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CHAPTER I
LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This is an investigative study that examines an applied problem of turnover among blue collar workers. Two aspects within the purview of the current study yield a unique view of previous scientific research. One part addresses the issue of female supervision with heterosexual blue collar work groups, while a second part deals with "sexually moderated turnover." The phrase "sexually moderated turnover" originated as a result of the male subordinate turnover rate which exceeded that of the female subordinate even though both sexes possessed similar backgrounds and performed similar duties on the job. (Note: Appendix I)

Although the literature is devoid of studies directly addressing the issue of differential turnover within blue collar heterosexual work groups under female supervision, Brayfield and Crockett (1955), Porter and Steers (1973), and Kraut (1975) indicated in their studies that there are increasingly larger turnovers in a single sex work unit (male supervisor and male subordinates). The results of several studies (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Porter and Steers, 1973; & Kraut, 1975) suggest two related but distinct variables showing the most promise in studying turnover are leader behavior and job satisfaction. While the empirical
relationships between turnover and leader behavior or turnover and job satisfaction have not been extremely high, the results of their research studies have been moderate but consistent. Therefore, the content of the current investigative study and writing will be restricted to the area of leader behavior.

LEADER BEHAVIOR

Two variables have been found that relate to turnover among blue collar workers: one is the leadership dimension of "initiating structure," the other is "consideration." Both variables evolved out of the Ohio State Leadership studies conducted by Hemphill (1949). Fleishman and Harris (1962) employing the "Supervisor Behavior Description Questionnaire" (described by Fleishman, 1972) found a negative curvilinear relationship of -.69 between "consideration" versus "turnover" and a positive curvilinear relationship of .63 between "initiating structure" versus "turnover" for a sample of all male blue collar workers.

When the levels of "consideration" and "initiating structure" where trichotomized into low, medium, and high groups and plotted against "turnover" in a three dimensional graph, "consideration" was revealed as the dominant factor. Even though the data depicted "turnover" as being highest among those groups whose supervisors were viewed as being
low in "consideration" and high in "initiating structure," it also indicated that "turnover" was high for those foremen who were low in "consideration" regardless of the amount of emphasis they placed on "initiating structure." Conversely, those work groups who viewed their foreman as having moderate to high levels of "consideration" regardless of the level of "initiating structure" experienced low turnover.

The previously cited research (Fleishman et al., 1962) suggests that supervisors whose leadership dimensions are characterized as being low in "consideration" would have work groups who experience high turnover. However, the Fleishman et al. studies do not appear applicable when applied to the present situation in that the findings fail to explain the differential turnover between male and female subordinates.

SEX AS A MODERATOR

The deficiency emphasized above concerning the lack of congruence between Fleishman et al. finding and the current study is not surprising in view of those limitations of the Ohio State Leadership studies which have been revealed by investigators (Korman, 1966; Bobbit, Breinholt, Doktor & McNaul, 1975). Kerr, Schricsheim, Murphy and Stogdill (1974) indicated that one of the most serious criticisms of the Ohio State studies was the failure of its advocates
to take situational variables into account. To eliminate the deficiency Kerr et al. (1974) reviewed the literature involving the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" for the purpose of identifying situational variables that moderate the effectiveness of leaders ("leadership is to a great extent situational, and what is effective leadership in one situation may be ineffective in another," Fleishman, 1953, p. 2). Kerr et al. (1974) identified eight variables that researchers found to moderate a leader's effectiveness and incorporated those variables found into a situational theory of leadership.

However, one situational variable omitted from the Kerr et al. (1974) study that might influence the effectiveness of various levels of "initiating structure" and "consideration" was identified by Petty and Lee (1975) as the sex of the supervisor. It was Petty and Lee's contention that certain leadership styles might result in a dysfunctional outcome for a female supervisor within an organization if sex role stereotypes were operative, even though the same leadership style for a male supervisor proved very effective.

In order to investigate the hypothesis of sex as a situational moderator, Petty et al. (1975) administered the Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD) (Fleishman, 1972)
and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall & Julin, 1966) to one hundred sixty five employees from non-academic divisions of the University of Alabama.¹ Those subjects selected were then sub-grouped into four different groups: female supervisor-female subordinate, female supervisor-male subordinate, male supervisor-female subordinate, male supervisor-male subordinate.

It was Petty and Lee (1975) findings that those male subordinates who were under female supervisors viewed their supervisors as lower in "consideration" and higher in "initiating structure" than did the subordinates in the other three groups. While the Petty and Lee (1975) finding is consistent with the research of Goldberg (1968) and Schien (1973), it also expands the current knowledge in the leadership area by considering the sex of the subordinate in the evaluation process. Although an argument can be made that the above results of earlier researchers are based on perceived behavior rather than actual behavior on the part of the supervisor, Hollander and Julian (1969) have suggested that perceived behavior is the most important aspect rather than the supervisor's actual behavior.

Based on Petty and Lee (1975) findings that male

¹This information served as pre-test data for first and second level supervisors' subordinates who were to participate in a training program.
subordinates who are supervised by female supervisors view their supervisor as lower in "consideration" and higher in "initiating structure," the next logical step would be to assess the effects of these two leadership dimensions ("consideration" and "initiating structure") in the work setting. One such attempt was made by Bartol and Butterfield (1976) in a laboratory setting. In Bartol and Butterfield's investigation a case study was developed for each of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" for both male and female managers. In each case study the hypothetical manager was projected as either high in "consideration" or "initiating structure." The authors Bartol and Butterfield had both male and female students rate the hypothetical managers in the case studies in terms of their present satisfaction with the manager, their anticipated future satisfaction with the manager and their desire to work for the manager.

In the situation where the managers were high in "initiating structure," Bartol and Butterfield found the evaluators' present and future satisfactions were lower for the female manager than for the male managers. Bartol and Butterfield also found that the male evaluators gave lower present and future satisfaction ratings for managers high in "initiating structure" than did female evaluators. However, when the evaluators' desire to work for a manager
high in "initiating structure" was considered, both male and female evaluators preferred the male manager over the female manager.

In terms of the leadership dimension of "consideration," Bartol and Butterfield found only one significant effect. The effect found was with the present satisfaction and the data indicated that both male and female evaluators rated present satisfaction higher for the female manager than did the male manager when both managers were high in "consideration."

Another criterion employed by Petty and Miles (1976) in assessing the effects of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" has been that of "propensity to leave" the job. In a field study Petty et al. (1976) administered a "propensity to leave" scale ranging from one to five along with both the Supervisory Behavioral Description questionnaire and the Job Descriptive Index to two hundred and twenty six professional level personnel employed in social service organizations. A correlational analysis was employed to estimate the strengths of the relationships between the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" and "propensity to leave" for both male and female supervisors.

Petty et al's. analysis yielded a significant relationship between the leadership dimension of "consideration"
and "propensity to leave." A further interpretation of the relationship found by Petty et al. (1976) indicated that when female supervisors were viewed as low in "consideration" the subordinates had a higher "propensity to leave" (r = .28, p. 01). While the relationship between "consideration" and "propensity to leave" for male supervisors was near zero (.01), this relationship was significantly different from the previously mentioned female supervisor and "propensity to leave" relationship. Furthermore, even though the relationships between the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" and "propensity to leave" were not significant, they were in the hypothesized direction, i.e., the higher the "initiating structure" on the part of the female the higher the "propensity to leave" on the part of the subordinate.

Although one might question Petty's et al. (1976) criterion of "propensity to leave" as being a valid predictor of turnover, such a measure has been found to be significantly related to turnover by Waters, Roach and Waters (1976). Also, the significant relationship found between the leadership dimension of "consideration" and turnover is consistent with Fleishman's et al. (1962) findings, and the moderating effects of sex of the supervisor was to be expected on the basis of Petty's et al. 1975 study. Furthermore, the lack of relationship between
the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" and turnover does not seem incongruent with the other cited research studies if "consideration" is given to the subjects employed in the various studies.

GROUP AS A MODERATOR

The subjects employed in the research cited above are as follows: Fleishman et al. (1962) blue collar with little or no education past high school, Bartol et al. (1976) high school graduates with at least two years of college, Petty et al. (1975) non-academic personnel with 60% being college graduates, and Petty et al. (1976) professional personnel with 100% being college graduates. Furthermore, if a logical assumption is made that a relationship between education and occupation exists where a higher education is associated with a more prestigious job, then a reasonable interpretation of the above findings can be assumed. The interpretation would be that as one moves up the hierarchy of jobs the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" becomes a less potent variable.

One explanation for the above interpretation might be the contextual nature of the job itself. Jobs which require more education and/or training on the part of the occupant generally provide the occupant with more opportunity for autonomy and initiative in his work setting.
Some empirical support for this explanation can be found in a field study conducted by Hsu and Newton (1974).

In order to assess how a supervisor felt he should behave toward his work group, Hsu et al. (1974) administered the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) (Fleishman, 1969) to 243 foremen employed in a manufacturing area in the Midwest. While these foremen did not differ in terms of age, education or number of hourly workers supervised, they did differ in terms of the type of work group they supervised. The difference found manifested itself in the skill level of the work groups with 41 of the supervisors supervising skilled workers and 202 supervisors supervising unskilled workers. Fleishman (1969) found that those supervisors who supervised unskilled workers perceived a need to be higher in "initiating structure" than did those foremen who supervised skilled workers. However, Fleishman (1969) also found that there was no difference between the two groups of foremen in terms of the leadership dimension of "consideration."

If an interpretation is made of the above results the data suggests a number of implications. One implication is that some empirical support is provided for the interpretation that the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" becomes a less potent variable as one moves up the hierarchy in terms of jobs. That is, supervisors generally perceive
less need to "initiate structure" with work groups who are skilled than with work groups who are unskilled. However, with respect to the leadership dimension of "consideration," the data suggests that the skill level of the work group has no effect on the supervisors' "consideration" dimension. These data cited also suggest a moderating effect for the leadership dimension of "initiating structure," i.e., skill level of the work group. Furthermore, if a summation is made of the above findings along with the preceding evidence, a viable explanation exists for the differential turnover described earlier.

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Although none of the above cited studies in the research literature reviewed addressed the problem of sexually moderated turnover among heterosexual blue collar work groups directed by female supervisors, an integration of those research studies cited provide a partial explanation of sexually moderated turnover.

The integration proceeds from the finding that the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" were found to be related to turnover in blue collar work groups (Fleishman et al., 1962). Furthermore, the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" were found to be moderated by certain variables
(Kerr et al., 1974). One of the variables found to moderate the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" was supervisor's sex (Petty et al., 1975). Another variable found to moderate the leadership dimensions was the skill level of the work group (Hsu et al., 1974).

An interpretation of the moderating effects of supervisor's sex indicated that male subordinates viewed their female supervisors as being lower in "consideration" than did the female subordinates. An interpretation of the moderating effects of the work group skill level suggested that the lower the skill of the work group the higher the structure on the part of the supervisor.

Therefore, in view of the work group under consideration in the present study being characterized as very unskilled along with the supervisor being female, the above data lends itself easily to interpretation. That is, the male subordinate turnover rate exceeds that of the female subordinate because not only are the female supervisors viewed as high on the structure dimension but the male subordinates perceive her as lower in "consideration" as well. Furthermore, the above interpretation is consistent with those findings of studies by both Petty et al. (1976) and Butterfield et al. (1976).
CHAPTER II
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

The literature seems devoid of any studies that examine the effects of differential turnover among blue collar heterosexual work groups under female supervision. An investigation of the effects of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" may provide information that will enable researchers to understand and better predict turnover in a work setting which has female supervisors supervising blue collar work groups.

The following hypotheses represent the major considerations of this current study.

1. A linear combination of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" can effectively discriminate between those employees who leave the job and those employees who remain on the job.

2. The leadership dimension of "consideration" will account for more of the variance in turnover than will the leadership dimension of "initiating structure."

The five percent (.05) level of significance will be used as the criteria for rejection of the null hypothesis in all statistical tests.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Eighty-one custodians employed by a residence hall department at a large southern university during the spring and summer of 1976 participated in this study. The sexual composition of the group consisted of 46 female custodians and 31 male custodians. There were no significant differences between the sexes in terms of age, education, or race (Appendix II).

Instrument

The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) developed by Fleishman (1972) was employed to assess the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" (Appendix III). This instrument currently used contains 48 items which describe a supervisor's behavior. Each subject of the study is requested to respond to each item on a Likert type scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). Twenty-eight items of the questionnaire are related to the leadership dimension of "consideration" while twenty of the items are related to the leadership dimension of "initiating structure." Each subordinate receives two scores which reflect his/her perception of his/her supervisor on the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure."
Even though the literature is replete with studies addressing the reliability (Stogdill & Coons, 1957), validity (Ilgen & Fujii, 1974), and stability across samples (Szilagyi & Sims, 1974) of the SBDQ, an internal consistency check was performed in terms of the present sample. A coefficient Alpha for the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" revealed coefficients of .88 and .74 respectively. While these coefficients are not as high as desired they are still in the respective range to warrant the instrument's use in the current research.

PROCEDURE

Some custodians could not read or had failed to bring their reading glasses to work, therefore each question on the SBDQ was read individually to small groups not exceeding three persons. The five point Likert scale was reproduced with bold letters on a two by six foot roll of white butcher paper. After each question had been read the anchor points on the Likert scale were also read so those having reading or visual problems could respond by location on their respective questionnaire.

The following instructions were read aloud by the experimenter to all subjects prior to starting the questionnaire.

This study is part of a project that is necessary to be completed for a class I am enrolled in at the University. You are requested to be completely truthful in answering the questions.
which will be read to you shortly. You are free to discontinue the questionnaire at anytime without any explanation on your part. However, you are requested to sign your name to the questionnaire for identifying purposes of the study but confidentiality will be maintained and you are assured no one will ever see the results or will be able to trace any of the findings to any individual personally. You were chosen, as a group, to participate in the study because workers such as yourself have received very little attention by researchers who are studying jobs. Are there any questions?

After all questions had been answered the following directions were read aloud to the participating subjects.

The questionnaire you have before you is one for describing certain aspects about your supervisor. I will read each item aloud. Please think about how frequently your supervisor engages in the behavior described by the item. I will then read the scale choices aloud. If you have forgotten your glasses, please note where I am pointing on the scale in front of you and draw a circle on the scale on your paper in the same place. If there are any questions, please feel free to ask them.

ANALYSIS

Turnover was the dependent variable employed in this study. The turnover data were collected approximately one year after the subjects completed the SBDQ. At the time of collection each person was assigned a number of 1 or 0 depending on his/her being still employed or voluntarily terminated.

A discriminant analysis was performed to find the linear combination of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiation" structure that best discriminates between the groups classified on the basis of turnover.
The significance of the discriminant functions was tested using a test statistics which is approximately distributed as a chi-square variable when computed by the procedure in Overall and Klett (1972). However, in this situation which involves only two groups (stayers and leavers), only one discriminant function is found, and the results are functionally equivalent to those that would be found from a multiple regression using a dummy criterion variable.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The sample of employees used in the current study were divided into those who remained on the job (stayers) and those who left (leavers) based on turnover data. Mean scores for each group were calculated on the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure." Group means, standard deviations and sample sizes for each group are presented in Table I.

Table I. Mean Leadership Dimension Scores and Standard Deviation For Those Employees Who Stay On The Job and Those Employees Who Left The Job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M = 65)</td>
<td>(M = 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Consideration&quot;</td>
<td>97.43</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Initiating Structure&quot;</td>
<td>62.23</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group of employees who remained on the job and the group of employees who left the job were homogeneous with respect to the demographic variables of race, age, and formal education. Table II which contains the cross-tabulation
of race by job status indicates that both black and white employees were similarly represented in both groups with respect to job status (leavers and stayers).

Table II. Crosstabulation Between Race and Job Status For Those Employees Who Remained and Those Employees Who Left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.33, \text{ D.F.} = 1, \text{ P} = 0.05 \]

Likewise, Table III suggests no significant difference between those who remained and those who left the job in terms of formal education and age.

Table III. Demographic Variables For Those Employees Who Stayed On The Job and Those Employees Who Left The Job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.81</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Since the homogeneity of variance assumptions were not met, a test was employed based upon separate variance estimates.

Presented in Table IV are the intercorrelations among the dependent variable (turnover), leadership dimensions ("consideration" and "initiating structure") and demographic variables. An examination of these relationships indicate that four of the correlations are greater than could be expected due to random sampling when the .05 criterion is employed.

Table IV. Intercorrelation Among the Leadership Dimensions, Demographic Variables and Turnover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consid.</th>
<th>Int. St.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ed.</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Consid.&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Int. St.&quot;</td>
<td>-.244*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-.299*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.255*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p. < .05

Even though the significant point biserial correlation (r = .255, p < .05) between the dependent variable of turnover and sex was to be expected in terms of the current study, the other three relationships provide some insight with respect to the data in the current study. The significant negative
relationship \((-0.244, p < .05)\) between the leadership dimensions of "initiating structure" and "consideration" indicates that these two dimensions are not independent. While the above relationship implies that the employees view the leadership dimension in an unidimensional manner, an examination of the coefficient of determination indicates that the two variables of "consideration" and "initiating structure" share only \(0.059\) percent of common variance. Thus a great deal of the variation within each scale is still left unexplained by the variation within the other scale.

The covariation between age and the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" suggests that older employees tend to view their supervisors as higher in structure than do the younger employees. However, neither age nor "initiating structure" were related to the dependent variable of turnover.

The other significant relationship revealed by the correlation matrix in Table IV was between the variable of education and the dependent variable of turnover. An interpretation of this negative relationship \((-0.229, p < .05)\) would be that those persons who left the job tended to have less education than those who remained on the job.

Presented in Table V is a stepwise discriminate analyses which examines the relationship between the dependent variable of turnover and the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure." The stepwise procedures selects
the leadership dimension that discriminates most effectively between the two groups in relation to the dependent variable of turnover. The prior probabilities assigned to each level of the dependent variable of turnover were .19 (employee who left the job) and .81 (employee who remained on the job). These prior probabilities were based on the data actually observed in the present sample. The inclusion criterion for the variables of "consideration" and "initiating structure" to be entered into a linear equation was a F-ratio of 1.0.

Table V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Consideration&quot;</td>
<td>.5601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Initiating Structure&quot;</td>
<td>.0185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Neither ratio exceed inclusion criterion.

An examination of Table V indicates that neither of the discriminating variables satisfied the minimal inclusion criterion. Therefore, neither of the hypothesis stated in Chapter II were supported. The data in Table V suggests that a linear weighted combination of the leadership dimension of "consideration" and "initiating structure" does not exist that can differentiate between the two groups of employees (stayers and leavers) in reference to the dependent variable of turnover.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

One of the major goals of the current study was to determine the weighted linear combination of the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" that would differentiate between the employees who left the job and the employees who remained on the job. However, the data obtained in the current study indicated that these two leadership dimensions were not related to turnover for this group of employees. While the data from the current study may seem contradictory to other research (Fleishman et al., 1962; Porter et al., 1973; Petty et al., 1975) which has found relationships between the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "turnover," the subjects employed in the current study were operating under a concurrence of unique factors. The major difference of the subjects in the current study was the concurrence of female supervision and blue collar work.

Some of the cited research addressed the topic of turnover as it related to the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" for subordinates under female supervisors (Petty et al., 1975; Bartol et al., 1976 and Petty et al., 1976). Other research addressed the topic of turnover as it related to the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" for blue collar workers.
(Fleishman et al., 1962 and Porter et al., 1973). However, the literature researched did not reveal studies that consider both female supervision and blue collar workers on the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" in terms of turnover.

Another goal of the study was to determine some possible explanations of why the present work groups under investigation experienced a higher turnover rate for male subordinates. To the issue of differential turnover the study fell short again. Not only were the employees who stayed and the employees who left similar in terms of demographic variables both sexes were homogeneous on the demographic variables as well. While there must be some factor or factors operating to induce such a disparity of sexual turnover, the data in the current study was not sensitive to the issue of differential turnover.

The only variable in the current study found to be related to the dependent variable of turnover was education. The relationship between education and turnover indicated that in general the employees with less education tended to turnover more readily than did those employees with more education. One possible explanation for the relationship between education and turnover might be related to frustration on the part of employees with less formal education. If the lack of education interfered with their job performance they may have perceived the situation as hopeless and resigned their position.
The current data were consistent with those findings of Petty and Miles (1976). The data from both the current study and Petty et al. (1976) indicated that when the supervisor is female the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" may not be related to turnover. It is also of interest to note that the supervisors in Petty's et al. were professional white collar employees instead of the blue collar employees employed in the current study. The diversity of subjects employed would seem to increase the general ability of the lack of relationship found between the leadership dimension of "initiating structure" and turnover.

Several cautions should be observed in interpreting the data of the present study. One point to be noted was the data collection as it relates to instrumentation. The SBDQ was designed for the respondents to complete individually with no assistance. However, the data in the current study were obtained in small groups while the investigators read aloud each item and the scale choices. The actual presence of the group as well as the oral presentation by the investigator may well have had a contaminating effect on the results.

The type of subjects employed in the current study placed some limitation in the current findings. While the subjects were employees and not student participants, they did participate on a voluntary basis. Therefore, the results obtained may not be the same as those obtained employing subjects in
a non-voluntary situation. Thus, if it were a job requirement to participate, different findings may have been found altogether.

The current study was less than should be desired from a design point of view. The supervisors in the present study were all females. This artifact prevented any contrasts to be made concerning heterosexual blue collar workers being supervised by a group of heterosexual supervisors. Had the supervisors been both male and female it would have greatly strengthened the current study.

Another deficiency with respect to the design concerns the lack of institutional sampling employed. Since all the persons employed in the current study were affiliated with the same institution, this would limit the area of generalization. Furthermore, since only one institution was involved, the study was not sensitive to any policies that might have affected the differential turnover.

Therefore, in view of the above limitations, further research is needed to examine the reliability and generality of the current findings. It is recommended that future research in the area of turnover should involve subject pools employed by different institutions. Also, it would be helpful if the supervisors involved represent both sexes.
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Appendix I

Crosstabulation between the variables of sex by turnover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.08, \text{ DF} = 1, \ P < .05 \]
Appendix II

Demographic variables for male and female subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Male       | 35 | 10.71| 12.64| 8.88    | .01   | 1.31    | 39.85| .19   |
| Educ.      |    |      |      |         |       |         |      |       |
| Female     | 46 | 7.78 | 4.25 |         |       |         |      |       |

* Since the homogeneity of variance assumptions were not met, a test was employed based upon separate variance estimates.

Crosstabulation between the variables of sex and race for the sample of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.64, \text{ DF} = 2, P > .25 \]
Appendix III

Supervisor's Name______________________

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently your supervisor engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the words following the item to show the answer you have selected.

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: She often acts as described.

Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

Example: She never acts as described.

Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

QUESTIONS:

1. She refuses to give in when people disagree with her.

Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

2. She encourages overtime work.

Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never
3. She does personal favors for the employees under her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. She tries out her new ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. She expresses appreciation when one of us does a good job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. She rules with an iron hand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. She is easy to understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. She criticizes poor work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. She demands more than we can do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. She talks about how much we should do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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11. She helps her employees with their personal problems.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

12. She encourages slow working employees to greater effort.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

13. She criticizes her employees in front of others.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

14. She waits for her employees to push new ideas before she does.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

15. She stands up for her employees even though it makes her unpopular.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

16. She assigns people under her to particular tasks.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

17. She insists that everything be done her way.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never

18. She asks for sacrifices from her employees for the good of the entire branch.
Always | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never
19. She sees that an employee is rewarded for job well done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. She insists that her employees follow standard ways of doing things in every detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. She rejects suggestions for changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. She sees to it that people under her are working up to their limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. She changes the duties of people under her without first talking it over with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. She offers new approaches to problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. She treats people under her without considering their feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
26. She insists that she be informed of decisions made by employees under her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. She tries to keep the employees under her in good standing with those in higher authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. She lets others do their work the way they think best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. She resists changes in ways of doing things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. She stresses being ahead of competing work groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. She "rides" the employee who makes a mistake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. She "needles" employees under her for greater effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. She refuses to explain her actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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34. She decides in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. She acts without consulting her employees first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

36. She emphasizes meeting of deadlines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. She stresses the importance of high morale among those under her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. She backs up her subordinates in their actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. She emphasizes the quantity of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. She is slow to accept new ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

41. She treats all her employees as her equals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
42. She criticizes a specific act rather than a particular individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

43. She is willing to make changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

44. She makes those under her feel at ease when talking with her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

45. She is friendly and can be easily approached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

46. She puts suggestions that are made by employees under her into operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>