This study examines the self-reported behavior and ideals of a sample of upper level managers, in relation to conflict management with subordinates.

A survey developed by the author, which measures directive and participative managerial behavior and ideals, was sent to a randomly selected sample of 250 female and 250 male managers in the thousand wealthiest corporations in the United States. Usable responses were obtained from 69 women and 93 men, 32.4% of the original sample.

A t test of significance of mean differences was performed on the data. Participative behavior was reported to be used significantly more often than directive behavior and was considered to be closer to the ideal behavior for managers to use. No significant differences were found between female and male respondents in either
reported behavior or behavior considered to be ideal. The variables of age, years of managerial experience, and level of conflict on the job were also examined. None correlated with conflict management behavior or ideals.

The author describes several implications for practical applications and suggestions for future research.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Relevance of the Study

Several broad areas of inquiry, in the fields of management, psychology and communication, have become intertwined in the last few decades. First, since the turn of the century, theorists and managers have been seeking to understand how best to manage workers. Over this time, the prevalent outlook has evolved from acceptance of the "entrepreneurial" model, with all power vested in the "the boss," through the "scientific" model, which delegates powers to each office, to the currently accepted "participatory management" model, which prescribes sharing certain powers with the workers. Exploration of the question shows no sign of waning in the mid-1980's (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

The second broad area has received increased interest in the past 15 years. This is the study of conflict and how best to respond to it, in interpersonal, intergroup and international affairs (Thomas & Schmidt, 1976; Berryman-Fink, 1985). In writings on business, this has of course been entwined with the development of the "human relations" outlook in general. As managers and theorists come more and more to accept that conflict is inevitable in organizations, the focus moves from trying to prevent it to trying to find ways to handle it constructively (Deutsch, 1973; Hampton, Summer & Webber, 1982).

A third area is the examination of women in the public sphere. In the second half of this century, women (among other groups) have
sought fuller involvement in all levels of American public life, including the "private sector." There has been political lobbying leading to legislative support of this goal (Affirmative Action, EEOC, the 1964 Civil Rights Act); greater enrollment of women in educational institutions, especially MBA programs, that should lead to greater professional involvement (Hunsaker & Hunsaker, 1986); and increased attention in the media (Berryman-Fink, 1985). In spite of the effort put forth and the gains made, however, women still remain underrepresented in management positions (Hunsaker & Hunsaker, 1986). The causes of this situation have been heavily researched in the past 15 years (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973, 1974; Schein, 1973, 1975; Kanter, 1977; Haccoun, Sallay & Haccoun, 1978; Collins, Waters & Waters, 1979; Welsh, 1979).

In pulling together these three strands, it seemed most logical to explore conflict resolution in a business setting. It may be more than coincidental that the interest in the conflict management aspect of the manager's job has increased at about the same time as the interest in expanding women's role in the public domain. Rothschild (1986) refers to the new emphasis on such skills as active listening, facilitating consensus and participation, and giving feedback, as the "feminization" of conflict management. This stands in contrast to the longstanding emphasis on the requisite "masculinity" of the ideal manager (McGregor, 1967; Kanter, 1977; Powell & Butterfield, 1979).

This work is based on exploratory interviews conducted by Professor Wells, one of the author's advisors. She proposed two types
of managerial styles for dealing with conflict, based on descriptions she had gathered of discreet behaviors which formed two dimensions. She called these dimensions "Debate" and "Dialogue;" I added several behaviors to her list, widening the scope, and relabeled them "Directive" and "Participative." Clearly, the first style is prescribed by earlier writers, particularly prior to the ascendance of the "Participatory Management" model, while the second has been prescribed in increasingly innovative terms since the time of the first "Human Relations" enthusiasts.

Statement of the Problem

The problem undertaken in this study is to determine three pieces of information, in connection to managerial handling of conflict with their subordinates: the behavioral styles that practicing managers actually use; the behavioral styles they consider to be ideal for managers to use; and whether female and male managers differ on these two questions.

Need for the Study

Three questions need exploring. First, how do high-level American managers handle conflicts with their subordinates? Are successful American managers generally following the advice of the current theorists? (Or, it could be asked, are current theorists grounding their advice for successful management in reality?)

Second, what do managers think is the "ideal" way for a manager to handle conflicts with subordinates?
The last question is: "Does gender make a difference in this area?" Many studies have explored managerial behaviors considered "masculine" in our culture, such as giving orders, using logic, and making decisions under pressure, in order to test the prevalent stereotypes concerning women's inability to handle such tasks (see Wexley & Hunt, 1974; Brief & Oliver, 1976; Jeyaraj, 1982; Izraeli & Izraeli, 1985). These researchers have consistently found that gender does not make a difference. This study is slightly different, since, as mentioned above, the skills involved in participative conflict resolution involve many that women have been socialized to use from childhood (Berryman-Fink). Therefore, rather than asking, in effect, whether women can do "men's work," this study examines who, if anyone, handles conflict in the traditionally labeled "masculine style" and who uses the currently touted "feminine style."

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses are proposed. The first and third are null hypotheses, and are non-directional; the second is directional in nature.

1. As has been discussed in this chapter, both directive and participative methods of handling conflict with subordinates have been advocated and practiced among management. Hypothesis 1: The average scores for Participative and Directive Behaviors used will not significantly differ.
2. However, since participative behavior has been far more popular among theorists since the 1920's, the author expects that today's managers will believe that it should be used, whether or not they in fact use it. Hypothesis 2: The average score for Participative Behavior as Ideal will be significantly higher than that of Directive Behavior as Ideal.

3. Finally, while there are conflicting findings and theories about gender differences to be found in the literature, the author finds most compelling the evidence for the null hypothesis. Hypothesis 3: there will be no sex differences found, in either reported behavior or in the behavior considered to be ideal.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to aid in the decision making processes of four kinds of groups. First are those, both public and private, who make policy regarding employment and its subcategories: recruitment; training; promotion. The more they know about effective conflict management practices and the capabilities of men and women in management, the better their policies will be. This nationwide study can help in clearing away parochial, limited assumptions.

The second group to benefit will be the people filling, or seeking to fill, managerial positions. This study allows managers to learn from the experience of others, expanding their repertoire of skills to deal with interpersonal conflict. In addition, as inaccurate stereotypes about men's and women's abilities are replaced
by empirical data, people will be encouraged to seek appropriate opportunities for personal and career growth.

The third group is the academicians and researchers who constantly work to understand both effective management and true gender differences and similarities. Sound theory must be based on representative data, which this study will provide.

The last group to benefit is society at large. This may be a more vague and difficult to observe benefit; however, the words of Douglas McGregor, written 30 years ago, have not become outdated.

To a degree, the social sciences today are in a position like that of the physical sciences with respect to atomic energy in the thirties. We know that past conceptions of the nature of man are inadequate and, in many ways, incorrect. We are becoming quite certain that, under proper conditions, unimagined resources of creative human energy could become available within the organizational setting. (1957, p. 22)

Limitations of the Study

This study may be limited by:

1. The abilities of the respondents to answer the survey questions.

2. The honesty of the respondents in answering the survey questions.

3. The possibility that someone other than the addressee completed the form.

4. The possibility that those who did not respond may hold very different views than those who did respond.

However, these limitations, inherent in mail surveys, were balanced against the strengths of this method:
1. The costs were low enough to allow the study to be nationwide.

2. The respondents were bona-fide high-level managers, rather than students imagining themselves as managers.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study has been limited in the following ways:

1. The sample was taken only from officers in companies appearing in *The Corporate 1000: A Directory of Who Runs the Top 1000 Corporations*.

2. No attempt was made to verify or assess the accuracy of the self-perceptions of the respondents.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study.

"Conflict": Any disagreement or dispute about policies, procedures or work quality, whether or not the people involved feel antagonistic.

"Conflict Management": Handling work-related interpersonal conflicts and discussions where the manager and employee disagree on a work-related matter.

"Officer": Any person listed in *The Corporate 1000* under the "Officers and Management" list given for each corporation (thus excluding the list of Board members), except for the Chief Executive Officers of the parent companies. The officers used in the sample included Vice Presidents; Corporate Secretaries, Treasurers, Counsel and Comptrollers; and people whose title was Director or Manager.
Some of the Vice Presidents included in the sample were also CEO's of subsidiary companies.

"Random Sampling": This was done in conjunction with a computer. Since there were approximately 24,000 men to draw on, and only 646 women, the two samples were conducted differently. For each man, the computer gave 2 numbers: first, the number of a company, randomly selected (a number between 1 and 1000, since there were 1000 companies listed); second, the number of a man within that company, again random. For each woman, the computer simply gave one number, since all of the women had been numbered in the order in which they appeared in the directory.
Chapter Two: Literature and Research Review

Introduction

Purpose Of The Review

The purpose of this review is threefold; thus it is organized in three major sections. The first section focuses on the first two questions posed by the study: Are today's managers directive or participative in their behavior with their subordinates? And, distinct from their actions, which style do they believe would be ideal to use? In the first section the author shows the sources of the managerial styles currently considered acceptable by most managers. In Section II she reviews the importance of the managerial role of handling conflict, as well as describing the most influential constructs of conflict management. Again, this is done in order to illuminate the effect which these constructs may have had on the options for conflict management perceived as legitimate and effective by managers. In Section III the author reviews the research relating to women entering and participating in management. This section provides the background information for the third question of the study: Are there differences, in behavior or ideals, between female and male managers?

Methodology Used For The Review

This literature and research review began with a "Library Information Retrieval Service" computer search using these databases:
Dissertation Abstracts (1861 through 1986); INFO (a Business database; 1971 through 1986); Psychological Abstracts (1967 through 1986); Sociological Abstracts (1963 through 1986). Recent editions of the following indices were consulted: Business Periodical Index; Social Science Index; Psychological Abstracts; Dissertation Abstracts. Finally, the author consulted with numerous professors and other interested people who provided valuable recommendations.

Organization of the Review

The review is organized in three major sections. The first two sections are each in chronological order; the third is separated into two subsections, each in chronological order.
Directive and Participative Managerial Styles

Introduction

This first part reviews the shifting attitudes in America toward relationships between bosses and workers. Starting with the pre-Industrial Revolution period, one can trace four eras of different outlooks: the Entrepreneurial era; the Scientific Management era; the Human Relations era; and the current Participative Management era. The writers of each of these periods have affected current management styles, the first two leading to the "Directive" style and the second two leading to the "Participative" style.

This review describes the writings of influential theorists for the purpose of exploring the kinds of supervisory behavior considered acceptable by managers today. The author makes no assumptions about the motivation or sincerity of the theorists or the managers: as Derber & Schwartz (1983) point out, advocates of participative management may be simply using what they perceive as a pragmatic strategy "designed to maintain or increase production by generating strong feelings of loyalty of workers to their companies" (p. 64).

The "Directive" Style of Management

The paternalistic view. Ewing (1983), paraphrasing Martin J. Morand, explains that

As late as the seventeenth century,...the notion of property was broad. It included a person's capacities, rights and liberties, not just chattels and lands. Indeed, the intangible rights came to be viewed as the source and justification of ownership of material things. Because of a
historical flip-flop, however, material ownership came to be viewed as the source and justification of intangible rights, and when modern market societies developed, the rights became dependent on ownership....the individual who once had been considered justified in pursuing material wealth because of inalienable properties possessed by all humans now had to "earn" many rights by ownership. (p. 9)

Thus, prior to the rise of corporations in the late 19th century, the "boss," who owned the property and capital, also held total control of his business. Workers "sold" their labor and had few rights. Ewing puts it succinctly: "Do it my way or you're fired!" (p. viii).

The very success of these "one-man empires" helped lead to acceptance of the need for a new form of management. Kanter (1977) claims that modern bureaucratic management was born in the last decades of the 19th century, when the technical and organizational complexity of successful enterprises made safe and efficient business operations impossible for any single man to handle.

The theorists who came to the fore to meet the needs of these complex organizations were the German sociologist Max Weber and the American engineer Frederick Taylor (Merton, 1957; Kanter, 1977; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Derber & Schwartz, 1983). The social acceptance of relationships based on hierarchy and rank was widespread; thus, at a time when a new management practice was needed, the world of business was heavily influenced by the writings of two pragmatists who modified but did not dispense with worker stratification.
The scientific or bureaucratic management view.

[Weber] postulated the view that bureaucracy--order by rule--is the most efficient form of human organization. Taylor, an American, put Weber's theories to the test with time and motion studies. The thrust of the Weber-Taylor school was to suggest that if a finite body of rules and techniques could be learned and mastered--rules about breakdown of work, about maximum spans of control, about matching authority and responsibility--then the essential problems of managing large groups of people would be more or less solved. (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 92)

[The] specific nature [of bureaucracy]...is developed the more perfectly bureaucracy is 'de-humanized,' the more completely it succeeds in elimination from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. This is the specific nature of bureaucracy, and it is appraised as its special virtue. (Weber, 1958, pp. 215-216)

Some saw in this bureaucratic system a way to supplant the greed of the capitalists with rationality (Kanter, 1977); Taylor himself "hoped to eliminate harmful "soldiering" and destructive conflict through scientific management" (Hampton, Summer & Webber, 1982, p. 651). Merton (1940) described it thus: "...the subordinate is protected from the arbitrary action of his superior, since the actions of both are constrained by a mutually recognized set of rules" (p. 560). He adds as another merit, its "formality, [which] serves to minimize friction...The structure is one which approaches the complete elimination of personalized relationships and non-rational considerations (hostility, anxiety, affectual involvements, etc.)" (p. 561).

However, more recent theorists have been critical of the goal of eliminating non-rational considerations:
The model, articulated most fully in the writings of Frederick Taylor, was to reduce all workers to mechanical "executioners" of jobs...A range of theoretical arguments have been advanced to explain why [non-Taylorist job structures] are emerging now [1983] in American industry. The most important,...highlights the problems of absenteeism, turnover and other labor problems reflecting low worker commitment in conventional [Taylorist] worker structures. (Derber & Schwartz, 1983, p. 64)

Yet most organizations, we find, take a negative view of their people. They verbally berate participants for poor performance....They call for risk taking but punish even tiny failures. They want innovation but kill the spirit of the champion. With their rationalist hats on, they design systems that seem calculated to tear down the workers' self-image. (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 57)

The idea of professional management held different promises to other men. Men who lacked the capital to be bosses could now exercise great power within others' organizations. While theoretically anyone with talent could become a manager, in reality the field was limited to certain white men (Kanter, 1977). Taylor himself wrote that "The workman who is best suited to actually doing the work is incapable of fully understanding (the science underlying it) without the guidance and help of those who are working with him or over him" (Quoted in Kanter, 1977, p. 21).

Clearly, Weber and Taylor greatly influenced American management for many years. Many of their ideas, as well as much from the "paternalistic" period, continue to underlie many managers' philosophies. But most business historians believe that a new era of attitudes began with the famous Hawthorne experiments, held in the 1920's and 1930's.
The "Participative" Style of Management

The human relations view. The Hawthorne experiments began as ordinary field work by Harvard psychologists, manipulating structural variables to see their effect on productivity. As Peters & Waterman (1982) describe it:

These investigations started out inauspiciously,... consistent in most respects with the Taylor tradition... But a surprising series of events intruded on the theoretical background and continued to persist as stubbornly as the stubbornly held beliefs that preceded them. [For example,] lights were turned up; productivity went up; lights were turned down; productivity went up again. (pp. 93-94)

In order to understand this puzzle, the researchers began developing skills for interviewing the workers, skills that managers are exhorted to use today in handling conflict with their subordinates. Roethlisberger (1941) emphasizes the innovation of the researchers:

This was a revolutionary idea in the year 1928,... the idea of getting a worker to talk to you and to listen sympathetically, but intelligently, to what he had to say. In that year a new era of personnel relations began.... At first, [the researchers] found it difficult to learn to give full and complete attention to what a person had to say without interrupting him before he was through. They found it difficult to learn not to give advice, not to make or imply moral judgments about the speaker; not to argue, not to be too clever, not to dominate the conversation, not to ask leading questions. (pp. 16-17)

Several authors (Roethlisberger, 1941; Peters & Waterman, 1982) argue that these experiments were the reason that the general perception of workers began to shift, from "economic man" to people of feeling, motivated not just by money but also by "loyalty, integrity, solidarity" (Roethlisberger, 1941). However, the
author proposes that, rather than causing the shift, the experiments simply lent "scientific credibility" to an already emerging popular attitude: that workers are fully human. Theorists in the past have proposed similar ideas about the treatment of workers (John Stuart Mill, for example); but these ideas did not catch the popular imagination until the late 1920's and early 1930's, when pro-Union legislation and the achievement of voting rights for women mark watersheds in U.S. history and in social acceptance of the rights of the less powerful.

The rise of fascism in Europe brought a wave of research in the United States dealing with authoritarianism and democracy. One of the most important studies was carried out by Lewin, Lippitt & White, and published in 1939. Among the questions they raised was "Is not democratic life more pleasant, but authoritarianism more efficient?" (p. 271). They concluded that the answer was no; that democratic groups were actually more productive than others. This study influenced many writers in the social sciences and in business research.

The researchers organized clubs of ten-year-old boys, carefully selected so that each club was "matched," to be observed working on projects. The clubs were led by young men, trained in three styles of leadership: democratic; authoritarian; and laissez-faire. The leaders were rotated through the groups and through the three styles, so as to diminish the effects of personalities.
The authoritarian groups often became hostile and aggressive, to the detriment of productivity as well as morale. Several times the boys made scapegoats of a member, driving these boys out of the clubs; often when authoritarian leaders left the room, the observers recorded great increases in aggressive behavior. Those authoritarian groups that were not aggressive were extremely apathetic. However, with a new leader and a new style, the atmosphere changed. Morale was highest under the democratic leaders, and second under the laissez-faire leaders.

With World War II came a burgeoning of studies and analysis on management, leadership, and organizations. Harold Koontz wrote in 1961 that:

Although students of management would readily agree that there have been problems of management since the dawn of organized life, most would also agree that systematic examination of management, with few exceptions, is the product of the present century and more especially of the past two decades [the 40's and 50's]. (p. 174)

Peter Drucker advised managers in 1954 that "Mutual understanding can never be attained by 'communications down,'...It can result only from 'communications up.' It requires...the superior's willingness to listen" (p. 324). Chris Argyris (1957) went further, proposing that "There is a Lack of Congruency between the Needs of Healthy Individuals and the Demands of the Formal Organization....The Results of This Disturbance Are Frustration, Failure, Short-Time Perspective, and Conflict [sic]" (pp. 20-21). He suggested redesigning the workplace away from the scientific management image:
The basic problem is the reduction in the degree of dependency, subordination, submissiveness, and so on experienced by the employee in his work situation. It can be shown that employee-centered (or democratic or participative) leadership [is an element] which, if used correctly, can go a long way toward ameliorating the situation. (p. 23)

The participative management view.

Historians are not in agreement about the correct name for the current prevailing view in management, in contrast to the previous three "eras." As a corollary, there is no particular theorist that can be cited as its originator, or date that can be given as its onset. Perhaps Chris Argyris was one of the first to use the term chosen here, "Participative Management;" perhaps Douglas McGregor was its strongest champion. However, many other talented theorists also developed rationales for and innovations on the basic concept, among them March & Simon, in 1958; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, in 1958; Blake & Mouton, in 1964; and Rensis Likert, in 1967.

In 1957, Douglas Murray McGregor published his classic Theories X and Y. He proposed that there are two very different ways of perceiving workers. People who believe in "Theory X" believe that workers are, at best, passive and in need of control; at worst, they are lazy, self-centered and not very bright. He claimed that this belief caused managers to act either "hard" (coercing, threatening, controlling) or "soft" (being permissive so as to make the workers tractable, so they will accept direction). In contrast, he suggested
that a more realistic view of workers, which he called "Theory Y," would be to assume that

People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations. The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves....It does not involve the abdication of management, the absence of leadership, the lowering of standards... (pp. 88-89)

March & Simon's (1958) thesis is interesting in its attempt to synthesize the various outlooks about employees. They claimed that "Propositions about organizational behavior can be grouped into three broad classes, on the basis of their assumptions." The first class assumes that employees are passive; the second, that they hold attitudes, values, and goals; and the third, that they are decision makers and problem solvers. Clearly, these are correlated with the three historical eras explored in this review. The authors go on to say:

There is nothing contradictory among these three sets of assumptions. Human beings are all of these things, and perhaps more. An adequate theory of human behavior in organizations will have to take account of the instrumental aspects of human behavior, of the motivational and attitudinal, and of the rational. (p. 6)

This sudden burst of acceptance for the idea of workers participating in decision making is not surprising, if the historical context is considered. The 1960's was a time of changing expectations and demands. Americans who felt excluded from the centers of power
challenged traditions and made changes. It is a decade perhaps most often remembered for the achievements of blacks and women, but several of these achievements affected them primarily as workers, such as the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which forbids discrimination in employment on account of race, color, religion, national origin or sex.

Daniel Yankelovich reports a marked shift in attitude surveys toward what he calls a 'psychology of entitlement' among employees. Instead of saying that they would prefer to have more influence on how things are run, the growing tendency now is to insist that they have a right to take part in decisions affecting their jobs....Opinion Research Corporation, the Conference Board, and other such organizations also have reported pronounced shifts in employee attitudes--more discontent, more willingness to challenge management, more questioning of supervisors' decisions. (Ewing, 1983, p. 5)

A former University President referred to this shift in attitudes in more negative terms: 'managing the unmanageable.' "We face a new movement of populism; the fragmentation, the caucusization of constituencies" (Bennis, 1975, p.37). Heller noted that "...changing patterns often are described in the management literature as a 'loss' or 'erosion' of authority" (1985, p. 488). Ewing (1983) commented:

Never in American history has there been so much confusion over the prerogatives of managers to manage and the rights of their subordinates to be managed within limits....Some of the confusion arises from laws about collective bargaining, civil rights, sexism and safety. But...[t]he most important changes have to do with a whole new way of regarding the manager-subordinate relationship...a new way of thinking about human dignity in the workplace--among managers as well as nonmanagers. For the time being, the new way coexists with the old; this is what causes so much confusion. (p. 1)
Sayles, in his 1979 handbook for prospective managers, attempted to give a realistic image of the business manager. In Sayles' view, successful managers must earn respect through their actions, rather than simply receiving the deference many assume will come with their authority:

The professional image is a worthy substitute for the more militaristic concept of manager as commander. Such absolute authority was inconsistent with our society, which demanded rights for workers, the community, and other parties at interest....Respect should come from the managers' professional competence to utilize balanced judgment and compassion (as is so for good doctors or lawyers). (p. 9)

In contrast to previous metaphors for the role of manager, such as the "father," the "head" of an organism or the "control" of a machine (Kanter, 1977, p. 24), Ewing (1983) suggested that "Administrators now find themselves in roles comparable to the atomic 'glue' that holds the forces of the nucleus together" (pp. 2-3).

Derber & Schwartz (1983) added:

The conventional system is characterized by the effort to remove decisions concerning the job from the discretion of the worker and to vest task control exclusively in management;...the model, articulated most fully in the writings of Frederick Taylor, was to reduce all workers to mechanical "executioners" of jobs conceived and programmed in exquisite detail by management....Aglietta,...emphasizes that labor in the new system is organized more closely around "informational" rather than "mechanical" principles of division of labor, where tasks and responsibilities are flexibly assigned to groups of workers on the basis of pooled knowledge and skill rather than being permanently fixed to...machine-defined roles or positions. (pp. 63-64)

Yet in spite of the advocacy of more participative models of relationship since the late 1920's, directive attitudes continue in force among managers:
The emergence of shop-floor worker participation projects [over the period 1973 to 1983] in many of the largest corporations in the United States has major theoretical interest because it points to a shift in the structure of American management from Taylorist forms of organization toward "post-Taylorist" systems based on "relative worker autonomy" and limited democratic organization on the shop floor....Over the last decade, many of America's largest corporations have introduced a rich array of workplace innovations that increase the control of the worker over his or her immediate job....The delegation of authority to workers over shop-floor decisions...is of extraordinary interest because it seems to suggest an emerging shift in established management practice from strictly hierarchical job control toward a limited form of shop-floor democracy....Its intent is to reduce worker alienation by ceding limited forms of direct worker control over production, thereby increasing psychological and ideological integration into both job and firm. (Derber & Schwartz, 1983, pp. 61-62)

A range of theoretical arguments have been advanced to explain why labor process and structures based on relative worker autonomy are emerging now in American industry. The most important, called here the "corporatist theory," highlights the problems of absenteeism, turnover, and other labor problems reflecting low worker commitment in conventional worker structures. Corporatism has classically been defined in this context as a management system or strategy designed to maintain or increase production by generating strong feelings of loyalty of workers to their companies. (Derber & Schwartz, 1983, p. 64)

It is this mixture of attitudes, this coexistence of managerial styles, that leads to the need for research asking how managers actually do relate to their subordinates, and how they believe they should be relating.

Summary of Research on Directive and Participative Managerial Styles

Over the last 100 years, managers in the United States have been exposed to a number of ideas about how to relate to their subordinates. In general, these recommendations fall into two major
categories: "Directive" and "Participative" styles of behavior. Certainly, within both categories are those who support their position with humanitarian arguments (for example, Merton, (1957) defended "scientific management" as protecting the worker, while Argyris, (1957) again on behalf of the worker, suggested replacing "scientific management" with participation. Others have focused on more pragmatic concerns. As a result of this proliferation of theories, a variety of behavioral options may seem effective and legitimate to managers today.
Conflict Management

Introduction

This second part briefly explores important constructs of conflict and the increasingly emphasized role of conflict management within organizations. Clearly, there are many areas of corporate life in which the managerial styles of men and women could be explored; this area, the handling of conflict with subordinates, is particularly relevant to today's managers.

Influential Constructs and Increasing Relevance to Managers

In 1964, Blake & Mouton introduced the concept they called "The Managerial Grid" (see Figure 1); the basic grid has since been adapted by the authors for use in a variety of contexts. It has also been adapted by others to provide understanding about the interrelationships among alternative strategies for handling conflict (for example, Thomas, 1976; Ross, 1982; see Figure 2). The author believes that this grid model of conflict resolution is among the most influential of conceptualizations of conflict, for both academics and managers.

The grid construct expands the manager's options from two (aggression or passivity) to five: avoidance, accommodation, compromise, competition, and collaboration. Building upon Fiedler's (1965) "Contingency Model," Blake & Mouton advocated choosing one or another strategy depending on the situation. Further, these choices can be seen as reflecting varying, interrelated degrees of commitment to both productivity and relationships, a novel concept. Many
**Figure 1**

Blake & Mouton's 1964 "Managerial Grid"

(from The Managerial Grid, p. 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-9 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly organization atmosphere and work tempo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-9 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work accomplishment is from committed people. Interdependence through a &quot;common stake&quot; in organization purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-5 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work with maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-1 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organization membership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-1 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2
Ross's "Major Styles of Coping with Conflict"
(from "Coping with Conflict," in The 1982 Annual for Facilitators, Trainers, and Consultants, p. 136)
previous theorists had posited that certain leaders (particularly male leaders) were "task-oriented," while others (especially female leaders) were supposed to be "relationship-oriented" (Fleishman, Harris & Burtt, 1955; Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Fiedler, 1967). This model is based on the assumption that managers are more effective when they are flexible in their behaviors, incorporating behaviors thought of as both "masculine" and "feminine."

Walton (1967) made specific recommendations about effective managerial behavior, including: inviting differences; listening with understanding, rather than judgmentally; clarifying the issues; accepting feelings; and suggesting procedures for resolving the problem. These are the same recommendations being made twenty years later (for example, Friend, 1985).

Deutsch (1973), a former student of Kurt Lewin (of the 1939 authoritarian-democratic study reviewed in the first section), analyzed conflict and suggested that there are useful similarities to be found among all levels of conflict, from the personal to the national. His work, focusing on constructive and destructive methods of handling conflict, is built on the premise that conflict is inevitable:

I stress the positive functions of conflict,...because many discussions of conflict cast it in the role of the villain, as though conflict per se were the cause of psychopathology, social disorder, war. A superficial reading of psychoanalytic theory...field theory...and dissonance theory...would seem to suggest that the psychological utopia would be a conflict-free existence. Yet it is apparent that most people seek out conflict in competitive sports and games,...in the teasing interplay of intimate encounters,
and in their intellectual work. Fortunately, no one has to face the prospect of a conflict-free existence. Conflict can neither be eliminated nor even suppressed for long. (p. 10)

It is this acceptance of conflict as a natural part of human interaction that allows managers to focus on ways of dealing with it. People who believe that careful planning and clearly spelled out limits of authority can prevent conflicts see each conflict as a problem, indicating a need for policy or procedural redesigning. Thinkers like Deutsch indicate a different set of priorities: managers should not waste time trying to accomplish the impossible. Rather, they are better advised to find ways to handle the ubiquitous conflicts constructively.

In recognition of the growing interest in the topic, the American Management Association (AMA) sponsored a survey of managerial interest in conflict and conflict management, undertaken by Thomas & Schmidt in 1976. The authors pointed to the large number of articles on the subject of conflict, the special journal issues and books devoted to it, and the presence of conflict management courses in both organizational training programs and business schools.

The questionnaire was administered to organizational presidents, vice-presidents and middle managers. The AMA concluded that:

These managers perceive conflict as an important part of their organizational life. 1. Specifically, they spend about 20% of their time dealing with conflict....2. Their ability to manage conflict has become somewhat more important over the past 10 years. 3. They rate "Conflict Management" as of equal (or slightly higher) importance compared with topics presently taught in AMA programs [which
include planning, communication, motivation, and decision making]. (p. 316)

In 1979, Robbins wrote:

The early evidence suggests that the 1970's may be remembered in the annals of management history as the decade that conflict management came to the forefront as a major interest of both practicing managers and academic researchers....

We have come a long way since conflict was believed to be universally destructive. (p. 299)

His article is entitled "'Conflict Management' and 'Conflict Resolution' Are Not Synonomous Terms!" He defined "Conflict Management" as the general, overall goal of the manager, including both "Conflict Resolution" and also "Conflict Stimulation," when necessary. He argued that while excessive conflict can result in reduced employee satisfaction, increased absence and turnover rates, and eventually in lower productivity, a certain level of conflict is necessary to maintain a responsive and innovative unit. "Survival can result only when an organization is able to adapt to constant changes in the environment. Adaptation is possible only through change, and change is stimulated by conflict." (p. 300)

Sayles (1979), writing for business students, made his major theme the argument that the popular image of the manager spending most of the day in planning and analysis is completely wrong. Rather, he repeatedly showed that managers mostly jump from one problem to the next, negotiating and trouble-shooting as need arises. He argues that the successful manager must be prepared to expect constant turmoil, with resolving conflicts high on the list of priorities.
Hampton, Summer & Webber (1982) listed the managing of conflict as a fundamental managerial function, along with "the more familiar areas of planning, controlling, structuring and directing" (p. 633). They described it as "probably the most difficult management task because most people find it personally stressful. Although anxiety provoking, the presence of conflict does not necessarily indicate a breakdown in the organization or management failure." (p. 633). They cited the increasing complexity and interdependence of today's organizations as the major causes of increased conflict.

They concluded that organizations seem to be shifting, in their handling of conflict, toward more open and rational processes, adding that:

[A]ll organizational activity engenders some conflict--and business is no worse than other areas in this respect....When competition and conflict appear, managers must deal with them. Only by understanding the process can managers use conflict constructively... (p. 655)

Tjosvold, in 1985, defined "controversy" as a subclass of conflicts particularly relevant to people working together in organizations. He described controversy as the type of conflict that "occurs when one person's ideas, opinions, conclusions, theories, and information are incompatible with another's when they discuss problems and make decisions" (p. 22). He differentiated this type from the "conflict of interests" type, which occurs "when the actions of one person pursuing his or her own benefits interfere with, prevent, or block the actions of another pursuing his or her own interests (Deutsch, 1973; Johnson & Johnson, 1982). He pointed out the
frequency with which group members may share goals while disagreeing only about the best course of action for their group to take; this type of conflict is amenable to collaboration, in contrasts to conflicts of interest, which may need to be resolved through less satisfying compromises.

Summary of Research on Conflict Management

Acceptance of the inevitability of conflict within organizations has led to attempts to handle it constructively, rather than trying to prevent it. It may be the most difficult area of management. In spite of this, or perhaps because of it, conflict management skills have gained increasing attention in the past decade and a half among managers.
Women in Management

Introduction

The third part focuses on the involvement of women in management in this country. Historical factors are mentioned in brief; empirical studies on stereotypes about women and women's competence in management are reviewed.

Historical Factors

Kanter (1977) presented an excellent and thorough review of the history of women in the American workplace. For the purpose of this review, it is sufficient to say that in spite of steadily increasing numbers of working women after the turn of the century, the proportion of women managers has not been equivalent. One of the major factors involved in excluding women from management is what Kanter calls a "masculine ethic" for managers, which she traces to the influence of Weber. McGregor, similarly, had described the prevailing attitude in 1967 by saying:

The model of the successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm, just. He is not feminine; he is not soft or yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. The very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with effective business processes. (p. 23)

Then, with a pioneering insight into the value of what would soon be well known as androgyny, he added:

Yet the fact is that all these emotions are part of the human nature of men and women alike. Cultural forces have shaped not their existence but their acceptability; they are
repressed, but this does not render them inactive. They continue to influence attitudes, opinions and decisions. (p. 23)

As was shown in the first part of this review, some theorists have argued against the position that managers should be as coolly rational as possible. A different problem, with which this part of the review deals, is that rationality, with its strengths and weaknesses, is so often unquestioningly equated with masculinity, and then with males. General acceptance of this tacit chain of logic has made entering and succeeding in management difficult for women, even those who wish to manage in a "masculine" manner. Kanter (1977) cited a study of young working women, made just before World War II:

[It] uncovered so much hostility toward women bosses that even the author...[who thought women belonged behind a typewriter], had to conclude that there was overreaction. Of the women workers, 99.81% said they preferred a male boss... (p. 201)

Why? The workers described women bosses as bossy, jealous, petty, supervising too closely, critical, and "...scream[ing] to impress people with their importance" (p. 201).

However, the number of women in the workplace continued to increase, dramatically during World War II and steadily thereafter (Shaffer, 1970). At the same time, the "psychology of entitlement" described above (Ewing, 1983) was growing, among women and minorities as well as workers. The achievements of this period were formidable, for women and for workers: the Equal Pay Act of 1963 (an amendment to the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act); Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,
created for this purpose; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; The Women's Education Equity Act of 1974; amendments in 1974 to the 1968 Fair Housing Act; and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974.

Shortly after the country and Congress began yielding to women's pressure for inclusion in the public sphere, the academic world began to take notice. Theories and studies on women's involvement dramatically increased after the 1960's (Baird & Bradley, 1979).

A significant amount of research focused on women in management, particularly on the two areas of stereotypes about women and the actual comparison of women and men. In other words, the central question was: why do women not enjoy equality in the work world? Are they inaccurately perceived as less capable, and unjustly excluded and held back? Or are they, as a group, actually less competent than men as managers? And the related question, woven into those previous, is: what does constitute competent managerial behavior?

Stereotypes About Women in Management

Researchers studying perceptions of women in management were unanimous in their conclusions. There are widely held stereotypes that women are unfit for management, and these affect the success of women striving for leadership positions. In 1965, the Harvard Business Review surveyed its readers' attitudes about women executives (Bowman, Worthy & Greyser). They entitled their article "Are Women
Executives People?" As Camden & Witt (1986), reviewing the article, succinctly put it, "The answer was 'Probably not!'" They added:

Their...survey uncovered many negative attitudes held by women and men toward women in management positions, including that they "scare male executives half to death" and tend "to break under pressure" (p. 258).

In a classic study in 1972 of civilian employees in the Air Force, Day & Stogdill found that slow advancement was correlated to performance for men but not for women. They concluded that "...slow advancement [is]...a result of their being females" (356).

Benson & Jerdee conducted a series of experiments (1974a; 1974b; 1975). From the first study, which involved bank supervisors, they concluded that women are discriminated against in promotion and development. Their second study, which utilized male business undergraduates, led them to describe the "female stereotype":

Discriminatory behavior against women seems based on a set of attitudes which depict women as limited in the toughness, stability, creativity and judgment required to meet the demands of high-level managerial positions. (p. 511)

Their final study, again involving bank supervisors, revealed acceptance of a wider range of behaviors for men than for women in appealing for redress of organizational inequities.

In 1973 and 1975, Schein sampled insurance managers to see if they associated "successful middle managers" with male stereotypes. She found that men and women agreed on the attributes of the "successful manager," but disagreed on some of the attributes of women. While the male sample credited "men" and "good managers" with being "emotionally stable and steady," logical, analytical and
consistent, the women tended to credit "women," "men" and "good managers" with these qualities. In other areas, however, the "male manager" image prevailed.

These results suggest that among women managers any lessening of the relationship [manager equals masculine] may be a function of a change in the perception of women in general rather than a change in perception of requirements for managerial success or perception of men in general. (p. 344)

Haccoun, Sallay & Haccoun (1978) investigated the attitudes of blue collar employees toward three possible supervisory styles: Directive, Rational, and Emotional/Friendly. They acknowledged that the workers may never have encountered these styles. They found that employees of both sexes preferred the Emotional/Friendly style, followed by the Rational, and that they rated equal satisfaction and effectiveness for male and female supervisors using these two styles. However, in line with sex-role stereotypes, the strongest findings showed the Authoritative style rated more unfavorably for female managers than for males, particularly by male employees. In addition, the female employees thought the rational approach would be less effective and less satisfying than the male employees.

Powell & Butterfield (1979) found 65% of a sample of male and female undergraduates sex-typing the managerial profession as masculine, in spite of "recent evidence suggest[ing] a shift away from sex-role stereotypes" and the claims of Haccoun, Sallay & Haccoun (1978) that "[S]tereotyping is attenuating among college
students...and the level of educational achievement is inversely related to the strength of the stereotypes..." (p. 124).

In another study, in which undergraduates viewed a video showing either a male or female leader directing a task, Welsh (1979) found subjects generally evaluating leaders of their own sex more positively. Males defined a more conservative role for female leaders; they were more strongly against women leaders than women were against males. Both sexes rated women as communicating better and liking the group better, but less effective.

Comparison of Women With Men

Complementing the research on stereotypes were studies designed to detect objective differences between female and male managers. An interesting complication that must be kept in mind when assessing these studies over time (1969 through 1986) is that sex roles, and possibly behaviors, have been changing at the same time. Thus, a study done a mere 17 years ago may already be inapplicable to today's population, although the author was unable to find replications of such studies that tested this hypothesis.

In 1969, Megargee designed a classic laboratory experiment to look at leader and follower behaviors. He first tested college students to determine whether their personalities were dominant or submissive, then created four groups of pairs: dominant men with submissive men; dominant women with submissive women; dominant men with submissive women; and dominant women with submissive men. Each
student was in only one pair. Each pair was told to decide who would be the leader and who the follower in a task. In the homogeneous pairs and the pairs in which dominance was congruent with sex role, the results were predictable: The dominant partner was chosen as leader. In the final group, however, in which dominant women were paired with submissive men, 91% of the women actively put their male partners in the role of leader.

Day & Stogdill's 1972 study, referred to above, actually compared the behavior patterns and promotion patterns of male and female supervisors. The presence of prejudice against females by their superiors, described earlier, was inferred by the researchers because of the inconsistencies they found in promotion patterns.

Male and female supervisors, who occupy parallel positions and perform similar functions, exhibit similar patterns of leader behavior and levels of effectiveness when described and evaluated by their immediate subordinates. (p. 359)

Wexley & Hunt (1974) paid 32 MBA students to lead groups of undergraduates in a task. An analysis of variance yielded no significant differences between the success of male and female leaders on either human relations or administrative/technical skills, although a Bales Interaction Process Analysis revealed that the women leaders "joked, laughed, showed satisfaction..." and asked for more opinions and suggestions than the males. "This implies that, although women leaders behave differently...[this has] no relationship to their performance [that is, success] as leaders." Also, "Although more
research is needed,...the variable of subordinate sex neither hinders nor enhances the effectiveness of the leader" (p. 871).

In 1975 Chapman commented, "Throughout the leadership literature, very little empirical research attempts to determine if there is a significant difference between male and female leadership styles or behaviors" (p. 645). He used Fiedler's definition of 'leadership behaviors' as specific acts in which a leader engages during the course of directing and coordinating task oriented activities, in contrast to 'leadership styles', which he defines as the underlying need structure of the leader, which motivates his behavior. (These definitions have not been used by subsequent researchers.) His study focused on styles, or underlying needs; he concluded that:

Practicing female managers do not have a significantly higher need for fostering good interpersonal relationships than do their male colleagues. Also of importance is the finding that the females studied are not more task oriented than are the males... (p. 649)

Brief & Oliver (1976) looked at work attitudes among retail sales managers. They found no differences between males and females who were department managers in the "allegedly male" career-related areas of pay and promotion or the "allegedly female" social aspects of co-worker relationships.

Osborn & Vicars wrote in 1975 that:

One of the frequently espoused arguments against women stems from a sex role stereotype that posits that men are naturally superior in productive pursuits. Only men are considered to be dominant, aggressive and competitive enough to gain the follower respect necessary for successful supervision--women just do not make good leaders. The fact that such stereotyping is generally accepted by male
managers is well-documented....In field studies, however...there has been a consistent failure to find differences between male and female leaders in behavior, performance, or subordinate satisfaction. (p. 440)

In their study, they found that while female managers behaved differently toward their subordinates than male managers, in some respects, they did not have a different effect on the subordinates than the male managers.

In 1977, Kanter published _Men and Women of the Corporation_, detailing her 5-year indepth study of an American corporation she called Indsco. She examined the roles and images of managers (virtually all men), secretaries (all women), and wives of the managers. Her most important conclusions dealt with the behavior of the "players." She found that although the behavior seemed to be predictable according to sex-role stereotypes, in fact it was a result of power and majority/minority imbalances, and that when those circumstances changed, people's behavior changed as well, regardless of their sex.

She posited that the most important characteristic of a good manager is not his or her gender, but rather his or her sense of power, for those who feel powerful confidently delegate power to their subordinates, thus building strong relationships with the subordinates while carving out a firm place for themselves and their "entourage" in the firm. In contrast, males and females who felt powerless were frightened of letting their subordinates "outshine" them, and so became more and more stingy and less and less powerful. She concluded
that, although many women had in fact been less competent as managers, it was because of their lack of confidence, not because of their genetic capabilities; she recommended a number of steps for corporations to bring out the potential talents of their female employees.

Kramer (1978) investigated the common assumption that for women to succeed in organizations, they should learn to "copy men's style." She asked 466 high school and college students to pick elements of "typical women's," "typical men's," and "ideal" speech and non-verbal patterns. Out of 51 items (from an open-ended pre-test) she found consensus among female and male students on 50. (Males chose "deep voice" as "ideal"; females didn't.) "Typical women's" speech was perceived by both males and females as closer to the "ideal."

Baird & Bradley (1979) reviewed the findings on male-female differences in "leadership": "...One of the most consistently-obtained findings is the greater tendency for males to emerge to leadership positions" (p. 102). These studies link leadership to aggressive-assertive behavior, initiating more verbal acts, concentrating their remarks in "performance-output" categories, and so forth. They also reviewed the "consistent findings" in the literature on communication: Women, in general, surpass men in the ability to be self-disclosing, warm, helpful, able to express emotions, and so forth.

Neither of these categories of findings contradicted conventional wisdom about men's and women's behavioral characteristics. The
innovation, begun with previous researchers and continued in the Baird & Bradley study, was to question the conventional wisdom of the efficacy of the "masculine manager." The researchers quote Baird (1976) as posing the question of "whether female leaders in fact are enacting the 'male' role, or whether the 'female role' is uniquely suited for leadership in certain situations" (p. 108). They developed a questionnaire "to survey managerial communicative behaviors and employee morale" (p. 104). As expected, "...females generally were perceived to be more concerned and attentive than males, who in turn were perceived to be more dominant, more directive, and quicker to challenge others than were females" (p. 106). The qualities perceived as stronger in the women managers correlated with qualities named by subordinates as strengthening morale, leading to the conclusion that "female managers may be more effective supervisors than the male managers seen in this sample" (p. 109).

However, the authors did offer some caveats. First, they pointed out that women are strong in areas that seem to affect subordinate assessment of them; that is, male managers are not rated lower for lacking those qualities. Second, it is possible that "because of biases against women executives, a female manager must indeed be superior to a male manager to achieve results equal to his" (p. 111). Finally, they recommended future studies to compare managerial styles against another variable than morale; they recommended the variable of productivity.

Birdsall (1980) claimed that:
Studies of female managers in work organizations generally have been concerned with the issue of whether or not the sex of a leader affects his or her behavior, or style, toward subordinates....The results of this fairly broad body of research have been basically inconclusive. (p. 183)

He also discussed methodological problems:

The underlying assumption of the previous research has been that measuring the perceptual claims of the subordinates reflects the actual behavior of managers, and that subordinates can reliably define their managers' behavior. Fisher (1977) discusses this problem: "...if the question seeks to identify leadership behaviors, the investigator should look at what the leader does, not ask the group members for their perceptions." p. 16 (p. 184)

He concluded that the female and male managers he studied held masculine self-perceptions and communication styles; that women can adjust to their work context and perform similarly to men.

Montgomery & Norton (1981) stressed the importance of self perceptions of behavior:

Understanding the perceptions of one's own and other's behavior may be as vital to the explanation of the communication process as is the behavior itself. Self and other perceptions comprise the input data for determining expected outcomes of interaction situations, which in turn, influence actual behavior. (p. 122)

They found that male and female undergraduates reported more similarities than differences in their own communicator styles; the two consistent differences were that females report being more animated and males report being more precise.

Jeyaraj (1982) examined the self-reported behavior of male and female religious secondary school principals, and found no significant differences between females and males.
In 1983, Camden & Witt replicated the Baird & Bradley research, attempting to use productivity as the criterion variables instead of organizational morale. (However, their use, as a measure of productivity, of the number of merit raises and promotions received in the previous 24 months by the worker completing the survey, seems unreasonably subjective to this author.) They found that:

Contrary to "popular conceptions" about the general effectiveness of female managers, [they] can be effective...while employing stereotypically feminine characteristics....this study indicates that there is...a positive correlation [between female supervisory ability and] "bottom-line" factors such as productivity. (p. 265)

They cautioned:

Obviously, correlational relationships do not address cause-effect analysis. It is possible that female managers are perceived to be more "feminine" by their successful employees. While there is no apparent rationale to support such a position, organizational communication research argues against the opposite conclusion [i.e., that female managers induce higher productivity from their workers]. Traditionally, research indicates a very weak, if not nonexistent, relationship between communication climate and productivity. (p. 266)

Revilla (1984), after studying top, middle and first-line administrators at three private colleges, concluded that conflict management styles may be more influenced by the amount of time the person has spent in administration than by any other variable, including sex.

In 1985, Berryman-Fink wrote:

The gender-typical behaviors which females have been socialized to develop may, in fact, be incompatible with traditional organizational definitions of managerial effectiveness. It has been suggested that traditional organizational norms derive from military and athletic
models....Yet, contemporary norms of the American workplace may be undergoing change....The workplace of the future will combine norms of competitiveness with cooperativeness, aggressiveness and supportiveness, rationality with...empathy...successful management already means using behavioral flexibility--combining skills that males have typically demonstrated with skills that females have typically demonstrated--so that an organization can use the multifaceted potentials of all of its members....men and women have a great deal to offer each other in the molding of new work climates. (p. 308)

Todd-Mancillas & Rossi (1985) examined "Gender Differences in the Management of Personnel Disputes." Using an interview schedule previously developed by Rossi & Wolesensky (1983), Rossi interviewed 40 male and 40 female managers, asking them for their thoughts about four scripts, each of which briefly describes a managerial problem. They found significant differences between the responses of the women and men to three of the four problems presented.

For the most part, female managers were more prone to use some form of communication in gaining their employees' and peers' acceptance of their policy change, whereas male managers were more prone to insist that the employee adopt the change as a function of his or her lesser...status in the organization. (p. 28)

They add, 'Although these findings suggest differences in male and female managers' interaction styles, future research is needed to determine whether, in fact, managers actually behave in these ways" (p. 28).

Camden & Kennedy (1986) point out the double-bind for women in management: "Unfortunately, just as there are penalties for a woman 'acting like a woman,' there also appear to be penalties for a woman 'acting like a man'" (p. 553). They focused on the impact on
subordinates of female managers who use the masculine versus the feminine style of communication, using the Baird & Bradley survey. Their sample was made up of nurses. They found that the "feminine" style was more effective in raising employee morale than the "masculine" style for these women, although they added that "it is not yet known if males would experience a deterioration in their managerial outcomes if they [changed to] a more feminine or androgynous communicative style" (p. 559).

Summary of Research on Women in Management

Research has shown that many females and males believe that women do not make good managers, although these beliefs may be changing in the 1980's. At the same time, attempts since 1972 to objectively compare the behavior of female and male managers, and to measure their effects on employee morale and productivity have repeatedly shown this common belief to be inaccurate. While differences in behavior are sometimes found, they have not been linked to adverse effects on productivity and have sometimes been linked to improved morale on the part of the subordinates.
Summary of Research and Literature Review

In the first section, the four historical manager-worker relationship patterns were reviewed, showing the influences affecting managers in understanding how to relate to their subordinates. These were the Directive styles, first "paternalistic" and then "bureaucratic," and the Participative styles, first known as "human relations" and currently called "participative management."

In the second section, the focus was those influences affecting managerial outlooks toward the resolution of conflict with their subordinates. Particularly in the area of conflict management, which has been called the most stressful of managerial tasks, managers may not always choose the more difficult "Participative Management" behaviors, although, as this review reflects, they are so strongly advocated in the literature.

The review supports the Hypothesis 1, stated in Chapter 1, that respondents will report using both Participative and Directive behaviors, resulting in average scores for each kind of behavior that do not significantly differ.

The review only indirectly addresses Hypothesis 2, that respondents will report that the Participative behaviors are closer to the ideal, since no research was found that explored the ideals of managers. However, insofar as the majority of prescriptive writers in the last 60 years, many of whom are managers, advocate Participative behaviors as ideal, there is some support for Hypothesis 2, that the
average scores for Participative Behaviors as Ideal will be significantly higher than those for Directive Behaviors as Ideal.

The third section explored research dealing with women in management. Stereotypes about women's inability to manage were found to be commonly held. Yet most research on managerial women's performance revealed no significant differences between men and women; other studies found differences but concluded that they did not affect the quality of the women's work.

Theories can be found to support a variety of hypotheses. Berryman-Fink and Baird & Bradley suggest that women will choose Participative styles while men will choose Directive styles, due to sex-role stereotyping. The popular perception that women are too "bossy" for leadership roles, as described in Kanter (1977), supports the hypothesis that women will choose Directive styles while men, more relaxed, will choose Participative styles. Kanter's own theory, that the variable of power is more important than that of gender, predicts no difference between men and women, since all of the participants are at such a high level of power in their corporations.

Kanter's theory supports the null hypothesis stated in Chapter 1, that there will be no significant differences, in reported behavior or ideals, between the female and male respondents.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

Introduction

This chapter is organized in chronological order. It reports each of the steps taken, by the author (and, in the case of the first step, by a professor on the author's committee), in the same order that they were carried out. The process began with informal fieldwork, followed by the selection of a method for further investigation. No instrument could be found in the literature, so the author developed and pre-tested one. This included the formulation of the tabulation procedures to be followed. The final steps were the development of a valid sampling procedure and the implementation of the instrument by mail to the sample.

Methodology

Seminal Fieldwork

The research began with some informal fieldwork done by Dr. Pat Wells, Professor of Management at Oregon State University. Dr. Wells interviewed several managers in the course of several months during 1985 and 1986. On the basis of these informal conversations about conflict management, she compiled the lists of commonly used behaviors, labeled "Dialogue" and "Debate," shown in Table 1.

The author decided to explore further the use of these two dimensions of behavior in upper-level managers. Although representing a certain conceptual simplicity, as compared with, for example, Blake and Mouton's grid with its five behavioral options, this
**Table 1**  
**Dr. Wells' Original List of Managerial Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen, then list your rebuttals</td>
<td>Listen, then list their points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend your position</td>
<td>Hear their position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give answers</td>
<td>Explore options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret, judge others' behavior as right or wrong</td>
<td>Observe, describe others' behavior without evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume you know what they mean</td>
<td>State what you hear; check it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think either-or; find one best way</td>
<td>Think more-or-less without evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give advice on what's best</td>
<td>Share ideas and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate each others' views</td>
<td>Accept and disclose views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome objections</td>
<td>Respect differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask &quot;Why don't you?&quot; questions</td>
<td>Ask &quot;How can we?&quot; questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strive to win</td>
<td>Strive for mutual gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make points now to build your track record</td>
<td>Build relationships to create ongoing benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two-dimensional construct is worth examining for two reasons. First, it had fit the empirical data gathered in the field better than more elaborate constructs; theory should always be firmly grounded in observation. Second, it is a construct commonly used in the business literature. For example, Munter (in press) writes that "students know that the current trend toward 'participative' (as opposed to 'authoritarian') management makes communication more important than ever before."

After discussion and a review of the literature, some of the behaviors on the lists were dropped, several non-verbal behaviors were added, and the names of the dimensions were changed to "Directive" and "Participative" (see Table 2). These words, while not used exclusively, are commonly found in the literature, (e.g., Argyris, 1957; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Ewing, 1983;) and they are not limited to verbal behavior.

Selection of a Method for Investigating the Dimensions

Methodologists agree that each method of conducting research has its strengths and weaknesses (Dillman, 1978; Emory, 1985). Lab experiments are under the control of the researcher, but the artificiality of the situation may provoke superficial responses (Emory, 1985). In addition, they can only measure the responses of available populations, such as the proverbial "college sophomores" (Emory, 1985). These weaknesses ruled out this method of investigation for this study. Observations and personal interviews,
Table 2
List of Managerial Behaviors Surveyed

**Directive Behaviors**

Give directions

Remind the other person of who's in charge

Interrupt the other person

Strive to win

Speak roughly, when necessary, to maintain control

**Participative Behaviors**

Repeat the other person's points back, to check

Search for common ground

Focus on exploring all the options

Show that you are listening (e.g., nod, make eye contact)

Ask for feedback
while yielding valuable data, are costly. Mail surveys provide a less expensive way to reach a meaningful number of participants, although the rejection rate is higher for this type of survey than for telephone or face-to-face interviews (Dillman, 1978). In addition, the "social desirability bias" (caused by respondents giving untrue answers because they believe these answers are more socially acceptable than the truth) is lowest in mail surveys (Dillman, 1978).

After consideration, the author chose to survey corporate officers directly, asking them to report their own behavior and beliefs about conflict management. As noted in Chapter 1, there are some limitations to self-reporting surveys. Wall (1982) notes that:

These limitations [include] the general weaknesses and shortcomings of "paper and pencil" instruments...as well as the acknowledged discrepancy between self-perception and the perception of others when utilizing...attitudinal or behavior instruments. It has been observed that self-descriptions are not free from the halo effect and they are somewhat more favorable than descriptions by subordinates.

On the other hand, he adds some strengths:

However, as Donald Campbell (1956) argues, self-perceptions "stand a much better chance of revealing stable and persistent attributes of individuals than do the reputational measures," and are in fact more discriminating than evaluation by others. (p.7)

Bartol (1978) points out that:

Further studies utilizing observers also may be useful in delineating actual versus perceived behavior, although it may be difficult to control for possible confounding effects due to sex-role stereotypes among observers. Schmitt & Hall (1977) have argued that consensus among observers can be due to shared stereotypes. (p. 806)
Finally, Kramer (1978) concludes that attention to perception is at least as important, in the study of sex differences in communication, as is attention to actual behavior.

A review of the literature revealed no instrument focusing on the dimensions described above, so one was developed, under the guidance of Professor Wells and the Oregon State University Survey Research Center. The wording of the instrument and its cover letter, as well as the format design, coding for tabulation, and all other details, followed the guidelines delineated by Dillman (1978). The pages of the survey used for this study are shown as Appendix A; the cover letters and followup notices are shown as Appendix B. The design of the questions investigating Directive and Participative behavior and ideals is shown in Figure 3.

Hypothesizing that managers are not exclusively Directive or Participative, the questions asked the participants to consider 5 Directive and 5 Participative behaviors. Using Likert-type response categories, the respondents were to indicate the percentage of discussions in which they used each behavior (Question 5) and the percentage of discussions in which they believed it would be ideal to use the behavior (Question 16). In both questions, the behaviors numbered a,c,e,g, and i are "Participative" in nature, while those labeled b,d,f,h, and j are "Directive" behaviors.

Participants responded on a 5 point scale for each behavior, from "never" (0%) to "always" (100%). In scoring the responses, the answers were weighted from 0 points for "never" to 5 points for
Figure 3
Design Used for Questions About Behavior and Ideals

Q-5 How would you describe your part in these discussions with subordinates, where you disagreed on work-related matters? Below are descriptions of 10 different actions that managers use in handling conflicts. Please circle the word next to each action which best describes how often you used it over the past 12 months.

ALWAYS means you did it at every discussion (100% of the time)
OFTEN means you did it at most discussions (about 75% of the time)
SOME means you did it at about half of the discussions (50% of the time)
SELDOM means you did it at fewer than half of the discussions (about 25% of the time)
NEVER means you never did it (0% of the time)

Overall Frequency of Actions (please circle your answer)

(100%) (75%) (50%) (25%) (0%)

a. Repeated the other person's point(s) back, to check..............ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
b. Gave directions.............................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
c. Searched for common ground..............ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
d. Reminded the other person of who's in charge.......................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
e. Focused on exploring all the options..........................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
f. Interrupted the other person..............ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
g. Showed you were listening (e.g., nodding, eye contact)............ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
h. Strived to win..............................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
i. Asked for feedback..........................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
j. Spoke roughly, when necessary to maintain control...............ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER
k. Other*:.....................................ALWAYS OFTEN SOME SELDOM NEVER

*please specify
"always". Each respondent's Directive answers could then be summed and averaged; likewise his or her Participative answers. A manager thus could possibly score high on one dimension, or on both dimensions, or on neither dimension.

**Pretesting the Instrument**

A pilot study was made by sending the penultimate draft of the survey and its accompanying cover letter to 15 business people (8 women and 7 men) and 8 academics (3 women and 5 men). In a separate cover letter, their reactions and suggestions were solicited. Fourteen people responded. Their comments were used to make the final version of the survey more understandable and friendly.

**Sampling Methodology**

The population from which the sample was drawn was made up of the officers and upper-level management of the one thousand wealthiest American corporations, as listed in *The Corporate 1000: A Directory of Who Runs The Top 1000 U.S. Corporations*, published by the Washington Monitor, Inc. (September, 1985). After deleting the Chief Executive Officers and all Board members who were not also officers or executives, as well as all sexually ambiguous names, the pool of names was divided into two groups. One contained the names of 24,619 men; the other contained the names of 668 women. From each pool, a random sample of 250 names was drawn, using computer-generated lists of random numbers.
Implementing the Instrument

All five hundred people in the random sample received the first copy of the survey, with a cover letter and return envelope. One week later, all 500 received a follow-up reminder notice. New copies of the survey were sent immediately to the executives who called saying they had not received one.

A follow-up survey by telephone to a random sample of 39 (10%) of the non-respondents was initiated, to learn why they had chosen not to respond. Theoretically, they could be similar to the respondents in their attitude toward conflict management, but simply have not responded because of time restraints, policies against completing any surveys, or other such unrelated reasons; or, they could be quite different from the respondents in their attitude about conflict management, and this attitude could be the reason they had self-selected themselves out of the sample. Obviously, this second possibility would leave the study with quite skewed results, whereas the first would not. However, limited research has shown that although some bias is generated by refusals, it is generally insignificant (Dillman, 1978).

This survey of non-respondents yielded limited information. Probably the most useful data gained was that 20.5% of those called (8 managers) had not responded because they were no longer with their companies. 2.6% (1 manager) had completed the survey and returned it, but it had been lost in the mail. The secretaries for 28.2% (11 managers) said they could not remember having seen the survey arrive,
and corrected the address that I read to them over the phone, in part or whole. 5.13% (2 respondents) explained that the survey was not applicable to them (no subordinates). These data support the assumption that a strong percentage of the non-respondents were people whose non-involvement was not based on particular feelings about conflict management.

However, of the 56.4% of non-respondents (22 managers) who promised to fill out a new copy of the instrument, only 7 (17.9% of the non-respondents called) followed through with completed surveys. An additional 4 answered Q-23, giving reasons for declining to complete them. Had all 22 completed the surveys, their responses could have been, as a group, compared against those of the other respondents. Statistically, 7 surveys is too small a number to be meaningfully used as a cell, so this comparison was not made. Rather, these 11 surveys were simply added to the pool.

A final copy of the survey, with a new cover letter, was sent 6 weeks after the original. This copy included a new question on the back, Question 23, which asked those who declined to respond to simply circle one or more reasons for their decision. 109 executives (56 men and 53 women) answered Question 23, (including, as mentioned above, 4 of the non-respondents who were contacted by telephone). Of this group, 70% of the men and 81% of the women gave lack of time, or personal or company policies against completing surveys, as their reasons for not participating. The remaining 25 people (23%) listed: lack of interest in the subject (4 respondents); privacy of
information requested (6 respondents); various problems with the wording or format of the instrument (5 respondents); or "Other", including 8 who said they simply had no subordinates. When these responses are added to the 161 completed surveys, the total is 270, or 54%. Again, while not conclusive, these findings lend support to the possibility that for many of the 230 people who never responded at all, time constraints or general policies about surveys, rather than specific attitudes related to the content of this survey, were the limiting factors.

Summary

Having decided to conduct a formal study on some informal data gathered by a professor, the author developed and implemented an instrument. It was sent to 250 female and 250 male upper-level managers across the United States. Care was taken to follow the guidelines in Dillman (1978) for mail surveys.
CHAPTER 4: Results

Introduction

In this chapter, the author discusses the numerical results of the survey: the response rate; the participant demographics; the statistical analyses performed on the data gathered relevant to the hypotheses; and three exploratory looks at other variables.

The Response Rate

Within three weeks from the time the first surveys were sent to the sample of 500 executives, 101 usable surveys (20% of the sample) were returned (51 from women and 50 from men). A second (and final) copy of the instrument was sent six weeks later, to all those who had not responded in any way. In response to this mailing, 60 executives (43 men and 18 women) completed the instrument. The final total of completed responses was 162: 93 men and 69 women. This is 32.4% of the original sample of 500.

Not every survey was complete. 21 participants reported experiencing no conflicts in the previous 12 months. They subsequently left blank Q-5, which asked for a report of the behaviors used in conflicts over the previous 12 months. One participant left blank Q-16, which asked for the ideal behaviors to use. Thus, the sum of weights (number of respondents) for the directive and participative behaviors was 141, while the sum of weights for the directive and participative behaviors considered ideal was 161.
Participant Demographics

The people who completed the instrument reported a wide variety of ages, years of managerial experience, percentage of work time spent handling conflict (of any kind) and percentage of conflict-handling time spent on conflict with subordinates (see Table 3). The women ranged from 30 to 60 years old (mean 41.4; standard deviation (sd) 6.9). The men ranged from 27 to 66 years old (mean 48.9; sd 8.5). Women reported a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 27 years of managerial experience (mean 12; sd 5.8); men reported a range from one year's experience to 39 (mean 19.6; sd 8.6). Women estimated spending from 0% to 63% of their time dealing with job-related conflict (mean 18.3%; sd 15.0); of that time, from 0% to 80% in conflict with subordinates. Men estimated .5% to 80% of their time in job-related conflict (mean 15.4; sd 15.1), and of that time, 0% to 90% with subordinates (mean 15.7, sd 22.1).

Statistical Analysis

Methodology

The statistical analysis consisted of a series of comparisons of the means of scores, to test the hypotheses which dealt with differences between Directive and Participative behaviors used, differences between Directive and Participative behaviors considered to be ideal, and differences between female and male managers, in their behaviors and ideals. To make the comparisons, a t test of significance of mean differences (analysis of variance) was used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (n=69)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Men (n=93)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>27-66</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Managerial</strong></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Time Spent</strong></td>
<td>Handling Conflict</td>
<td>0-63%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>.5-80%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Conflict Time</strong></td>
<td>with Subordinates</td>
<td>0-80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>(14.2)</td>
<td>0-90%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first and third hypotheses are null hypotheses, predicting no differences; the second hypothesis is directional, predicting a difference.

Hypothesis 1: Among managers as a whole, average scores for Participative and Directive Behaviors used will not significantly differ.

In order to test this hypothesis, each respondent's scores for Question 5 a, c, e, g, and i were summed and averaged, resulting in a "Participative Behavior Score." In the same way, each respondent's scores for Q-5 b, d, f, h, and j were summed and averaged, giving a "Directive Behavior Score." (See Figure 3 in Chapter 3.) Since each response had a possible range from 0 (behavior never used) to 5 (behavior always used), each score had the same possible range, 0 to 5.

The mean of the Participative Behavior Scores was 3.04 (sd .45) (see Table 4). The mean of the Directive Behavior Scores was 1.61 (sd .51). The t test showed this to be significant difference at the 99% confidence interval (0.298, 2.542). The participative behaviors described in the instrument are used more frequently than the directive behaviors described in the instrument. Hypothesis 1 was not supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp 1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>90% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents'</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.0--4.0</td>
<td>(0.298, 2.542)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents'</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>0.4--3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>90% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents'</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.8--4.0</td>
<td>(1.177, 2.531)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Behavior As Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents'</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.0--3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Behavior As Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp 3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>90% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's Participative Behavior</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.2--4.0</td>
<td>(-0.405, 0.725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Participative Behavior</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.0--3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.4--3.2</td>
<td>(-0.619, 0.699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.4--2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Participative Behavior as Ideal</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.8--4.0</td>
<td>(-0.499, 0.739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Participative Behavior as Ideal</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.2--4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Directive Behavior as Ideal</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.0--3.0</td>
<td>(-.689, 0.769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Directive Behavior as Ideal</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0.2--2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 99% Confidence Interval
Hypothesis 2: Among managers as a whole, the average score for Participative Behavior as Ideal will be significantly higher than that of Directive Behavior as Ideal.

This second hypothesis was tested by using the same process on the scores given for Question 16 as was used for Question 5 (above). Question 16 was identical to Question 5, except for the instructions. These requested the participant to identify the frequency with which behaviors should ideally be used, in contrast to Question 5, which requested the identification of behaviors which the manager remembered using in the previous 12 months. Again, the possible range of scores for each response went from 0 (never recommended) to 5 (recommended for use 100% of the time).

The mean of the "Participative Behavior as Ideal" was 3.32 (sd .49); that of the "Directive Behavior as Ideal" was 1.46 (sd .57). Again at the 99% confidence interval (1.177, 2.531) the t test showed this difference to be significant. The participative behaviors are seen as closer to the ideal; Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no sex differences found, in either reported behavior or in the choice of behavior considered to be ideal.

This hypothesis was tested by making 4 tests. First, the women's mean Participative Behavior Score was compared with that of the men; then the Directive Behavior Score mean of each group was compared. Second, the mean Participative Behavior as Ideal Scores for
each group were compared, followed by the mean Directive Behavior as Ideal Scores.

Participative Behavior Used: for the women, the mean score was 3.13 (sd .41), while the men's was 2.97 (sd .46). The t test showed no significant difference at the 90% confidence interval (-0.405, 0.725).

Directive Behavior Used: The women's mean score was 1.63 (sd .57); the men's mean score was 1.59 (sd .47). The t test showed no significant difference at the 90% confidence level (-0.619, 0.699).

Participative Behavior as Ideal: The mean score for women was 3.39 (sd .50); the corresponding men's mean score was 3.27 (sd .47). The t test indicated that this is not a significant difference at the 90% confidence interval (-0.499, 0.739).

Directive Behavior as Ideal: The women's mean score was 1.43 (sd .65); the men's mean score was 1.49 (.50). Again, the t test showed that this is not a significant difference at the 90% confidence interval (-0.689, 0.769).

The female and male managers in this sample do not significantly differ in their reported behavior or ideals on the issue of conflict management with subordinates. This supports Hypothesis 3.
Other Variables

Since gender does not appear to be the variable that determines whether a manager tends toward a participative or a directive style, the author explored three other variables, comparing each with behavior reported used by the respondents.

Do Younger Managers Use Different Behaviors Than Older Managers?

The ages of the total group of respondents formed a bi-modal distribution, with one mode slightly over and the other slightly under the age of 45. The author used this natural split to create two groups for comparison. This put 77 managers into the "younger" category, and 85 into the "older" category, although since 4 of the former and 17 of the latter reported not experiencing conflict within the last 12 months, only 141 responses were usable.

The mean score of the younger group for Participative Behavior was 3.12 (sd .43); the mean score of the older group for Participative Behavior was 2.95 (sd .45). For Directive Behavior, the younger group's mean was 1.65 (sd .57) while the older group's mean was 1.57 (sd .44). These numbers are so similar to those found for men and women (see Table 6) that further analysis was unnecessary to determine that there was no significant difference between the 2 groups.

Do Managers With Fewer Years of Experience Use Different Behaviors Than Managers With More Years of Experience?

The review of literature and research noted Revilla's (1984) conclusion, that the number of years a person spent in administration
Table 5

Results of the Study Relating to Other Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2.2--4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.0--3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.4--3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>0.4--2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Experienced Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2.0--4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Experienced Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.0--3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Experienced Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.4--3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Experienced Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0.4--2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Conflict Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.0--3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Conflict Managers' Participative Behavior</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2.0--4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Conflict Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.4--2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Conflict Managers' Directive Behavior</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>0.4--3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was the most important factor influencing his or her management behavior. Considering the changes in emphasis on conflict management that have taken place within the last decade and a half, the author divided the participants into those with less than 15 years of managerial experience, and those with 15 years or more. There were 84 (80 usable) respondents in the less experienced group, and 78 (61 usable) in the more experienced group. Those who were less experienced had a Participative Behavior mean score of 3.11 (sd .43); the mean of the more experienced was 2.94 (sd .45). For Directive Behavior, the less experienced managers' mean score was 1.67 (sd .53); the more experienced managers scored 1.53 (sd .49). Again, no additional analysis was needed to determine that there is no significant difference between the groups (see Table 6).

Do Managers Who Deal With Little Conflict Use Different Behaviors Than Managers Who Deal With Much Conflict?

The third variable that seemed promising as a predictor of Directive and Participative Behaviors was the amount of time spent handling job-related conflict (not necessarily with subordinates). The author separated those who reported spending less than 15% of their time in conflict management (87 respondents, 68 usable) from those who estimated spending 15% or more of their time in conflict management (75 respondents, 73 usable).
For Participative Behavior, the mean of the low-conflict group was 3.04 (sd .47); the high-conflict group mean was also 3.04 (sd .43). For Directive Behavior, the low-conflict group mean was 1.59 (sd .48), and the high-conflict group had a mean of 1.63 (sd .54). These numbers were so similar to the results for the overall group that further analysis was unnecessary to see that there was no significant difference between the scores (again, see Table 6).

Summary

A wide range of managers participated in the study, with a reasonable spread in their responses. A t test of significance of mean differences was used to compare means of responses.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported. This hypothesis predicted that, among the respondents as a group, no significant difference would be found between average scores for Participative and Directive Behaviors Used. A significant difference was found between the means for the reported participative behaviors and the reported directive behaviors: the participative behaviors were reported to be used significantly more often.

Hypothesis 2 was supported. This hypothesis predicted that, among respondents as a group, the average score for Participative Behavior as Ideal would be significantly higher than that of Directive Behavior as Ideal. Such a difference was found: the participative behaviors were considered to be closer to the ideal behavior for managers to use in handling conflict with subordinates.
Hypothesis 3 was supported. This hypothesis predicted that no significant differences would be found between the mean scores of the men and the women, in behavior or ideals, and none were found.

Since gender did not appear to be a predictor for conflict management styles, three other variables were explored. No significant differences were found between the mean scores for behavior used by younger and older managers; less experienced and more experienced managers; or managers reporting more and less time spent in conflict management.
Table 6
Similarities Between Means of Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participative Behavior</th>
<th>Directive Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Conflict Managers</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Conflict Managers</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Managers</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Experienced Managers</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Managers</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Experienced Managers</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: Discussion

Introduction

In this last chapter, the author discusses the results of the study. This includes a brief summary of the results, the conclusions the author draws from them, their practical implications, and suggestions for further research in this area.

Summary of the Results

The managers surveyed reported using the participative behaviors significantly more often than directive behaviors. This contradicts Hypothesis 1, which predicted that the respondents would report average scores for both kinds of behavior that would not significantly differ. Although the respondents did report using both kinds of behaviors, they showed, as a group, a significantly average score for the participative behaviors.

The managers reported believing that participative behaviors are more ideal for handling conflict with subordinates than are directive behaviors. This supports Hypothesis 2.

The female and male managers showed no significant differences in their reported behavior or their reported ideals. This supports Hypothesis 3.

Three other variables were analyzed for influence on the behavioral choices of the managers. These variables were: the chronological age of the manager; his or her years of managerial experience; and the level of conflict he or she reported on the job.
None of these were found to be correlated with differences in the managers' reported use of participative and directive behaviors.

**Conclusions from the Results**

The results relating to managerial behavior suggest that managers have been influenced, either by the writings of the Human Relations and Participative Management schools or possibly by the same social forces that have influenced the writers. These upper-level managers, representing a nationwide population, report using behaviors with subordinates that encourage shared participation and problem-solving, in clear preference to the behaviors that simply direct the subordinates. This study does not examine the motives of the managers, in using the participative behaviors, so no conclusions can be drawn as to whether they use the behaviors for idealistic, pragmatic, or perhaps Machiavellian reasons. It can be concluded, however, that throughout upper-level management in the United States, participative behaviors are used more frequently than directive behaviors.

Similar are the results relating to managerial ideals. Indeed, since respondents may be able to report their present ideals more easily than their past actions, it can be concluded with additional sureness that, again throughout upper-level management in the United States, participative behaviors are considered to be closer to the ideal way for managers to handle conflict with subordinates than are directive behaviors.
The comparison of female and male managers supports the conclusion that they do not handle conflict differently, nor do they hold different beliefs about the way it should be handled. While there were a range of scores recorded for each of the four areas (participative behavior; directive behavior; participative behavior as ideal; directive behavior as ideal) gender was not an influential variable for predicting outcome in any of the areas. This result is consistent with much of the previous research.

The exploratory analysis done on the three variables of chronological age, years of managerial experience and level of conflict on the job, suggests that none of these variables influence participative or directive behavior or ideals. However, since these variables are not, like gender, intrinsically dichotomous, each had to be divided into two groups ("older and younger," "more and less," "higher" and "lower") based on information and logic. It is possible that additional analysis which divides the groups at different points could yield different results.

**Practical Implications**

There are two major groups who may be able to put these results to practical use, as described in "The Purpose of the Study," in Chapter 1.

The first group is the people in the private and public sector, who make policy regarding employment. These people need access to two kinds of information: first, for the purpose of strengthening their training programs, they need to know what constitutes effective
management today, including effective conflict management; second, for the purpose of improving recruitment and promotion, they need to be able to accurately assess applicants. As was shown in the Literature and Research Review, the belief is widespread that managerial potential can be assessed on the basis of gender. This study concludes that it cannot.

The second group is the managers themselves, and people who are considering working in management. Many of the participants expressed interest in learning the results of this study; as managers share their experiences, they can help one another to expand their repertoire of behaviors for dealing with interpersonal conflict. Another benefit of the study will be to help women and men see the inaccuracy of limiting stereotypes, which will encourage them to strive for new opportunities in their own careers, as well as those of their subordinates.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

It would be useful to administer this survey to people on other levels of management. One of the respondents commented that it was more appropriate for first-line supervisors. Clearly, the lower employees are in the company hierarchy, the less power they are given; are the subordinates of supervisors encouraged to participate as much as the subordinates of the vice-presidents in this study?

Another valuable study would be the comparison of self-reports with reports by subordinates and trained observers. This could be useful as a part of a training or Organizational Development program.
An issue that came up several times during the course of this study was the question of managerial motivation for using participatory behaviors. This study did not address that issue. Future work could explore the questions of why the managers use the behaviors, and how they learned them.

In any of these studies, the survey itself would be strengthened by the creation of a second version, to be used together with the current version as a Form A and Form B, each distributed to half of the participants. The second form would offer as options the Directive aspect of each behavior now being offered as a Participative behavior, and vice versa, using the paired behaviors listed in Table 1. For example, the current behavior: "Repeated the other person's point(s) back, to check" would be replaced with "Repeated your rebuttals, for emphasis."

**Summary**

In this chapter, the results were discussed and conclusions drawn. Several implications were given for practical applications, and suggestions were made for future research.
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APPENDIX A

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN TODAY'S BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Your responses are extremely helpful. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space in the margins and on the back. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

Thank you for your help.

College of Business
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331-2603
503-754-4033
In the first part of this survey, you can help us to see what's going on in the work world with conflict management. By "conflict," we mean any disagreement or dispute about policies, procedures or work quality, whether or not the people involved feel antagonistic. Please focus only on work-related disagreements, not other conflicts that happen to be discussed on the job (such as who will win the Pennant!).

Q-1 What approximate percentage of your work time do you estimate is spent in handling work-related interpersonal conflicts? (This includes conflicts between you and other employees or non-employees, and also when you help others to resolve their conflicts.)

_______%

Q-2 What approximate percentage of this "conflict-handling time" do you estimate is spent in handling conflicts between you and your subordinates?

_______%

Q-3 Thinking back over the last 12 months, can you remember discussions with subordinates where you disagreed on a work-related matter? (please circle one)
   1 YES (if yes, please continue with Q-4 and Q-5)
   2 NO (if no, please skip to Q-6)

Q-4 About how many of these discussions do you recall having in the last 12 months? (An approximate number is fine. Fill in whichever of the choices makes your calculations easiest.)

____ per year

____ per month

____ per week

____ per day

(please go on to next page)

-1-
Q-5  How would you describe your part in these discussions with subordinates, where you disagreed on work-related matters? Below are descriptions of 10 different actions that managers use in handling conflicts. Please circle the word next to each action which best describes how often you used it over the past 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>(100%)</th>
<th>(75%)</th>
<th>(50%)</th>
<th>(25%)</th>
<th>(0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Repeated the other person's point(s) back, to check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gave directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Searched for common ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reminded the other person of who's in charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Focused on exploring all the options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Interrupted the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Showed you were listening (e.g., nodding, eye contact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strove to win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Asked for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Spoke roughly, when necessary to maintain control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*please specify
This second section focuses on your thoughts and feelings on conflict management.

Q-14 What quality do you value the most in yourself, in dealing with conflict?
   a. Emotional control
   b. Logic
   c. Empathy
   d. Caution

Q-15 What quality do you value the most in your subordinates, in dealing with conflict?
   a. Emotional control
   b. Logic
   c. Empathy
   d. Caution

Q-16 None of us are perfect. We improve by striving for our goals. In this question, we seek to understand your goals. What do you think is the best or the ideal way to act, in order to be a truly effective manager, when dealing with subordinates in work-related disagreements?

Please circle the word next to each action which best describes how often you think the action should be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Repeat the other person's points back, to check</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Give directions</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Search for common ground</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Remind the other person of who's in charge</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Focus on exploring all the options</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Interrupt the other person</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Show that you are listening (e.g., nod, make eye contact)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strive to win</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Ask for feedback</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Speak roughly, when necessary to maintain control</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Frequency of Actions (circle your answer)

(100%) (75%) (50%) (25%) (0%)

*please specify

(please go on to next page)
Q-17 When you look at management in your organization, what do you see as the most difficult aspects of conflict resolution practices?

This is the end of the second section. For the third and final section, we would appreciate some information about you to help us interpret the data.

Q-18 What is your age?

______ (AGE)

Q-19 What is your sex?

1 FEMALE
2 MALE

Q-20 How many years have you been working as a manager?

______ (NUMBER OF YEARS)

Q-21 Which of the following best describes the area in which you are currently employed? (Please circle one.)

01 ADMINISTRATION
02 ADVERTISING
03 ENGINEERING
04 FACILITIES
05 FINANCE/ACCOUNTING
06 HUMAN RESOURCES
07 INFORMATION SYSTEMS
08 LEGAL
09 LOGISTICS
10 PRODUCTION/OPERATIONS
11 RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT
12 SALES/PUBLIC RELATIONS
13 OTHER (specify): __________________________________________

Q-22 Which of the following best describes the industry in which you are currently employed? (Please circle one.)

1 EDUCATION
2 FINANCE
3 MANUFACTURING
4 PROFESSIONAL
5 RETAIL
6 SERVICE
7 WHOLESALE
8 OTHER (specify): __________________________________________

If there is anything else that you would like to tell us, please do so here and on the back of the page. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
IF YOU PREFER NOT TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY, YOU CAN REMOVE YOUR NAME FROM OUR MAILING LIST BY ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING QUESTION.

Q-23 I chose not to complete this survey because (please circle all that apply):

01 I don't have time for surveys
02 I make it a policy to turn down all such requests
03 My company has a policy to turn down all such requests
04 I'm not interested in the subject
05 The information you request is private
06 I don't like the wording of the cover letters
07 I don't like the wording of the questions
08 The printing is too small
09 There are too many questions
10 Other: (please specify)

Thank you. Please return this question to us in the enclosed envelope.
Dear Colleague:

As a manager, you handle conflict every day. While others talk about conflict resolution, you do it. Students of both business and social science need to learn from this managerial experience.

We are embarking on a project to do just this. Your input is critical to the success of the research. We are asking you to read the enclosed survey and cover letter and to comment on them, before we write our final draft. This will ensure that when the finished survey is sent out to 500 businesspeople across the country, it will be understandable, interesting and friendly.

It would be most helpful if you would just fill out the questionnaire, and, as you go, write comments in the margins, or on another piece of paper, about what you like, what you don't like, and what you find confusing or bothersome in any way. Do the same for the cover letter. Don't worry about our feelings! All suggestions are welcome. Your responses to the survey, as well as your suggestions, will remain completely confidential and will not be mentioned in the report on the study.

If you would like a copy of the results of this project, just enclose your business card when you send your comments. We hope to complete the study by the end of the year.

Your comments are needed by July 20, to keep us on schedule. Again, let us thank you for sharing your valuable time with us. Your candid responses will increase the value of this project immeasurably.

Sincerely,

Pat Wells
Professor of Management

Lindsay Rahmun
Master's Candidate
Dear Colleague:

Managers handle conflicts every day. While others talk about "conflict resolution," managers do it. Your experience and insights are invaluable, both to social scientists and to other managers across the country.

As researchers, we have the resources to gather your comments and those of your counterparts in other organizations. Your name was drawn in a random sample from officers of the 1000 most successful companies in the United States. In order that the results will truly represent the entire group of officers, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. We have kept the survey as brief as possible, in appreciation of your full schedule.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The survey has an identification number only to allow us to check your name off the mailing list when the completed form is returned, to prevent the inconvenience of receiving a followup letter. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire or mentioned in the report.

If you would like the results of this survey sent to you, simply send us your business card under separate cover. In addition, we plan to publish our results for the benefit of managers and academics.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please do not hesitate to write or call us.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Pat Wells
Professor of Management

Lindsay Rahmu
Master's Candidate
August 8, 1986

Last week a questionnaire seeking your comments about Conflict Management in Business Organizations was mailed to you. Your name had been drawn in a random sample of officers of the 1000 most successful companies in the United States.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of high level management, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study so that the results will be accurate.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call 503-754-2551 and tell the receptionist. I will get another one in the mail to you immediately.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Rahmun, Project Coordinator
September 17, 1986

Dear Colleague:

In early August we wrote to you seeking your comments on conflict management in business organizations. As of today, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

The number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. But whether we will be able to describe accurately how successful executives handle the important issue of conflict management depends upon you and the others who have not yet responded. Our past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaires may hold quite different views than those who have. Thus, your response at this time is especially valuable.

In case you never received your previous copy of the survey, we would like to reemphasize your significance in this research. Your name was drawn through a scientific sampling process in which every officer in the 1000 largest corporations in the United States had an equal chance of being selected. There are approximately 25,000 officers; only 500 of you were selected. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative, it is essential that you return your questionnaire.

Please be assured of complete confidentiality. Neither your name nor that of your company will appear in any report.

Please send your completed survey by the end of September, so that we can begin to analyze the data. If you would like a copy of the results sent to you, simply enclose your business card or send it to us under separate cover.

Your contribution to the success of this research is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Pat Wells
Professor of Management

Lindsay Rahmun
Master's Candidate

P.S. If you decide not to complete the survey, you can remove your name from our mailing list by answering ONE question, Q-23 on the back cover of the survey. Then simply return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. This brief process will help our future research and will prevent us from sending you further follow-ups.