

AD-A136 699

NAVY RECRUIT'S EXPECTATIONS OF PRODUCTIVITY LIKING AND INTENTIONS TO QUIT..(U) ILLINOIS UNIV AT URBANA DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY M VILLAREAL ET AL. NOV 83 TR-DNR-28 1/1

UNCLASSIFIED


N00014-80-C-0407

F/G 5/9

NL



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
2 84  
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963 A

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ONR-28	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Navy Recruit's Expectations of Productivity, Liking, and Intentions to Quit under Different Supervisors		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Marcelo Villareal Harry C. Triandis		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N 00014-80-C-0407
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Illinois 603 E. Daniel, Champaign, IL 61820		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 170-906
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Group Office of Naval Research (Code 442) Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE November, 1983
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 7
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the U.S. Government.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Hispanics, Mainstream, preference for supervisors		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Samples of Hispanic and Mainstream recruits responded to a questionnaire which presented 64 supervisors and asked for an estimate of the degree of liking and the probable productivity of workers working under each supervisor. There were no systematic differences between the Hispanics and the Mainstream. Both samples indicated a preference for structured (he tells you exactly what to do...) open (you know exactly what he thinks about you) and considerate (when you don't feel well he assigns you an easy job) supervisors.		

AD- A136699

DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC  
EXTRACTE  
JAN 11 1984

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

Unclassified  
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Navy Recruits' Expectations of Productivity, Liking,  
and Intentions to Quit under Different Supervisors

Marcelo Villareal and Harry C. Triandis

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Social interaction seems to be determined by mutual attributions and expectations held by the participants of the interaction about each other (e.g. McCall & Simmons, 1978; Triandis, 1977a, 1977b, 1981), as well as by the behavioral and social alternatives of the participants (e.g. Putallaz & Gottman, 1981; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959).

Diverse researchers have studied the effects of attributions and expectations on supervisory and leadership styles as well as the effects of these styles on the perceptions, behavior, and productivity of group members (e.g., Bales, 1950; Cartwright & Zander, 1968; Hollander, 1978). Of particular interest, along these lines, have been the effects of emphasis on productivity as opposed to emphasis on the personal well-being of the workers (e.g., Bales, 1950; Fiedler, 1967). More specifically, two factors have been identified to be of major relevance for effective leadership and supervision: Consideration for the workers and initiation of structure by the supervisor (Hemphill, 1955; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Whether a supervisor provides workers with information about the work environment has also been observed to affect the workers' satisfaction with and efficiency in their jobs (e.g., Katz & Kahn, 1978; Laird & Laird, 1975 edition).

In this study we assessed the relevance of these supervisory styles for the perception of high productivity and quitting intentions, as well as for the expressed liking for the supervisor, among Hispanic and Mainstream Navy recruits. In addition, we examined the effects of the supervisor's personal characteristics, such as his age, race, or ethnic background, on these perceptions.



Dist Special

A1

### Subjects

Two samples of male Navy recruits separately responded to two questionnaires as part of a larger study of their perceptions of the social environment. One of these samples was formed by 19 Mainstream (see description below) and 20 Hispanic participants, while 40 Mainstream and 40 Hispanic recruits constituted the second sample. These samples were formed at different times following the procedure to be described next. In each of three Navy Recruit Stations, when a recruit with a Spanish surname was to be classified the classification officer checked the recruit's self-identification on an application form on which "Hispanic" was one of the ways in which the applicant could identify himself. A Spanish-surnamed recruit who identified himself as Hispanic was asked to complete the aforementioned questionnaires. At the same time, another recruit was randomly selected and given the same questionnaire. The recruits in the latter group constitute the "Mainstream" sample.

The contrast between the Hispanics and Mainstream was of special interest, since if there is a contrast between a common set of cultural elements across diverse American groups (differing in race and region) with U.S. Hispanic culture, it would be useful to extract it for Hispanic recruitment, training, and retention programs, both in the Navy and in U.S. industry.

### Procedure

Two questionnaires presented 64 stimulus persons. They described male supervisors who varied along four dimensions: age (25- or 45-years old), race (white or black), ethnicity (Anglo or Hispanic), and supervisory style. The supervisor's style was: (1) Either open (described as "He tells you more than you want to know about what is going on on the job. You know exactly what he thinks about you") or closed ("You don't know

what he thinks about you; he tells you nothing about what goes on on the job"); (2) either laissez-faire ("He never tells you what to do, and sets no deadlines for your work; he does not check to see whether you complete your assignments") or structured ("He tells you exactly what to do and sets specific deadlines for when it should be done. He makes sure you carry out your assignments exactly as expected"); (3) either considerate ("When you don't feel well, he assigns you an easy job. One time your brother was sick in the hospital and he let you take leave and visit him") or inconsiderate ("In assigning jobs to you, it makes no difference to him whether you feel well or not. One time your brother was sick in the hospital and he did not give you leave and insisted that you stay on the job"); or (4) either intimate ("He reveals you his intimate feelings about the way he feels about the commanding officer; he talks to you openly about his sex life") or formal ("He tells you nothing about his intimate feelings concerning others; he keeps his sex life completely secret from you"). This results in a 2<sup>4</sup> within-subjects design (age, sex, ethnicity and behavior) for each of four behavioral dimensions, plus a between subjects ethnicity factor. Thus a total of 4x16=64 different supervisors were used.

Each participant was asked to rate how much they would like each of these 64 supervisors, and to indicate how likely it would be that, given a particular supervisor and behavior, they would "work faster and produce more", "quit", "work more carefully and increase the quality of your work", and that "productivity (output/hour) would increase in America".

One of the samples answered this questionnaire using a 5-point scale, whereas a second sample responded on a 10-point scale for a methodological study reported elsewhere. In both cases, the lowest category was "never" and the highest was "always" and "for sure". Corresponding middle points in the scales (3, and 5 or 6, respectively) indicated that the participant was undecided about the likelihood of an event given a particular supervisor.

A principal axes factor analysis with varimax rotation was then

performed on the sums of the five categories of events, for each of the two versions of the questionnaires. Results from these analyses suggested that the best grouping of the scales was in three clusters: (1) productivity expectations (work faster and produce more, work more carefully and increase the quality of the work, productivity in America would increase); (2) expected quitting intentions; and (3) expected liking. This permitted three repeated-measures split-plot 5-way ANOVAs, with one between subjects and four within subject factors. Whenever a cell score in a  $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$  matrix was missing for a participant, all of his scores were dropped from the analysis.

### Results

Results for the analyses of variance showed consistent and very strong main effects for supervisory styles. These effects were inconsistently moderated but rarely overridden by higher-order interaction effects. Given these considerations, we will limit our discussion to consistent main effects. Before detailing our results we would like, however, to highlight the fact that, given the nature of our research design, it was possible to ascertain that the results to be reported apply to both Mainstream and Hispanic Navy recruits.

Both samples (5 point and 10 point scales) reported higher expectations and intentions of productivity when the supervisor was structured [ $F(1,34) = 31.56$ ,  $p = .0000$ , and  $F(1,54) = 86.1776$ ,  $p = .0000$ ], open [ $F(1,36) = 4.16$ ,  $p = .0487$ , and  $F(1,55) = 40.79$ ,  $p = .0000$ ], and considerate [ $F(1,33) = 47.23$ ,  $p = .0000$ ;  $F(1,57) = 109.83$ ,  $p = .0000$ ], than when he was laissez-faire, closed, and inconsiderate.

Regarding quitting intentions, the participants of both samples indicated higher intentions to quit whenever the supervisor was laissez-faire [ $F(1,32) = 5.67$ ,  $p = .0233$ ;  $F(1,61) = 22.86$ ,  $p = .0000$ ] or inconsiderate [ $F(1,35) = 16.43$ ,

$p = .0002$ ;  $F(1,60) = 36.08$ ,  $p = .0000$ ]. However, the results for the other supervisory styles were more complex.

Results for liking scores show patterns similar to those for productivity. Both samples indicated that they would like structured [ $F(1,34) = 9.17$ ,  $p = .0046$ ;  $F(1,59) = 47.51$ ,  $p = .0000$ ], open [ $F(1,35) = 4.24$ ,  $p = .0470$ ;  $F(1,58) = 57.1632$ ,  $p = .0000$ ], or considerate supervisors [ $F(1,34) = 41.90$ ;  $F(1,64) = 187.73$ ,  $p = .0000$ ] better than laissez-faire, closed, or inconsiderate supervisors.

### Discussion

Our results suggest that a supervisor's behavior is of paramount importance in influencing workers' perceptions of him and their intention to produce and quit. If this is the case, training programs in leadership and social skills, as well as simple recommendations to supervisors regarding "appropriate" supervisory behaviors may prove a fruitful avenue to increase workers' satisfaction and productivity, and to reduce turnover.

On the other hand, it is theoretically appealing to assume that liking for a supervisor affects productivity and quitting intentions, but our results do not indicate an unqualified support for this hypothesis. The fact that liking results seem to parallel those for expectations of productivity, however, call our attention to the possibility that quitting intentions may be highly influenced by the availability of alternatives (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and that dislike for a supervisor might be better reflected by a drop in productivity (psychological withdrawal) than by quitting (e.g., Hom & Hulin, 1978; March & Simon, 1958; Miller, 1981). Further research in this area, however, is clearly necessary.

The Hispanic/Mainstream contrast, in this study, did not reveal any important differences. While on several other studies with the same sampling design (Technical Reports ONR-13, ONR-14, ONR-15, ONR-19, and ONR-24) there were important cultural differences, the present study did not identify any.



References

- Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1950.
- Cartwright, D. C., & Zander, A. Group Dynamics: Research and theory (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Fiedler, F. E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Hemphill, J. K. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1955, 46, 385-401.
- Hollander, E. P. Leadership dynamics. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- Hom, P. W., & Hulin, C. L. A comparative examination of four different approaches to the prediction of organizational withdrawal. University of Illinois, Technical Report 78-5, 1978.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Laird, D. A., & Laird, E. C. The new psychology for leadership. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. Identities and interactions (Revised edition). New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- Miller, H. E. Withdrawal behaviors among hospital employees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1981.
- Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. Social skills and group acceptance. In S. R. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Triandis, H. C. Interpersonal behavior. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1977(a).

Triandis, H. C. Cross-cultural social and personality psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 143-158 (b).

Triandis, H. C. Influencias culturales en el comportamiento social. Inter-american Journal of Psychology, 1981, 15, 1-28.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

LIST 1  
MANDATORY

Defense Technical Information Center (12)  
ATTN: DTIC DDA-2  
Selection and Preliminary Cataloging Sec  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Library of Congress  
Science and Technology Division  
Washington, D.C. 20540

Office of Naval Research (3)  
Code 4420E  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Naval Research Laboratory (6)  
Code 2627  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Office of Naval Research  
Director, Technology Programs  
Code 200  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

LIST 2  
ONR FIELD

Psychologist  
Office of Naval Research  
Detachment, Pasadena  
1030 East Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91106

LIST 3  
OPNAV

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations  
(Manpower, Personnel, and Training)  
Head, Research, Development, and  
Studies Branch (Op-115)  
1812 Arlington Annex  
Washington, DC 20350

Director  
Civilian Personnel Division (OP-14)  
Department of the Navy  
1803 Arlington Annex  
Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations  
(Manpower, Personnel, and Training)  
Director, Human Resource Management  
Plans and Policy Branch (Op-150)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations  
Head, Manpower, Personnel, Training  
and Reserves Team (Op-964D)  
The Pentagon, 4A478  
Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations  
Assistant, Personnel Logistics  
Planning (Op-987H)  
The Pentagon, 5D772  
Washington, DC 20350

LIST 4  
NAVMAT & NPRDC

Program Administrator for Manpower,  
Personnel, and Training  
MAT-0722  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Naval Material Command  
Management Training Center  
NAVMAT 09M32  
Jefferson Plaza, Bldg #2, Rm 150  
1421 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 20360

Naval Material Command  
Director, Productivity Management Office  
MAT-00K  
Crystal Plaza #5  
Room 632  
Washington, DC 20360

Naval Material Command  
Deputy Chief of Naval Material, MAT-03  
Crystal Plaza #5  
Room 236  
Washington, DC 20360

Naval Personnel R&D Center (4)  
Technical Director  
Director, Manpower & Personnel  
Laboratory, Code 06  
Director, System Laboratory, Code 07  
Director, Future Technology, Code 41  
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Washington Liaison Office  
Ballston Tower #3, Room 93  
Arlington, VA 22217

LIST 8  
NAVY MISCELLANEOUS

Naval Military Personnel Command (2)  
HRM Department (NMPC-6)  
Washington, DC 20350

Naval Training Analysis  
and Evaluation Group  
Orlando, FL 32813

Commanding Officer  
ATTN: TIC, Bldg. 2068  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Chief of Naval Education  
and Training (N-5)  
Director, Research Development,  
Test and Evaluation  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508

Chief of Naval Technical Training  
ATTN: Code D17  
NAS Memphis (75)  
Millington, TN 38D54

Navy Recruiting Command  
Head, Research and Analysis Branch  
Code 434, Room 8001  
801 North Randolph Street  
Arlington, VA 22203

Navy Recruiting Command  
Director, Recruiting Advertising Dept.  
Code 40  
801 North Randolph Street  
Arlington, VA 22203

Naval Weapons Center  
Code 094  
China Lake, CA 93555

Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
1801 North Beauregard Street  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Sequential by Principal Investigator

LIST 14  
CURRENT CONTRACTORS

Dr. Clayton P. Alderfer  
Yale University  
School of Organization and Management  
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Janet L. Barnes-Farrell  
Department of Psychology  
University of Hawaii  
2430 Campus Road  
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dr. Gary Bowen  
SRA Corporation  
800 18th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Jomills Braddock  
John Hopkins University  
Center for the Social Organization  
of Schools  
3505 N. Charles Street  
Baltimore, MD 21218

Jeanne M. Brett  
Northwestern University  
Graduate School of Management  
2001 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60201

Dr. Terry Connolly  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
School of Industrial & Systems  
Engineering  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Richard Daft  
Texas A&M University  
Department of Management  
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Randy Dunham  
University of Wisconsin  
Graduate School of Business  
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Henry Emurian  
The Johns Hopkins University  
School of Medicine  
Department of Psychiatry and  
Behavioral Science  
Baltimore, MD 21205

Dr. Arthur Gerstenfeld  
University Faculty Associates  
710 Commonwealth Avenue  
Newton, MA 02159

Dr. J. Richard Hackman  
School of Organization  
and Management  
Box 1A, Yale University  
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Wayne Holder  
American Humane Association  
P.O. Box 1266  
Denver, CO 80201

Dr. Daniel Ilgen  
Department of Psychology  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824

Dr. Lawrence R. James  
School of Psychology  
Georgia Institute of  
Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. David Johnson  
Professor, Educational Psychology  
178 Pillsbury Drive, S.E.  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. F. Craig Johnson  
Department of Educational  
Research  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Dan Landis  
Department of Psychology  
Purdue University  
Indianapolis, IN 46205

Dr. Frank J. Landy  
The Pennsylvania State University  
Department of Psychology  
417 Bruce V. Moore Building  
University Park, PA 16802

List 14 (continued)

Dr. Bibb Latane  
The University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill  
Manning Hall 026A  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Edward E. Lawler  
University of Southern California  
Graduate School of Business  
Administration  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. William H. Mobley  
College of Business Administration  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Lynn Oppenheim  
Wharton Applied Research Center  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dr. Thomas M. Ostrom  
The Ohio State University  
Department of Psychology  
116E Stadium  
404C West 17th Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. William G. Ouchi  
University of California,  
Los Angeles  
Graduate School of Management  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Robert Rice  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Department of Psychology  
Buffalo, NY 14226

Dr. Irwin G. Sarason  
University of Washington  
Department of Psychology, NI-25  
Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Benjamin Schneider  
Department of Psychology  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Edgar H. Schein  
Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology  
Sloan School of Management  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Program Director, Manpower Research  
and Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 N. Pitt Street, Suite 120  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Richard M. Steers  
Graduate School of Management  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. Siegfried Streufert  
The Pennsylvania State University  
Department of Behavioral Science  
Milton S. Hershey Medical Center  
Hershey, PA 17033

Dr. Barbara Saboda  
Public Applied Systems Division  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P.O. Box 866  
Columbia, MD 21044

Dr. Anne S. Tsui  
Duke University  
The Fuqua School of Business  
Durham, NC 27706

Andrew H. Van de Ven  
University of Minnesota  
Office of Research Administration  
1919 University Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55104

Dr. Philip Wexler  
University of Rochester  
Graduate School of Education &  
Human Development  
Rochester, NY 14627

Sabra Woolley  
SRA Corporation  
901 South Highland Street  
Arlington, VA 22204

**LMED**

**8**