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THE SELECTION AND TRAINING OF SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The Problem of Selection and Training of Supervisory Personnel

The general problem of personnel procedure in business and industry has been emphasized in research and publications during the past three decades. More efficient personnel organizations have been originated for the benefit of management and labor as a result of these attacks on personnel problems. Improved methods of hiring the employee, placing him in jobs according to his capabilities, and training him in skills determined by job analyses are further examples of scientific management.

The problem of selecting and training individuals who supervise and guide employees has been neglected in most research to date. It is commonly recognized that the foreman, superintendent, or department head is a decisive factor in promoting morale, reducing labor turnover, and increasing production, yet little has been done by industry and research agencies to evaluate the necessary characteristics, essential experiences, and
training programs of supervisory employees.

During the early years of American business, in fact, until the start of the present century, most business firms were controlled and operated by the owners who were personally acquainted with not only the foreman but with individual workmen. With the growth of large corporations and the development of mass production industries, the owner became separated from the employee and the place formerly occupied by the individual entrepreneur has been taken by those individuals who are referred to as management.

The role of the supervisor in management has become increasingly important. Mass production methods have been a major factor in focusing the attention of management upon the supervisor as has been the collective bargaining movement in labor. The upsurge of organized labor due to the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, which was held as constitutional by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, and the increased power of organized labor during World War II placed the supervisor of employees in a very strategic position. Efforts have been made and are still being made by certain groups to organize the foremen into unions. In the past they were excluded from membership in most unions as the supervisor was considered a part of management.
In consideration of this vital role that supervisory personnel perform in modern industry, the problem of this study is to determine what business and industry are doing in the Pacific Northwest to apply scientific principles to the selection and training of supervisors.

Pacific Northwest Was Selected as Locale for the Study

The Pacific Northwest was selected for the field of this investigation as the writer believed more cooperation would be received from the industrial firms in this area since the findings would be more applicable to their use.

Another factor of interest in this study is that most business firms located in the Pacific Northwest states are either individual enterprises of small size or branch plants or offices of larger corporations with headquarters in the Middlewest and East. This limits the scope of the study as it is obvious that a plant employing a full-scale personnel department must be large enough to afford the expense of the personnel director, staff, and equipment required for effective operation.

Sources of Data and Methods Employed

The firms utilized in this study were picked at random from telephone directories of Seattle and Portland.
plus the companies selected from a list of the members of the Pacific Northwest Management Association. No attempt was made to select firms according to size or type of business, so there is a composite selection of lumber, public utilities, department stores, banks and various types of manufacturing plants. The information was collected by means of a questionnaire forwarded with a covering letter to these firms requesting their cooperation in this investigation and inviting suggestions for improvement of personnel relations involving supervisory employees.

**Influence of the Armed Services on Personnel Work**

Business and industry profited to some extent by the experience of the army's program of testing, selecting, and training men during World War I. Looking backward it is easy to observe how meager was the beginning of the comprehensive program developed by the armed forces in 1917-1919, and much credit is due the military forces for their pioneer work in the field of testing and personnel. Emphasis was placed primarily on the selection and training of officers. These were the individuals needed to train and lead others. However, when business and industry initiated their personnel programs, the tendency was to emphasize the selection, placement,
and training of the new employee rather than the supervisor. Great advances were made in the industrial field after World War I in improving the basis for selecting and training these workers. Recognition is due the directors of personnel programs in business and industry for their contributions to this field of knowledge. The armed services utilized this information and experience of business and industry during the rapid mobilization period from 1939 to 1945.

During World War II and since that time more emphasis has been placed on the problems of the selection, placement, and training of supervisors. This was partially due to the armed forces' emphasis on leaders of men and specialists in various fields.

**Limitations of the Study**

The number of firms contacted is not great enough to give any conclusive results; nevertheless, the number is sufficient to indicate certain trends. If the results of the study, as discussed in detail later, are taken in this light, they can be of value to the business executive and may enable him to gain a better understanding of the problems that arise in the selection and training of supervisory personnel. This is important at the present time due to the continual growth in size of most
industries and the resultant separation of the employer and employee. The decentralization trends of big business will furnish greater emphasis upon this problem. Currently there are three levels in most American business: the owners or stockholders; management; and the workers. As a result of this separation, the role of the foreman or supervisor has come to occupy a most important part in industry as, by the average worker, the foreman is considered to be management and upon his judgment, interpretation, and execution of higher rulings much of the labor unrest or peace is caused. The writer has attempted to determine how far industry in this area is employing scientific methods for selection and training of supervisory personnel.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature Pertaining to the Selection and Training of Supervisory Personnel

Benefits of a Centralized Personnel Department

Several factors entered the industrial picture with the advent of large corporations and the subsequent separation of the owner and worker which were of little importance in the earlier industrial development of the United States. The great growth of labor unions and their resulting power plus more active governmental supervision of industry led to the necessity of instituting centralized personnel departments to handle personnel problems. Personnel relation functions involve advising, cooperating, and being available for service in personnel relations rather than actually performing these functions in a line organization. The main task, to a large extent, is persuading the line organization to perform properly personnel relations work as well as selling them on the value of the functions of a personnel relations department.

Stagner (14) reports the results of a survey made by two of his students at Dartmouth College. One of the questions asked in the survey was whether the company had a unified personnel department. Of the firms
answering the questionnaire, 72 percent indicated they did have unified personnel departments. Table I is reproduced in its entirety from Stagner's article and contains some items that are not specifically applicable to this thesis but are valuable to those interested in the field of psychology as applied to industry. Specific items from Stagner's article will be discussed later.

Table I

Attitude of Corporate Executives Regarding Psychological Methods in Personnel Work
(after Stagner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your company have?</th>
<th>(All are percentages)</th>
<th>Do you consider this desirable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1. A unified personnel office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2. Tests of intelligence for applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3. Tests of performance for applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>28 **</td>
<td>4. Preference in employment to college men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5. Periodic checks on the morale of employees by attitude tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6. Professionally trained psychologists in the personnel department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7. Training program for new employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Training program to show supervisors how to deal with men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your company have?</th>
<th>Do you consider this desirable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(All are percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average= 22,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures do not add to 100 percent because some respondents answered only a few items.

** Most respondents specified that this applied only to technical or prospective executive employees.

# Figures on absenteeism and turnover were supplied only by a minority of firms, and some of these were apparently on differing bases.
Walters (19.74) states that the principal reasons for the proper management of personnel relations are that it:

(1) Improves employee and employer relationships
   a. Improves attitude of employees toward the company
   b. Improves morale and goodwill
(2) Prevents personnel relations difficulties
(3) Pays in dollars and cents
(4) Develops employees and management

Since the advent of the New Deal and particularly during the period of World War II, labor unions in this country made phenomenal growth and have become increasingly powerful. Management is realizing that one way of securing a constructive economic peace is to utilize scientific methods to match the appeal of the union for the average worker, and to counter the bargaining power of the unions which hire the best legal talent.

Prevalence of Testing in Industry

A study made by the California Council of Personnel Management (13) reported that of 100 organizations surveyed, 45 percent were using personnel tests and another five percent had used them but discontinued the practice for various reasons. In Stagner's study (14) we find that 57 percent of the reporting companies used both intelligence and performance tests for applicants.
We can conclude that firms using tests are of the opinion that information regarding skills and aptitudes can be obtained more accurately and in less time by means of suitable tests. Of the reporting companies, 45 percent used tests in making promotions or upgradings and 40 percent used them for filling supervisory positions from their employees.

In an article, "Testing is Big Business," (20) Wolfle stated that in 1944, from the best available data, 26,781,759 tests and 11,493,407 persons had been tested by business organizations, educational institutions, and personnel consultants. This summary was made at the request of Walter D. Scott, Chairman of the Editorial Board of Nelson's Encyclopedia. There is no breakdown of the number of tests used for supervisory employees.

Since very little information is available regarding the testing of supervisory employees, some mention will be made of the findings and the type of tests used for original applicants as many of these tests are applicable to supervisory employees. Tiffin (16.2) states:
Industry has long recognized the existence and importance of individual differences in training and skill. Personnel managers hiring tradesmen make every effort to determine in advance the degree of skill that the applicant possesses. But often employers do not so clearly recognize the fact that differences in capacity for machine operation and other jobs that are ordinarily considered as unskilled or semi-skilled are just as great and just as important as differences in skill among tradesmen. The significance to industry of individual differences among employees is far more important than that of differences in skill already developed or of differences that can be detected in an interview. The concept of individual differences is concerned with basic differences in capacity which are of importance in every phase of industrial personnel placement.

Recent legislation has made it costly - and in some instances impossible - for management to continue past procedures of indiscriminately discarding employees if they do not prove satisfactory. Also, union contracts may carry clauses forbidding discharge of employees with a certain amount of seniority. It is important, therefore, for industry to exercise care in the proper selection of the initial applicant, as well as in the selection and training of the personnel who are to be in charge of the workers.

It must be realized that testing does not eliminate the necessity of other employment techniques such as the interview, the application form, and checkup on the references and recommendations. Tests should supplement other procedures. Hepner (6.263) states that
the tests alone are not a sufficient basis in most firms for hiring or rejecting an applicant. They are merely one of the factors that must be evaluated just as age or education must be weighed in determining a composite score. Hepner concludes that if tests are not utilized the interview is influenced frequently by the attitude of the interviewer and too often personal prejudices are allowed to affect the final judgment. For example, one person may be prejudiced against an individual with red hair, and subjectively reject an applicant with red hair regardless of his qualifications.

The Role of the Foreman in Industry

The personality of the supervisor is one of the greatest single influences on employee morale. McMurry (7.4) indicates that the personality of the supervisor may easily create hostility. Two of the principal causes for employee dissatisfaction, according to McMurry, are:

(1) The personalities of top management as expressed in company policies and practices.

(2) Personalities of line executives and supervisors with whom the workers come in daily contact.

Too little attention has been paid to the personality factors on the supervisory level of foreman and department head. As management studies its job today
it is generally agreed his supervision is important in influencing employee attitude and it cannot be over-emphasized.

McMurry (7.9) adds:

If any level of supervision may be said to be of maximum significance in influencing employee attitudes, it is that of the department head, supervisor, foreman, or straw boss. He is on the firing line; he is the only representative of management with whom the rank and file of employees have daily contact. Hence, he comes to symbolize the company.

In a recent survey made by Cherinton and Roper for the National Association of Manufacturers, 42.9 percent of the employees named the foreman when asked to define management. In addition, the foreman or department head is important in employee relations because it is he who usually interprets management's policies. In consequence, an attitude toward a foreman or department head can easily and often does become an attitude toward the organization as a whole.

Unfortunately, many people in supervisory positions do not know how to handle people. A major source of trouble is the almost universal practice of selecting men and women for junior executive and supervisory positions solely in terms of their technical knowledge, without reference to their leadership ability. The fact that a person is a good mechanic or craftsman does not guarantee that he has even an elementary knowledge of how to work with or handle people. Nor is faulty selection the only factor. Of equal importance, few have ever been taught how to handle people. In addition, a number suffer in some degree from emotional maladjustment or mild mental illness. Because of these factors, good leadership at the level of the department head or foreman is the exception rather than the rule in industry today. Furthermore, few of these supervisors are aware that their methods of handling people are defective.
Machines and materials behave in accordance with fixed laws. To a man or woman who has been accustomed to the way of the machine, human behavior is often incomprehensible. Furthermore, they fail to understand the interactive processes of humans, how one personality influences another. The foreman may have difficulty in conceiving that the principal cause of his difficulties frequently lies in himself; that is, his own personality. Because of this, he projects the responsibility for the trouble onto the employee.

Hepner (6.591) believes the immediate supervisor is the most potent representative of management. He, rather than the major officials of the company, influences the attitudes of the employees by his personality, mannerisms, ability, and personal leadership. The corporation and business as a whole are personified in the foreman. To the factory employee, the company is "but the lengthened shadow" of the foreman. Psychologically, the worker is in a state of readiness for a precipitating stimulus that will give an outlet for his dammed-up feelings. The foreman may be a highly skilled workman but supervision of humans places him in a difficult position. His simplest criticism of error may release an accumulation of feeling or action that is wholly out of proportion to the seriousness of the
employee's offense.

The National Association of Manufacturers queried 6000 employees in 1937. The replies indicated the workers believe troubles and misunderstandings between themselves and management are largely management's fault. The importance of the foreman in regard to these misunderstandings was indicated by the following: 45 percent of the workers blaming management in general placed the blame on the foreman in specific instances.

It is obvious that the foreman plays an exceedingly important role in American industry. Upon his personality adjustment and his ability to handle problems arising in the daily routine of the job depends the stabilization of friendly relations between management and the worker.

A competent foreman has the human touch which enables him to build morale because he thinks sincerely. A skilled foreman begins his art of handling employees with the individual employee. An efficient foreman aids the new employee in acquiring the feeling of belonging which psychologists have found to be exceedingly important for satisfactory social adjustment.

Use of Merit Rating

Much importance was placed upon merit rating in
the United States government service when Congress passed the law establishing a civil service commission. The principal duty of the civil service commission was to test the fitness of applicants for certain classes of positions in the federal service. This action came as a result of the assassination of President Garfield by a dissatisfied office seeker.

Industry did not adopt merit rating immediately. However, the last thirty years have witnessed a gradual adoption of merit rating programs whereby an individual employee is rated by his supervisors, managers, or department heads. Walters (19.200) states:

To rate means to set an estimate on, to appraise, or to put a value on. To rate the personnel of a company is to put an estimate on the value of an employee or the employees. Rating appraises the employee's relative value in his job and in his organization. It is a judgment of how well he does his job. It is not a measurement, because to measure is to compare with a standard.

Walters (19.201) further adds that the purposes of ratings are accomplished by use in the following management functions:

1. Selection of workers
2. Employee development and adjustment
3. Training of employees
4. Rating for improvement of foremen
5. Wage control and adjustment
6. Improvement of employee-employer relations and morale
7. Promotion of employees
8. Layoff of employees and determination of priority of men of same seniority.
In a study made in 1934 Walters (19.202) found that 34 percent of 233 companies investigated maintained a rating plan in their companies, and that 31.8 percent of the companies rated their employees periodically. In 1936 the National Industrial Conference Board found that 363 companies maintained rating systems. This report was based on 2,452 companies investigated. Starr and Greenly made a study in 1938 and 1939 of 64 companies with 44 replying to their survey. They found that about one-third of the firms replying were using merit rating plans. It is interesting to note from Stagner's study in 1945 and 1946 (Table I) that 67 percent of the reporting companies utilized a system of merit rating.

Rating scales may be of various types such as: man to man comparison scales developed for the army in preparing efficiency reports, yes and no scales, and graphic or adjective types. Other forms may be listed but they are variations of these three types of rating scales. The most commonly accepted form today is the graphic or adjective type of scale. It is more accurate than other types; it attempts to make the rating of an individual as objective as possible.

Poffenberger (11.279) believes no final answer can be given as to the number of raters that should be used, but he does believe a minimum of three is necessary
to eliminate idiosyncrasies of opinion. These raters should know the individual well enough to make an impartial analysis based upon actual information and observation. He should know the requirements of the job and be able to judge the degree to which the individual worker is performing the job according to the standards set by management.

The primary advantage of the merit rating system in industry when applied to promotion, transfer, or layoff is to replace former haphazard methods by more objective means; thereby, minimizing favoritism and snap judgment. It is recognized that such procedures are not infallible and have inherent dangers but research indicates merit rating can be used to advantage if properly administered. Cooperation is a requisite by all individuals from top management down to the newest employee. If the employees understand the purposes of the rating system, cooperation will be more readily maintained than if they believe they are being spied upon. It is important that ratings be made at regular intervals. Most authors agree that six-month intervals are desirable.

Tiffin (16.236) lists the following as some of the main values of merit rating:
(1) It prevents grievances because it stimulates the supervisors to talk over with their men possible sources of grievances before serious problems have a chance to arise.

(2) It improves job performance because if an employee for lack of information or lack of experience continually performs his job in the wrong way, the supervisor will be doing both the employee and the company, as well as himself, a favor by bringing this matter to the employee's attention in the proper manner.

(3) It increases the analytical ability of the supervisor.

(4) It assists the management in promotion, demotion, and transfer problems.

(5) It reveals areas where training is needed.

Also, Tiffin (16.233) lists the following as some of the disadvantages of merit rating:

(1) The "halo" effect
(2) Improper "weighing" of traits
(3) Pooling unreliable with reliable ratings
(4) Failure to determine the reliability of ratings
(5) Failure to consider departmental differences in rating, and differences between various jobs within the plant.

Other factors not considered frequently in evaluating merit rating are the failure to consider the age of the employee, length of time on present job, and years of service in a plant.

**Necessity of Training Supervisors**

Tiffin (16.198) states that perhaps no job in
industry has undergone such great changes during the past 20 years as that of the supervisor or foreman. Several decades ago, when a supervisor's position was to be filled, the best producer in the department was usually promoted without regard to his ability in industrial relation phases of the supervisor's position. As a result of this policy, the foreman frequently became a "bull of the woods". He hired and fired, set the rates for his men, dealt with problems of discipline as he saw fit, was responsible for his own quality control, determined methods of work, did his own training, and took care of his own maintenance. The emergence and development of scientific management gradually took many of these responsibilities away from the foreman. Problems of hiring have been taken over largely by the personnel department and the responsibility for layoff has been assumed by the department of industrial relations. Many of the other duties have been transferred to industrial engineers and the industrial relations department.

The removal of many of the foreman's former duties and responsibilities brought about the assignment of duties with which the foreman had not been concerned 20 years ago. The foreman of today must have some knowledge of the law. Recent social legislation has made it
imperative that decisions made by management with respect to layoffs, transfers, seniority, hours of work, wages, and a host of other matters must conform to certain legal requirements. Preliminary decisions on such matters must be made by the foreman and often must be made at once with no time for conferences or the consultation of statements of the law. The foreman of today must be a statesman who has both wisdom and tact. Twenty years ago the rule in settling disputes was simple and easy to learn—in any dispute the foreman was right and the employee wrong. Today both may be right or both may be wrong, or each may be partly right or partly wrong. A decision reached by management today must be made after consideration of all angles and viewpoints of all parties.

Leadership is a primary quality of a foreman of today. He must not boss his men so much as he must understand them. He must know why this one becomes disgruntled upon a slight pretext and why another one is often late to work. His job is to help the men help themselves. This is particularly true in periods of emergency production. Though the foreman has seldom studied the subject of psychology, it is very important for him to know, if he is to do his job well, that desires and wishes of his men must be both understood and
considered. Without such understanding he cannot hope to be a satisfactory supervisor. Changes in the job of the supervisor, such as described above, have made it necessary for management to devote considerable time and effort to the training of supervisors. Many industries have set up a complete program of supervisory training conferences to train the present supervisors in the newer aspects of their job that are developing almost daily and to prepare younger men to become supervisors. The subject matter covered in such conferences varies considerably from plant to plant to meet the needs of that organization. One plan in common use is to have every supervisor or potential supervisor attend a conference or class on the company's time for a period of from one and one half to two hours every two weeks. Typical lists of subjects covered include such matters as company policy, industrial relations, union contracts, and the services of experts in such fields as job analysis and insurance.

Stagner (14) reported that 78 percent of the reporting companies had compulsory training programs for new employees and that 83 percent of the firms considered it desirable. Eighty-three percent of the firms reported they maintained training programs to improve supervisor's skill in dealing with men, and 81 percent
of the companies considered this training desirable.

Walters (19.290) believes the training of foremen has been recognized as a necessity by the leading progressive companies today. Most companies do not go outside their own organization for new foremen. Many maintain a reserve through training sub-foremen, bosses, and general employees. Some mention company contacts with high schools and trade schools as a means of obtaining potential foremen.

Conference and discussion groups are the principal methods used for foremen training. Because one of the principal jobs assigned to the foreman today is managing his men, many companies have centered their foremen conferences on the subject of handling men. Walters (19.293) lists the following as suitable topics to be covered in foremen conferences:

1. Personnel relations policies
2. Job description
3. Judging employees on merit rating
4. Organization of employees
5. Selection, training, promotion, layoff
6. Dealing with people
7. Morale
8. Handling grievances and suggestions
9. Training employees
10. Safety
11. Business conditions of the company and industrial economics

A book of instruction and facts for performance is also an effective method of training foremen. This booklet is usually printed by the company with articles
on the following subjects: employment, absenteeism, company insurance, company insignia, medical service, workmen's compensations, housing, training, safety, time and time-keeping, employee services, savings, employee clubs, sales of stock to employees, and recreation. In recent years foremen's letters have been used in some companies to give the foremen weekly, biweekly, or monthly current data about the company and the problems of the foreman.

Necessity for Scientific Methods in the Selection, Promotion, Transfer, and Layoff of Employees

The majority of employees are interested in advancement and seek promotion. According to Walters (19253) promotions may be made in the following forms:

1. Advancement in wages or salary
2. Increased responsibility, authority, position, or title
3. Decreased working time such as hours per day, days per week, or increased vacations
4. Transfer of employment to better location or department
5. Improvement of working and living conditions
6. Provision of opportunities for greater training, experience, and outlook
7. Increased security of position and benefits offered
8. Extension of length of service because of outstanding work

Systematic promotions within a business concern are a vital factor in maintaining morale of the employee
as he knows he will not be pushed aside by an outsider and will be rewarded for good work. However, studies indicate that relatively few companies, large or small, maintain systematic promotion programs. Most concerns make promotions on the basis of expediency as vacancies and opportunities occur.

Transfer of employees from one position to another within the organization may increase interest in the job, reduce the monotony of long period of work on one job or in one department, reduce labor turnover, and decrease the number of blind-alley jobs. Also, transfers aid in improving the health and mental attitude of the employees as they tend to equalize and to regularize employment in the various departments and tend to prevent or correct personal maladjustments between foremen and workmen. Most investigators have discovered that a systematic or regular transfer plan for employees is rarer than a promotion plan.

The selection of those who are to be promoted or transferred remains a major problem for industry. Some personnel departments have utilized intelligence, special ability, and personality tests as guides. Others have maintained cumulative personnel records of employees which include the employee's history, character, personality, performance, work, outside activities, and other
information which may seem to be pertinent to his promotion or transfer. Some companies make use of rating scales and reports of the supervisors concerning the employee being considered for promotion or transfer. The usual procedure is to have the personnel department average the ratings and make a composite analysis.

Discharge is the termination of employment by the employer and is due in most cases to the employee's inability to perform satisfactorily in that organization. Layoff differs from discharge in that the employee's inefficiency is not the reason for the termination of employment. In the case of layoff, the solution rests with the employer because the personnel, production, and sales budgets are not worked out in such a way as to maintain a steady force of workers. If employment is not regularized, the employee has a feeling of insecurity and frequently develops an antagonistic attitude toward management and industry. When layoffs are necessary, the use of merit rating scales and cumulative records may be utilized by management to insure the most valuable employees are retained.
CHAPTER III

The Study

Methods Used

A questionnaire (Appendix B) consisting of 18 items was forwarded with a covering letter to 170 organizations in the Pacific Northwest states. The first 16 items requested definite answers, while item number 17 afforded the reporting companies an opportunity to suggest changes they would recommend within their own organizations for the selection and training of supervisory personnel. Item 18 asked whether a summary of the study was desired.

Completed or partially completed questionnaires were returned by 74 organizations which is a 43.5 percent response. Separate letters were received from an additional five companies. As these firms did not answer the questionnaire, they were not included in the totals. As the respondents did not answer every question, a total of 74 organizations will not appear in all tables. Thus when percentages are used, they indicate the number of firms answering a particular question and total 100 percent. No attempt has been made to correlate the several factors involved in the investigation as the
study is broad in scope for the purpose of indicating general trends rather than conclusive data.

The writer arbitrarily divided the reporting companies into two groups: those having less than 500 employees and those with more than 500 workers. This was done to show the differences that result from ability to maintain the staff and equipment required for a comprehensive personnel department. Thirty of the reporting organizations have less than 500 employees and will hereafter be referred to as the "small firms," while the 44 companies with more than 500 employees will be referred to as the "large firms." The 30 small firms had a total of 5,984 employees with a median of 203 and a mean of 187 employees. The large organizations employed a total of 135,735 employees with a median of 1,250 and a mean of 3,085 employees. A total of 141,719 employees was represented by the responding companies. This figure, in comparison with industrial operations in the East and Middlewest, is not great but it is believed to be sufficiently large to provide a fair sampling of business and industry in this section of the country.
Table II

Results Obtained from Specific Questions in the Questionnaire Regarding Policy of Pacific Northwest Business on Personnel Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question *</th>
<th>Small Firms</th>
<th>Large Firms</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Less than 500 employees)</td>
<td>(More than 500 employees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your company have a personnel department?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are tests used in selection and promotion of supervisors?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are merit rating scales used as a basis for promotion, transfer, and layoffs?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your firm use any type of cumulative records?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe these cumulative records are satisfactory? **</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are union agreements regarding seniority factors in promotion?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A definite promotion policy?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A definite training program?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility for promotion to executive positions?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix B for exact wording of questions.
** A total of 15 companies were uncertain. This is 43 percent.
Of the 74 companies answering question two of the questionnaire (Appendix B), 80 percent indicated that they have personnel departments. In comparing the small firms with the large firms it will be noticed that companies with less than 500 employees show 57 percent have such a department while companies with more than 500 employees report 95 percent have personnel departments. This may indicate that small companies in general are less able to support full-time personnel workers. The 80 percent of the companies in this study compares closely with the findings of Stagner (14) in which 72 percent of the reporting companies had unified personnel departments.

Tests Used in Selection and Promotion of Supervisors

A marked difference is noted in this item from studies made in the East. Only 13 percent of the 74 companies that answered the questionnaire indicated they were using tests at the present time whereas a considerable number, in commenting on item 18, mentioned that they were contemplating initiating a testing program in the near future. The difference between the small companies and the large companies in the use of tests as
part of their personnel program is very slight since 18 percent of the companies with less than 500 employees are using tests while 21 percent of the companies employing more than 500 people used tests. The following table indicates types of tests used by business in this area.

Table III

Tests Used in Selection and Promotion of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Small Firms</th>
<th>Large Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit Tests by Washington State Personnel Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Data Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Progressive Education Association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative General Education Test (Author Not Listed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Interest Inventory (Author Not Listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Temperament Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Examination Formulated by Washington State Personnel Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Manual Dexterity Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Vocational Test for Clerical Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Pegboard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Small Firms</th>
<th>Large Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacQuarrie Test of Mechanical Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Relations (Author Not Named)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuder Preference Record</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humm-Wadsworth Temperament Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Evaluation Form (Author Not Named)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptitude Test (Author and Type not Listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality (Author Not Listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesmanship (Author Not Listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Supervisory Employees Promoted Within the Company

The findings of this study indicate that most of the companies attempt to promote their employees to supervisory positions. Table IV clearly shows the high percentage of employees in companies of the Pacific Northwest that are promoted to supervisory positions from within the ranks of the company.
**Table IV**

Percentage of Supervisory Employees Promoted Within Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees)</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources Outside Organization from which Supervisory Personnel are Selected

Many authors in this field have indicated the importance of high school students as sources of foreman material, but this study shows that in the area of the Pacific Northwest graduates of high schools and trade schools are of comparatively little importance as sources of supervisors. Both the small and the large firms appear to secure a preponderance of their supervisory personnel from rival firms. Where technical training, such as engineering, accounting, and chemistry, is required, colleges are used to a great extent. The principal sources of supervisory personnel for Pacific
Northwest companies not selected from within own organizations are shown in Table V.

Table V

Sources of Supervisors Selected from Outside Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees)</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rival Firms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges #</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others **</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Colleges are emphasized when technical training is a prerequisite for qualification.

** This includes such sources as parent companies, governmental agencies, armed forces, unions, war industries, and business colleges.

The Extent of Merit Rating

Seventy-one companies answered question number eight of the questionnaire, "Are merit rating scales used as a basis for promotion, transfer, and layoffs?" Twenty-four reporting companies showed they use such scales for promotion, transfer, and layoff. This makes a total of 34 percent that are using and 66 percent that are not using merit rating scales in this area. In relation to size of the firms, 25 percent of the companies
with less than 500 employees use merit rating scales while 40 percent of the companies with more than 500 employees use the scales. In the larger firms there appeared to be little choice between the six and 12-month frequency of ratings. However, in the smaller firms there was a definite preference for the six-month period between ratings. As to the number of raters used, the larger firms used three raters predominately while the smaller firms frequently used one rater. Tables VI and VII indicate the frequency and number of raters used.

Table VI
Frequency of Merit Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Time</th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees)</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII
Number of Raters Used in Merit Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Raters</th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees) N</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees) N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Cumulative Records

Both the large and small firms in this area reported approximately the same use of cumulative records. Sixty-nine companies answered the question, "Does your firm use cumulative records?" Only 20 companies answered the question, "Do you believe these cumulative records are satisfactory?" An additional 15 companies were uncertain as to whether cumulative records were satisfactory. The writer defines cumulative records as those records of the individual worker that give a history of his background including education, family, health, work record, and attendance record. These records also include such items as past merit ratings and the training that has been received by the employee. Only 30 percent of the reporting companies are using
cumulative records, 40 percent of these are positive they are satisfactory while 43 percent are uncertain.

**Are Union Agreements Regarding Seniority Factors in Promotion?**

Only 13 of the 69 reporting companies answering this question stated that union agreements were factors in promotion of supervisors. However, many indicated that for promotion of non-supervisory personnel, union agreements were factors of considerable importance in promotion but did not apply in the case of executive and supervisory people. This condition has been due to the fact that most unions have not been aggressive in attempting to organize foremen.

**Extent of Definite Promotion Policies of Pacific Northwest Industries**

Seventy companies answered the question regarding definite promotion policies and of these 74 percent stated they have such a policy. The smaller firms showed 59 percent have a definite policy for promotion; the large firms indicated 83 percent. These results are significant and are sufficient to indicate that the majority of companies reporting are not promoting haphazardly and without consideration being given to experience, training, and length of service.
Personnel Who Recommend Employees for Promotion

In both the small and large firms the manager and superintendent are most frequently used to check the records, tests, and other factors to determine the individual to be promoted. In the companies with more than 500 employees, the personnel director is used as frequently as the manager in making this evaluation but in companies with less than 500 employees the personnel director is used less frequently. Table VIII shows the individuals who do the evaluation for promotion.

Table VIII

Individuals Responsible for Selection of Employees for Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees)</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Publisher, Department Heads, Supervisors, and Directors.
Sixty-six companies answered the question whether they have a specific training program for supervisors within their organization. Fifty-four percent of the reporting companies have such a training program while 46 percent do not. Of the smaller firms 48 percent have a definite program whereas 59 percent of the larger firms maintain such instruction.

Company policies, labor relations, and safety are the most common subjects covered by all companies. Economic theory is taught by 12 companies having more than 500 employees and 13 of these larger firms included governmental relations in their training program. Only one company with less than 500 employees gives instruction on economic theory. Eighty-three percent of the smaller companies made the training course compulsory while 67 percent of the larger organizations did so.

There was little difference between the percentages of large and small firms that financed the training course. Ninety-two percent of the larger firms and 93 percent of the smaller companies financed the training program. This is significant as most authorities agree that a successful training program must be company financed.
of the large firms hold their training program during regular working hours. Table IX indicates the amount of compulsory training and extent of company time involved in training. Table X lists the frequency of topics covered in such a training program.

Table IX
Training Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees)</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training compulsory</td>
<td>10  2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financed by company</td>
<td>11  1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During regular working hours</td>
<td>10  2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table X

Topics Covered in Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Small Firms (Less than 500 employees) N</th>
<th>Large Firms (More than 500 employees) N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility for Promotion to Executive Positions

The question as to whether the foreman and supervisor, upon completion of the training program, would be eligible for promotion to executive positions was answered by 31 companies. Only one firm reported these individuals would not be eligible for promotion. Although the number of replies is small, the trend is interesting as the opportunity to achieve an executive position helps to keep the supervisory personnel interested in their work and more active in the training program. The fact that only 31 companies answered this particular question may indicate that the others did not care to answer it. The old saying, "There is always plenty of room at the top," is definitely untrue today as all industry is based on a pyramid with the common laborer at the bottom and the executive at the top, and, as the individual
progresses from the bottom to the top, the opportunities open to him become less and less. It is the writer's opinion that the opportunities for promotion to executive positions are not as great as was indicated due to the small number of firms answering this question.

**Typical Comments of Pacific Northwest Industry**

Names of firms will not be mentioned in connection with the following comments as many of the reporting companies requested this information be kept confidential. The writer believes these comments are suggestive of what personnel directors would like to do if given a free hand within their organization.

An oil company commented as follows:

A program along the general lines of that outlined in American Management Association pamphlet "The Job of General Management" (General Management Series No. 138) has much to commend it.

Comments of a lumber company were:

No change is recommended in our present policies. Our policy is to promote men from within the company for all vacancies. If training is necessary such training will be given while the man is on a lower job. Selection for such jobs as foreman or subforeman is not necessarily by seniority. For craftsmen, suitable material for such jobs is selected from the ranks of labor and transferred to the mechanical department and after working as a helper for a period of time is promoted to 3rd, 2nd, and 1st class machinist, electrician, pipefitter, millwright, welder, etc. in the line he has been trained in.
A public utility company which at the time of reply had just organized a personnel department stated:

We are establishing training programs, rating programs, and selection procedures. Our personnel department has been organized for only a short time.

A large logging concern made the following comment:

Additional emphasis on a study of our labor relations program and particular emphasis upon our contract with the local union is needed. Recommend additional study under the training of a psychologist in human relations dealing with the proper approach of a supervisory employee to his men to so interpret their thinking as to gain maximum production.

A division of one of the largest lumber manufacturing firms in the West wrote:

In my judgment, the one outstanding qualification every foreman must have is the ability to get along with people. This ranks above knowledge of the job.

A manufacturing plant suggested:

Thorough testing and well balanced training are requirements for successful supervisors.

Comments of a leading manufacturing concern were:

The further utilization of tests and more emphasis placed on ability to deal with people is needed. At present, too much consideration is given to technical knowledge.

One trucking concern made the following suggestions:
Recommend a compulsory ruling that supervisors on all levels attend conference meetings held by higher level of supervisors. Our plan is now good but staff authority has no power to make line supervisors (division superintendents) follow the plan. Would also use magazine, "Supervision" and "Industrial Relations" etc. for text books in supervisory training conferences in addition to our own manuals.

The above are only a few of the suggestions made by the reporting companies but are typical of the interest in this field.
Summary and Recommendations

Summary

This study was made to determine the extent to which scientific methods are applied in the selection and training of supervisory personnel. Data for the study was obtained by means of a questionnaire forwarded to typical business and industrial firms of the Pacific Northwest. The questionnaire consisted of 18 items, 16 of which were direct questions regarding factors involved in the selection and training of supervisory personnel. Item 17 requested comments as to what changes the reporting companies would recommend in personnel procedures within their own companies. Item 18 asked if a summary was desired.

The information presented in this study is based upon the returns from 74 of the 170 firms which received the questionnaire. Comments from five companies who replied by letter rather than the completed questionnaire were not included in the summaries.

The need for the study is self-evident due to the great increase in industrial development in this area and the lack of any such previous survey covering this
section. With the added importance of labor in industrial peace and harmony and the return of industry to a peace-time basis, this particular period is considered opportune for such a survey.

No attempt was made to select companies of a particular size or representing a particular industry which might be better able to pay for full-time personnel organizations. As a result, the companies that responded represent a cross-section of typical industries within this area. As the study is general in scope, correlations between the various items that compose the questionnaire have not been made as these would have little value. The findings of this study indicate the percentage of companies in the Pacific Northwest having personnel departments compares favorably with other sections of the United States. It is interesting to note, however, that the percentage of personnel departments is greater in the large firms than in the small. This in itself indicates the necessity of size as well as financial ability for a properly equipped personnel department.

The findings show the Pacific Northwest firms recognize the value of merit rating scales as a basis for promotion, transfer, and layoff in about the same percentage as firms investigated in similar studies
covering other sections of the country. However, the results indicate the industrial firms of this area are slower in recognizing the value of tests in the selection and promotion of supervisors. This can be seen in comparing the results of this study with that of Stagner (Table I). In addition, there is less use made in this area of cumulative records and less confidence placed in their value.

This study shows that of the firms answering the questionnaire 80 percent have personnel departments; 18 percent use tests in selection and promotion of supervisors; and 34 percent use merit rating scales as a basis for promotion, transfer, and layoff. Thirty percent use cumulative records in selection of employees for promotion to supervisory rank. Of this number, 40 percent believe cumulative records are satisfactory while 43 percent are not certain as to their value. Only 19 percent indicate union agreements regarding seniority are factors in promotion of supervisors. Seventy-four percent have definite promotion policies. Few factors in business tend to cause more hard feelings and antagonism than the lack of a suitable and systematic promotion policy. If an employee realizes his hard work will be repaid by a chance for promotion, his morale will tend to be better. This in itself will help reduce labor turnover and
decrease labor strife. Strange as it may seem, the re-
search in the field of personnel has shown that until re-
cently most promotions have been a result of a hunch on 
the part of the foreman or executive who has the author-
ity to promote, rather than being based on a check of 
records, testing, or merit rating.

Fifty-four percent of the reporting companies have 
required training programs. Often the individual workman 
does not feel enough responsibility and interest to de-
vote his time to such training if it has to come out of 
his own pocketbook or on his own time. This study shows 
that 92 percent of the companies answering Question 15 
state their training program is company financed. The 
trend toward having the program during company time and 
not expecting the worker or supervisor to come back to 
the plant after the work day is finished is important.

Ninety-seven percent of the respondents indicate 
that the supervisors are eligible for promotion to 
executive positions but this figure is questionable 
since only 31 companies answered this question. A high 
percentage of firms promote their employees to super-
visory positions but when it is necessary to select 
foremen from outside their own organization, rival firms 
and college are the chief sources.

Considering the comments made by many of the
reporting companies, a definite trend is shown toward a greater use of objective methods for selecting, promoting, and training supervisory employees. This is encouraging as the growth of such a practice will tend to stabilize labor practices, assist in developing cooperation between labor and management, and improve the morale of the supervisor.

**Recommendations**

Many questions are left unanswered as this study touches only a few of the broader aspects of the field of personnel relations. The following recommendations are made for future investigations in this field:

(1) A study should be made of the relationship between the success of the supervisor and the various tests used in selection and promotion.

(2) A study should be made of the relationship between merit rating and its use as a basis of promotion, transfer, and layoff and the supervisor's actual success on the job.

(3) A thorough analysis is needed regarding the eligibility for promotion to executive positions. This appears to be one of the weak items of this study due to the small
number of companies replying to this particular question.

(4) Investigation should be made as to the actual type of cumulative records used by industrial firms in this area and the extent to which they are used by top management.
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APPENDIX A

COVERING LETTER
Department of Psychology
Lower Division and Service Work

November 22, 1946

Dear Sir:

With the added emphasis now being given to personnel matters, it is considered timely to investigate the present policies within business organizations of the Pacific Northwest in regard to the selection and training of supervisory employees. No similar survey has been made and the findings may be of particular interest to you.

This study is being made by Oregon State College under the direction of Dr. R. K. Campbell of the Division of Business and Industry, and Dr. J. W. Sherburne of the Department of Psychology.

Your cooperation in completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire will be appreciated. Company forms, such as tests and merit rating scales, would be of great value to this study. No disclosures of company practices or forms will be made without permission.

Copies of the report of this study will be available in the library at Oregon State College for use of students and others interested in this topic. A summary of the report of this study will be furnished you upon request.

A self-addressed return envelope is inclosed for your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Kermit M. Johnson,
Research Assistant in Industrial Psychology.

2 Incls:
Questionnaire
Return Envelope
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
THE SELECTION AND TRAINING OF SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

Name of Reporting Company ____________________________ Date ______________

1. The total number of employees in this company is ____.

2. Does your company have a personnel department?______
   Yes ______ No

3. If there is no organized personnel department, please check the following individuals who perform personnel functions:
   ______ Manager ____ Office Manager _____ Superintendent
   Others (please specify) _______________________________________

4. Check the percentage of your supervisory employees (foremen, superintendents, department heads, etc.) that are promoted from within your organization:
   ______ 10% ______ 20% ______ 30% ______ 40% ______ 50% ______ 60% ______ 70%
   ______ 80% ______ 90%

5. From which of the following sources are most of the supervisors, not selected from within your organization, chosen?
   ______ Rival firms ____ Trade Schools ____ High Schools
   ____ Colleges
   Others (please name) _______________________________________

6. Are tests used in selection and promotion of supervisors? ____ Yes ______ No

7. If tests used, please list them by name:
   ____________________________ ____________________________
   ____________________________ ____________________________
   ____________________________ ____________________________
   (If tests have been originated by your company, a copy would be appreciated)
8. Are merit rating scales used as a basis for promotions, transfers, and layoffs?

   Yes  ____  No (A copy of such merit rating forms would be appreciated)

9. If merit rating scales are used, how frequently (months) are ratings made? _______  and how many raters are used in rating each individual?__________

10. Does your firm use any type of cumulative rating record in selecting employees for promotion to supervisory rank?  ____Yes  ____No

11. Do you believe these cumulative records are satisfactory?  ____Yes  ____No  ____Uncertain

12. Are Union agreements regarding seniority factors in promotion?  ____Yes  ____No

13. Does your organization have a definite promotion policy?  ____Yes  ____No

14. Who evaluates the results of the cumulative records, tests, and other factors to determine the individual to be promoted:

   ____Manager  ____Asst. Manager  ____Office Manager  
   ____Superintendent

   Others (please specify)________________________________________

15. After selection and appointment of your supervisors, is there a required training program?  ____Yes  ____No  Please check topics in program:

   ____Company policies  ____Economic theory  ____Labor relations  ____Governmental regulations  ____Safety

   Others (please name)________________________________________

   Is this training program compulsory?  ____Yes  ____No

   Is it financed by the company?  ____Yes  ____No

   Is it during the regular work day?  ____Yes  ____No

16. Are those who complete the training program eligible for promotion to executive positions?  ____Yes  ____No
17. If you had a free hand in your organization, what changes would you recommend in regard to selection and training of supervisory employees? (A brief statement is desired)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

18. Please check if desire a copy of this study forwarded to you.

NOTE - If requested, any information will be kept confidential.

Please return in self-addressed envelope to:

Department of Psychology
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon

Attn: Kermit M. Johnson
Research Assistant in Industrial Psychology