignored potentially important distinctions. For example, it is unknown how respondents interpreted "overall success". Because different respondents may have interpreted this and other terms differently, the exact meaning of the corresponding results may be in question. The current research served to examine general trends. Future research may refine the concepts used.

Similar to the discussion of the general terminology used to assess perceptions of productivity and overall success (SUCCESS), the assessment of job satisfaction (SATISFACTION) was general in nature. SATISFACTION ratings were obtained by combining respondents' perceptions of employees' job satisfaction ("To what extent do you think employees get satisfaction from their job?"), perceived absenteeism, and perceived turnover rates. Responses to the three corresponding items were averaged to produce an aggregate variable, SATISFACTION.

Respondents were asked to rate employees' job
satisfaction overall. This general assessment of satisfaction may be narrowed into finer distinctions, perhaps by examining different work attitudes (Buch & Raban, 1990). By using general terms, the respondents' overall impressions are conveyed. However, it is unknown why respondents responded as they did. Similar to the case for SUCCESS ratings, respondents may have based their impressions on different aspects of the information provided. The use of general terms does not allow the data to capture the source of differential ratings. Future research may build upon the current research by probing each dependent variable in finer detail.

A further concern regarding the SATISFACTION variable derives from the aggregation of perceived satisfaction, perceived turnover, and perceived absenteeism ratings, as described above. The exact nature of the relationship between the three items is unknown, and therefore this aggregation into a single, general SATISFACTION variable may be questionable. Evidence from research involving quality circle interventions indicated that turnover, absenteeism, and work-related attitudes (considered here to be parallel to ratings of employee satisfaction) may not vary similarly (Buch, 1992; Buch & Raban, 1990). Therefore, their aggregation may eliminate or distort their effects. Future research may break down the constructs used in the present study to assess the relative influences of the different
facets of a construct. For example, instead of assessing job satisfaction as a whole, this construct could be broken into several factors which may contribute to satisfaction, including turnover rates, absenteeism rates, and employees' perceived satisfaction. Future research may consider each item separately for the other variables as well.

A factor not examined in the current research is the time frame of the scenarios. It is possible (if not likely) that the ratings of the dependent variables (RELATIONSHIP, SATISFACTION, and SUCCESS) would change depending on which point in the intervention one considered. The effects of an intervention may taper off with time. For example, a study of an organization which implemented a participative structure (including gainsharing) revealed a significant decrease in the number of grievances filed (which may be interpreted as an increase in job satisfaction) and an increase in product quality - but only at the time of the intervention (Hatcher & Ross, 1991). Results of the current study may have differed had the timing of the intervention been taken into account. Future research may assess the effect of different points of time during and following an intervention toward employee participation.

The current research did not account for respondents' experience with SMWTs or other participative structures, such as quality circles and participative decision-making. Having experience with SMWTs (or other participative
initiatives) may have affected the results, due to the way in which those respondents' attitudes toward SMWT initiatives may have been affected by their experiences. Future research may examine the differences in questionnaire results (if any) between respondents who have had experience with SMWTs or other forms of participative management, and those who have not.

Conclusions

This study represents a good initial step to assessing attitudes toward two styles of leadership and organizational structure. The present study has demonstrated overwhelming support for a participative style of supervisory leadership which allows employees more autonomy in decision-making and responsibility. The results suggest that employee participation in organizations, although not a new concept, has perhaps become viewed as a critical factor in employee satisfaction and productivity.

The compatibility of the supervisor's leadership style and the structure of the organization was not perceived to be an important factor affecting the organization's success. However, the leadership style of the supervisor was perceived to be an important factor above and beyond the influence of the organization's structure. A possible implication of these findings is that the implementation of a participative style of supervision, without necessarily altering the organizational structure, may produce greater
employee satisfaction, a better relationship between the supervisor and employees, and improved productivity and overall success.
Statement of Informed Consent

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between organizational culture and supervisors' style of leadership.

Your participation will take approximately 15 minutes. You will be asked to read a set of paragraphs and respond to questions about them.

The research being conducted today is completely confidential. Please be assured that you cannot be identified from any of the information you provide. Do not write your name or any other identifying information on the questionnaire.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Returning the following questionnaire to me will be considered as giving your consent for participation. You have the right to withdraw at any time or to refuse to answer any questions, should they make you feel uncomfortable. Otherwise, please answer each question to the best of your ability from the information provided.

The data from this survey will be used in Stuart Silverman's M.A. thesis at the University of Windsor. Only Stuart Silverman and his advisors will see the completed questionnaires. Summaries of the data and statistical tables will be included in the thesis and any subsequent publications. A copy of the finished report will be made available upon completion in the Psychology Department.

This study has been reviewed and has been found to be acceptable by the Psychology Department Ethics Committee. Stuart Silverman will be available during your completion of the questionnaire to address any questions or concerns you may have. If you have any questions or concerns after participating in this survey, please contact any of the following people:

Stuart Silverman, Graduate Student 253-4232 ext. 2218 (leave message)
Dr. D. Wong-Rieger, Thesis Advisor 253-4232 ext. 2248
Dr. R. Engelhart, Ethics Committee Chair 253-4232 ext. 2222

To obtain further information about this study and its results, call me (Stuart Silverman) at the telephone number listed above after May 31, 1995 and I'll be happy to discuss it with you.

Instructions

Read the information at the top of each page and answer the questions which follow. Answer all questions on each page before proceeding to the next page.

It is very important that you answer all questions honestly, according to your own opinion. There are no right and wrong answers. It is your opinions that are important.

Please take this page with you (detach it from the package)
Thank you for your participation.

Stuart Silverman
Company G manufactures widgets. Its Hamilton plant has 400 employees, including 6 levels of management. In this organization, instructions are given from the top and carried out by employees lower down. To increase efficiency, jobs are narrowly defined and workers are expected to do only as they are told. The company's main concern is to produce more widgets and to increase profits.

J.A. is 42 years old. He has worked at Company G for 20 years and has been in charge of a group of workers for 4 years. J.A. delegates work to his employees, but remains responsible for its progress. He has a lot of management responsibilities, including planning, organizing, and making sure that the employees are working hard. He must also ensure the compliance of his employees.

Please circle the number that most reflects your opinion about each question.

1 = not at all  4 = somewhat  7 = very much so

To what extent do you think:

1. J.A.'s style of management fits with the organization's style?..................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. J.A. is focused on tasks as opposed to people? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. J.A. is focused on developing healthy relationships with his employees................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Company G rewards creativity by lower level employees? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. J.A. gets along with his workers?..........................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. J.A.'s workers will be successful overall? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Company G will be successful overall?.............1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. J.A.'s team will achieve its productivity goals? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Company G will achieve its productivity goals?.........1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. There is a low turnover rate among J.A.'s employees? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. There is a low absenteeism rate among J.A.'s employees?......................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. J.A.'s employees get satisfaction from their job? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. J.A.'s employees truly respect J.A.?..................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. J.A.'s employees like J.A.? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Company L manufactures widgets. Its Hamilton plant has 400 employees, including 6 levels of management. In this organization, instructions are given from the top and carried out by employees lower down. To increase efficiency, jobs are narrowly defined and workers are expected to do only as they are told. The company's main concern is to produce more widgets and to increase profits.

R.B. is 42 years old. He has worked at Company L for 20 years and has been in charge of a group of workers for 4 years. R.B. believes that workers are smart and trustworthy, and lets them work in groups. He gives them the challenge of solving problems (like production problems and scheduling). He also lets the workers help in making decisions.

Please circle the number that most reflects your opinion about each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=not at all</th>
<th>4= somewhat</th>
<th>7=very much so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent do you think:

1. - R.B.'s style of management fits with the organization's style?
2. - R.B. is focused on tasks as opposed to people?
3. - R.B. is focused on developing healthy relationships with his employees?
4. - Company L rewards creativity by lower level employees?
5. - R.B. gets along with his workers?
6. - R.B.'s workers will be successful overall?
7. - Company L will be successful overall?
8. - R.B.'s team will achieve its productivity goals?
9. - Company L will achieve its productivity goals?
10. - There is a low turnover rate among R.B.'s employees?
11. - There is a low absenteeism rate among R.B.'s employees?
12. - R.B.'s employees get satisfaction from their job?
13. - R.B.'s employees truly respect R.B.?
14. - R.B.'s employees like R.B.?
Company Q manufactures widgets. Its Hamilton plant has 400 employees. There are 2 levels of management. Company Q has set up self-managed work teams, so workers have some management responsibilities and share in decision-making. Work teams are given projects and are expected to complete them using their knowledge and experience.

T.C. is 42 years old. He has worked at Company Q for 20 years and has been in charge of a group of workers for 4 years. T.C. delegates work to his employees, but remains responsible for its progress. He has a lot of management responsibilities, including planning, organizing, and making sure that the employees are working hard. He must also ensure the compliance of his employees.

Please circle the number that most reflects your opinion about each question.

1=not at all  4=almost  7=very much so

To what extent do you think:

1. T.C.'s style of management fits with the organization's style?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. T.C. is focused on tasks?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. T.C. is focused on developing healthy relationships with his employees?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Company Q rewards creativity by lower level employees?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. T.C. gets along with his workers?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. T.C.'s workers will be successful overall?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Company Q will be successful overall?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. T.C.'s team will achieve its productivity goals?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Company Q will achieve its productivity goals?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. There is a low turnover rate among T.C.'s employees?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. There is a low absenteeism rate among T.C.'s employees?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. T.C.'s employees get satisfaction from their job?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. T.C.'s employees truly respect T.C.?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. T.C.'s employees like T.C.?
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Company V manufactures widgets. Its Hamilton plant has 400 employees. There are 2 levels of management. Company V has set up self-managed work teams, so workers have some management responsibilities and share in decision-making. Work teams are given projects and are expected to complete them using their knowledge and experience.

F.D. is 42 years old. He has worked at Company V for 20 years and has been in charge of a group of workers for 4 years. F.D. believes that workers are smart and trustworthy, and lets them work in groups. He gives them the challenge of solving problems (like production problems and scheduling). He also lets the workers help in making decisions.

Please circle the number that most reflects your opinion about each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1=not at all</th>
<th>2=somewhat</th>
<th>3=very much so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s style of management fits with the organization's style?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D. is focused on tasks?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D. is focused on developing healthy relationships with his employees?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company V rewards creativity by lower level employees?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D. gets along with his workers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s workers be successful overall?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company V will be successful overall?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s team will achieve its productivity goals?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company V will achieve its productivity goals?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a low turnover rate among F.D.'s employees?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a low absenteeism rate among F.D.'s employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s employees get satisfaction from their job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s employees truly respect F.D.?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.D.'s employees like F.D.?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions.

In what year were you born? ____

Are you male / female (circle one)

What type(s) of work experience have you had?

   a) management  yes  no
   b) non-management  yes  no
   c) no work experience  yes  no

How many total years of work experience do you have? ____

Have you ever been a member of a union?

   yes / no (circle one)

Would you willingly join a union?

   yes / uncertain / no (circle one)

What year of university study are you in? ____

What is your major discipline of study (eg. Business, Psychology, Chemistry, etc)? ______________

Do you have any additional comments?
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