1972

Internal Promotion--A Psychological Asset or Debit?: a Study of the Effects of Leader Origin.

Jeffrey Wayne Daum

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation

Daum, Jeffrey Wayne, "Internal Promotion--A Psychological Asset or Debit?: a Study of the Effects of Leader Origin." (1972). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 2277.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/2277

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-2950

DAUM, Jeffrey Wayne, 1946-

INTERNAL PROMOTION- A PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSET OR
DEBIT?: A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF LEADER
ORIGIN.

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural
and Mechanical College, Ph.D., 1972
Psychology, industrial

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

INTERNAL PROMOTION- A PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSET OR DEBIT?;

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF LEADER ORIGIN.

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Psychology

by

Jeffrey Wayne Daum

M.A., Louisiana State University, 1970

August, 1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author expresses his gratitude to Drs. N. Gottfried, I. Lane, P. Prestholdt, L. Richardson, and L. Siegel for their constructive criticism during the planning and final stages of this experiment. The author also would like to express his appreciation to his wife, Sharon, who in addition to serving as a proofreader, has been a continual source of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE.	1
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.	11
LIST OF TABLES.	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
ABSTRACT.	vi
INTRODUCTION.	1
METHOD.	6
Subjects.	6
Procedure	6
RESULTS	12
DISCUSSION.	26
Summary	29
REFERENCES.	30
FOOTNOTES	33
APPENDIX.	34
VITA.	39

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Mean scores of control vs. experimental groups on questionnaire.	18
2.	Analysis of variance on factor 1.	19
3.	Analysis of variance on factor 2.	20
4.	Analysis of variance on factor 3.	21
5.	Analysis of variance on factor 4.	22
6.	Analysis of variance on factor 5.	23
7.	Analysis of variance on factor 6.	24
8.	Means on factors drawn from questionnaire	25

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Layout of group project.	11
2. The contents of the six factors.	16

Internal Promotion- A Psychological Asset or Debit?:

A study of the effects of leader origin.

Jeffrey Wayne Daum

Louisiana State University

The effects that two different origins of appointed group leaders --internal vs. external-- had on group member attitudes and behavior were investigated. 128 undergraduate male students served as members of 4-man teams working model construction problems under a confederate leader. Four treatments were utilized to simulate the following situations: (1) promotion of a group member to succeed the leader of that group; (2) promotion of a group member to become leader of another group; (3) hiring of an outside individual to succeed the leader of an ongoing group; (4) no change in an ongoing group. In all treatments the criteria used to determine leadership were not revealed to participants. The results indicated: (1) The selection of a member from within a group to become a leader tends to cause the remaining members to express lower satisfaction and lower levels of non-rewarded behavior following the change. Non-rewarded behavior was defined as volunteering to disassemble the group's project without receiving additional extra credit points. (2) This immediate effect was not evident when an opportunity for rewarded behavior occurred. Rewarded behavior was defined as participating in a second session of the experiment which received extra credit points. (3) Attitude change caused by a present event can retroactively influence the perception of previous events. Experimental Ss expressed more negative attitudes as

compared to control Ss on questions pertaining to pre-manipulation events which were identical for both. The results are discussed in terms of both the structure of the experiment and the difference found between rewarded and non-rewarded behavior.

Internal Promotion- A Psychological Asset or Debit?;

A study of the effects of leader origin.

Jeffrey Wayne Daum¹

Louisiana State University

The policy of promotion from within an organization has gained significantly in popularity in the last decade and a half. Surveys indicate that an increase -from 50% in the 1950's to above 90% recently- of all management has come from internal sources (Campbell et al., 1970, Megginson 1963, National Industrial Conference Board 1957, Newcomer 1955, and Scientific American 1965).

However, this trend is not grounded in data from research. For example, Campbell et al. (1970) concluded that sufficient empirical evidence is lacking in support of either the positive or negative aspects of internal promotion. The folklore supporting internal promotion includes its presumed value in industrial incentive programs, the shortened training period required, minimized initial search costs, etc. Possible negative aspects include the reinforcement obtained for upward aspirations at the cost of total involvement at one's present level (Merton 1957), and the possibility of disenchantment with one's work group and job in general following another member's promotion (Festinger 1964). In addition, since perceived homogeneity increases with group interaction (Lott & Lott 1965) the singling out of one of the group for promotion could result in perplexity to the remaining members.

Research in related areas has provided several hypotheses which

can serve as a foundation for understanding promotion's effects. The experiments on leadership are relevant in order to understand certain constants related to "who" is promoted. These studies have been succinctly reviewed elsewhere (Bass 1960, Hemphill 1949, Hollander & Julian 1970, Mann 1959) and the reader is referred to them for greater detail. In general the research has demonstrated that the type of leader the individual is tends to be more important than his source of authority. The factors that create an effective leader have been both conceptualized into models (Fiedler 1964) and linked to employee grievances and turnover rates (Fleishman & Harris 1962).

Promotion normally results from or in leadership change. Several studies have focused on the disruptive effects of a leadership change and concluded that, while most changes were initially detrimental, continuity of leadership could be enhanced by allowing groups to elect their own successors (Christensen 1953, Cohen and Bennis 1961, Gouldner 1954). However Trow (1960) concluded it was the change in the variability of the rate of succession rather than the change per se that was disruptive to production.

Goldman and Fraas' (1965) study on the effects of leader selection techniques found that the method of selection (i.e., whether the leader was elected by members or appointed by E based on ability or arbitrarily) has minimal effect on the member's ratings of leader fairness, enjoyment of task, etc. The factors they found to be significant essentially replicated findings of previous leadership studies: the type of leadership, the leader's interest in the members, the task and

so forth.

However, there is an alternative interpretation of the persistently reported finding that the leader's origin is relatively insignificant. Since all of the previously cited experiments took their measures after the groups had worked under the new leader, the importance of his origin could easily have been masked. Several studies provide impetus for this interpretation:

Job satisfaction indicies have been directly linked to recognition of one's performance (Ross & Zander 1957) and thus appear to be a relevant factor assuming promotion is perceived as a reflection of job performance. While job satisfaction has not been directly linked with productivity there are indications that dissatisfied workers have higher turnover and absence rates than satisfied workers (Lawler & Porter 1967, Smith 1967, Guion 1965).

Further, performance was affected in Burnstein and Zajonc's (1965) study where they manipulated group member rank (status) and found a rise in rank resulted in improved performance, while a drop in rank was followed by a decrease in performance. A shift in attitudes of group members resulted when an "incongruent status hierarchy" was created by telling Ss they were all of the same ability but then distributing a hierarchy of voting rights. The members demonstrated an increase in interpersonal conflict (Exline & Ziller 1959).

The present study attempted to examine the specific effects of different leader origins on group members. To avoid the possible masking of the effects caused by allowing the Ss to continue working under

the new leader, the experiment was designed to obtain its measures immediately following the leadership change. Factors such as task, original leadership style, and group homogeneity were held relatively constant across treatments. Four treatments were utilized to simulate the following situations: (1) The promotion of a group member to succeed the leader of that group. (2) The promotion of a group member to become leader of another group. (3) The hiring of an outside individual to succeed the leader of an ongoing group. (4) No change in an ongoing group. These four treatments were combined to form the experimental groups -internal leader origin (#1 and 2)- and the control groups- external leader origin or no change (#3 and 4). In all treatments criteria used to determine leadership were not revealed to the participants.

Two hypotheses were investigated. Based on Exline and Ziller's (1969) finding that the disruption of the homogeneity of a group resulted in increased interpersonal conflict, and Ross and Zander's (1957) conclusion that job satisfaction was directly linked to recognition for one's performance, hypothesis 1 is:

If individuals have worked together in a group which is manifestly homogeneous and then one of its members is appointed to become a leader without explanation, the remaining group members will express lower satisfaction on an attitude survey when compared to groups in which no member of the group was appointed to become a leader or in which there was no change.

Based on the findings that dissatisfied workers tend to have

higher turnover and absence rates than satisfied workers (Lawler & Porter 1967, Smith 1967, Guion 1965), hypothesis 2 is:

If individuals have worked together in a group which is manifestly homogeneous and then one of its members is appointed to become a leader without explanation, the unpromoted members will demonstrate a decrease in group participation and eventual termination of membership in the group to a greater extent than members of groups in which no member was promoted to the position of leader.

METHOD

Subjects: The subjects were 128 male undergraduate students recruited on a voluntary basis from introductory level courses at Louisiana State University. They received extra credit for their participation. The Ss signed up for a specific time segment with four Ss scheduled in each segment. Thus 32 one hour groups were obtained and were randomly assigned into one of four treatments previous to the experimental manipulation.

Procedure: At a specified time each group of four Ss arrived at the laboratory and was led by E into a medium size room in which there were chairs and a rectangular table, and the confederate leader² (CL) who stood holding and examining some pictures. The component parts of an Erector set (model Mark 40 by Gilbert) were placed in an orderly fashion at one end of the table.

E introduced the group members to CL stating that "CL was a member of a group like yours which had worked together last week on the same type of tasks you will be working on today." E then explained that, "the experiment you have volunteered for is part of a research program in human relations being conducted at Louisiana State University. These sessions are attempting to gain some information about specific factors which are related to effective work groups. Each group is given a project to build within a specified time period, using the Erector set parts. CL will go over the project layout with you and explain what needs to be done to complete the task. He will work with you and any questions or problems you have after starting on

the project should be directed to him.

As indicated when you volunteered, you will receive extra credit points for participating. The amount of credit you will receive depends on how much the group accomplishes and how well you work as a team. The maximum credit received will be 4 points for each member and the minimum will be 2 points. CL, as your leader and coordinator, will receive double the individual member points earned. Now CL will explain your project to you and your team has 35 minutes to complete it." E then walked to the end of the room and sat down, apparently observing the group.

CL proceeded to pass around copies of the project layout and explained how some of the structures were to be constructed. He briefly demonstrated what had been found to be the easiest method of assembly. Then to each member he assigned components to be built which had been equated for average time involvement³. Finally he showed, using the layout, how the group would work together to assemble the components to make the completed projects. The Ss and CL then started to work.

After 35 minutes E stopped the group and complimented them on how well they had worked as a team. He then told them they would receive three extra credit points. E continued "Now I would like you to complete one of these brief surveys. But before that, I want to mention that there will be an opportunity for a second session of this experiment. The exact time will be scheduled as soon as we know which time block will be convenient to all group members. This second ses-

sion is, of course, voluntary. If a member of your group decides not to continue, a person from another group which also has completed session 1 will be added to keep your group size the same. As in the session just completed, the group will be able to earn up to the maximum of 4 points for each group member with the exception of the leader, who will earn double the individual member points."

At this point, the statement differed for each of the treatments. The no change group (NC) was told, "In the second session CL will continue as your group leader." The treatment which simulated the internal promotion of a member to become leader of the same group (LS) was told "In the second session __ (the name of one of the group's members, selected by E randomly) will be your group leader, as CL will be leaving." The third treatment simulated the promotion of a member to become leader of a different group (LD) and was told, "In the second session CL will continue as your leader, but __ (the name of one of the group's members) will leave to be leader of a new group." The last treatment simulated the hiring of a new leader from outside the group (OL) and was told, "In the second session Bob Jackson will be your group leader as CL will be leaving. Bob is a member of a group, which just like yours, has complete session 1." The remainder of the instructions was the same for all treatments: "Now I would like you to take one of these surveys and go into any of these rooms to complete it. When you finish leave both the survey booklet and answer sheet in your room on the table. (Pause) Oh yes! Some brief help will be needed to disassemble your group's project. If you would like to help __ (CL or the

appointed 'new' leader) in disassembling your project, after you complete your questionnaire please come back in here. If not, just leave your booklet and answer sheet on your table and leave through these doors. Thank you!"

Each member was given the survey and led to individual rooms which had two sets of doors; one leading back to the experimental room and one leading out into the hall. The member appointed as leader in the IS and LD treatments was then debriefed, and told that he would receive an additional 1 point extra credit. No survey was completed by same.

E recorded the names of those Ss who returned to help disassemble the project.

All Ss were then contacted by phone within a few days. If they indicated minimal desire to participate again (a score of 1 or 2 on question 14) they were debriefed on the experiment over the phone. If they indicated a desire to participate again (a score of 3 through 5 on question 14) a time was arranged for the second session. Upon arrival they were debriefed, and received an additional 1 point credit. If they failed to show up they were called again and debriefed over the phone. Thus two behavioral measures were obtained, whether a S returned to disassemble the project, and whether a S showed up for a second session of the experiment.

The survey (duplicated in the appendix) used to obtain the dependent measure 'satisfaction' was composed of 19 questions plus 4 semantic differentials. The questions were selected to evaluate the

S's satisfaction within several general areas: group unity and cooperation, time, equipment and facilities, personal feedback, original leadership, and leadership selection procedures. One of the 19 questions was related to the behavioral measures in that it asked for the subject to rate his degree of willingness to participate again. All questions were rated on a five point scale by the S. Two scales were provided, one ranging from "1. To a very little extent" to "5. To a very great extent", and one ranging from "1. Very dissatisfied" to "5. Very satisfied." Each scale covered certain questions. The semantic differentials had six point scales for each of the adjective pairs. Some questions used were modified from questionnaires developed by Fiedler (1964) and Likert (1972).

Two different experimenters⁴(E₁ and E₂) were used to minimize potential demand characteristics. Further the CL was 'blind' as to what type of group was being conducted until the actual manipulation occurred.

The layout for the project is pictured in Figure 1.

 Insert Figure 1 about here

FIGURE 1
Layout of group project

RESULTS^{5,6}

The results of an analysis of variance between E₁ and E₂ groups on each of the 22 survey responses indicated that there was no difference at a significant level (the combined total probability being .51). For this reason E₁ and E₂ groups were combined for all other comparisons.

Analysis of variance between the control groups- NC and OL- on the 22 responses yielded all p values greater than .05 .

Analysis of variance between the experimental groups- LS and LD- on the 22 responses yielded two questions (numbers 5 and 18) which were significant at the .05 level (with 1 & 28 df). All other responses yielded p values greater than .05 .

The mean scores of the control groups and the experimental groups from the survey are presented in Table 1. All comparisons are in the direction predicted by hypothesis 1, with the experimental groups being lower than the control groups in expressed satisfaction.

Insert Table 1 about here

A rotated factor matrix was set up using the 22 survey items to empirically establish factors. Six factors were found which incorporated 20 of the items. The correlation of an included item within its factor was required to be significant at the .01 level (30 df, r $\geq .4487$). Figure 2 indicates the questions included in each factor along with each item's r value within the factor.

 Insert Figure 2 about here

Table 2 is a summary of the analysis of variance on factor 1. No significant overall effect was found for factor 1 ($F= 2.71$, df 3 & 28). However LS was significantly lower than LD ($F= 7.73$, df 1 & 28) with $p < .05$. This factor did not support hypothesis 1.

 Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 is a summary of the analysis of variance on factor 2. There was a significant overall effect for factor 2 ($F= 3.09$, df 3 & 28, $p < .05$) as well as a combined control vs. experimental group effect ($F= 7.93$, df 1 & 28, $p < .01$) in the direction predicted by hypothesis 1.

 Insert Table 3 about here

Factors 3 and 4 did not support hypothesis 1, yielding no significant comparisons at the .05 level, and are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

 Insert Tables 4 & 5 about here

Factor 5 supported hypothesis 1 with overall effects significant at the $p < .01$ ($F= 6.55$, df 3 & 28). Similarly, the combined control vs. experimental groups comparison was significant in the predicted direction at the $p < .01$ ($F= 14.69$, df 1 & 28). A summary table is presented in Table 6.

 Insert Table 6 about here

Factor 6 supported hypothesis 1 with overall effects significant at the $p < .01$ ($F = 4.80$, df 3 & 28). Similarly, the combined control vs. experimental groups comparison was significant in the predicted direction at the $p < .01$ ($F = 10.41$, df 1 & 28). A summary table is presented in Table 7.

 Insert Table 7 about here

Combined means on the factors are presented in Table 8.

 Insert Table 8 about here

A Hotelling-Lawley's Trace was carried out on the six factors and indicated a significant overall treatment effect in support of hypothesis 1 ($F = 1.958$, df 18 & 65, probability of 0.0256).

In the first behavioral measure: 3 members out of 32 in the NC treatment, 3 members out of 32 in the OL treatment, 9 members out of 24 in the LS treatment (appointed leaders not included), and 10 members out of 24 in the LD treatment did not return to help disassemble the group's project. A chi square test of significance indicated the experimental groups had a significantly lower rate of return at the $p < .001$ (1 df). These results were as predicted by hypothesis 2.

Question 14 from the survey, which asked for the subject to indicate his desire to participate again in the near future, yielded no significant difference in overall or partial comparisons. 10 con-

trol Ss out of 64, and 7 experimental Ss out of 48 (does not include the 16 Ss designated as leaders) did not wish to participate again. The second behavioral measure, whether Ss actually showed up for a scheduled second session when they said they would, did not yield any significant overall or partial comparisons. 9 of the possible 54 remaining control Ss, and 5 of the 41 remaining experimental Ss did not show. These results did not support hypothesis 2.

An attempt to give psychological meaning to the empirical factors by a tentative set of comprehensive labels is presented in Figure 2. However it is important to note that such factor designations are idiosyncratic to the particular items from which they were derived. Thus the author feels it important to demonstrate the replicability of these factors using the same questions as a precondition to confidence in those factor designations presented in figure 2.

FIGURE 2

LABELING OF EMPIRICAL FACTORS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Factor 1: SATISFACTION WITH GROUP PROCESSES

-To what extent are the activities of the group sensibly organized?

($\underline{r}=.67$)

-How satisfied are you with your group's productivity? ($\underline{r}=.79$)

-How satisfied are you with the work you had to do? ($\underline{r}=.68$)

-In general, how satisfied are you with persons in your work group?

($\underline{r}=.54$)

-In general, how satisfied are you with your original leader? ($\underline{r}=.78$)

Factor 2: INTERACTION PROCESSES (in conjunction with LEADER SELECTION)

-How friendly and easy to approach are the persons in your work group?

($\underline{r} = -.69$)

-When you talk with the group leader, to what extent does he pay attention to what you are saying? ($\underline{r} = -.70$)

-To what extent are you told what you need to know to do your job in the best possible way? ($\underline{r} = -.73$)

-To what extent is the most capable member selected to be leader?

($\underline{r} = -.55$)

-How satisfied are you with the procedures used to select a leader for session 2? ($\underline{r} = -.48$)

Factor 3: EVALUATION OF JOB PARAMETERS

-To what extent are the tools and parts supplied adequate and efficient to accomplish the tasks? ($\underline{r} = .91$)

-To what extent are the assigned group goals reasonable? ($\underline{r} = .49$)

-To what extent is recognition given when you have done a good job?

($r = .47$)

Factor 4: CAPABILITY RATING

-Please rate your group on the following adjective scales ($r = .74$):

competent--incompetent

self-assured--hesitant

efficient--inefficient

superior--inferior

-Please rate yourself on the following adjective scales..($r = .78$)

-Please rate your estimate of your leader for session 2 on the following adjective scales..($r = .69$)

Factor 5: GROUP COHESION

-To what extent is the most capable member selected to be leader?

($r = -.55$)

-How much do persons in your work group encourage each other to give their best efforts? ($r = -.53$)

-To what extent have cooperation and teamwork been developed in your group? ($r = -.87$)

Factor 6: EVALUATION OF LEADER FUNCTION

-To what extent are time and facilities used to the best advantage?

($r = .54$)

-To what extent are the assigned group goals reasonable? ($r = .45$)

-To what extent is there freedom from favoritism? ($r = .77$)

TABLE 1

MEAN SCORES OF CONTROL VS. EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	<u>NC</u> & <u>OL</u>	<u>LS</u> & <u>LD</u>
1	3.08	2.66
2	3.70	3.37
3	4.06	3.74
4	4.64	4.44
5.	4.15	4.07
6	4.32	3.89
7	4.20	3.95
8	4.40	4.29
9	4.25	3.93
10	3.17	3.10
11	4.14	3.81
12	3.71	3.32
13	4.20	4.15
15	4.50	4.41
16	4.65	4.52
17	3.52	3.26
18	4.31	3.97
19	4.48	4.36
20	4.91	4.72
21	5.41	5.25
22	4.71	4.68
23	4.86	4.71

TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 1

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	4.84	2.71
Error	28	1.79	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	4.50	2.51
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	2.13	1.19
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	7.73	4.32*

*p < .05

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 2

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	6.54	3.09*
Error	28	2.12	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	16.82	7.93**
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	.34	0.16
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	2.89	1.37

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 3

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	1.26	1.48
Error	28	0.85	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	1.62	1.91
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	0.31	0.37
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	1.90	2.24

TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 4

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	1.29	0.75
Error	28	1.73	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	2.00	1.16
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	1.08	0.63
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	0.58	0.34

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 5

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	4.70	6.55**
Error	28	0.72	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	10.58	14.69**
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	1.39	1.94
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	2.25	3.14

**p < .01

TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON FACTOR 6

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Treatment	3	4.45	4.80**
Error	28	0.93	
<u>NC,OL</u> x <u>LS,LD</u>	1	9.68	10.41**
<u>NC</u> x <u>OL</u>	1	3.24	3.49
<u>LS</u> x <u>LD</u>	1	0.77	0.83

**p < .01

TABLE 8

MEANS ON FACTORS DRAWN FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>N</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>	<u>Factor 4</u>	<u>Factor 5</u>	<u>Factor 6</u>
16	<u>NC</u> & <u>OL</u>	22.08	20.26	11.49	19.87	10.48	12.51
16	<u>LS</u> & <u>LD</u>	21.31	18.88	11.04	19.34	9.34	11.43

DISCUSSION

Based on the consistent trend of the experimental groups being lower than the control groups on expressed satisfaction, and on the overall significance at the .05 level of the established factors in the same direction, it appears that in the present study being a member of a group in which one S was appointed to become a leader was less satisfying than being a member of a group with either no leader change or an outside leader change. Further, the data indicate that when there was an opportunity for helping the leader and possibly other members disassemble the group's project, members of experimental groups were less likely to return to help.

However, no significant difference between experimental and control groups was found either in terms of volunteering to participate again in a second session with a similar task, or in actually showing up for it.

Factor 1 indicated that being a member of a group in which the appointed leader was to replace the present leader tended to be less satisfying than when the appointed leader was to move to a different group. While this trend was not statistically supported (with only 3 of the 22 comparisons being significant at less than the .1 level) the possible negative effect of a promoted person remaining with the group vs. leaving the group warrants further examination.

Thus, unlike previous studies (Goldman & Fraas 1965) on leadership where origin apparently had a uniform lack of influence on the groups, the present study indicates that a complex effect on both be-

havior and attitudes occurs. In experimental groups, the initial (short term) effect was decreased satisfaction and a decrease in non-rewarded voluntary behavior (no additional extra credit points earned). However, at the same time that low satisfaction was being expressed on the survey, the question pertaining to volunteering again for the second session which would receive extra credit points, was answered similarly across all treatments. Further, the actual rate of return for the second experiment was not significantly different across all treatments.

Two possible explanations for the significance of leader origin found in this study and not previous studies exist. The first was expressed earlier in this paper in terms of the possible masking of any effects by obtaining dependent measures after the Ss had worked under the new leader. If one only looked at the combination of the question of desire to return and the behavioral response of showing up, in this experiment a similar conclusion to previous studies would be reached--no apparent effect. However, there was a very definite effect on both attitudes and behavior when one considers the measures obtained immediately following the change. It is possible that previous experiments did not allow Ss to withdraw from the situation or volunteer for additional work, as did the present study. This could account for the difference in conclusions.

The second alternative lies in the difference found between the leader's-origin-effect on voluntary rewarded and voluntary non-rewarded behavior. It is possible for a S to be less satisfied and still want

to get the additional reward. This would account for the lack of difference between control and experimental groups in this and previous experiments. However, given a situation where work is asked for but not rewarded the experimental Ss demonstrated their lower satisfaction by not volunteering to help to the same extent as control Ss. Again it is not apparent that this rewarded vs. non-rewarded opportunity existed in previous experiments.

One factor not mentioned earlier but warranting further discussion concerns the questionnaire. The majority of items on the survey were assessing retroactive attitude changes. Assuming a S became less satisfied as a result of being in an experimental group, and that attitude change is not retroactive, then only those items specifically reflecting upon his treatment should demonstrate the lower satisfaction, i.e., questions pertaining to leadership selection procedures, the leader of the second session, etc. On the other hand if lower satisfaction is manifest not only on those items, but items pertaining to all the activities during the previous experiment, attitude change seemingly has a pervasive and retroactive effect. In the present study seven of the questions in the factors found to be significantly lower (factors 2, 5, & 6) were of the retroactive type. This generalizing of attitude change could prove to be significant in terms of the importance of any currently displeasing event on an individual's overall feelings. Further research is needed to (a) demonstrate the consistency of this phenomenon and (b) study the parameters governing the duration and extent of its influence.

the following conclusions were evident:

1. The selection of a member from within a group to become a leader tends to cause the remaining members to express lower satisfaction and lower levels of non-rewarded behavior following the change.
2. This immediate effect was not evident when an opportunity for rewarded behavior occurred.
3. Attitude change caused by a present event can be retroactive and cause changes in the perception of previous events.

This experiment needs to be replicated in an industrial setting before industrial implications can be justifiably made. Both the generalizability and the duration of the effect are yet to be established. What the present study indicates is that there are negative effects which occur in a situation simulating internal promotion. It should serve to establish a necessary concern for further investigation of a technique as widespread as internal promotion is in industry today.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B. Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior. New York: Harper, 1960.
- Burnstein, E. & Zajonc, R. Individual task performance in a changing social structure. Sociometry, 1965, 28 (1), 16-29.
- Campbell, J., Dunnette, M., Lawler, E., III, & Weick, K., Jr. Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Christensen, C. Management succession in small and growing enterprises. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1953.
- Cohen, A. & Bennis, W. Continuity of leadership in communication networks. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 351-367.
- Exline, R. & Ziller, R. Status congruency and interpersonal conflict in decision-making groups. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 147-162.
- Festinger, L. A technical study of some changes in attitudes and values following promotion in General Electric. Crotonville, New York: Behavioral Research Service, 1964.
- Fiedler, F. A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 1, 150-190, New York: Academic Press, 1964.
- Fleishman, E. & Harris, E. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievance and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 43-56.
- Goldman, M. & Fraas, L. The effects of leader selection on group performance. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 82-88.

Gouldner, A. Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954.

Guion, R. Personnel testing. New York: McGraw-Hill, 95-96, 1965.

Hemphill, J. The leader and his group. Education Research Bulletin, 1949, 28, 225-229, 245-246.

Hollander, E. & Julian, J. Studies in leader legitimacy, influence, and innovation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 5, 33-69, New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Lawler, E., III. & Porter, L. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations, 1967, Oct., 21-28.

Likert, R. Your organization survey. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Rensis Likert Associates, 1971.

Lott, A. & Lott, B. Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-309.

Mann, R. A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 241-270.

Meggison, L. Management selection, development, and motivation in the United States. Management International, 1963, 2, 97-106.

Merton, R. Social theory and social structure. New York: Free Press, 1957.

National Industrial Conference Board. Selecting company executives. National industrial conference board studies in personnel policy, No. 161, 1957.

Newcomer, M. The big business executive. New York: Columbia University

Press,1955.

Ross,I. & Zander,A. Need satisfaction and employee turnover. Personnel Psychology,1957,10,327-338.

Scientific American. The big business executive: 1964. New York: author,1965.

Smith,P. The development of a method of measuring job satisfaction: The Cornell studies. In E. Fleishman (Ed.)Studies in personnel and industrial psychology,Homewood Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 343-350,1967.

Trow,D. Membership succession and team performance. Human Relations, 1960,13,259-269.

FOOTNOTES

¹Requests for reprints should be sent to Jeffrey W. Daum, Faculty of Psychology, Alpha College, The University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida 32504.

²I wish to thank Mr. Wayne Momberg for serving as confederate leader.

³The components were equated for average time required to completion previous to the experiment by E₁, CL, and 16 Ss who were not participants in the actual study. In addition it had been at this time that CL had completely familiarized himself with the various project details.

⁴I wish to thank Mr. Samuel Nelson Craddock, Jr., for his time and help as the second experimenter.

⁵I wish to thank Dr. K. Koonce, Department of Experimental Statistics for his tremendous aid in supervising the running of the data on the computer, as well as for his suggestions and advice.

⁶The Statistical Analysis System utilized in analysing the data was developed by Anthony J. Barr and James Howard Goodnight, under funds from the National Institute of Health, project #FR-00011.

APPENDIX

L.S.U. RESEARCH PROGRAM IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Small Groups Survey

This survey is part of a research program in human relations being conducted at Louisiana State University. The program is attempting to assess those qualities which are related to effective work groups.

Your responses to this survey will be held in strict confidence. Your answer sheet will be machine scored and anonymously recorded by work group. There are no "correct" or "incorrect" answers to this survey.

Please look at your answer sheet. You'll note that next to each question number on your answer sheet in the first section there are five numbers. These numbers will represent your answer to the question based on the scale presented in the survey booklet preceding each group of questions.

Carefully X through your choice next to the question number. Erase any stray marks and/or changed answers.

Please turn to page 2 of this survey booklet and proceed.

PAGE 2

PLEASE REFER TO THIS SCALE IN ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

SCALE: 1.To a very little extent

2.To a little extent

3.To some extent

4.To a great extent

5.To a very great extent

MARK YOUR ANSWERS ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET

QUESTIONS:

1. How much do persons in your work group encourage each other to give their best efforts?
2. To what extent have cooperation and teamwork been developed in your group?
3. To what extent are time and facilities used to the best advantage?
4. When you talk with the group leader, to what extent does he pay attention to what you are saying?
5. To what extent are the activities of the group sensibly organized?
6. To what extent is there freedom from favoritism?
7. How friendly and easy to approach are the persons in your work group?
8. To what extent does your leader encourage group members to work as a team?
9. To what extent are you told what you need to know to do your job in the best possible way?
10. To what extent is recognition given when you have done a good job?
11. To what extent are the assigned group goals reasonable?
12. To what extent is the most capable member selected to be leader?

13. To what extent are the tools and parts supplied adequate and efficient to accomplish the tasks?

14. To what extent would you be willing to participate in similar tasks in the future?

PLEASE REFER TO THIS SCALE IN ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

SCALE: 1. Very dissatisfied

2. Somewhat dissatisfied

3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

4. Fairly satisfied

5. Very satisfied

QUESTIONS:

15. In general, how satisfied are you with persons in your work group?

16. In general, how satisfied are you with your original leader?

17. How satisfied are you with the procedures used to select a leader for session 2?

18. How satisfied are you with the work you had to do?

19. How satisfied are you with your group's productivity?

PLEASE DO NOT FORGET TO COMPLETE THE RATING SCALES SECTION ON THE
ANSWER SHEET.

SMALL GROUPS SURVEY ANSWER SHEET

CAREFULLY X THROUGH YOUR CHOICE NEXT TO THE QUESTION NUMBER, BASED ON THE SCALES PRECEDING THE QUESTIONS.

1. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	7. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	13. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
2. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	8. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	14. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
3. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	9. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	15. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
4. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	10. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	16. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
5. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	11. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	17. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
6. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	12. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)	18. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)
		19. (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)

PLEASE RATE YOUR GROUP ON THE FOLLOWING ADJECTIVE SCALES BY PLACING AN X THROUGH THE NUMBER WHICH REPRESENTS YOUR RATING FOR EACH SET OF ADJECTIVES.

competent -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- incompetent
 self-assured -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- hesitant
 efficient -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- inefficient
 superior -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- inferior

PLEASE RATE YOUR ORIGINAL LEADER ON THE FOLLOWING ADJECTIVE SCALES:

competent -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- incompetent
 self-assured -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- hesitant
 efficient -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- inefficient
 superior -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- inferior

PLEASE RATE YOURSELF ON THE FOLLOWING ADJECTIVE SCALES:

competent -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- incompetent
 self-assured -6- -5- -4- -3- -2- -1- hesitant

efficient -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- inefficient

superior -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- inferior

PLEASE RATE YOUR ESTIMATE OF YOUR LEADER FOR SESSION 2 ON THE FOLLOWING
SCALES:

competent -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- incompetent

self-assured -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- hesitant

efficient -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- inefficient

superior -6- -5- ~~-4-~~ -3- -2- -1- inferior

YOUR NAME:.....TELEPHONE #:.....

THANK YOU !

VITA

Jeffrey Wayne Daum was born in Long Island, New York on June 11, 1946. He attended both elementary and high school in Cincinnati Ohio. He entered Miami University (of Ohio) in 1964 and completed his B.A. degree in 1968. In 1968 he entered Louisiana State University, and completed his M.A. degree in 1970.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: JEFFREY WAYNE DAUM

Major Field: PSYCHOLOGY

Title of Thesis: INTERNAL PROMOTION- A PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSET OR DEBIT?:
A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF LEADER ORIGIN.

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

JUNE 12, 1972