PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN SUPERVISORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

CHESTER A. FRANCKE

1975

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN SUPERVISORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING

By

Chester A. Francke

This research was designed to determine what, if any, performance differences exist between women supervisors and men supervisors, as perceived by their superiors and subordinates, and what implications such differences, if any, have for the training of women supervisors.

Employers are being required to accelerate their efforts to hire and promote women (and other affected groups)--to hire and promote in such a way that every level and every function is populated with an appropriate number of women. One impact of this regulation on employers is the immediate need to move more women into supervisory and managerial jobs.

But how? Should women receive the same training and development effort as men? More? Less? If not, what training do women need?

This research attempted to determine if women have different training needs than men based on a study of their performance as supervisors.

The research was designed to test four hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in perceived managerial skill of women and men supervisors.

2. There is no difference between women and men supervisors in their reaction to job pressures, as perceived by superiors and subordinates.

3. Women and men supervisors are similarly willing to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility.

4. Women and men supervisors are similarly willing to assume greater responsibility.

The study was confined to twenty-two divisions of one large company; the design called for interviews with managers and workers, both men and women, to gather views and opinions about the effectiveness of women supervisors. As a result of these interviews (in which women supervisors were often described as not possessing certain managerial skills), a survey instrument was devised and administered.

The instrument, entitled Training Analysis Survey, was in three forms: Form I, administered to superiors; Form II, administered to supervisors; and Form III, administered to subordinates. The instrument used a question format with the stem, "To what extent . . ." with a seven-point response scale ranging from "not at all" to "completely."

The survey instrument was administered to 1,313 respondents, of whom 498 were women and 815 were men.

The design of the study attempted to isolate sex of the supervisor as the only possible factor to explain differences when they appeared. The sample selection matched men and women supervisors on a range of characteristics, including: type of job, position or level,

education, age, time on present job, total time of employment, race, and marital status.

Subordinates to each supervisor were selected randomly by a personnel technician from the total population of subordinates. All superiors of the men and women supervisors included in the study were selected from the total population of superiors.

The data were gathered with optical scanning response forms and analyzed by bivariate tables so that any of the survey items could be analyzed against the sex of the respondents.

Twenty-seven survey items were analyzed for this research. Eighteen items pertained to Hypothesis 1, concerning managerial skills (skills in communicating, delegating, planning, organizing, setting priorities, making decisions and solving problems, maintaining effective relationships, and getting work done). Of the eighteen items, only two showed a significant difference in perceived performance between women and men supervisors:

> Women supervisors' quantity of work is more satisfying to superiors than is men supervisors'.
>
> Subordinates perceive women supervisors to be more concerned with the quality of subordinates' work than are men supervisors.

Two items were analyzed to test Hypothesis 2, dealing with reaction to job pressure. On both of these items, there was no significant difference between women and men supervisors in perceived reaction to pressure.

Hypothesis 3 was concerned with the willingness to prepare for positions of greater responsibility. Four items were analyzed;

two indicated a significant difference between women and men supervisors:

> Women supervisors are more willing to attend evening school.
>
> Women supervisors are more willing to participate in on-the-job training.

To test Hypothesis 4, three items were analyzed and all three indicated a significant difference between women and men supervisors. The data showed that men supervisors are more willing to assume greater job responsibilities than are their women counterparts.

Regarding training implications, these data tended to indicate that women have no differential training needs on managerial skills or reacting to job pressures. Since women are more willing to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility, yet seem <u>less</u> willing to assume greater responsibility, some type of self-concept or awareness training might be indicated.

PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN SUPERVISORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING

By

Chester A. Francke

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1975

To Renie, who worked harder than

anyone else to make this happen.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation and gratitude are expressed to the individuals who made this possible: to my wife and family for their forebearance; to Professor Borosage for his inspiration and encouragement; to George Nowacek for his invaluable advice; to Liz Donaldson, Kathy Timmons, and Rose Griffin for their assistance; to the members of my committee for their help and understanding; and to my employers for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the background, problem, purpose, and hypotheses of this research are discussed. Moving women into management is an important problem in our society, stemming from various legal and social requirements, and ways must be found to train and develop women for managerial positions. The four hypotheses of the research suggest that there is no difference between men and women supervisors in certain factors that are important to managerial performance.

Background

In the preface of their book, Breakthrough: Women Into Management, Loring and Wells stated:

> This is the moment in history when the entire nation, from the White House down through organizations of all types, is aware that change must take place in employment of women. The practices of the past are no longer acceptable to women and various legal and governmental actions have declared that new approaches must be implemented. Immediate, pragmatic pressures are on employers . . . to implement goals and timetables to work more women into management.[1]

The need to "work more women into management" is the basis for this research.

---

[1]Rosalind Loring and Theodora Wells, Breakthrough: Women Into Management (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1972), p. v.

For many years, most employers have expressed belief in "non-discrimination" in employment matters. All companies of any consequence have formal policies, written statements, and slogans proclaiming their strong support of these employment practices. Much of the impetus for such nondiscrimination pledges has come from the Federal government, either through executive orders or clauses in government contracts.

The effort was aimed at prohibiting discrimination in employment --discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin. The emphasis was essentially negative (it sought to prohibit discrimination) and, in most cases, unenforceable. Note that these early non-discrimination efforts did not include discrimination because of age or sex. In other words, age and sex discrimination were tacitly condoned.

But because there was no enforcement of nondiscrimination policies and because the emphasis was essentially negative, the employment status of these minority groups changed only slightly. It was not until recent years that effective enforcement procedures were added, and the emphasis changed from negative to positive. Also, women were included.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 established the enforcement arm by creating the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and also included "sex" in the list of affected groups.

Executive Order 11246 required Affirmative Action Programs, enforced by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the Department of Labor. These affirmative action plan requirements changed the

effort from negative to positive by requiring employers to set specific goals and timetables for employment of women and minorities.

Other legislation, executive orders, agency rulings, and court decisions have accelerated this effort. Simply stated, employers are now required to hire and promote in such a way as to populate every level--from messenger to chairman--and every function--from engineering to sales--with an appropriate number of women and minorities. This research is concerned with the issue only as it applies to women.

One impact of these requirements on employers is the immediate need to move women into managerial jobs. But how? A large pool of experienced women managers is not available.

Hennig stated that:

> According to the U.S. Census, in 1960 there were about 25,000 women employed under the category "managers, officials, and proprietors." These were women who earned $10,000 or more and represented about two percent of the 1.2 million people (98 percent men) in total, who earn that amount. Of that two percent, or approximately 25,000 women, about fifty percent were employed by retail organizations, about 25 percent were insurance company employes, and 11 percent worked in banks. The remaining 14 percent encompassed were employed in all other types of business.[1]

It is clear that organizations, especially manufacturing and other types included in Hennig's 14 percent, will not find enough experienced women managers to meet the need. They must develop their own.

---

[1]Margaret Hennig, "Career Development for Women Executives" (Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1970), p. I-1.

Problem to Be Investigated

American industry has learned, largely through years of trial-and-error experience, that certain skills, abilities, and experiences are desirable in order to operate in an efficient manner. Each company has standards, whether formal or informal, by which individuals are judged to possess these skills and abilities, and by which individuals are judged to be effective.

Individuals who possess the desired skill and experience find their way, through management selection and development procedures, to supervisory positions in the company. Largely because of this selection process--sometimes explicit, sometimes not--the vast majority of people who have found their way to supervisory and management positions are men. And through the years, employers have learned how to train and develop men for supervisory and management positions.

Jennings described this situation:

> The implied assumption of management development generally shared by businessmen . . . was that talent would automatically declare itself through application of skill and industry to work, much as cream rises to the top of milk. This natural law worked adequately during periods of mild economic growth, but corporations came to realize that during a long period of sustained growth the corporation could not wait for nature to produce adequate numbers of talented managers. . . . A few corporations started to interfere with the natural law of talent development and to rush it along by careful nudging and, at times, downright violation of the law itself. . . . Corporations had become extremely pleased with the superior product of a managed program of management development.[1]

But still, this process--this "managed program of management development," as Jennings described it--was applied only to men.

---

[1]Eugene Emerson Jennings, The Mobile Manager: A Study of the New Generation of Top Executives (Ann Arbor: Bureau of Industrial Relations, 1967), pp. 1-2.

Does it also apply to women? Do women need the same types of training and development experiences as men? Do they need additional experiences? Do they need less training?

The issue was stated well by Slevin:

> When the organization decides whether its women workers do have certain developmental needs, it will also have to determine whether these needs will be different from the typical male worker's because of the difference in background and experience and whether similar career paths can be promised them.[1]

Part of the answer will come from determining how those women now in supervisory and management positions are perceived as performing. Are they perceived as having the necessary skills for supervisory and management positions? Are they perceived as being as effective as men supervisors?

Thus, the problem to be investigated in this research concerns the perceived performance differences between men and women supervisors and the resulting implications for training and development activities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what, if any, performance differences exist between men and women supervisors and what training and development needs, if any, women have that differ from the training and development needs of men.

Most companies know (or at least feel they know) how to train men for supervisory positions. It is tempting to conclude that women

---

[1] D. Slevin, "Full Utilization of Women in Employment: The Problem and an Action Plan," Human Resource Management, University of Michigan, Spring 1973, p. 28.

should be trained in the same way. Indeed, many companies have set about doing just that--providing exactly the same supervisory training for women as they do for men.

Cleeton and Mason, writing about the selection of people for executive jobs, stated:

> Every executive position should be considered as a separate and distinct one, and the person now filling the job successfully should be taken as the best available standard to be followed in selecting an understudy or replacement.[1]

But some managers and authors hold views that suggest women have <u>different</u> skills and experiences than men, and thus have different training needs. Interviews with managers reveal certain stereotypical beliefs about women in general, as well as in supervisory roles--beliefs that affect personnel decisions made by those managers.

Therefore, it is necessary to determine, on some sort of factual basis, whether women have different training needs than men so that appropriate and effective training and development processes can be established--in order to prepare more women for movement into management.

Hypotheses

Specifically, four hypotheses about supervisory performance are tested in the study. Each of the hypotheses is based on a frequently heard belief about the performance of women supervisors. The focus is on perceptions about supervisory performance rather than specific behaviors. While analyzing specific behaviors perhaps would

---

[1]Glen Cleeton and Charles Mason, <u>Executive Ability</u> (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1946), p. 174.

be more definitive, the question of perceptions of performance remains critically important because, in the final analysis, perceptions about behavior form the basis of most personnel decisions.

The hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1: There is no difference in perceived managerial skill of women and men supervisors.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference between women and men supervisors in their reaction to job pressures, as perceived by superiors and subordinates.

Hypothesis 3: Women and men supervisors are similarly willing to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility.

Hypothesis 4: Women and men supervisors are similarly willing to assume greater responsibility.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined, as used in this study:

Supervisor: An individual responsible for managing the affairs of an operating department and to whom several subordinates report directly for administrative purposes.

Subordinate: A worker in an operating department responsible for doing productive work and who reports directly to a supervisor.

Superior: An individual responsible for managing the affairs of several operating departments and to whom several supervisors report directly.

Appropriate: Refers to the number of women employed in job categories, usually as a percentage based on the number of women with requisite skills available for employment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter the literature pertinent to the present study is reviewed, beginning with the socio-psychological antecedents of the problem and followed by a look at obstacles to women's development in the business world and women's motivation to work, satisfaction with the job, and orientation to the job. The chapter concludes with a review of pertinent literature on training and development.

The literature concerning women's roles has been growing very rapidly, especially in the past three or four years. As the so-called feminist movement becomes stronger, and as the legal implications become clearer, more and more is being said about women's rights, aspirations, needs, abilities, and status. Loring and Wells pointed this out: "The impact of women's changing role is potentially greater than those of technology, zero population growth, or any other single issue because women are in every part of life."[1]

Thus, there is a growing amount of literature to review. Unfortunately, much of it is not on point. It suffers from a lack of research and data. Bartol pointed out this problem:

> Today more than 38% of the work force is composed of women. While the bulk of these women are in low-paying, low-skilled jobs, legal and social forces are making it possible for women

---

[1]Loring and Wells, Breakthrough, p. 165.

> to acquire business positions entailing leadership responsibility. Presently, little empirical data exist with which to assess the organizational implications of placing women in positions of business leadership. Most available materials are based mainly on conjecture and opinion; they do little to lay a foundation for further research or to assist organizations in evaluating or adapting to changes in the role of women. Hence, there is a vital need for research on leadership issues related to women in all levels, and especially in administrative levels of organizations.[1]

Much of the literature deals with the socio-psychological antecedents of the problem--the factors within men and women, and within our society, which have led to the present state of affairs.

Hennig dealt with parental relationships, interpersonal relations, school experiences, conflict resolution, perceptions of sexuality, and other factors as they apply to successful women executives. She also dealt with social forces. For example:

> Throughout this discussion we will see two absolute societal roles developing concerning women working. The first, that the only acceptable reason for a woman to work was survival need; the second, that a work situation for a woman had to duplicate as best as possible her domestic position both in type of work and inferiority of position.[2]

Hennig's research on successful women executives is one of the few data-based writings available, and makes an important contribution to the field.

Other examples of this socio--psychological perspective contribute to the present research, to some degree. Hoffman suggested a perspective on the matter of women's achievement motives:

---

[1]Kathryn Bartol, "Male vs. Female Leaders: The Effect of Leader Need for Dominance on Follower Satisfaction," Academy of Management Journal 17 (June 1974): 225.

[2]Hennig, "Career Development," p. II-1.

> Socialization processes begin at birth which result in feminine, dependent girls, and independent, exploring boys. The outcome of this process is that girls become women who are more dependent and passive than men.[1]

Douvan and Adelson continued in this same vein:

> Boys tend to concentrate on the vocational future and their style is all business--concrete, crystallized, tied to reality if not always realistic. They think of job preparation and channels, and of their own capabilities and tastes for particular work roles. Girls focus on the interpersonal aspects of future life--on marriage and the roles of wife and mother. Their reasons for choosing particular jobs reveal that girls want jobs that express feminine interests and provide a social setting for meeting prospective husbands . . . . [A girl] need not test her desire against her own talent and skill, since these will not be crucial determinants of her future status.[2]

Much is written about women's "sex role." Wells, Hennig, Epstein, and others have dealt extensively with sex typing, sex roles, sex ranking, and sexual competition. Although not of paramount concern to this research, examples of this perspective are cogent. Teideman and O'Hara stated:

> Several years ago we decided that a separate theory of career development was needed for men and women . . . we are coming to think that the kind of resolution a woman achieves of her sex role is of major importance in her career.[3]

Korda held:

> Throughout the business world, in every decision, at every turn, the social attitudes we have grown up with affect women in their relationships with the men who are at once their rivals and

---

[1] L. W. Hoffman, "Early Childhood Experiences and Women's Achievement Motives," Journal of Social Issues 28 (November 2, 1972): 129-155.

[2] E. Douvan and J. Adelson, The Adolescent Experience (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), pp. 342-343.

[3] David Teideman and Robert O'Hara, Career Development: Choice and Adjustment (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963), p. 84.

> their masters. Women are not supposed to be ambitious; therefore, ambition in women is generally regarded as a negative trait, even though it is highly praised in men.[1]

Thus we see from this sampling that much of the literature is (a) focused on socio-psychological factors that contribute to today's situation, and (b) not based on empirical data. However, these writings have been helpful in understanding some of the perspectives held by today's workers and managers, and have influenced the direction of this study.

More to the point is a limited amount of literature dealing with obstacles to women's development in the business world, women's view of job satisfaction, and the performance of women in the work force.

Day and Stogdill studied civilian employes of the U.S. Air Force. The purposes of the study were: to seek reliable knowledge concerning the leader behavior of women; to determine how women behave when performing in leadership roles and how effective they are; to determine what relationships exist between behavior and effectiveness; and to compare results with findings for male leaders in similar situations. The method involved matching pairs of thirty-eight male and thirty-eight female supervisors. Two male and two female subordinates of each supervisor were asked to complete the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Form XII), which is composed of twelve subscales of leader behavior concerning such qualities as representation, demand, reconciliation, tolerance for uncertainty,

---

[1]Michael Korda, Male Chauvinism: How It Works (New York: Random House, 1973), p. 34.

persuasiveness, production emphasis, influence with superiors, etc. Regarding results, the authors stated:

> The results indicate that on the average, the male and female supervisors are perceived to exhibit similar patterns of leader behavior, and to be similar in terms of effectiveness. . . . Male and female supervisors who occupy parallel positions and perform similar functions exhibit similar patterns of leader behavior and levels of effectiveness when described and evaluated by their immediate subordinates.[1]

The conclusions reached by Day and Stogdill are germane to this study, as it is hypothesized in the present research that there are no significant differences in managerial skills between women and men supervisors.

The issues concerning women's motivation to work, satisfaction with the job, orientation to the job, and related matters have been studied by several researchers. Unfortunately, the evidence is not very clear.

Hacker, in Epstein's Woman's Place, touched on women's motivation to work:

> Because women have been trained to set greater store on personal characteristics than on accomplishments, their work lacks the performance orientation of men. . . . They receive mainly ascriptive rewards--the glamour of being a working woman. Their lack of achievement rewards is documented . . . we find so few women saying they work because they enjoy their jobs or work for the work's sake.[2]

---

[1]David Day and Ralph Stogdill, "Leader Behavior of Male and Female Supervisors: A Comparative Study," Personnel Psychology 25 (1972): 355-359.

[2]Helen Hacker, "A Functional Approach to the Gainful Employment of Married Women" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1961), p. 5.

Does this "lack of performance orientation" mean that the women supervisors in the present study will be perceived to perform less effectively than men supervisors?

Centers and Bugenthal studied job motivation among different segments of the working population. The purpose of their study was to contribute to the available information on the role of intrinsic (related to the work activity itself) and extrinsic (related to external or contextual factors) job factors as motivators, and to demonstrate that individuals at higher occupational levels place greater value on intrinsic job factors, and individuals at lower occupational levels place greater value on extrinsic factors. The method included gathering data through personal interviews with 692 employed adults, selected from a cross-section of a large urban area. The interviewers were graduate students, asking basically: "Which of these things were most important in keeping you on your present job?" Interviewees then chose their first, second, and third selection from a list of factors. As for results, the data indicated that job motivation did have the expected relationship to occupational level. All three intrinsic factors were more valued by white-collar groups; all three extrinsic factors were more valued by blue-collar groups. No consistent sex difference appeared in the value placed on intrinsic vs. extrinsic job components. The authors concluded that men placed higher value on good co-workers (interpersonal factors).[1]

---

[1]R. Centers and D. Bugenthal, "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivation Among Different Segments of the Working Population," Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (1966): 193-197.

Manhardt conducted a study of recently placed college graduates to see whether men and women who have accepted employment on similar jobs in business also have similar orientations to their jobs. The sample included 365 men and 301 women. All subjects appointed to starting jobs in one company since 1966 completed a questionnaire in which they were asked to rate the importance of twenty-five job characteristics. The results showed that sex differences existed on eleven of the twenty-five job characteristics. A significant proportion of women did not regard a job and a career as a critical factor in their lives, and did not expect to be working for more than a few years--so that long-range success was irrelevant to them. Of importance here is the conclusion that men rated significantly more important than women those characteristics having to do with advancement/responsibility factors to long-range career success. Women gave higher ratings of importance to those characteristics having to do with the work environment. It was suggested that this difference could be explained by the fact that a number of women did not expect to work more than a few years; for them long-range career success was irrelevant.

This conclusion supports a finding of Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell from their research into important job characteristics, including data from nine studies involving approximately ten thousand employes:

---

[1]Philip Manhardt, "Job Orientation of Male and Female College Graduates in Business," Personnel Psychology 25 (1972): 361-368.

> The factor which is most apparently different in importance for male and female employes is Work Conditions. As might be expected, working conditions are substantially more important to women than to men. Similarly, "ease" of work ranks higher for women than for men. Since the majority of employed women do not have the same magnitude of off-the-job responsibility of their male co-workers, the lower ranks given by women to Wages and to Opportunity for Advancement seem quite reasonable. Similarly, in line with current stereotypes is the greater influence on women's preferences of the Social Aspects of the job.[1]

Herzberg et al. concluded that men were more intrinsically oriented than women. This conclusion, however, has been the subject of some dispute.

Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings studied job values and did not substantiate the conclusion of Herzberg and his associates.[2] Burke studied desirable job characteristics by sex, and found that both men and women had similar preferences for job characteristics, and both ranked intrinsic characteristics as more important than extrinsic ones.[3]

Crowley, Levitin, and Quinn, in a paper entitled "Facts and Fictions About the American Working Woman," summarized all of this research and concluded:

> Three conclusions may therefore be drawn from previous research on what men and women want from their jobs:
>
> 1. The most consistently replicated finding is that women are more concerned with the social aspects of their jobs, particularly with having good relations with co-workers.

---

[1]F. Herzberg et al., Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion (Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957), p. 52.

[2]F. Kilpatrick, M. Cummings, Jr., and M. Jennings, Source Book of a Study of Occupational Values and the Image of the Federal Service (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1964): pp. 83-94.

[3]R. Burke, "Differences in Perception of Desired Job Characteristics of the Opposite Sex," The Journal of Genetic Psychology 109 (1966): 27-46.

2. The often-repeated generalization that women are less intrinsically oriented than men has received only slight, and generally inconsistent empirical support.
3. Sex differences in importance of job facets, when they are observed, are small in magnitude and tend to disappear when the confounding effects of educational and/or occupational level are removed.[1]

These conclusions bear on the instant study, which hypothesizes that sex differences are not significant in these areas.

Not so incidentally, Crowley, Levitin, and Quinn commented about the dearth of research in this area:

> Many of the stereotypes about working women hinge upon supposed sex differences in what is important to workers in their jobs. Considering the social implications of these sex differences, relevant data are surprisingly scarce and replicated findings are even scarcer.[2]

The study by Day and Stogdill referred to earlier, in addition to concluding that men and women supervisors are perceived to be similar in terms of behavior patterns and effectiveness, also concluded that women face obstacles to their advancement different from those faced by men.

> These findings suggest that slow advancement when it occurs on the part of women supervisors is not a result of ineffectiveness or lack of such factors as influence, predictive accuracy, or reconciliation of conflicting demands, but a result of their being females. . . .
>
> Although male and female peers are described as similar in leader behavior and effectiveness, their behavior and effectiveness appear to produce different outcomes in regard to advancement. For males, rapid advancement tends to go to those who are more effective and who have more influence. For females, rate of advancement is unrealted to effectiveness.[3]

---

[1]J. Crowley, T. Levitin, and R. Quinn, "Facts and Fictions About the American Working Woman" (Unpublished paper, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1973), pp. 8-9.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

[3]Day and Stogdill, Personnel Psychology, p. 356.

If, in fact, rate of advancement for women supervisors is unrelated to their effectiveness, then efforts to make them more effective (say, through better training and development) will not succeed in getting more women into management. And the need for training is not at the woman supervisor's level, but at the level of those in the organization who determine the rates of advancement. Also, if women perceive that their rate of advancement is unrelated to their effectiveness, they may be reluctant to express, openly, any desire to advance.

The literature of training and development was reviewed, uncovering little of importance to this study.

The attempt to tie together training and job performance, as the present research does, is not universally supported. The literature is replete with studies indicating that formal training programs are effective in developing managerial skills. It was noted, however, that such conclusions are based usually on the participant's own opinion, rather than an objective measure. For example, Nevis, Smith, and Harper suggested there is considerable change in managerial behavior following training, but pointed out that such change is based on the trainees' own evaluation of their behavior. Part of the problem seems to be the inability of the trainee to apply, in the work situation, what he learned in the training program.[1]

Smith and Knight indicated that at least one factor (self-insight) can be carried over from training to the job. They pointed

---

[1]E. Nevis, Adair Smith, and Robert Harper, "Behavior and Attitude Changes Related to Laboratory Training," Training Directors Journal, February 1965, pp. 3-7.

out that self-insight of foremen was shown to be highly related to the productivity of their departments.[1]

In an article pertaining to human relations training and changes in job performance, Miles reported:

> Two of our pre-post questionnaires showed no job gains attributable to training. The LBDQ (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire) showed no mean shift, and the Group Participation Scale moved up significantly for both experimentals and controls, a finding which produced the usual mixed emotions in the researchers. However, our open-end perceived-change measure differentiated the samples significantly . . . 73% of the experimentals, and 17% and 29% of the matched and random controls, respectively, showed change. . . . Changes in sensitivity and behavioral skill (ex: "listens more," "communicates better," "shares decisions more").[2]

One final note on the effectiveness of training: Bond, Leabo, and Swinyard collected opinions of sixty-six chief executive officers of leading American corporations. One quote from this work is of interest here:

> Considering all fields of knowledge, the executives were asked whether they felt an improved understanding of some subjects, even at this stage of their careers, would help them to be more effective business leaders. Overwhelmingly, the respondents replied in the affirmative.[2]

Education and training are commonly accepted in this country as being the appropriate means of advancing. Many businessmen feel that employes can be "trained up" to meet almost any challenge. But

---

[1]Ewart Smith and Stanford Knight, "Effects of Feedback on Insight and Problem Solving Efficiency in Training Groups," Journal of Applied Psychology 43 (March 1959): 209-211.

[2]Matthew Miles, "Human Relations Training: Processes and Outcomes," Journal of Counseling Psychology 7 (April 1960): 301-306.

[3]Floyd Bond, Dick Leabo, and Alfred Swinyard, Preparation for Business Leadership (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1964), p. 10.

less is known about the applicability of training to both sexes, and the ability of "training" to meet this challenge.

Lorin and Wells pointed out the need for answers in this area by commenting:

> The percentage of women in the work force will not rise substantially (currently 38%, probably up to 40%) but the percentage of women in supervisory, professional, managerial and executive positions will increase dramatically.[1]

This dramatic increase makes it imperative that ways be found to train and develop women to meet this need. The authors went on to say:

> Comparable opportunity for developing the capabilities and potentials of both men and women must be available before we can know whether or not there is any shred of intrinsic difference between the sexes in handling the managerial role.[2]

Agreed. But does "comparable" mean "the same"? Killian thought so:

> The training of women differs only slightly from the training of men; and if women are well trained, the results, in some cases, can be better. The same basic overall training plan used for men can be used for women, with some special adjustments tailored to a woman's needs.[3]

One would feel more comfortable if Killian's conclusion were supported by some evidence. Perhaps he is right, and if he is, what are the "special adjustments tailored to a woman's needs?"

Still talking about training and the differences in education and qualification, Killian seemed to be at odds with Day and Stogdill's

---

[1]Lorin and Wells, Breakthrough, p. 171.

[2]Ibid., pp. 100-101.

[3]Ray Killian, The Working Woman: A Male Manager's View (New York: American Management Association, 1971), p. 55.

finding (which held that slow advancement of women is the result of their being females) when he wrote:

> Many executives tend to believe that today the principal limitation to female opportunity is not prejudice against women, but the limited availability of women with the necessary educational, technical and motivational qualifications for available openings.[1]

If, in fact, women do not have the "necessary educational, technical and motivational qualifications," then we have discovered some training and development needs of women.

Theodora Wells provided some insights on the training and development implications of moving women into management:

> Women have not been typically found in significant numbers in management. In many companies management trainee programs are one of the ladders to management positions. Traditionally, few, if any, women have been admitted to these programs. An important element of affirmative action shall be a commitment to include women candidates in such programs. . . .
>
> Self-concept training must be a part of management training as applicable to the participants. . . .
>
> Enough is known from past research to indicate that self-concepts are the critical area for training.[2]

Summary

In summary, the review of literature included those areas in which there seem to be differences between men and women at work. Many of the areas were not specifically concerned with the subject of this study, and many of the writings were not research based. However, the preponderance of available literature seemed to support,

---

[1]Ibid., p. 13.

[2]Theodora Wells, "Woman's Self-Concept: Implications for Management Development," in Optimizing Human Resources, ed. G. Lippitt, L. This, and R. Bidwell (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971), pp. 302-310.

in some cases only tangentially, the general thrust of this study; that is, there are no significant differences between men and women supervisors' perceived managerial effectiveness and aspirations.

CHAPTER III

THE STUDY

The methodology used in the study is described in this chapter. The population consisted of 1,313 men and women superiors, supervisors, and subordinates in twenty-two divisions of one company. The sampling technique used matched men and women supervisors on a range of characteristics to isolate sex as the only possible factor to explain performance differences when they appeared. In this chapter the development of the Training Analysis Survey Instrument is covered in some detail. The techniques used to manage the data are described.

Description of the Population

The study examined differences between women and men supervisors in certain managerial skills. Informal interviews were held with forty-three managers, supervisors, and workers, both men and women, to delimit the number of managerial skills to be studied; only the most frequently mentioned managerial skills were included in the study.

The study was limited to a population in twenty-two divisions of one company composed of:

1. Men and women supervisors
2. Men and women who are subordinate to these supervisors

3. Men and women who are subordinate to these superiors

Superiors and subordinates were included to help assure complete understanding of any differences that might appear between men and women supervisors.

The total population of the organization exceeded 500,000. The sample size was as follows: 245 women and 218 men supervisors, 3 women and 378 men superiors, and 250 women and 219 men subordinates. This totaled 1,313 respondents, of whom 498 were women, 815 men. Data were gathered using a survey instrument.

Sampling Technique

The design of the study attempted to isolate sex of the supervisor as the only possible factor to explain differences when they appeared. The sample selection, therefore, matched each woman supervisor respondent with a comparable man supervisor. To hold all characteristics, except sex, constant, men supervisors were selected on the basis of the closest "match" to the women supervisors on a range of characteristics that included: type of job, level (position), education, age, time on present job, total amount of service, race, and marital status.

Men supervisors were "matched" on these characteristics with the women supervisors by experienced personnel technicians, based on an examination of employe personnel records. This was done to eliminate--or mediate--the effects of any non-sex-based influence. Subordinates to each supervisor to be included in the study were selected randomly from all subordinates by a personnel technician.

Superiors of the men and women supervisors were included from the total population of superiors; that is, every superior of supervisors included in the study was selected from the total population of superiors.

Training Analysis Survey Instrument

The Training Analysis Survey Instrument was designed as a result of the preliminary interviews. These interviews indicated the need for data in several areas, but especially: (1) to perceive differences in managerial skill of women and men supervisors, and (2) to support or refute certain stereotypical beliefs.

During the interviews with managers, supervisors, and workers, statements were made that indicated a belief that women and men perform differently as supervisors. Interviewees were asked to describe their experience with men and women supervisors and subordinates. Their opinions comparing men and women were gathered. After each interview, the interviewers wrote detailed notes summarizing the comments and opinions of each interviewee. The most frequently mentioned beliefs served as a guide in developing survey items.

For example, a comment from one interview was: "Men seem to be better able to plan and organize their work." Similar comments from other interviewees led to the development of several survey items on this issue.

The following are several more examples of interview comments, many of which led to survey items:

"I think most people would prefer to work for a man."

"Women supervisors seem to play favorites. That's probably why they have more trouble with subordinates."

"Some women want better jobs, but are not willing to prepare themselves for them."

"Why promote a woman--she'll just quit to get married or have a baby."

"Most women like things spelled out for them."

"In a tight situation, you can't count on a woman to stay cool."

As a result of the interviews, survey items were written, tested, and included in the instrument (see Appendix A).

Three forms of the instrument were administered: Form I was administered to superiors, Form II to supervisors, and Form III to subordinates. Form I contained items pertaining to the superior and to the supervisors immediately below; Form II contained items pertaining to the superior, the supervisor, and subordinates. Form III contained items pertaining to the supervisor and the subordinate.

The instrument used a question format with the stem, "To what extent . . ." with a seven-point response scale ranging from "completely" to "not at all." For example, a typical item was:

To what extent would you be willing to assume greater job responsibilities?

- o Not at all
- o To a very limited extent
- o To a limited extent
- o To some extent
- o To a great extent
- o To a very great extent
- o Completely

Trained survey administrators, both women and men, administered the survey instrument to respondents in small groups. Administrators were trained for five hours; their training included detailed instructions on how to organize, code, and administer the survey instrument, using simulation training techniques.

Management of the Data

The data gathered through the survey instrument were handled in the following manner:

1. An optical scanning response form was used to convert responses to tape.

2. The tape was used as the basis for calculations and analysis.

3. Data were organized using the OSIRIS program, designed specifically for the management and analysis of social science data.

4. For each variable, several statistics were computed by OSIRIS, including bivariate tables, chi-square, Cramers V, standard deviation, T test, degrees of freedom, and mean.

The primary analysis was bivariate tables, creating tables of two variables: the sex of the respondents and any of the survey items. The difference in mean response of men and women as revealed by the T test indicated those survey items in which women were perceived as performing differently than men. The chi-square statistic for each item was reviewed and served to highlight the data.

5. Differences were deemed significant when reaching or exceeding the .05 level of significance.

Summary

The design of this study called for the administration of the Training Analysis Survey Instrument to 1,313 individuals in one company, 498 women and 815 men. These individuals were either supervisors, superiors, or subordinates. Men and women supervisors were matched on a number of characteristics to isolate sex of the supervisor as the only possible factor to explain differences when they appeared.

The data were analyzed by bivariate tables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Presented in Chapter IV are the results of the research. Each hypothesis is stated, along with the survey items related to it. Data are presented in tables. The data for each hypothesis are summarized, showing that Hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported; Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not supported. There is a general summary of results at the beginning of Chapter V.

As a part of the survey, certain demographic data were collected. The demographic data regarding women and men supervisors are shown in Appendix B.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 holds that there is no significant difference in perceived managerial skills exhibited by men and women supervisors. To test this hypothesis, questions were asked of those who were superior to men and women supervisors, and of those who were subordinate to men and women supervisors. The responses to these questions were grouped into six categories, each of which represents an important managerial skill. The six skill groups were:

1. Skills in communication
2. Skills in delegating work
3. Skills in planning, organizing, and setting priorities
4. Skills in making decisions and solving problems
5. Skills in maintaining effective relationships
6. Skills in getting work done

Although it might be argued that these six groupings of managerial skills do not exhaust the full range of skills needed to be an effective manager, it was assumed, for purposes of this study, that they represent the basic skills a supervisor must possess to succeed.[1] Each is discussed separately.

Skills in Communication

The ability to communicate is one of the supervisor's most important skills. In interviews preliminary to this research, the comment was heard frequently that women tend not to keep their boss informed. However, some authors have suggested that women are more concerned than men with "socializing" on the job, and therefore are thought to be better communicators.

Responses to three specific questions were tabulated and appear in Table 1. The three specific questions, all referring to the supervisor, were:

(Asked of the supervisor's superior):

To what extent does the supervisor keep you informed about job-related information?

(Asked of subordinates):

To what extent do you have the information you need to carry out your job?

(Asked of subordinates):

To what extent does your supervisor provide you with the information you need to schedule work ahead of time?

---

[1]These skills are commonly mentioned in most standard management or personnel administration texts. For example, Strauss and Sayles, Personnel--The Human Problems of Management; Reddin, Managerial Effectiveness; Koontz and O'Donnell, Principles of Management.

It was assumed that these three questions permitted an assessment of the supervisor's skill in communicating both upward (to the superior) and downward (to subordinates).

Table 1.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's skill in communications.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Keeps superior informed about job-related information	5.163 (1.142)[a]	5.100 (1.20)	0.526 N=380	>.5
Subordinates have information needed to carry out job	5.549 (1.494)	5.462 (1.681)	0.413 N=224	>.5
Provides subordinates information needed to schedule work	4.893 (1.828)	4.663 (1.779)	0.950 N=224	>.35

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Analysis of the data in Table 1 reveals that men and women supervisors communicated job-related information with nearly equal effectiveness. There was no significant difference in any of the items. Regarding their skills in communicating, there was no significant difference between men and women supervisors as measured by this research.

Skills in Delegation

The second grouping of responses dealt with the supervisor's ability to delegate. Responses to seven questions are included here. The seven questions were:

(Asked of the superior):

To what extent does the supervisor delegate work effectively?

To what extent does the supervisor effectively utilize his/her people?

(Asked of subordinates):

To what extent do you have the authority you need to meet your responsibilities?

To what extent are your job responsibilities clearly defined?

To what extent does your supervisor give work assignments in small, non-related pieces?

To what extent does your supervisor communicate in detail how your job will be done?

To what extent does your supervisor effectively utilize your ability?

Several of these questions squarely confronted the issue of delegation skills. Others assumed that the extent to which a subordinate understands the job responsibilities and has authority to meet them is a direct reflection of the supervisor's ability to delegate. Likewise, the questions concerning the manner in which the supervisors delegate ("in small, non-related pieces"; "in detail") were taken as a measure of effectiveness in delegating. The supervisor's perceived ability to utilize people also reflects the ability to delegate.

The responses to this group of questions are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of the data in Table 2 indicates there was no significant difference between men and women supervisors' skill in delegating.

Table 2.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's skill in delegation.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Does supervisor delegate work effectively?	4.528 (1.199)[a]	4.500 (1.290)	0.215 N=369	>.5
Does supervisor effectively utilize people?	4.722 (1.287)	4.653 (1.401)	0.483 N=352	>.5
Do subordinates have authority needed?	4.512 (1.855)	4.731 (1.766)	-0.896 N=223	>.35
Job responsibilities clearly defined	5.358 (1.788)	5.635 (1.641)	-1.193 N=222	>.25
Assignments given in small, non-related pieces	5.217 (1.577)	5.298 (1.709)	-0.369 N=222	>.5
Does supervisor tell how job is to be done?	3.322 (1.745)	3.308 (1.871)	0.060 N=223	>.5
Does supervisor utilize subordinate's ability?	4.694 (1.574)	4.388 (1.725)	1.381 N=222	>.15

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Skills in Planning, Organizing, and Setting Priorities

The skills of planning, organizing, and setting priorities are important to a supervisor's effectiveness. During preliminary interviews, a number of managers commented that women are less skilled than men in these important skills. So a question was directed at superiors as follows:

> To what extent is the supervisor effective at such activities as planning, organizing, and setting priorities?

The responses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3.--Mean responses of superiors pertaining to supervisor's skill in planning, organizing, and setting priorities.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Skill in planning, organizing, and setting priorities	4.723 (1.248)[a]	4.667 (1.342)	0.422 N=380	>.5

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Again, there was no significant difference between men and women supervisors' skill in planning, organizing, and setting priorities, as perceived by their superiors. Questions dealing with this skill were not asked of subordinates.

Skills in Making Decisions and Solving Problems

Decision making and problem solving are a part of the supervisor's job. For this reason, superiors were asked how effectively

supervisors make decisions and solve problems. The specific question was:

> To what extent do supervisors logically and effectively make decisions and solve problems?

Some authors have suggested that women are not as logical as men and, therefore, have more difficulty making decisions and solving problems. Data on this question are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.--Mean responses pertaining to decision-making and problem-solving skill.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Supervisor logically and effectively makes decisions and solves problems	4.759 (1.108)[a]	4.833 (1.133)	-0.650 N=381	>.5

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

In the critical skill of decision making and problem solving there was, again, no significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of men and women supervisors.

Skills in Maintaining Effective Relationships

Maintaining harmonious and productive relationships with fellow workers is an important skill for supervisors. This is a skill at which women are reputed to excel.

To clarify this matter, superiors were asked:

To what extent does the supervisor contribute to a harmonious working relationship with fellow workers?

The responses to this question appear in Table 5.

Table 5.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's skill in effective relationships.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Does the supervisor contribute to harmonious working relationships?	5.069 (1.377)[a]	5.222 (1.276)	-1.222 N=381	>.26

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Regarding skills in effective relationships, there was no significant difference between men and women supervisors' effectiveness.

Skills in Getting Work Done

The ultimate test of supervisory effectiveness is whether or not the work gets done on time, and in the proper quality and quantity. Five questions were asked to determine whether there is a difference in men and women supervisors' ability to get the work done.

The five questions were:

(Asked of superior):

To what extent does the supervisor meet work deadlines?

To what extent are you satisfied with the quality of the supervisor's work?

To what extent are you satisfied with the quantity of the supervisor's work?

(Asked of subordinates):

To what extent is your supervisor concerned with the quality of your work?

To what extent is your supervisor concerned with the quantity of your work?

The responses to these questions are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's skill in getting work done.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Supervisor meets work deadlines	5.362 (1.103)[a]	5.183 (1.138)	1.546 N=377	>.12
Supervisor satisfaction with quality of work	5.348 (1.293)	5.172 (1.361)	1.287 N=376	>.18
Supervisor satisfaction with quantity of work	5.510 (1.261)	5.140 (1.349)	2.755 N=377	<.01
Supervisor concerned with quality of subordinate's work	5.844 (1.379)	5.433 (1.703)	1.998 N=224	<.05
Supervisor concerned with quantity of subordinate's work	5.795 (1.361)	5.654 (1.555)	0.725 N=224	>.45

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Analysis of these data indicated that there was no significant difference in men and women supervisors' ability to meet work deadlines and provide satisfactory quality of work. There was, however, a significant difference regarding quantity of work: The quantity of

work of women supervisors was more "satisfying" to superiors than the quantity of work of men supervisors, to a significant degree.

There was no significant difference in the amount of concern shown for the quantity of subordinate's work between men supervisors and women supervisors. There was a significant difference in the amount of concern shown for the quality of subordinate's work, with women supervisors showing a greater degree of concern than men supervisors.

This finding appears to be paradoxical. When superiors looked at supervisors, they found the quantity of work of women supervisors more satisfying, but saw no significant difference in the quality of work. But when subordinates looked at supervisors, they found significantly more concern for quality being shown by women supervisors, and no significant difference in concern for quantity shown by men and women supervisors. So, to the superior, women looked better on quantity standards; to subordinates, they were more quality conscious.

Thus, on the ability to get work done, the results were mixed. On two of the five questions compiled in this category, women supervisors were perceived as performing significantly differently than men supervisors.

Summary

To test the hypothesis that there is no difference in perceived managerial skills of men and women supervisors, eighteen questions were asked--nine of superiors and nine of subordinates. Responses

to these questions were grouped into six managerial skill groupings--skills which are thought to be essential to success as a supervisor.

Based on the analysis of these data, it can be concluded that no significant difference was perceived between men and women supervisors on any of the six groups of managerial skills. In fact, only two significant differences were perceived between men and women supervisors on the eighteen specific items. One is struck by the similarity of responses, whether perceived by superior or subordinate.

Hypothesis 1 was supported by the data, with the notation that a significant difference existed on only two of the eighteen items--differences that indicated more effective performance by women supervisors.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that there is no significant difference perceived between women and men supervisors in their reaction to job pressures. A concern was frequently expressed during preliminary interviews that women do not bear up well under pressure, and that they would overreact to pressure in some dysfunctional way. The literature abounds with this notion.

To test this hypothesis, two questions were asked about supervisors. One, asked of superiors, was:

> To what extent does the supervisor deal effectively with crises?

It was felt that a supervisor's ability to deal with crises presents, to the superior, a view of that supervisor's reaction to pressure--since

a crisis always carries with it a substantial amount of pressure for the supervisor. And since the superior is often the source of the pressure, it seemed best to word the question this way.

The other question, asked of subordinates, was:

> To what extent does your supervisor overreact to job pressures?

The responses to these two questions are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's reaction to pressure.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Supervisor deals effectively with crises	4.685 (1.282)[a]	4.828 (1.255)	-1.098 N=381	>.29
Supervisor overreacts to job pressures	4.549 (1.865)	4.750 (1.764)	-0.824 N=224	>.38

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Based on these data, there was no significant difference in the effectiveness of men and women supervisors in dealing with crises and overreaction to job pressures, as perceived both by superiors and subordinates.

Summary

While it is frequently held that women do not react well to pressure and to crises, the data showed no significant difference

between men and women supervisors in this regard. In both measures, men supervisors were perceived slightly more positively than women supervisors but the difference was not significant.

Hypothesis 2 was supported by the data.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that women and men are similarly willing to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility. There exists a notion, strengthened by recent feminist demands and government requirements, that women want promotions and greater responsibility, but are unwilling to invest the time and effort to prepare themselves for such responsibility. One view was stated by Killian:

> She should remember that every woman will have the same basic opportunities to participate in company-sponsored programs . . . and that a woman who wants to advance quickly uses the company program only as a launching pad. She then engages in additional programs on her own initiative, recognizing that her development is her personal responsibility.[1]

Four questions aimed at this issue were asked of supervisors and subordinates:

> To what extent would you be willing to return to school in the evening for more training?
>
> To what extent would you be willing to participate in on-the-job training to learn a new job in your present organization?
>
> To what extent have you had the opportunity to develop your potential in this organization?
>
> To what extent do you feel the organization adequately prepared you to perform your present job?

---

[1] Killian, The Working Woman, p. 59.

The first two questions directly faced the issue of willingness to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility. Although there may be other alternatives an individual could choose to prepare for greater responsibility (correspondence courses, leave of absence to pursue education, etc.), surely the willingness to return to school in the evening provides some measure of the individual's willingness. Attending evening school is, for most employed people, a substantial inconvenience and chore--one not entered into frivolously or with little hope of reward.

The willingness to learn a new job in one's present organization also implies the willingness to invest extra time and effort, especially when it was not clear from the question whether the new job would be better than the present one.

The third question, dealing with the opportunity to develop potential, presented a modifying view. One could assume that men traditionally have had more opportunity to develop their potential than have women, and thus would feel differently about the implications of this question. But to understand women's willingness to prepare themselves, one needs an understanding of their past opportunities to develop.

The fourth question was included to understand how respondents viewed the issue of preparation. If they felt poorly prepared for their present job, it is unlikely they would be willing to undertake preparation for a different job.

Data on these questions are presented in Tables 8, 10, 11, and 12.

Table 8.--Mean responses pertaining to willingness of supervisors to prepare for greater responsibility.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Willingness to attend evening school	5.435 (1.797)[a]	5.041 (1.843)	2.329 N=464	<.02
Willingness to participate in on-the-job training	6.250 (1.403)	5.949 (1.546)	2.194 N=463	<.03

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Analysis of the data in Table 8 indicates a significant difference in men and women supervisors' willingness to prepare themselves for positions of greater responsibility. On both items, the willingness to return to evening school and the willingness to participate in on-the-job training, there was a significant difference between men and women supervisors, with women supervisors expressing a higher degree of willingness both to attend night school and participate in on-the-job training. Both men and women expressed a willingness to prepare for greater responsibility, with women expressing the stronger feeling.

It might be suggested that women expressed a greater willingness to take training because the men already had a higher level of education, which they felt was sufficient--they didn't feel the need for further education. To explore this notion, educational level was held constant and the data reexamined. When education level was held constant, the mean responses were higher for women on both items, as shown in Table 9.

The data indicated that women supervisors were more willing than men supervisors to seek further education to prepare for positions of greater responsibility.

Table 9.--Mean responses of supervisors pertaining to willingness to prepare for greater responsibility, moderated by educational level of respondent.

Educational Level	Willingness to Attend Evening School		Willingness to Participate in On-Job Training	
	Women Supv.	Men Supv.	Women Supv.	Men Supv.
College Graduate	5.3 (1.74)[a]	4.7 (1.84)	6.1 (1.40)	5.7 (1.22)
High School Graduate, Plus	5.7 (1.59)	5.3 (1.74)	6.4 (1.09)	6.1 (1.57)
High School Graduate	5.4 (1.87)	5.0 (1.90)	6.2 (1.48)	5.9 (1.74)
Less than High School Diploma	5.2 (2.01)	5.0 (2.08)	6.2 (1.59)	5.7 (1.30)

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Looking at the responses to these items by men and women subordinates (Table 10), there was no significant difference in men and women subordinates' willingness to participate in on-the-job training, or their willingness to attend evening school. Both were willing, but to a lesser degree than supervisors.

Table 10.--Mean responses pertaining to willingness of subordinates to prepare for greater responsibility.

	Women Subordinates	Men Subordinates	t	P
Willingness to attend evening school	5.009 (1.822)[a]	4.864 (2.024)	0.554 N=217	>.5
Willingness to participate in on-the-job training	5.758 (1.746)	5.804 (1.698)	-0.195 N=220	>.5

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Turning to the opportunity to develop potential provided in the organization, shown in Table 11, there was no significant difference between men and women, either at the supervisor or subordinate level. Again, subordinates felt less positive than supervisors on this item. Women subordinates felt slightly less positive than men about their opportunity to develop potential. This could explain why they expressed greater willingness than men subordinates to seek further education That is, because they felt they had had less of an opportunity to develop their potential, they perhaps felt more strongly the need to take advantage of educational opportunities.

Regarding the matter of how adequately the organization prepared respondents to perform their present jobs, the data in Table 12 reveal there was no significant difference between men and women, either for supervisors or subordinates.

Table 11.--Mean responses pertaining to opportunity to develop potential.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Opportunity to develop potential	4.263 (1.553)[a]	4.179 (1.490)	0.594 N=463	>.5

	Women Subordinates	Men Subordinates	t	P
Opportunity to develop potential	3.442 (1.764)	3.712 (1.900)	-1.097	<.3

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Table 12.--Mean responses pertaining to feeling prepared for present job.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Organization prepared me for present job	4.796 (1.656)[a]	4.624 (1.561)	1.144 N=461	<.3

	Women Subordinates	Men Subordinates	t	P
Organization prepared me for present job	4.841 (1.714)	4.845 (1.858)	0.027 N=222	>.5

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Summary

Responses from both supervisors and subordinates revealed some differences regarding the willingness to prepare for greater responsibility.

Women supervisors were significantly more willing than men to attend evening school and participate in on-the-job training. On the other hand, women subordinates' willingness to attend evening school and their willingness to participate in on-the-job training were not significantly different than men subordinates'.

Regarding the opportunity to develop potential and how adequately they were prepared to do their present job, there was no significant difference between men and women at either level.

Based on this view of the data, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was unequal willingness to prepare for positions of greater responsibility, with women indicating more willingness than men. This finding was supported by data from another survey item, showing that 62 percent of the women respondents had attended company-funded training programs, whereas only 57 percent of the men respondents had attended such programs. However, a sampling of tuition-reimbursement records from the same company revealed that of those employes who had attended college-level courses on their own time, approximately 16 percent were women.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 holds that men and women supervisors are similarly willing to assume greater job responsibility. In the preliminary

interviews many managers felt that women supervisors were not willing to assume greater responsibility, thus limiting their potential for promotion. This issue has received much attention in the literature, although little empirical evidence has been presented.

What did the data from this study reveal? Three questions were asked of supervisors to determine their willingness to assume greater responsibility:

> To what extent would you be willing to assume greater job responsibilities?
>
> To what extent would you like your boss's job?
>
> To what extent do you feel you could perform your boss's job with the same degree of effectiveness as he/she does?

The first question confronts the issue squarely. The second question assumes that desiring the boss's job is a strong indication of a willingness to assume greater responsibility. The third question is a more obtuse measure of the desire for more responsibility--with the assumption that those who do not feel they could perform the job effectively would probably not aspire to it.

The responses to these questions are shown in Table 13. Analysis of these data presented, on the surface, an unclear picture. Regarding their willingness to assume greater job responsibilities, the mean responses of men and women supervisors were close to the .05 level of significance, although they were not, in fact, significant at that level.

Concerning whether or not they would like their boss's job, men supervisors were significantly more desirous of the position than were women supervisors. Similarly, men supervisors were significantly

more confident than women supervisors that they could perform their boss's job as effectively as the boss was performing it.

Table 13.--Mean responses pertaining to supervisor's willingness to assume greater responsibility.

	Women Supervisors	Men Supervisors	t	P
Willing to assume greater job responsibilities	5.671 (1.449)[a]	5.918 (1.506)	-1.803 N=466	.07
Would like boss's job	4.033 (2.206)	5.028 (2.046)	-4.990 N=459	.001
Could perform boss's job as effectively	3.886 (2.027)	5.073 (1.738)	-6.714 N=462	.001

[a]Numerals in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Because the data regarding the willingness to assume greater job responsibilities were so close to significance, a chi-square analysis was examined. The T-test approached significance on one of these survey items, but not on others. The data were regrouped, and the chi-square statistic analyzed. The results of this analysis are seen in Table 14.

Few supervisors, men or women, indicated they were not very willing to assume greater job responsibility. A significantly larger proportion of men supervisors were very willing to assume greater responsibility, and a significantly larger proportion of women supervisors were only somewhat willing to assume greater responsibility.

Table 14.--Percentage responses of supervisors pertaining to assuming greater responsibility.

		Not Very Willing	Somewhat Willing	Very Willing
Supervisor willing to assume greater responsibility	Women Supervisors	5.6%	37.8%	56.2%
	Men Supervisors	8.3%	21.4%	70.4%
	Total	6.8%	30.3%	62.9%

$x^2 = 15.32$

$p = .001$

$df = 2$

Summary

Although the mean responses on the question of willingness to assume greater job responsibility did not show a significant difference, the chi-square analysis showed a significantly larger proportion of men supervisors were very willing to assume greater responsibility, whereas a significantly larger proportion of women supervisors were only somewhat willing to do so.

Taking into account the significant difference that--to a higher degree than women supervisors--men supervisors desired their boss's job and were confident they could perform it as effectively, this increased willingness on the part of men supervisors led to the conclusion that men supervisors were significantly more willing than women supervisors to assume greater responsibility.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In Chapter V the research is summarized by presenting a synopsis of general study conclusions, followed by conclusions and training implications. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a presentation of further research possibilities.

Synopsis of General Study Conclusions

Twenty-seven items from the Training Analysis Survey Instrument were analyzed in this study. These items represented the observations most germane to the four hypotheses being tested.

For Hypothesis 1, six groups of managerial skills were established:

1. Skills in communication
2. Skills in delegating work
3. Skills in planning, organizing, and setting priorities
4. Skills in making decisions and solving problems
5. Skills in maintaining effective relationships
6. Skills in getting work done

Eighteen survey items were analyzed within this grouping. Of those, only two showed any significant difference in perceived performance between women and men supervisors. They were: Women supervisors' quantity of work is more satisfying to their superiors; and subordinates perceive women supervisors to be more concerned with

the quality of subordinates' work. On the other sixteen items dealing with managerial skills, there was no significant difference in perceived performance between women supervisors and men supervisors.

Regarding quantity and quality of work, the results presented some interesting possibilities. It is frequently held by manufacturing managers that emphasizing the need for high-quality work (showing concern for the quality of subordinates' work) is the most effective way to achieve a high quantity of work. The reason for this is that high-quality work means less time and effort are devoted to repair and rework; thus more time and effort are devoted to producing quantity. Conversely, if the men supervisors are perceived as more concerned with quantity, then quality could suffer, with a resultant decrease in quantity.

To test Hypothesis 2, responses to two items were analyzed. On both of these items there was no significant difference in perceived performance between women and men supervisors, indicating that women and men do not differ in their ability to handle crises or in overreacting to pressure.

For Hypothesis 3 regarding the willingness to prepare for a position of greater responsibility, responses to four items were analyzed. Of the four, two indicated a significant difference between women and men supervisors: Women supervisors, to a significant degree, are more willing to attend evening school than their men counterparts; and women supervisors, to a significant degree, are more willing to participate in on-the-job training than are their men counterparts. To those who believe that women could get ahead if

only they were willing to become qualified, these data should provide cause for reflection.

To test Hypothesis 4, responses to three items were analyzed; all three indicated a significant difference. The data showed that men supervisors, to a significant degree, are more willing to assume greater job responsibilities than are their women counterparts.

Conclusions and Training Implications

The general conclusion of this research is that women supervisors are perceived to be as effective as men supervisors in performing their supervisory job--a contention that is either ignored or disputed by many people. By whatever means the women acquired their proficiency, it is clear that they have learned to perform as effectively as men. (At the moment, the standard for supervisory effectiveness is the experienced man supervisor. Perhaps the inclusion of more and more women supervisors will raise that standard of effectiveness, but only time will tell.) This tends to confirm the finding of Day and Stogdill that "male and female supervisors . . . exhibit similar patterns of leader behavior and levels of effectiveness. . . ."[1]

These data serve to refute many of the statements heard in the preliminary interviews, statements that indicated some managers perceived substantial differences in managerial skill between men and women supervisors. Generally, in these interviews, men supervisors were described more positively, based on some very nonspecific criteria.

---

[1]Day and Stogdill, Personnel Psychology, p. 359.

But, in fact, these data showed that the perceptions about women supervisors' effectiveness were strikingly similar to perceptions about the effectiveness of men supervisors.

For those who believe men supervisors are more effective than women supervisors, these data will not support their belief--a fact that will come as a great disappointment. But the fact that in the two instances where there was a significant difference, the woman was perceived to be more effective--that will be a great shock!

Since a basic notion behind this research was that by identifying performance differentials, if any, one can identify corresponding training needs, then the absence of performance differentials (regarding managerial skills) indicates there are no differential training needs. This tends to support Killian's notion that "the same basic over-all training plan used for men can be used for women. . . ."[1]

As for training women to be effective supervisors, this research indicated they have no special training needs regarding their managerial skill. Thus, if one is satisfied with the level of supervisory effectiveness currently exhibited (equally by men and women), it would seem wise to continue the existing training and development programs, or at least make no adjustments in them to accommodate imaginary sex-based performance differences.

Likewise, since women and men supervisors exhibit no significant difference in reacting to pressure or dealing with crises,

---

[1]Killian, The Working Woman, p. 55.

no special training or developmental accommodations need be made here.

In the hypothesis dealing with willingness to prepare oneself for positions of greater responsibility, women supervisors were significantly more willing than men to undertake such training, although the difference for women subordinates was not significant. What are the training implications of the fact that women supervisors are more willing than men to prepare for greater responsibility?

If, as Killian stated, women do not have the "necessary educational, technical, and motivational qualifications,"[1] it is clear from this research that they are willing to get it. (It must be remembered, however, that this research did not indicate any lack of educational or technical qualifications--at least as it shows up in supervisory performance.)

Thus, employers have the job of making available to women information, direction, and support pertaining to their seeking further instruction. Given this willingness of the student, employers must enroll women in their training programs, establish appropriate developmental activities and policies, and take the initiative in getting women into these activities.

In the process of doing this research, some anecdotal evidence indicated that women find it quite difficult to be included in traditionally all-men student groups when only one or two women are in a group of fifteen to twenty men. They tend to feel unwelcome and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

unsupported--their questions and contributions are mocked by their men counterparts, and they soon withdraw (either physically or mentally) from the class. A certain minimum number of women participants seems to be necessary--a "critical mass"--so that women can find recognition, support, and encouragement. This idea should be subjected to further research.

The final hypothesis dealt with the willingness to assume greater job responsibility. Men supervisors indicated, to a significant degree, more willingness to assume greater job responsibility than women supervisors. Since the hypothesis was rejected, an explanation was sought.

Recall Manhardt's study showing that men rate as more important those factors having to do with advancement/responsibility and long-range career success. He suggested this was because women (at least some of those in the study) did not expect to work more than a few years, and long-range career success was irrelevant.[1]

Loring and Wells quoted the president of a consumer goods firm:

> There are very few [women] who can stand the stress and strain of present day business without it affecting their family relationships. A woman enjoys an outlet from routine household chores, but very few choose to go higher when it affects their home and families.[2] [Emphasis added.]

Epstein, talking about the decline of males and the increase of females in certain jobs, stated:

---

[1]Manhardt, Personnel Psychology, pp. 361-368.

[2]Loring and Wells, Breakthrough, p. 90.

> Yet, it is still unclear why males have come to be excluded from many lower-level white collar jobs in which there are no defined masculine or feminine characteristics. Women may make better subordinates simply because they accept their position and do not aim higher.[1] [Emphasis added.]

Wells strongly recommended self-concept training for women--the implication being that their self-concept is not suitable for success in the business world.[2] Korda held, "Women are not supposed to be ambitious; therefore ambition in women is generally regarded as a negative trait, even though it is highly praised in men."[3] If women have this self-concept, then it is understandable that they might not be willing to display their ambitions in a survey like the present one.

This reluctance was strengthened by Day and Stogdill, who found that women's rate of advancement is not related to their effectiveness nor to other leadership characteristics.[4]

Given these circumstances, why demonstrate ambition? Why indicate a willingness to assume greater responsibility? Why run the risk of rejection? Why take such a chance when it is felt women are not going to advance anyway? There are precious few role models for women to see, and thus, no reason to believe that advancement is a realistic option. In addition, there is always a question of the employer's sincerity when the possibility of advancement comes up.

---

[1]Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Woman's Place (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), p. 158.

[2]Theodora Wells, "Woman's Self-Concept: Implications for Management Development," p. 306.

[3]Korda, Male Chauvinism, p. 34.

[4]Day and Stogdill, Personnel Psychology, p. 356.

All in all, it is psychologically safer for a woman not to indicate her ambition, whereas it is more or less expected of a man to strive for advancement.

If this explanation is true, what are the training implications? For the woman, training experiences need to be structured to deal with the self-concept issue. (This is frequently called "awareness" training.) Work is being done in this regard.

But more importantly, the supervisors, managers, and executives who make career decisions must be trained--trained to understand women's capabilities; trained to provide meaningful opportunities to women; trained to see the ways in which women's aspirations can be blunted; trained to forget cliches and stereotypes; trained to deal with the facts, not the myths.

Wells stated it this way:

> The central change that needs to happen is a move away from perceiving men and women in the traditional sex-role patterns in the work environment . . . toward perceiving people as human beings first, seeking their own ways of growth, and who are defined only secondarily by their biological sex traits . . . this kind of change requires an organizational climate where individual growth is valued.[1]

To summarize, the data from this research led to the following conclusions:

1. Women who are supervisors, or about to become supervisors, should have essentially the same managerial skills training as men.

---

[1]Theodora Wells, "Woman's Self-Concept: Implications for Management Development," p. 307.

3. Men at the middle and upper levels need to be trained in more effective ways of seeing, understanding, and dealing with women's ambition and reluctance to express it.

4. Steps must be taken to establish policies and programs that will provide equal opportunity for women to advance--to take advantage of their greater willingness to seek further instruction. Women should be involved in the development of such policies and programs.

5. Much more research is needed, and the results of such research must be given greater visibility, especially to managers and executives.

Future Research Possibilities

Not unexpectedly, the research raised some interesting issues, which could form the basis for future studies in this general field. Listed below are some possibilities:

1. The respondents in this research were a group of women and men supervisors who were matched on many traits, meaning that the perceived performance of women supervisors was related to the perceived performance of comparable men supervisors, rather than average or typical men or randomly selected men supervisors. One could expect that there would be a greater likelihood of difference (in perceived performance) if the groups were not matched. Another study could clarify this concern.

2. This research focused on the perceived performance (and thus training needs) of current supervisors. Very little was included

pertaining to potential supervisors, who might be in the surbordinate group or outside the organization. What are their training needs? Do their needs differ according to sex?

3. This research raised some questions about raters' (or, in this case, perceivers') sex bias. Do women supervisors perceive women subordinates differently than they perceive men subordinates? If so, how--more positively? Do men supervisors perceive women subordinates differently than they perceive men subordinates? Do supervisors who supervise operations populated both by women and men subordinates perceive them differently than supervisors who have subordinates of only one sex?

4. This research focused on perceptions, not behaviors. There is a need to study the specific behaviors of men and women supervisors pertaining to their promotability.

5. This study could be replicated in other firms, or a sampling from other firms, to determine the generalizability of the results.

6. More research should be done concerning the need for self-concept or awareness training for women. Again and again this issue came up, both in the literature and in this research. Answers must be found to such questions as:

> What effect does a woman's self-concept have on her potential for management?
>
> Can women's self-concept be changed through training?
>
> What type of training is most effective in changing self-concepts?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TRAINING ANALYSIS SURVEY

APPENDIX A
TRAINING ANALYSIS SURVEY

The Training Analysis Survey instrument was administered, in three forms, to Superiors, Supervisors, and Subordinates.

Each question began with the stem, "To what extent...", and provided a seven point response scale:

— Not at all
— To a very limited extent
— To a limited extent
— To some extent
— To a great extent
— To a very great extent
— Completely

Listed below are questions from the survey. Some that were included in the printed form have been omitted here. A company policy would not permit reproduction of the actual instrument used.

Items from Superiors Survey Form only

To what extent .....

1. Does this subordinate keep you informed about job-related information?
2. Does this subordinate delegate work effectively?
3. Does this subordinate deal effectively with crises?
4. Is this subordinate effective at such activities as planning, organizing and setting priorities?
5. Does this subordinate logically and effectively make decisions and solve problems?
6. Does this subordinate contribute to a harmonious working relationship with fellow workers?
7. Does this subordinate effectively utilize his/her people?
8. Does this subordinate meet work deadlines?
9. Are you satisfied with the quality of this subordinates work?
10. Does this subordinate understand the technical aspects of the job?

11. Does this subordinate tend to become moody or hold grudges after disagreements or criticism?
12. Does this subordinate respond positively to changes and/or suggestions?
13. Does this subordinate demonstrate ambition and drive?
14. Does this subordinate take long coffee breaks, come in late, take too many days off, etc.?
15. Are you satisfied with the quantity of this subordinates work?
16. Does this subordinate frequently show his/her emotions?

Items from both Supervisors and Subordinates Survey Forms

The following questions are about your job and how you feel about it. Remember, your work group refers to all those people who report to the same immediate supervisor as you.

To what extent . . . . .

1. Does your job give you a chance to use your own ideas?
2. Would you be willing to assume greater job responsibilities?
3. Do you want more freedom to determine how to do your job?
4. Do you have the authority you need to meet your responsibilities?
5. Does your job offer you personal satisfaction?
6. Are your fellow workers receptive to your ideas?
7. Do you have the information you need to carry out your job?
8. Are you included in such activities as lunches, breaks, bull sessions, etc., by persons in your work group?
9. Are job titles important in your organization?
10. Is your pay important in determining how hard you work?
11. Would you be willing to return to school in the evening for more training?
12. Would you be willing to participate in on-the-job training to learn a new job in your present organization?
13. Would you like your boss' job?
14. Do you feel you could perform your boss' job with the same degree of effectiveness as he/she does?
15. Have you had the opportunity to develop your potential in this organization?

16. Are your job responsibilities clearly defined?
17. Have you been exposed to different operations within your work area?
18. Do you feel the organization adequately prepared you to perform your present job?
19. How many company-funded management development courses have you attended?

These next questions are about your supervisor. Remember, your supervisor is the person that you report to directly.

To what extent . . . . .

1. Does your supervisor provide you with the information you need to schedule work ahead of time?
2. Does your supervisor encourage those he/she supervises to develop better ways of doing things?
3. Does your supervisor insist that he/she be kept informed on decisions made by persons under him?
4. Are you able to influence your supervisors decisions and actions that affect you?
5. Does your supervisor give work assignments in small non-related pieces?
6. Is your supervisor impressed by titles and/or positions?
7. Does your supervisor take an active interest in your job advancement.
8. Does your supervisor put suggestions made by you or others in your work group into operations?
9. Is your supervisor concerned with the quality of your work?
10. Is your supervisor concerned with the quantity of your work?
11. Does your supervisor over-react to job pressures?
12. Does your supervisor act without consulting you or others in your work group?
13. Does your supervisor support you — "Back you up"?
14. Does your supervisor understand your job?
15. Does your supervisor communicate in detail how your job will be done?
16. Does your supervisor go out of his/her way to praise good work?

17. Does your supervisor insist that those he/she supervises follow the rules?

18. Does your supervisor favor certain employes?

19. Does your supervisor hold grudges after disagreements or other conflicts?

20. Does your supervisor behave in a moody or unpredictable manner?

21. Is your supervisor overly concerned with such things as tardiness, absenteeism, long coffee breaks, etc.?

22. Does your supervisor become irritated by non-job related conversation?

23. Does your supervisor treat you as his/her equal?

Items from Supervisors Survey Form only

To what extent . . . . .

1. Do your subordiantes keep you informed about job-related information?

2. Are you satisfied with the quality of your subordinates work?

3. Do your subordinates deal effectively with crises?

4. Are your subordinates effective at such activities as planning, organizing and setting priorities?

5. Do your subordinates logically and effectively make decisions and solve problems?

6. Do your subordinates contribute to a harmonious working relationship with fellow workers?

7. Do your subordinates contribute to a productive working relationship with fellow workers?

8. Do your subordinates meet work deadlines?

9. Are you satisfied with the quantity of your subordinates work?

10. Do your subordinates understand the technical aspects of the job?

11. Do your subordinates tend to become moody or hold grudges after disagreements or criticism?

12. Are your subordinates responsive to changes and/or suggestions?

13. Do your subordinates demonstrate ambition and drive?

14. Do your subordinates take long coffee breaks, come in late, take too many days off, etc.?

APPENDIX B

DATA PERTAINING TO WOMEN AND MEN SUPERVISORS

APPENDIX B

DATA PERTAINING TO WOMEN AND MEN SUPERVISORS

	Number of Respondents	
Age	Women	Men
20-24	5	5
25-29	27	31
30-34	46	48
35-39	31	34
40-44	39	30
45-49	51	33
50-54	40	24
55 and over	9	11
Marital Status	Women	Men
Married	147	194
Single	45	12
Divorced	48	9
Separated	3	1
Widowed	5	1
Other	2	2
Level of Formal Education	Women	Men
8th grade or less	0	1
Completed 1 to 4 years high school	28	11
High school graduate or equivalent	121	77
Completed formal journeyman or technical program	8	3
Completed 1 to 4 years college	45	75
College graduate	22	30
Some graduate training	13	11
Masters, Ph.D., etc.	5	4

Years With Company	Women	Men
Less than 1 year	11	2
1 to 2 years	5	8
2 to 3 years	8	3
3 to 4 years	3	8
4 to 5 years	12	13
5 to 10 years	65	52
10 to 15 years	33	34
15 to 25 years	62	70
25 years or more	49	27

Years on Present Job	Women	Men
Less than 1 year	108	78
1 to 2 years	82	29
2 to 3 years	9	21
3 to 4 years	10	18
4 to 5 years	4	11
5 to 10 years	12	31
10 to 15 years	3	16
15 to 25 years	12	12
25 years or more	8	1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartol, Kathryn M. "Male vs. Female Leaders: The Effect of Leader Need for Dominance on Follower Satisfaction." Academy of Management Journal 17 (June 1974): 225.

Bond, Floyd; Leabo, Dick; and Swinyard, Alfred. Preparation for Business Leadership. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1964.

Burke, R. "Differences in Perception of Desired Job Characteristics of the Opposite Sex." The Journal of Genetic Psychology 109 (1966): 27-46.

Centers, R., and Bugental, D. E. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivation Among Different Segments of the Working Population." Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (1966): 193-97.

Cleeton, Glen V., and Mason, Charles W. Executive Ability. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1946.

Crowley, J.; Levitin, T.; and Quinn, R. "Facts and Fictions About the American Working Woman." Unpublished paper, Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan, 1973.

Day, David R., and Stogdill, Ralph M. "Leader Behavior of Male and Female Supervisors: A Comparative Study." Personnel Psychology 25 (1972): 353-360.

Douvan, E., and Adelson, J. The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. Woman's Place. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Hennig, Margaret. "Career Development for Women Executives." Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1970.

Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B.; Peterson, R.; and Capwell, D. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hoffman, L. W. "Early Childhood Experiences and Women's Achievement Motives." Unpublished paper, The University of Michigan, 1972.

Jennings, Eugene Emerson. The Mobile Manager: A Study of the New Generation of Top Executives. Ann Arbor: Bureau of Industrial Relations, 1967.

Killian, Ray A. The Working Woman, A Male Manager's View. New York: American Management Association, 1971.

Kilpatrick, F.; Cummings, M., Jr.; and Jennings, M. Source Book of a Study of Occupational Values and the Image of the Federal Service. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1964.

Korda, Michael. Male Chauvinism: How It Works. New York: Random House, 1973.

Loring, Rosalind, and Wells, Theodora. Breakthrough: Women Into Management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1972.

Manhardt, Philip J. "Job Orientation of Male and Female College Graduates in Business." Personnel Psychology 25 (1972): 361-368.

Miles, Mathew B. "Human Relations Training: Processes and Outcomes." Journal of Counseling Psychology 7 (April 1960): 301-306.

Nevis, E. C.; Smith, Adair; and Harper, Robert. "Behavior and Attitude Changes Related to Laboratory Training." Training Directors' Journal, February, 1965.

Slevin, D. "Full Utilization of Women in Employment: The Problem and an Action Plan." Human Resource Management, The University of Michigan, Spring, 1973.

Smith, Ewart, and Knight, Stanford. "Effects of Feedback on Insight and Problem Solving Efficiency in Training Groups." Journal of Applied Psychology 43 (March 1959): 209-211.

Tiedeman, David V., and O'Hara, Robert P. Career Development: Choice and Adjustment. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.

Wells, Theodora. "Women's Self-Concept: Implications for Management Development." Optimizing Human Resources. Edited by G. Lippitt, L. This, and R. Bidwell. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

General References

Albrecht, Paul A.; Glaser, Edward M.; and Marks, John. "Validation of a Multiple-Assessment Procedure for Managerial Personnel." Journal of Applied Psychology 48 (December 1964).

Background Facts on Women Workers in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1968.

Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary. Human Behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.

Blake, Robert, and Mouton, Jane S. The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Cohen, Malcolm S. "Sex Differences in Compensation." The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. I, No. 4.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Dill, William R.; Hilton, Thomas L.; and Reitman, Walter R. The New Managers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Dooher, M. Joseph, and Marting, Elizabeth. Selection of Management Personnel. New York: American Management Association, 1957.

Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963.

Ginzberg, S. W.; Axelrod, S.; and Herma, J. L. Occupational Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.

Levitin, Teresa; Quinn, Robert; and Staines, Graham. "Sex Discrimination Against the American Working Woman." American Behavioral Scientist 15 (November/December 1971).

Lewis, Edwin C. Developing Women's Potential. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1968.

Lynda, Edith M. The Executive Suite--Feminine Style. New York: American Management Association, 1973.

Perrella, Vera C. "Women and the Labor Force." Monthly Labor Review, February 1968.

Rayburn, Letricia Gayle. "Do Women Discriminate Against Each Other?" The National Public Accountant, October 1971.

Rigel, John W. Executive Development. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952.

Sands, Edith. How to Select Executive Personnel. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1963.

Shaw, Edward A. "Differential Impact of Negative Stereotyping in Employe Selection." Personnel Psychology 25 (1972).

Skinner, B. F. Science and Human Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1953.

Super, Donald. "A Theory of Vocational Development." Vocational Guidance Development. Edited by Peters and Hansen. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.