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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to determine if managers' philosophy of management tends to influence managerial behavior and employee satisfaction. Two procedures were employed in conducting the investigation. First, a review of the literature was undertaken to discover the major philosophical trends within management. These philosophies were then analyzed to determine possible effects upon managerial behavior and employee satisfaction. The second major portion of the research consisted of an empirical investigation of the relationship between managerial philosophy, managerial behavior and employee satisfaction.

The literature search revealed that three philosophies have dominated management thought in this century. Various names have been used to describe the three philosophies, but in this study the terms Classical Management, Human Relations Management, and Human Resource Management were selected as most descriptive. Each of the philosophies is basically normative in orientation and, therefore, contains definite behavioral exhortations. Each one also implies certain consequences regarding employee satisfaction.

Classical management places primary importance on organizational needs for productivity. Emphasis is focused on the management functions of planning, organizing, and controlling work situations.
Human Relations Management focuses principally upon employee needs. Attention is directed toward the psychological and social forces which affect employee satisfaction. This philosophy assumes that satisfied workers will be more productive.

Human Resource Management constitutes a synthesis of the other two philosophies. This approach concentrates on integrating organizational and employee needs. It recognizes a wide range of forces which affect both the workers and the organization. In addition, the human element is considered the source of productivity and the paramount component of an organization.

This portion of the study concluded with an analysis of library managers' philosophy of management as revealed in the literature. It was found that library managers have generally concentrated on Classical issues such as organizing and directing work. Human Relations and Human Resource topics have received limited attention.

The empirical portion of the investigation consisted of an analysis of the specific relationship between managerial philosophy, managerial behavior and job satisfaction. In this section a study was also made of the effect of selected demographic and organizational factors upon the three principal variables.

Using the Human Resource philosophy as a model, a mail survey was conducted of top level managers and their subordinates in 70 academic libraries in the Southeast. A measure of managers' philosophy was obtained through a Likert type attitude scale. Managerial behavior and subordinates' satisfaction measures were
procured through a Porter type scale. These three scores were then correlated using product moment techniques.

The resultant correlations were \(-.24\) for philosophy and behavior and \(.18\) for philosophy and satisfaction. However, neither correlation was significant at the required .05 level. It was, therefore, concluded that, for these subjects, managers' philosophy of management had little or no effect upon managerial behavior or subordinates' job satisfaction.

Further analysis revealed that younger managers and managers with less experience were more Human Resource oriented than older managers and managers with more experience. Another finding was that librarians working in public service positions were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than librarians working in technical service positions. Finally, the study revealed that librarians working in larger organizations were more satisfied than those in small organizations.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A major element in the success of any organization is the quality of its management. Resources and technology are important to organizational effectiveness. These factors, however, are essentially inert and require some force to activate them. Management provides the energy which makes all other resources productive. As Johnson, Kast, and Rosenzweig point out, "management is the primary force within organizations which coordinates the activities of the subsystems and relates them to the environment."\(^1\) It is this integrative nature of management which makes organizational effort possible. According to Hicks, organizations "... without managers will probably dissipate members' energies and other resources in random activity."\(^2\)

The question which continues to defy theorists and practitioners, however, is what determines managerial effectiveness? Certainly there is no single answer to this problem. Knowledge, skill, and effort are undoubtedly important components affecting managerial performance.

---


Many students of management also contend that a manager's philosophy of management has a significant impact upon his behavior and his effectiveness. There are numerous references in the literature recommending that managers and the management profession develop a philosophy in order to improve managerial performance. Oliver Sheldon, a pioneer management theorist, was especially concerned about developing a philosophy as a guide to management behavior. He said, "... we should devise a philosophy of management, a code of principles, scientifically determined and generally accepted, to act as a guide, by reason of its foundation upon ultimate things, for the daily practice of the profession."\(^3\)

Another early management scholar, Ralph C. Davis, strongly advocated that managers formulate a philosophy. According to Davis, "an executive without a philosophy can have only limited capability for creative thinking, regardless of his basic intelligence."\(^4\)

Dean Stanley P. Teele of the Harvard Business School also supports the belief that managerial effectiveness is influenced by one's philosophy. Teel has said, "A man's personal philosophy, his way of looking at the world and the men and women around him

---


determine his success as a manager of things and people more than any other single factor. His basic attitudes are far more significant than the techniques he uses ...”

Perhaps the foremost spokesman on the impact of philosophy upon managerial performance is Douglas McGregor. He states "... I believe that good leadership in industry depends more than any other single thing on the manager's conception of what his job is—of what management is. Second, it depends on his convictions and on his beliefs about people." 

A similar view is expressed by Carl Stover. He contends, "if the manager is to deal at all with the problems before him, he must simplify them, put them in a context he understands, relate them to some system, however imperfect, over which he has a command. He must analyze them in terms of ideas that have meaning to him and of values that he believes in and that have significance for him. To make his job manageable then, and to make himself in some measure rational, the manager must depend on a philosophy."

---


Perhaps the most succinct council for developing a philosophy of management is presented by Megginson. He maintains that "in order to perform his duties most successfully, a manager needs to have a personal philosophy of management in addition to an understanding of the codified body of knowledge that we call the principles of management."  

Each of these authors reflects the same general conviction that individual and organizational effectiveness can be enhanced if managers make their decisions and direct their actions on the basis of a sound philosophical foundation. Yet, our knowledge of the precise relationship between a person's philosophy and his behavior is very limited. The belief that philosophy exerts a strong influence upon behavior suggests a need for further empirical analysis.

Statement of the Problem

Management theorists and practitioners are concerned about development of a philosophy as a guide to behavior. The purpose of this investigation, therefore, is to examine the relationship between managers' philosophies of management and the way in which managers perform their administrative functions. More specifically, the study will determine whether or not a direct relationship exists between managers' expressed philosophy of management and their managerial behavior. The aim of the research is to ascertain whether one's philosophy does, indeed, tend to influence overt behavior. The

---

variables of interest are philosophy and behavior. All other variables are considered extraneous and will be controlled by selecting subjects so that they are as homogeneous as possible.

A second objective of this study is to determine whether or not there is any relationship between managers' philosophy of management and their subordinates' job satisfaction. Research supports a linkage between explicit managerial actions and employee satisfaction. Miles, Likert, and McGregor, however, contend that a superior's values and attitudes also affect subordinates' satisfaction with their jobs.

Miles says that values and attitudes influence the quality of the work relationship between a superior and his subordinates. In a similar fashion, Likert proposes that subordinates respond to implicit attitudes of their superiors. McGregor is even more explicit. He asserts that attitudes and assumptions on the part of a superior produce subtle, unconscious manifestations which create a psychological 'climate' between a superior and his subordinates. According to McGregor, "these daily manifestations of theory and attitude in turn affect the expectations of subordinates concerning their ability to achieve their goals and satisfy their needs through membership in the organization." McGregor further maintains that a

---


manager's deeper attitudes are themselves more significant to the subordinates than the superior's particular style of management.\textsuperscript{12} This study, therefore, will examine whether a direct relationship exists between managers' expressed philosophy of management and their subordinates' job satisfaction.

A final goal of this research is to examine selected demographic and organizational factors for possible impact upon managerial philosophy, managerial behavior, and subordinate job satisfaction. Various studies have discovered instances in which factors such as age, sex, experience, size of organization are related to variations in values, attitudes, and beliefs. In general, however, the research has not provided conclusive answers to the question of how or why demographic and organizational factors affect job attitudes. This study, therefore, will explore the relationships further in an effort to add greater clarity to the issue.

**Significance of the Study**

The subject of this inquiry is important to management, to workers, and to society as well. There are four specific benefits which should emerge from the investigation. First, a clearer understanding of the relationships between managers' philosophy, managers' behavior, and employees' job satisfaction is bound to assist in improving managerial effectiveness and employee satisfaction. Whatever the outcome, the empirical analysis will provide additional insight into the factors which influence manager behavior and worker satisfaction.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 134.
A second contribution which this study will make relates to the teaching and training of managers. Presently, considerable effort is being directed toward developing, within managers, specific attitudes and values as a means of improving their performance. Any research which furthers our knowledge of these issues will certainly have an impact upon the manner in which these topics are presented to managers.

The third benefit which may be derived from the investigation is closely related to the second. This study should provide further direction for research into these subjects. The study certainly will not furnish a complete understanding of the relationships between managers' philosophy, their behavior, and their subordinates satisfaction. It will, however, supply additional facts which can form the basis for further research.

Finally, the study will add to existing knowledge concerning the effects of certain demographic and organizational factors upon managers' and employees' attitudes and behavior. Such knowledge should assist efforts to structure and guide interpersonal relationships within organizations. Taken as a whole, therefore, the benefits to be gained from this study apply not only to management, but to organizations and workers in general. Consequently, the total potential contribution of the research is substantial.

Research Procedures

Two processes were employed in collecting evidence for this investigation. The two procedures will be discussed in detail within
Chapters II and III. At this juncture, however, a brief introduction will provide an orientation to the research methodology.

First, a survey was made of the literature in order to discover the principal philosophical themes which have emerged within management. Each of the major philosophies was examined to discover its possible impact upon managerial behavior and employee satisfaction. The review also provided a foundation for the next part of the study.

The second step in the investigation consisted of an analysis of the specific relationships among managers' philosophy, managerial behavior, and employees' job satisfaction. In this portion of the study a group of practicing managers and their subordinates was queried through a mail survey. Data on manager philosophy, manager behavior, and employee job satisfaction were collected and analyzed to ascertain the precise relationships among these variables. In order to test whether or not managers' philosophy tends to influence their behavior and their subordinates' job satisfaction, the following hypotheses were proposed.

**Hypotheses**

Preliminary review of the literature suggests there is a direct relationship between managers' philosophy of management and the manner in which they perform their managerial functions. There also seems to be some indication that employees' job satisfaction is directly affected by managers' philosophy of management. This study, therefore, tested the following hypotheses:
Hypotheses 1: There is a direct, positive relationship between managers' self-expressed philosophy of management and the behavioral ratings given them by their subordinates.

Hypotheses 2: There is a direct, positive relationship between managers' self-expressed philosophy of management and the extent of job satisfaction expressed by their subordinates.

Limitations

While every effort has been made to design the study in such a way as to provide the opportunity to draw the broadest possible inferences, certain conditions impose necessary limitations. In the first place, the restrictions placed on subject selection will limit the extent to which results can be generalized. In order to control for extraneous variables, subjects were chosen from top level positions within libraries. It is possible that inclusion of lower level managers or managers from other types of organizations would have altered the outcome of the study.

A second limitation relates to the particular research design selected. The nature of the study called for a mail survey as a means of obtaining the required data. It was also found that correlation analysis would be the most appropriate method of ascertaining the relationships among the variables. Each of these procedures results in some inherent limitations. Survey research is subject to various errors which may result from nonresponse and from lack of adequate control over independent variables. Correlation is limited in that it can only suggest, rather than prove, casual relationships.
These limitations are mentioned in order to show that the investigator is aware that certain qualifications are required in interpreting the results of the study. They do not indicate that interpretation is impossible, only that it is subject to some limits.

Assumptions

Three assumptions are necessary in order to interpret the results of this investigation. First, Likert type attitude scales were utilized in the study. It was, therefore, assumed that the scales measure each attribute along a continuum of intensity with the central position representing a neutral response. Second, it was assumed that the intervals of possible responses are approximately equal. These are standard assumptions employed when using Likert type scales.

The third assumption was that the relationships among the variables are of a linear nature. Because it is sometimes difficult to detect curvilinear relationships when sample size is small, linearity must often be assumed. However, Ferguson maintains that such an assumption is generally well satisfied in social science research.13

Definitions

The term philosophy has acquired a variety of meanings. It is used in reference to a body of knowledge, a method of procuring knowledge, a set of principles, values, beliefs, or attitudes, a way of thinking. The Oxford English Dictionary presents several definitions

of philosophy. One of them is, "the system which a person forms for the conduct of life."\textsuperscript{14} Webster's Third International Dictionary offers a similar theme in defining philosophy as, "a system of motivating beliefs, concepts, and principles." Webster also proposes that philosophy is "the sum of an individual's ideas and convictions," "a personal attitude," and "a basic theory concerning a particular subject, process, or sphere of activity."\textsuperscript{15}

Management scholars follow these general themes. Davis defines philosophy as, "... a body of related knowledge that supplies a logic for effective thinking for the solution of certain kinds of problems."\textsuperscript{16} According to Wortman, a philosophy of management is, "... the systematic study of the nature of management, especially its methods, its concepts, and presuppositions ..."\textsuperscript{17}

Synthesizing these various meanings, philosophy is defined for purposes of this study as a set of beliefs, concepts, and attitudes formulated to provide a systematic view of a subject or activity. According to this definition the philosophy may be developed collectively or individually. The study is concerned primarily with the management philosophies of individual managers. It is assumed,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: The Claredon Press, 1933), p. 782.
\item \textsuperscript{15}Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam, 1966), p. 1698.
\item \textsuperscript{16}Davis, op. cit., p. 5.
\end{itemize}
managers are influenced by the general beliefs and attitudes expressed within the literature. Therefore, consideration will be given to the general views represented in the literature as well as to individual positions.

A second concept which requires some elucidation for purposes of this study is job satisfaction. McGregor refers to satisfaction as expectations regarding the ability to satisfy needs. In this context, McGregor's position parallels Brayfield and Rothe's concept of job satisfaction. According to these authors, employee satisfaction relates to beliefs and feelings about a job. Schwab and Cummings also conceive of job satisfaction as an attitude toward work. In this study, therefore, job satisfaction pertains to employees' feelings about their job and it will be measured in terms of their expectations concerning how their supervisors should behave.

**Preview of the Presentation**

The material in this investigation is arranged in a logical sequence beginning with the theoretical foundations underlying the study and concluding with a summary and recommendations. Chapter II traces the major philosophical trends which have emerged within the

---


field of management. Emphasis is placed on illustrating the impact of philosophy upon managers' behavior and employees' job satisfaction.

The third chapter consists of a description of the research methods employed in the study. Particular attention is given to explaining the development of the instruments and selection of the subjects.

In Chapter IV the data is analyzed and interpreted. At this point consideration is also given to the possible impact of various organizational and demographic factors upon manager philosophy, manager behavior, and employee job satisfaction.

The study concludes with Chapter V which presents a summary of the results. In this chapter recommendations for further study are also presented.
CHAPTER II

MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHIES IN PERSPECTIVE

In the previous chapter philosophy was defined as a set of beliefs, concepts, and attitudes formulated to provide a systematic view of a subject or activity. Considered from this context, philosophy consists of a viewpoint, or a state of mind. In this sense all disciplines have a philosophy. They have a particular view of the nature and purpose of their existence. This viewpoint may be highly developed or only vaguely implicit; nevertheless it exists.

A review of management literature indicates that philosophical development within this profession has been rather dynamic and, at times, somewhat disorderly. Harold Koontz contends that, at present, there are six approaches to management. He calls them: the process school; the empirical school; the human behavior school; the social system school; the decision theory school; and, the mathematical school. Other authors propose slightly different categories.

Robert Blake and Jane Mouton suggest a great variety of philosophies. They have developed a means of identifying eighty-one variations of management philosophy. In discussing specific

---


14
approaches, however, they focus on five categories which they have named: impoverished management; task management; country-club management; middle-of-the-road management; and team management.

William J. Reddin proposes that management philosophies fall into four primary groupings with two variations within each of these categories. In total this amounts to twelve viewpoints. The four primary groups with their variations are: (1) integrated-compromiser-executive; (2) dedicated-autocrat-benevolent autocrat; (3) related-missionary-developed; and, (4) separated-deserter-bureaucrat.

Researchers at the University of Michigan, on the basis of extensive studies, have identified two basic philosophies which they called employee-centered and job-centered. These were later refined and expanded to a total of four approaches by Rensis Likert. The four are named exploitive authoritative (System I); benevolent authoritative (System II); consultative (System III); and participative group (System IV).

A classification similar to the original Michigan grouping was developed by researchers at Ohio State University. They defined two management philosophies. One is called initiating structure and the other consideration.

---


Several students of management have proposed classifying management philosophies along somewhat historical lines. Leon Megginson, for example, contends that three basic philosophies have dominated management thought. He calls these the factor-of-production or classical philosophy, the human relations philosophy, and the human resource philosophy. Raymond Miles and Amitai Etzioni propose an identical classification using slightly different terms. Miles labels his categories traditional, human relations and human resources. Etzioni uses the names classical or scientific management, human relations, and the structuralist approach. Other authors employ different terms in discussing management philosophies. However, the categories listed above include all of the significant designations appearing in the literature. Initially the listing seems rather formidable. Further analysis, however, suggests that many of the finer distinctions are somewhat arbitrary.

Koontz, for instance, suggests that there is not a great deal of difference between the process and the empirical schools. A further point may be made that both of these schools are founded upon the classical approach and continue to follow the same viewpoint.

---


9Koontz, op. cit.
It may also be said that Koontz's human behavior and social system schools are quite similar in substance and together approximate the human relations approach described by others. Finally, Koontz himself admits that the decision-theory and mathematical schools are parallel and consist of a tool for management rather than a school of management.\textsuperscript{10}

Similar observations may be made regarding most of the other classifications of management philosophies. The Blake and Mouton, Reddin, Michigan, and Ohio State models are all built upon the same basic concepts. Each of them derives its classifications on the basis of manager attitudes towards people and production. Furthermore, each of the research groups draw essentially the same conclusions. They have all determined that managers' philosophies of management generally fall into one of four categories. These are: (1) high concern for production coupled with low concern for people; (2) high concern for people with corresponding low concern for production; (3) high concern for both people and production; and, (4) low concern for both people and production.

When juxtaposed in this fashion, the research reveals further parallels. The first category resembles much of what the literature suggests about the Classical Management philosophy identified by Megginson,\textsuperscript{11} Miles,\textsuperscript{12} and Etzioni.\textsuperscript{13} In like manner, the second and

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{11}Megginson, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{12}Miles, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{13}Etzioni, \textit{op. cit.}
third orientations approximate the Human Relations and Human Resource philosophies defined by those authors. The fourth category, on the other hand, represents a negative attitude toward management and, therefore, has no relationship to this study.

In view of these results it seems that the empirical studies support the position that management thought in this century has revolved around three principal philosophies. In this study the names Classical Management, Human Relations Management, and Human Resource Management will be used in reference to these philosophies. The three terms are used rather widely in the literature and are easily identifiable with respect to the major elements of each approach.

The remainder of the chapter, therefore, will be devoted to the analysis of the three philosophies. Specific consideration will be given to four characteristics of each approach. Included are: (1) the basic goals and values underlying each philosophy, (2) the assumptions regarding employees reflected in the philosophy, (3) the managerial behavior suggested by the philosophy, and (4) the implications regarding the effects of the philosophy upon employee job satisfaction. The chapter will conclude with an analysis of library managers' philosophies of management as reflected in library literature.

The Classical Management Philosophy

Classical Management philosophy derives its name from its historical roots. The philosophy is not, however, bound to any one
period of time. As will be apparent from the discussion, Classical Management beliefs and attitudes endure today in several forms. The philosophy originated at the turn of the century, however, and is built upon early concepts of management. Other terms are used in reference to the philosophy. The most common ones are traditional, operational, principles, and process approach to management.

Classical Management actually developed along two parallel but distinct lines. One branch is called Scientific Management; the other is generally referred to as Administrative Management. The two approaches are similar in most respects. They differ on one significant point, however. Scientific Management employs a micro perspective while Administrative Management focuses on macro issues. The difference results principally from the manner in which the two approaches were formulated.

Scientific Management was erected primarily by engineers and managers familiar with basic task issues. The chief architects of the approach were Frederick W. Taylor, Henry L. Gantt, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, Harrington Emerson, and Morris L. Cooke. Each of these individuals was concerned with improving organizational performance through application of more systematic methods of executing operational tasks.

In contrast to Scientific Management, Administrative Management was designed by managers experienced in top level decision making. These managers, therefore, had a broader view of organizational requirements. They concentrated on drawing inferences on the basis
of their experiences as high level executives in large complex organizations. From their experiences they formulated principles which were meant to apply to all types of complex organizations. The major contributors to this approach were Ralph C. Davis, James D. Mooney, Alan C. Reiley, and Luther Gulick of this country, and Henri Fayol of France.

Scientific Management and Administrative Management, while they concentrate on different levels of organizational problems, generally draw similar conclusions regarding the role of management and employees in organizations. For this reason the two philosophies, in effect, supplement and complement one another. Together, therefore, they form the comprehensive cohesive philosophy which is called Classical Management.

Goals and values of Classical Management.

The central goal of Classical Management philosophy is productivity. Taylor and his associates were concerned first and foremost with the improvement of work methods in order to increase productivity. They advocated the substitution of science for the old rule-of-thumb approach. Their goal was to replace haphazard procedures with rational techniques. According to Taylor, the essence of Scientific Management consists of a mental revolution on the part of management and labor. He said, "the great revolution that takes place in the mental attitude of the two parties under scientific management is that both sides take their eyes off of the division of the surplus as the all-important matter, and together turn their attention toward increasing the size of the surplus..."
until this surplus becomes so large that it is unnecessary to quarrel over how it shall be divided. 14

Administrative Management philosophy supports this same basic objective. According to Mooney and Reiley the first necessity of industry was productive efficiency. 15 In developing their philosophy of management these two authors placed primary emphasis on discovering principles of organization which would guide managers in the achievement of this end.

Research efforts by the various groups mentioned previously show that many managers continue to place major emphasis upon productivity. Blake and Mouton have labeled such an orientation task management. 16 The University of Michigan investigators have called it a job-centered attitude. Similar terms are used by other researchers.

Assumptions Regarding Employees.

Douglas McGregor claims that Classical Management assumes the average employee is indolent, irresponsible, and opposed to work. 17 There is evidence, particularly from Taylor, that managers have held this view. He contends, "there is no question that the tendency of the average man (in all walks of life) is toward working at a slow, easy

---


16 Blake, op. cit.

gait, and that it is only after a good deal of thought and observation on his part or as a result of example, conscience, or external pressure that he takes a more rapid pace.\textsuperscript{18}

Other authors have noted that Classical Management views workers in the same light as machines. While such a view is less apparent today there are indications that early Scientific Management advocates were so absorbed by technology that they very likely did treat men as machines. Megginson declares, "it (Classical Management) assumed that the workers were simply adjuncts to machines and should be treated the same as physical factors of production."\textsuperscript{19}

Another characteristic of Classical Management is its concept of man as rational-economic. The assumption originated with Adam Smith and dominated early Classical thought. Essentially the view considers man as completely rational and motivated solely by economic returns. These assumptions are most evident in Classical Management attitudes toward motivation. Early Scientific Management, for instance, placed major emphasis on monetary rewards as the principal means of motivating employees. The reasoning advanced by Taylor in support of wage incentive systems was that employees seek to maximize their returns in the form of financial payments.\textsuperscript{20} Many managers today hold the same views.


\textsuperscript{19}Megginson, op. cit., p. 6.

In considering these various beliefs and attitudes of Classical Management in relation to many of the practices which are followed by advocates of these views, there seems to be a clear relationship between the philosophy and certain management practices.

Behavioral Implications.

Classical Management philosophy does seem to lead to specific behavioral patterns. Scientific Management, under the leadership of Taylor and others, actively promoted the adoption of more systematic approaches to work design. Administrative Management theorists such as Davis and Gulick also urged managers to follow their suggestions as a means of improving organizational effectiveness.

Taylor proposed four principles as a basis for his approach. These include:

1. Develop a science for each element of a man's work, which replaces the old rule-of-thumb method.

2. Scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop the workman; whereas in the past he chose his work and trained himself as best he could.

3. Heartily cooperate with the men so as to insure all of the work being done is in accordance with the principles of the science which has been developed.

4. There is an almost equal division of the work and responsibility between the management and the workman. The management takes over all work for which they are better fitted than the workmen, while in the past almost all of the work and the greater part of the responsibility were thrown upon the men.21

---

Each of the principles is a recommendation for specific action on the part of the manager. In the fourth principle, however, Taylor distinguishes between the responsibilities of management and workman. In discussing the principles, he explains, "... all of the planning which under the old system was done by the workman, as a result of his personal experience, must of necessity under the new system be done by the management ...."22 Taylor goes on to show that since the manager is better qualified to plan and design work this should be his primary role. The worker, on the other hand, is best suited to follow management's directions and instructions. His function, therefore, is to carry out management's orders.

A similar position emerged from Administrative Management. Davis defined the functions of management as planning, organizing, and controlling.23 Mooney and Relley proposed that organizational efficiency depended upon three principles: coordination, scalar process, and functional differentiation.24 Another management pioneer, Luther Gulick, followed the same pattern. Drawing upon Fayol and others he listed seven managerial functions. These include: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.25

---


24 Mooney, op. cit.

Considering these various positions it may be concluded that Classical Management considered the role of management to center upon activities such as planning, organizing, and controlling. Leaders in developing this approach clearly assigned such responsibilities to management. They also specified the means for executing these functions through the establishment of regulations and procedures, division of labor, delegation of authority, and limited span of control.

The response to these Classical concepts of the managerial role seems to have been an authoritarian approach to management. If the function of management is to plan, organize, and control the efforts of others; and, if the role of the others is to accept and follow the directions of management, the result must be authoritarian. Management determines the required tasks, breaks them down into simplified units, establishes procedures and routines, then closely supervises the workers to assure that routines are followed. Workers, in turn, comply.

Effect Upon Employee Satisfaction.

There is apparently no early research relating employee satisfaction directly to Classical Management philosophy. Most studies of employee satisfaction, in fact, focus either on general attitude toward a job, or else on specific job characteristics such as wages, security, work conditions, and supervisory practices. While each of these factors may be related to managers' philosophy of management, the principal interest of this study is employee expectations resulting from managers' philosophy or behavior.
The first major study to consider employee satisfaction was the Hawthorne investigation. These studies revealed that supervisory methods can have substantial impact upon employee morale. In discussing the research, Elton Mayo reported that workers experienced a much higher morale when working under experimental conditions characterized by a freer environment in which supervisors were not regarded as bosses. Such practices are, of course, contrary to Classical Management prescriptions.

Further evidence that workers object to Classical approaches to supervision is supplied by the Ohio State and the University of Michigan studies. Halpin reports research in which subordinates under superiors who rated high in concern for establishing trustful warm relationships were more satisfied than subordinates of superiors who rated high in concern for establishing well-defined patterns of organization and procedural methods. Similar results were disclosed by Likert. Research from the University of Michigan shows that employees are more satisfied working for supervisors who exercise general rather than close supervision. The evidence, however, is not absolute. Vroom and Mann have discovered situations in which workers preferred an authoritarian approach over a less structured pattern of

27 Halpin, op. cit.
supervision.\textsuperscript{29} Still, most of the studies relating job satisfaction to supervision indicate that a Classical approach to management tends to be less satisfactory to most workers. It was this discovery which led to the development of the next major philosophical emphasis in management.

**The Human Relations Philosophy**

The Human Relations philosophy of management originated in the late 1920's and early 1930's. This philosophy emerged as a result of research findings from an extensive study conducted at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company.\textsuperscript{30} The investigation, which has become known as the Hawthorne Studies, was originally designed to determine the relationship between physical conditions such as illumination and worker efficiency. Quite unexpectedly it was found that neither illumination, rest programs, or wage payment procedures had any significant impact upon worker productivity. The most important factors to affect employee performance were discovered to be psychological and social forces rather than physical factors.\textsuperscript{31} These findings led to the formation of the Human Relations philosophy.

Other research findings contributed to Human Relations thinking. Kurt Lewin experimented with group discussion methods of introducing

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{30}Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, \textit{Management and the Worker} (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1939).

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 572.
\end{footnotesize}
behavioral change. He found that participation in group discussion was more effective than lecture methods as a means of inducing change.\textsuperscript{32} Lewin also studied different approaches to leadership. Working with Lippitt and White he discovered that democratic leadership methods result in a better psychological atmosphere than autocratic methods.\textsuperscript{33} From a slightly different perspective Coch and French found that total employee participation in instituting a change in work methods was far more effective than either partial participation through representation or no participation whatsoever.\textsuperscript{34}

These and similar studies provided the foundation for the Human Relations philosophy. Hawthorne was especially significant because it dramatically illustrated that employee attitudes and social pressures could have profound influence upon employee performance. The Hawthorne studies also discovered the informal organization and introduced the concept of social system. The other research demonstrated the impact of participation in decision making. Taken collectively these developments formed the core of Human Relations.


Goals and Values of Human Relations.

Whereas Classical Management places major emphasis on production, Human Relations focuses on people. Human Relations shifted the emphasis from methods to man. With the discovery of the impact of psychological and social forces upon organizational affairs, people, rather than techniques, became the principal concern of management.

The philosophy began slowly but gained speed in time. As it developed, however, it split along two lines. On the one hand, the discovery of psychological and social forces within organizations led to a new concept of the role of organizations. Mayo responded to the Hawthorne findings by calling upon management to restore the 'capacity for collaboration in work' which had been destroyed by the industrial revolution.35 This view seems to have encouraged some managers to promote organizational harmony and neglect organizational goals. Such an approach is illustrated by Blake's country-club philosophy which places human interests over organizational requirements.36

A second response to the discovery of psychological and social forces operating within the work situation was quite different from the first. Some managers seek to incorporate the knowledge into a means of inducing workers to greater productivity by manipulating

35 Mayo, op. cit.
36 Blake, op. cit.
the workers. The attitude in this case is that employees object to many organizational requirements, but through skillful application of psychological and sociological techniques workers can be persuaded to cooperate with management. As Miles points out, this approach is, in most respects, just as authoritarian as the Classical approach. It is, however, more benevolent. The name benevolent autocrat is often used to describe such an approach to management.

From the discussion it is clear that Human Relations philosophy has two goals. In one instance it seeks to promote harmony and secure work relationships even to the neglect of organizational interest. On the other hand, it may advocate achievement of organizational goals through manipulation of social and psychological forces. In some respects each of these ends arises from assumptions about workers.

Assumptions Regarding Employees.

The two versions of Human Relations philosophy, quite naturally, have different assumptions regarding the role of employees in organizations. The country-club advocate considers the employee something of a victim of conditions imposed by industrialization. He believes that organizational complexity has produced a dependency and a sense of futility which leads to irrational behavior. This position was forcefully advanced by Mayo.  


38Mayo, op. cit., pp. 120-21.
The benevolent autocrat has an almost diametric view of employees. He sees a worker as an object in need of adjustment. Employees are irrational because they are out of balance. According to Miles the benevolent autocrat assumes that workers simply want to feel useful and important. The point which Miles stresses is that these managers don't consider employees important or useful. They believe that it is only necessary that the workers be made to 'feel' important.

There is one assumption regarding employees which the two branches of Human Relations share. Both positions consider management more qualified to determine employee needs than the employees themselves. Mayo proposed that an elite corps of managers be selected to manage organizations so as to restore meaning to work. In a similar manner Knowles acknowledged that the benevolent autocrat often feels that he understands the needs of the worker better than the worker. Such views must have some impact upon managerial behavior.

Behavioral Implications.

Like Classical Management, Human Relations philosophy tends to be normative. The philosophy, in fact, builds upon Classical concepts regarding management functions. Human Relations accepts the basic premises related to the management functions of planning, organizing,

---

40 Mayo, op. cit., p. 75.
and controlling. However, it seeks to modify the manner in which these functions are executed. This point is clearly illustrated by Miles. He explains that under Human Relations, "... while the manager is still viewed as essentially a controller with prime responsibility to the system, he is expected to take preventive steps to keep his people cooperative and compliant."42

The major modifications which Human Relations introduced were a call for greater employee participation in decision making, more general supervision, allowing employees to exercise greater self-control, and less structure in certain relationships. The philosophy also recognizes that many forces influence the manner in which managers and employees behave.

Several pioneers of Human Relations suggested specific actions for developing better interpersonal relationships and improved supervisory methods. Mayo advocated special selection of managers and training in counseling skills.43 Lewin promoted the use of discussion methods and democratic leadership.44 As a result of their research, Coch and French urged managers to involve workers in the design and implementation of change.45 Roethlisberger and

43Mayo, op. cit., p. 75.
44Lewin, Lippitt, and White, op. cit.
45Coch and French, op. cit.
Dickson strongly advocated creation of large scale counseling programs for supervisors as well as workers.\textsuperscript{46}

As mentioned previously, these appeals have produced two results. The manager who adopts a country club philosophy is primarily interested in avoiding conflict and maintaining harmonious relationships. He, therefore, seeks opinions in order to find acceptable solutions. He also urges supervisors to listen to their subordinates. Managers with such a philosophy are often described as 'soft' because they hesitate to make controversial decisions or take unpopular action. The employee is placed before the good of the organization.

A manager with a benevolent autocratic attitude is also concerned with maintaining good relationships. However, his motives are different; he is concerned about employees accepting his authority. This type of manager, therefore, appeals to the psychological and social needs of the worker in order to help them feel important and useful. According to Miles, a manager adopting this approach allows employees to participate in decisions. The decisions, however, are related to minor, unimportant matters. He states, "participation, in this model, is a lubricant which oils away resistance to formal authority.\textsuperscript{47}

The two varieties of Human Relations, therefore, are similar in many respects. Even though their motives may differ, they often follow

\textsuperscript{46} Roethlisberger, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{47} Miles, "Human Relations or Human Resources?" \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 149-150.
a similar course of action. Whatever course is chosen, however, it usually is to affect employee satisfaction.

Effect Upon Employee Satisfaction.

In a sense the Human Relations approach is designed to produce employee satisfaction. According to Megginson:

The basic assumption of the human relations approach was that the goal of human administration should be to provide the workers with job satisfaction. It was believed that employee participation should be obtained in order to produce job satisfaction and to improve employee morale. The assumption behind this belief was that greater job satisfaction would result in greater productivity.48

Both the country club manager and the benevolent autocrat attempt to increase worker satisfaction. One does it for the employee, the other for the organization. In many cases, however, the outcome is the same.

Research indicates that, in general, employees are more satisfied under a Human Relations approach than in a Classical Management situation. Likert has produced evidence that workers prefer a supervisor who is employee-centered and uses general supervision to one who is job-centered and practices close supervision.49 The Ohio State studies indicate similar findings in that subordinates are more satisfied with superiors who demonstrate more concern for employees than for initiating structure.50 These studies indicate

48 Megginson, op. cit.
49 Likert, New Patterns of Management, op. cit.
50 Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, op. cit.
that Human Relations approaches tend to result in greater satisfaction for workers. There is, however, other research which suggests that the relationship between supervision and satisfaction is not quite so simple as the Human Relation philosophy implies.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman have discovered that job satisfaction depends not only upon friendly supervision, but also upon the opportunity to perform meaningful work. They report that attractive work conditions and considerate supervision were not, in themselves, sufficient to produce job satisfaction. Workers also need to be able to achieve worthwhile goals and perform responsible work.

Similar conclusions were reported by Likert. Upon further evaluation of the University of Michigan research, he said that maximum employee satisfaction requires that supervisors stress high performance standards as well as practicing employee-centered supervision. It is not enough that workers feel important and share in minor decisions. They must be furnished the opportunity and encouragement to contribute effectively to organizational goals. It was this realization which led to the evolution of the Human Resource philosophy.

The Human Resource Philosophy

The Human Resource philosophy consists of a synthesis of management thought. It draws upon both Classical Management and Human Relations,

51Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1959)

abstracting those portions of each which have proven most meaningful. In this way it constitutes a total systems view of management. Scott points out that its uniqueness lies in its recognition of many mutually dependent parts and processes. He calls the philosophy the modern organization approach and places considerable stress on the interdependence of all parts. Perhaps, however, Scott does not render adequate emphasis to the particular significance which this philosophy assigns to the human element within organizations. As Megginson illustrates, the Human Resource philosophy is made up of the better elements of the two previous philosophies. Its principal features, therefore, are a systems perspective and a special emphasis on the human element as a resource and a human being.

It is difficult to ascertain just when the Human Resource philosophy actually began. Much of the support for this approach comes from research originally designed to determine whether the Classical approach is more effective than the Human Relations approach. This was the principal objective of both the Ohio State and the University of Michigan studies. Another basis for the Human Resources philosophy is the writings of several management philosophers, especially Chester Barnard and Douglas McGregor.


54Megglinson, op. cit., p. 9.
In 1938 Chester Barnard published a highly significant and widely read work in which he proposed two requirements of organizations. According to Barnard:

The persistence of cooperation depends upon two conditions: (a) its effectiveness; and (b) its efficiency. Effectiveness relates to the accomplishment of the cooperative purpose, which is social and non-personal in character. Efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives, and is personal in character.\(^{55}\)

The significance of this position was Barnard's insistence that the organization must fulfill two functions—productivity and member satisfaction. Classical Management had stressed goal accomplishment, but ignored member satisfaction. Human Relations, on the other hand, emphasized member satisfaction, but often neglected productivity.

A second thrust towards Human Resource thinking came from Douglas McGregor in the form of an assault upon Classical and Human Relations philosophies.\(^{56}\) McGregor declared that both of these approaches were founded upon inaccurate assumptions regarding man and the task of management. He said each of these philosophies assumed that the average man is indolent, dislikes responsibility, and has no interest in organizational needs. Management, therefore, must direct and control workers in order to achieve organizational goals. McGregor names this theorem Theory X.

In contrast to Theory X, he proposed a new concept of man and called it Theory Y. According to the new theory, man is active rather

---


\(^{56}\)McGregor, op. cit.
than passive. He has a capacity for assuming responsibility and is willing to work toward organizational goals. The function of management under this theory is to arrange conditions so that workers can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives.57

These theories of Barnard and McGregor, along with discoveries being made by Ohio State and University of Michigan researchers, provided the basis for the Human Resource philosophy. The Ohio State and the Michigan groups employed different methodologies, but their overall objectives and final conclusions were quite similar. Essentially both groups wanted to determine which approach was most effective; one following the Classical prescription of placing primary emphasis on production, or one following the Human Relations recommendations of devoting major attention to human factors. After years of study both research groups concluded that the most effective managers were those supervisors who demonstrated high concern for both production and people.58, 59

Other studies, especially those of Blake and Mouton, have substantiated and expanded upon these findings.60 The Human Resource philosophy emerged from these various developments.

57Ibid.
58Likert, New Patterns of Management, op. cit.
59Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, op. cit.
60Blake, op. cit.
Goals and Values of the Human Resource Philosophy.

The aim of the Human Resource philosophy is to integrate organization needs and employee needs. The philosophy recognizes that both the organization and its members have needs which must be met if the organization is to remain viable. If it is to survive, the organization must be productive. It must produce a worthy product or service at a reasonable cost. If the organization is to be successful, it must attract and effectively utilize qualified human resources. People join and remain with an organization only if their needs are being adequately satisfied. Organizations, therefore, must achieve two ends: productivity and member satisfaction.

The Human Resource philosophy is also unique in that it acknowledges an intricate and complex pattern of human needs.

According to Maslow, man possesses five basic needs: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-realization. These needs are all interrelated, but generally manifest themselves according to a pattern beginning with the first mentioned and moving up as the lower ones are satisfied. Man, therefore, progresses from one type of need to another so long as the lower ones remain satisfied.61

McGregor contends that most employees in our culture have opportunities to satisfy their lower order needs, and are therefore primarily concerned with meeting higher level needs such as

self-realization. Herzberg presents a similar view. On the basis of extensive research, he proposes that employees are motivated only by factors related to job content. These include challenging responsible work and opportunities for achievement. The Human Resource philosophy asserts that management should direct considerable effort toward providing for all of the needs of its employees, especially the higher order ones.

Assumptions Regarding Employees.

Perhaps the most significant characteristic of the Human Resource philosophy is its assumptions regarding employees. Peter Drucker expresses this attitude clearly and eloquently. He declares, "the human resource—the whole man—is, of all resources intrusted to man, the most productive, the most versatile, the most resourceful." He continues, "... the human being has one set of qualities possessed by no other resource: it has the ability to co-ordinate, to integrate, to judge and to imagine." In considering man as a resource, however, Drucker also points out that it is extremely important that management recognize the human element of this resource. That is, man is a moral and social creature as well as an economic resource. He must be treated as such.

62 McGregor, op. cit.
63 Herzberg, op. cit.
65 Ibid., p. 263.
Megginson is another advocate of this position. In characterizing the Human Resource approach, he declares that it "... views the productivity of employees as being an economic resource of the firm." On the other hand, "the employee himself, in his relationships to the other members of the organization, is viewed according to the concept of human dignity." 66

The Human Resource philosophy considers employees as the most significant resource available to the organization. It believes that workers are capable of exercising initiative and self-control. It believes that members of the organization want to contribute toward organization goals in a positive and meaningful capacity. Finally, Miles affirms that the Human Resource philosophy is convinced that "most people can exercise far more creativity, responsible self-direction and self-control than their present jobs demand." 67

Behavioral Implications.

American management philosophy, according to Litzinger and Schaefer, has always been action oriented. 68 Managers in this country are pragmatists. They want a philosophy which provides a framework for action. The Human Resource philosophy, therefore, contains definite behavioral implications. The philosophy, in fact, prescribes

---

66 Megginson, op. cit., p. 9.
specific managerial requirements. Beginning with McGregor, proponents of this approach have recommended a particular role for management. McGregor's Theory Y in a sense constitutes the model of management's position under the Human Resource philosophy. He states, "the central principle which derives from Theory Y is that of integration: the creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise." Management's role in the organization, therefore, is to provide resources and assist employees to attain their objectives by contributing toward organizational objectives. According to McGregor, managers should encourage employees to develop and utilize their capacities, knowledge, and skills to the fullest extent possible.

Miles supports this role for management. He defines the manager's job in the following manner:

1. The manager's basic task is to create an environment in which his subordinates can contribute their full range of talents to the accomplishment of organizational goals. He must attempt to uncover and tap the creative resources of his subordinates.

2. The manager should allow and encourage his subordinates to participate not only in routine decisions but in important matters as well. In fact, the more important a decision is to the manager's department, the greater should be his effort to tap the department's resources.

---

69 McGregor, op. cit., p. 49.
70 Ibid., p. 55.
3. The manager should attempt to continually expand the areas over which his subordinates exercise self-direction and self-control as they develop and demonstrate greater insight and ability.71

These, then, are the major elements of the Human Resource concept of management's function. The focal point is the creation of conditions which will enable the organization to achieve its goals and also provide for attainment of member goals. Under such an arrangement the organization should be most effective and the members most satisfied.

Effect Upon Employee Satisfaction.

Another unique feature of the Human Resource philosophy is its attitude regarding employee job satisfaction. The Human Resource view is that employees derive maximum satisfaction from work which enables them to contribute meaningfully to a worthwhile endeavor. The evidence relating to this view is not yet sufficient to indicate proof. However, a number of studies do suggest strongly that performance often leads to satisfaction. Herzberg has compiled considerable evidence showing that accountants and engineers are most satisfied with jobs which provide opportunity to perform responsible work and achieve high results.72

Porter and Lawler have found that managers in a variety of positions who feel that they are able to satisfy high order needs such as self-actualization are generally quite satisfied with their jobs. The high-order needs are satisfied when those managers feel that their work is worthwhile and when they are able to exercise self-direction over

71Miles, "Human Relations or Human Resources?" op. cit.

72Herzberg, op. cit.
the work. Their research also indicates that it is the expectation of future rewards, especially in the form of continued opportunities, which provides the greatest satisfaction.

In a more recent study Richard Ritti reports that engineers want interesting work and a chance to do it well. If the work is not challenging, the engineers tend to become bored and dissatisfied. Furthermore, they want to be given the opportunity to perform the work to the best of their ability. Ritti concludes that performance leads to satisfaction.

Not all of the research supports this view. In some instances it is not possible to determine whether the causal relationship runs from satisfaction to performance or vice versa. But, many management theorists agree with Miles that "subordinate satisfaction will increase as a by-product of improved performance and the opportunity to contribute creatively to this improvement." Further research is needed in this important area before it can be said with certainty that performance leads to satisfaction. For the time being, however, many proponents of the Human Resource approach believe that such a relationship is likely. They, therefore, recommend that managers provide opportunities for employees to exercise self-direction as a means of improving performance and, thereby, satisfaction.

---
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Philosophies of Management in Libraries

In the preceding section an overview of management philosophies was presented, along with a detailed analysis of the three philosophies which have dominated American management thought. Much of the material relating to management philosophies was extracted from the literature of business and government administration. It is within these disciplines that most of the development took place.

Other disciplines, however, rely heavily upon management knowledge and skill in the conduct of their functions. Education certainly requires a thorough understanding of management theory and concepts. Hospital services are also very much concerned about improving their effectiveness through greater knowledge of management. All institutions which operate large complex organizations need to understand the role and function of management. Most of these institutions, however, look to business and government for much of the theoretical and philosophical development applicable to management. They, in turn, adapt and incorporate those elements which relate to their function. Librarianship seems to have followed this pattern.

The library profession, until recently, has not devoted much attention to constructing any philosophy of management. Library management literature is rather deficient of theoretical or philosophical content. A critic of librarianship's lack of conceptual substance regarding its management functions, Paul Wasserman, contends that library administration has not advanced beyond introductory
propositions in theoretical development. This is not to say that managers within the profession are completely devoid of management philosophy.

There is evidence within the literature indicating that library managers have, in some respects, adopted the philosophies of business and government administration. Library management literature contains material related to Classical Management, Human Relations and Human Resource approaches to management. Clearly, these managers are acquainted with the three philosophies. It seems, however, that the library profession has followed a different pattern of philosophical emphasis.

The literature suggests, for example, that Scientific Management was not significant to librarianship until the 1950's. This is thirty years after it was introduced to business and government. Administrative Management, on the other hand, has occupied a prominent position within librarianship. In fact, the literature indicates that Administrative Management has been the predominate philosophy of library managers. It has certainly received the most coverage in the textbooks and journals of the field.

It is only in the last decade that Human Relations and Human Resource concepts have begun to be seriously discussed in library literature. It appears, however, that these two philosophies are beginning to have an impact upon library managers.

In the following section a review of library literature is presented as a means of characterizing library managers' philosophies of management. Specific attention is directed toward the three philosophies which have dominated business management thought: Classical Management, Human Relations, and Human Resource.

**Classical Management in Libraries.**

Classical Management has received considerable emphasis in library literature. Scientific Management and Administrative Management concepts are discussed throughout the literature. It seems, however, that Administrative Management has received the bulk of attention. Interest in Scientific Management has been sporadic and never very extensive.

A few articles related to Scientific Management appeared in the journals around 1910 when the Eastern Rate Case was being conducted. Willard Austin recommended application of Scientific Management techniques for increasing efficiency in college and university libraries. Similar advice was given to public librarians by Adam J. Strohm. These two works introduced the idea of using systematic methods in library work, but provided little philosophical content.

---


The first significant work to relate Scientific Management principles to librarianship was written by Donald Coney in 1930.\footnote{Donald Coney, "Scientific Management and University Libraries," In G. T. Schwenning, ed., Management Problems (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930), pp. 168-198.} Coney emphasized the need for librarians to focus on determining the best methods as standards of performance. He then suggested means of applying scientific methods to various library operations.

It was 1947 before another contribution to the Scientific Management approach appeared in the literature. Ralph Shaw, a leading and lifelong advocate of Scientific Management, presented a lucid overview of both Scientific and Administrative Management.\footnote{Ralph R. Shaw, "Scientific Management in the Library," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 21, No. 5 (January, 1947), pp. 349-352.} In this work Shaw identified two approaches to management. He called one micro-management because it focuses on details. The second approach, according to Shaw, concentrates on broad general issues. He called this approach macro-management. Shaw pointed out that both approaches are necessary for effective results. He then demonstrated how Scientific Management techniques aid in the micro approach and could be used in libraries.

Ralph Shaw made another important contribution to library management thought in 1954 when he edited an issue of Library Trends dedicated to Scientific Management in libraries. The various papers gave librarians a diversity of viewpoints regarding this approach to library management. The theme of the work was
appropriately expressed by Shaw in the introduction. He said, "Scientific Management exists primarily as a concept and a mental attitude toward achievement."^81

The first book devoted to Scientific Management in libraries was written by two students of Shaw, Richard Dougherty and Fred Heinritz.^82 The book provided extensive coverage of scientific methods of work analysis appropriate to libraries. In addition, the authors present a brief introduction to the historical and theoretical basis of Scientific Management.

These are the major works which advocate and reflect Scientific Management thought within the library profession. Another indication of library managers attitudes toward Scientific Management is furnished by a 1967 study conducted by Richard Farley.^83 As part of his doctoral dissertation, Farley analyzed library managers' attitudes regarding the use of systematic, scientific approaches to decision making. He concluded that "the American library executive, in 1961, tended to be more scientific than not in his approach to administrative problems."^84 More than

---


^84 Ibid., p. 83.
half of the 272 executives in the study considered themselves to be scientific managers. The study, along with the other references in the literature, indicates a general acceptance of scientific concepts, but certainly there is no sizable support of a Scientific Management philosophy in the library profession. There is, however, evidence of a strong Administrative Management orientation among library managers.

All of the major textbooks on library administration employ an Administrative Management emphasis. Beginning in 1928 with John A. Lowe's publication of Public Library Administration,\(^5\) each author of a library administration text has placed major stress upon organizational aspects of management. Lowe established the pattern which was to follow. The major management issues which he discusses are: functions of the manager, advantages of specialization, methods of departmentation, and delegation of authority. He also devoted a chapter to finances. Practically nothing was said of employee needs. Other texts adhere to this model, allocating primary attention to organizational issues such as departmentation and largely ignoring human factors.

In chronological order, the next important publication to reflect and influence library management thought was a collection of papers presented before a University of Chicago Graduate Library School Institute.\(^6\) The papers included contributions from public


administration, education, social studies, the civil service, and municipal government as well as library science. References were made to material by Luther Gulick, Lyndall Urwick, Marshall Dimock, and other public and business administration writers. The emphasis projected by the institute is decidedly Administrative Management. The papers are quoted extensively in the literature of library management. They have undoubtedly influenced library management thought.

A publication which offered significant potential for influencing librarians' approach to management is an article by Paul Howard. Borrowing from Barnard and Fayol, Howard points out that a library is a cooperative enterprise which has the same management requirements as other cooperative endeavors. He then presents a model of library management functions including directing, ordering, supervising, controlling, organizing, and representing. As Wasserman notes, Howard's paradigm created a foundation upon which librarianship could have developed a comprehensive philosophy of management. Unfortunately, the composition received little notice and was never developed further.

Three library texts were introduced between 1943 and 1945. Errett and John McDiarmid formulated some principles for public library administration. Guy Lyle did the same for college library administration.

---
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administrators. He was followed by Wilson and Tauber addressing university library managers. While each book focuses on a different type of library, they are quite similar in their approach to management. The principal managerial topics discussed are organizing and financing libraries. Some attention is devoted to personnel. The emphasis, however, is on procedural aspects of selection and placement. Motivation and communication are not even given specific coverage. The orientation is very much Administrative Management.

The next contribution to library management thought was a collection of articles in Library Trends. A significant development in this publication was the increased reference to material from other disciplines. The articles written by librarians indicate a broader acquaintanceship with management developments in other fields. It is also evident from these works that the authors are aware of the need to relate these developments to library management. Errett McDiarmid, for instance, says, "until there is basic research in the theory and philosophy of librarianship, as well as in most of the areas of library science, librarianship will tend to be a practical art, where


administration consists largely of the application of tradition and
custom to newer problems as well as to the increasingly complex older
ones."93

Two additional textbooks have been produced in library administra-
tion. While both of them maintain the same format utilized by previous
authors, these two books present more material in the nature of manage-
ment functions. The earliest publication, written by Joseph Wheeler
and Herbert Goldhor in 1962, places more emphasis on planning, staffing,
and supervising than previous texts.94 The second book, written by
Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber in 1971, also devotes greater
attention to personnel matters and adds a section on communication.95

These two publications signal a slight shift in library managers' philo-
sophy of management. The expanded coverage into communication
and personnel issues suggests that the authors are aware of some
Human Relations and perhaps Human Resource developments. Still, the
orientation is predominantly Administrative Management in tone. The
approach which these books assume is actually similar to the practice
in business management wherein authors such as Koontz and O'Donnell96
incorporate new developments into an Administrative Management framework.

From this review it is clear that library management has a definite Classical Management focus. Other researchers agree. In a study of management theory within librarianship, Tai Keun Oh concludes that library management literature draws principally upon classical organization theory.\(^97\) Maurice Marchant also points out that most books on library administration are bureaucratically oriented.\(^98\) Classical Management philosophy has certainly influenced librarians. There are, however, indications within the literature of some familiarity with Human Relations and Human Resource approaches to management.


Librarians have for some time demonstrated an interest in democratic or participative management. It is not clear, however, whether this interest stems from a desire to improve their management or from a wish to be more equalitarian. In some instances an author recommends that library administrators permit greater staff participation in decision making as a means of increasing morale in order to improve performance. In other cases participation is advocated as a means of improving decision making. The first situation reflects a Human Relations attitude while the second is obviously of Human Resource orientation. There are instances in which an author expresses both


views in the same work. For this reason, it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether librarians are following a Human Relations or a Human Resource philosophy. The two philosophies will, therefore, be examined simultaneously.

One of the first statements on participation to receive attention from librarians was written by J. Periam Danton. In 1934 Danton presented a selection of examples of situations in which employees made positive contributions through participation in managerial activities. He concluded his remarks with the question, "In view of the foregoing paragraphs is it not pertinent to inquire whether furthering of that trend (toward democracy) in the interest of efficiency and esprit de corps should not be the concern of every librarian?"99 The view expressed by Danton is that employees can contribute to organizational decisions and their participation will lead to improved decisions. The opportunity to contribute will, in turn, result in higher morale. This is certainly a Human Resource attitude.

The second important work to approach these issues was a book on personnel management in public libraries. Clara W. Herbert analyzed several studies and added her experiences as a personnel officer in libraries to produce the first text on personnel administration in libraries. In her analysis she concludes that four factors contribute to employee satisfaction. These are:

1. Participation in a worthy enterprise
2. Surrounding atmosphere of justice and harmony
3. Opportunity for responsible and creative work
4. Realization of personal and professional growth.\textsuperscript{100}

Ms. Herbert's position closely parallels the attitude expressed by Miles.\textsuperscript{101} It is definitely Human Resource oriented.

Another view on the topic of participation in management has been expressed by Herbert Goldhor. He gives three reasons for allowing staff to participate in deciding library policy:

1. because assistants may not have an opportunity to advance in the organization, they should be given a chance to share from their present position
2. because participation will increase morale and help the chief librarian
3. because participation would aid citizens in grasping the essentials of intelligent application of common will to common needs.\textsuperscript{102}

Goldhor is, seemingly, concerned primarily with enhancing the morale of the employees or contributing to citizenship. It is not clear whether he considers the workers capable of making positive contributions to organizational effectiveness. His position, therefore, appears to coincide with the Human Relations philosophy.


\textsuperscript{101}Miles, "Human Relations or Human Resources?" \textit{op. cit.}, p. 151.

A similar view was presented by Richard E. Krug at a national conference of the American Library Association. Krug made the statement, "I think it will be generally conceded that the best job will be done by those whose morale is high: and high morale is fostered by the democratic approach." He referred to the Hawthorne experiments and called upon head librarians to allow employees to speak out. The tone of Krug's account reflects an attitude that managers should create a 'sense of importance and belonging' in order to achieve greater cooperation. He tends to project a human Relations orientation.

Two classic library administration texts include Human Relations and Human Resource views. Guy Lyle's text on college library administration includes material on personnel administration. However, even the recent fourth edition is rather void of current behavioral science developments. He mentions that consideration for subordinates is needed in promoting an esprit de corps and as a means of securing good work. Nevertheless, his discussion of employee abilities to contribute effectively through self-direction and self-control is quite meager. It is not clear whether his philosophy is Human Relations or Human Resource.


A similar view is expressed by Wilson and Tauber in their text. They refer to the Hawthorne Studies and call upon managers to consciously strive to resolve personnel difficulties in order to improve cooperation and coordination. They also urge administrators to encourage staff members to regard their work as vital to the organization. Wilson and Tauber suggest various methods for promoting esprit de corps. These include participation in preparing annual reports, making suggestions, and cooperating in conducting surveys. The attitude of these authors is similar to the Human Relations approach described by Miles. They want to improve morale by allowing limited participation in the hope that employees will be more cooperative in accepting management's authority.

Amy Winslow appears to have devoted more study to the topic of participation than most of the librarians writing on the subject. In 1952 she introduced to librarianship William Givens' concepts of bottom-up management. A few months later, in a paper presented before a Southeastern Library Association conference, she explained, "it (participation in management) is not a favor granted by the administration; it is a spontaneous working together, a seeking for help on the part of the administration, an uninhibited exercise of
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many minds in the job of running the library." This position certainly indicates confidence in employees ability to contribute to the objectives of the library.

Errett McDiarmid went one step further in giving two reasons for wider staff participation:

1. the wider base of influence and experience upon which decisions can be based as more people are drawn into the discussion of them

2. the great increase in morale that is presumed to occur when staff members feel they have a part in shaping decisions which directly or indirectly affect them.

With these two criteria firmly established, McDiarmid then suggests that participation is ineffective because it requires too much time, may lead to irresponsible decisions, and does not necessarily result in high morale. He concludes that participation should be aimed at promoting understanding through discussion and information rather than permitting actual administration. McDiarmid seems to be advocating a limited form of Human Resource management.

Additional positions on democratic management are expressed in the two most recent textbooks on library administration. Joseph Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor reflect Human Resource attitudes in their statement, "participation is particularly appropriate in librarianship as
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a source of morale and of ideas and as a management method."\textsuperscript{110} They further call upon management to treat each worker and his work with respect.

Rogers and Weber, on the other hand, seem to lean toward a Human Relations posture. They claim, "good personnel administration will seek ways of satisfying the employee's psychological needs, giving him a feeling of responsibility and accomplishment."\textsuperscript{111} They also stress the need for supervisors to explain the importance of each task and to show interest in the individual's job problems. There is little emphasis on the employee's ability to contribute meaningfully to organizational decisions and tasks.

The review presented above provides a general overview of librarians' philosophies of management. Most of the material included in the review was written by librarians who have held administrative positions in all types of libraries. Their views, therefore, may be considered representative of the attitudes of the leaders of the profession. Furthermore, since much of the material was written by leaders, their opinions tend to influence other members of the profession. It may be inferred, therefore, that the philosophies expressed in the preceding sections typify the attitudes of library managers.

\textsuperscript{110}Wheeler, op. cit., p. 90.

\textsuperscript{111}Rogers, op. cit., p. 46.
This conclusion is, of course, tenuous and calls for other forms of evidence. There seems to be a growing awareness of this need. In the last four years three survey studies of manager attitudes and behavior have been reported. These studies provide further understanding of manager philosophies in libraries.

Maurice Marchant, Edward Hess, and Henry Stewart each used some form of Likert's Profile of Organizational Characteristics to analyze three groups of library managers. Their conclusions are essentially identical and, therefore, rather significant. Likert's model is designed to measure management attitudes and practices in relation to a wide range of variables. According to Likert, the model may be used to characterize attitudes and practices within an organization along a continuum ranging from authoritative to participative. There are actually four somewhat distinct categories called System I through IV in which an organization can be classified.

The three library studies each concluded that those managers whom they analyzed exhibited attitudes and employed practices
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characterized within System III of Likert's model. According to Miles, a System III approach is essentially identical with his Human Relations model. The results of these studies, therefore, reveal that library managers tend to subscribe to and employ a Human Relations approach to management. The studies also showed some instances in which library managers employed authoritarian (Classical Management) and participative (Human Resource) approaches. The predominant approach, however, was Human Relations oriented.

Summary

In this chapter the literature of management and of librarianship was examined in order to gain a perspective on the major philosophies which have been formulated to provide a systematic view of the nature and role of management. The literature indicates that, while several philosophies have been proposed, three have tended to dominate management thought in this century. These three philosophies, Classical Management, Human Relations Management, and Human Resource Management, have furnished the basic framework upon which management thought and practice has evolved.

Each approach is unique in its emphasis. Yet, all three are bound together by a common goal. American management philosophy, like American philosophy in general, is pragmatic. It is results

oriented. Each of the management philosophies, therefore, focuses on providing guidelines for action. This is the reason there have been shifts of emphasis from one factor to another. As increased knowledge and understanding provide better guidelines, management philosophy adapts.

Beginning at the turn of the century managers found it necessary to cope with a rapidly developing technology. Machines and new forms of production were being created faster than was possible to handle under traditional approaches. There was a great need for more systematic approaches to designing work tasks and organizational structures. From this need arose Classical Management with special emphasis on planning, organizing and controlling work and workers. When this approach succeeded in establishing more stable efficient conditions new concerns began to manifest themselves.

As organizations succeeded in providing for the economic needs of the employees, workers turned their attention to psychological and social issues. They began to show interest in being treated as persons and they looked for opportunities to experience interaction with fellow workers. Management responded by shifting its emphasis from strict technological and production concerns to concern for employees. It turned its attention to providing motivation through the establishment of better interpersonal relationships and improved communication. Eventually it was discovered that employees were capable and desirous of more than token involvement in organizational affairs. They wanted responsible work in which they could contribute to the full extent of their abilities. Management has responded by
seeking to arrange conditions so that employees can achieve these goals by contributing toward the goals of the organization.

In view of the process described above, it may be said that management philosophy has followed an ecological evolution. Each approach was developed in response to external and internal requirements. Initially the needs of the organization and its members were rather simple and limited. As each need was met, however, new and more complex requirements emerged. Beginning with a relatively closed view management has progressed to an open philosophy which recognizes an exceedingly complex system of mutually dependent forces. As one philosophy replaced another the perspective enlarged. There are now indications that a fourth philosophy is emerging within management.

The new philosophy, called the Contingency approach, has actually been developing for some time. However, it is only now beginning to acquire a distinct form and direction. Considerable formulation is still needed before the approach can stand on its own. However, progress is being made and the philosophy deserves consideration.

Kast and Rosenzweig describe three features of the Contingency approach. These are:

1. it seeks to understand the interrelationships among parts,

2. it emphasizes the multivariate nature of organizations,
3. It is directed toward suggesting organizational designs and managerial actions most appropriate for specific situations.117

These characteristics reflect the fact that systems developments have been a significant force in creating the Contingency view. In essence Contingency negates the attitude that there is a 'one best' approach to organizing or managing. It emphasizes that numerous factors influence the manner in which an enterprise should be organized and managed. The Contingency approach attempts to take into account as many variables as possible. Unfortunately, the task has proven rather formidable. Many of the research findings are contradictory.

The approach actually concentrates on two separate issues—organizing and managing. Some strides have been made in each area. A significant contribution was made by Joan Woodward.118 She discovered that industries requiring certain types of technology were more effective if they organized on the basis of their technical requirements. Lawrence and Lorsch expanded upon this theme by including environmental considerations in the analysis. They discovered that the most effective organizations were those which achieved the most appropriate fit among task, organization, people, technology, and environment.119


119 Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, Organization and Environment (Boston: Harvard University, 1967).
From a management perspective, several scholars have proposed similar concepts. Some time ago C. A. Gibb introduced the theory of situational leadership.\textsuperscript{120} According to Gibb the leader role is dependent upon three major variables: the task, the organization, and the followers. Shortly afterward Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt introduced a similar, but more elaborate concept.\textsuperscript{121} In the Tannenbaum and Schmidt model the three major factors are leader, followers, and situation. Of particular significance in this model was emphasis upon leader and follower values, needs, knowledge, skills, and perceptions. The difficulty with the Gibb and the Tannenbaum and Schmidt proposals is that they are not operational.

This omission has been partially overcome by Fred Fiedler.\textsuperscript{122} After years of research Fiedler determined that a leader's style is dependent upon three factors: (1) leader-member relationships, (2) task structure, and (3) position power of the leader. The most favorable situation for a leader is one in which he is well liked, has a clear-cut task and considerable power. The research indicates that in such situations the most effective style was a task-oriented approach. The task approach was also most effective in situations which were least favorable to the leader. A relationship-oriented style was most effective in intermediate situations.


Fiedler also concluded from his research that a leader's style is deeply rooted in his personality and, therefore, difficult to change. Consequently, he recommends that leader performance be improved by designing the job to fit the leader. He maintains, "our theory of leadership effectiveness predicts that a leader's performance can be improved by engineering or fitting the job to the leader."^{123}

The Contingency concept is a significant development within management thought. The theory underlying the approach presents a realistic view of actual conditions affecting management. To this date, however, it does not seem that the approach is operational. The research still considers only a limited number of the multivariate forces operating within and without organizations. In addition, the results are contradictory. Some researchers recommend organizing to fit the technology or the environment. Others insist that it is necessary to accommodate the manager. Still others place the followers' needs first. These various views must be reconciled before the Contingency approach can provide a reliable guide to management practice. Most students of management acknowledge that the various forces mentioned are important in determining the most appropriate approach to employ. What is lacking is a means of determining how these forces apply to a given situation. The research offers considerable potential for answering this question. However, it does not yet furnish a solution.

Meanwhile, there are means of measuring a manager's Human Resource philosophy and there are indications that library managers are beginning to adapt this philosophy. Therefore, in order to determine the relationship between managers' philosophy and their behavior, library managers will be analyzed in relation to their Human Resource philosophy. The following chapter presents the methods utilized in developing the instruments and gathering the data.
The principal objective of this study is to discover whether a manager's philosophy of management has any significant impact upon his behavior and upon his subordinates' satisfaction with their job. The key variables are managerial philosophy, managerial behavior, and employee attitudes. Appropriate measurement of these variables requires a large number of subjects and a realistic situational setting. Therefore, an ex post facto field study was selected as the most suitable approach for this research. A preliminary investigation revealed that managerial philosophy and employee attitudes could be measured through the use of attitude scales, and the behavioral measurement could be obtained from reports of observed behavior. Further, consideration disclosed that a pertinent group of library managers and employees could be approached through a mail survey. This mode of inquiry was, therefore, selected for this study.

Four processes were employed in conducting this study. First, an extensive review of management and library literature was undertaken in order to identify the principal philosophical themes which have been developed within management. The review also provided information for construction of the required instruments. The
second procedure consisted of developing questionnaires for measuring the variables under consideration. The literature review disclosed that a new philosophy was emerging within management. This new approach called Human Resource management is still in a developmental stage even though it has begun to receive considerable attention within the past few years. Because of the evolving nature of the new philosophy it was felt that new instruments should be developed for use in this study.

The third step in the investigation involved the selection of subjects. The researcher was particularly interested in studying management developments within libraries. This necessitated analyzing several groups of librarians in order to locate an appropriate combination of subjects. The final process required of the research was the collection and analysis of data. A mail survey was used to gather measurements of the variables. The data were then processed by computer and analyzed to determine specific relationships.

**Construction of Instruments**

Three principal measurements are needed in this study: (1) a measure of managers' philosophy of management, (2) a measure of managers' managerial behavior, and (3) a measure of subordinates' job satisfaction. A review of numerous instruments convinced the researcher that an attitude type scale could provide an excellent measure of managerial philosophy. Further study of measurement instruments disclosed the feasibility of obtaining both the
behavioral and the job satisfaction measurement through a single instrument using a technique employed by Porter. Each of the instruments was, therefore, developed and tested in a pilot study.

**Philosophy Questionnaire.**

The managerial philosophy questionnaire was constructed according to a method suggested by Murphy and Likert, and Edwards. The procedure requires three steps:

1. Assemble a number of statements related to the philosophy in question. Items should be drawn from various sources: books, journals, newspapers, conversations, as well as from the investigators knowledge of the subject. More statements should be prepared than are likely to be used for some will be unsatisfactory.

2. Administer the scale to a sample group. Each subject is asked to respond to each statement in terms of his agreement or disagreement with the statement. The statements provide for five possible responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Response alternatives for positive items are assigned weights of 5 (strongly agree) to 0 (strongly disagree). Weights are reversed for negative statements.

3. Select the statements which most clearly differentiate between those persons who endorse the philosophy from those who do not.

Following this process, some 60 items were gathered from management literature and from the author's knowledge of the subject. A goal
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of 15 to 20 statements was set beforehand as an optimum number to be included on the final questionnaire. The 60 statements were assembled in questionnaire format and administered on a formal and informal basis to friends, colleagues, practicing librarians, and other interested parties. Each person completing this prototype questionnaire was asked to record any impression, reaction, or criticism which may occur to him as he completed the questionnaire. Based on the response from this pretest the questionnaire was re-constructed. Some statements were re-written to remove ambiguity, others were simply re-arranged in order to clarify them, some items were completely eliminated. The revised questionnaire containing 56 statements was then administered to a pilot group.

Libraries for the pilot study were selected on the basis of their similarity to the final test group. In order to obtain a representative sample, the schools in the final test group were categorized according to size, type of support (public or private), and graduate programs (doctoral or master). A group of schools similar in composition was then chosen from states outside the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Twenty-one schools were included in the pilot study (Appendix A). Philosophy questionnaires were sent to the library directors of these schools. Ten directors responded. A follow-up letter produced three additional responses for a return rate of 62 per cent. Three more philosophy questionnaires were sent to associate/assistant directors. All three were returned, to raise the total number of returns to 16.
Two of the replies were not usable. Thus, 14 pilot responses were analyzed in selecting the statements to be included in the managerial philosophy questionnaire.

The procedure recommended by Edwards was used in selecting the statements. The technique involves analysis of each item through comparison of a group scoring high on the scale with a group scoring low on the scale. Following Edward's suggestions, each manager's scores were summed and arranged in rank order from highest to lowest. The five subjects who scored highest were then designated as the high group and the five who scored lowest were assigned to the low group. These two groups were used in determining the statements which most clearly separate people who are high on the philosophy continuum from people who are low. The criterion employed to select the statements was the magnitude of the difference between the mean score of the high and the low group.

The next step, therefore, was to compute group mean scores for each statement. The difference between the means of each group was then calculated and the statements were arranged in rank order according to the magnitude of the difference. Twenty-six statements had a difference score of 0.8 or more (Appendix B). These items were chosen for further evaluation.

The final step in the item selection process calls for a re-examination of acceptable statements to determine if any of them
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might be excluded for logical or practical reasons. In reconsidering
the questionnaire as a unit it seemed appropriate to limit the number
of statements to 20. There is general agreement in the literature
on scale construction that with self-administered mail surveys of
this sort response will decline if the questionnaire is not kept
brief. Experimentation with different layouts revealed that a
maximum of 20 statements could be attractively placed on one page.
It was, therefore, decided that six of the items should be eliminated.

Two criteria were used in eliminating statements. First, each
of the returned questionnaires was reviewed for comments and criticisms
by respondents. Some of the statements lacked clarity or were other­
wise confusing in some way. These were dropped. The second basis for
eliminating items involved the overall composition of the questionnaire.
Authorities recommend that, in order to avoid development of a response
set on the part of subjects, approximately half of the statements on
the scale should be worded positively so that a response of strongly
agree is scored as five. The other half should be phrased negatively
so that a response of strongly agree carries a weight of one. The
two criteria were applied to the 26 statements. The 20 items which
seemed most appropriate were retained and randomly assembled to form
the managerial philosophy questionnaire.

Behavior Satisfaction Questionnaire.

A second instrument was required to measure supervisory behavior
and subordinate satisfaction. Since the study is concerned with
managerial behavior in relation to employees, subordinate perception
of supervisory behavior was deemed an appropriate measure of such behavior. Consequently, a type of scale used by Porter was created for the investigation.\(^5\) An added feature of this type of scale is the fact that it was originally designed to measure satisfaction. Therefore, it is possible to obtain measures of both managerial behavior and subordinate satisfaction from the same instrument.

The instrument adapted for this study consists of a group of statements regarding supervisory behavior. Subordinates were asked to respond to the statements in three ways:

1. To what degree does your supervisor presently practice the behavior?

2. To what extent do you think your supervisor should practice the behavior?

3. How important is the behavior to you?

A manager's behavioral score was taken as the mean rating given him by his subordinate(s) in response to the first question. A subordinate's score was obtained through computation. The procedure involved calculating the difference between the rating on what the supervisor does and what he should do, weighted by the importance rating. The calculation actually produces a measure of dissatisfaction. The logic is that, if a supervisor is not behaving as the subordinate thinks he should, the subordinate will be dissatisfied. The greater the difference between does and should, the greater the dissatisfaction. Therefore, higher scores will indicate greater dissatisfaction and lower scores will denote greater satisfaction.

\(^5\)Porter, \textit{op. cit.}
Porter claims that this method of measuring satisfaction should reduce the possibility of distorting the measure through response set. He explains, "it is more difficult, although by no means impossible, for the respondent to manipulate his satisfaction measure to conform to what he thinks he ought to put down versus what he actually feels to be the real situation." The method, therefore, seemed quite appropriate to this particular investigation.

The instrument was developed according to the same procedures employed in developing the managerial philosophy questionnaire. However, because each statement in this questionnaire requires three separate responses, it was not possible to use the item selection technique employed in developing the other instrument. In choosing statements, therefore, it was necessary to rely more heavily upon personal judgement and the evaluation of colleagues in the fields of management and librarianship.

In generating items for the scale, maximum effort was directed toward selecting situations which would clearly reflect whether or not a manager was following Human Resource principles. The statements were designed to allow employees to indicate whether their supervisors provided opportunities and encouragement for them to develop objectives, design means, settle major problems, and share in deciding important issues within their departments. Subordinates
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were also asked if their supervisors inspired them to provide input into broad organizational affairs such as goal and policy formulation. Statements concerning whether or not managers attempted to furnish employees with essential resources and information were also included in the questionnaire.

With those objectives in mind the investigator collected 22 statements which seemed suitable for inclusion in the questionnaire. The length of this instrument was particularly important because each statement required three responses. After experimenting with format it was decided that no more than 16 items should be included on the final questionnaire. The 22 original statements were, therefore, presented to colleagues for evaluation. Sixteen items were selected on the basis of these evaluations and administered to the pilot group. Analysis of the pilot responses indicated that one statement was often reported irrelevant. The item was, therefore, eliminated so that 15 statements were included on the final questionnaire.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects chosen for this study were library managers in college and university libraries. This group was selected for two reasons. First, library managers and librarians have, in recent years, demonstrated substantial interest in many of the issues related to this investigation. Participative management, organizational renewal, job improvement, and management development are frequently discussed in current library literature. The library
profession seems highly concerned about improving library effectiveness through better management. There is, however, very limited research being conducted within these areas. This study will provide more factual evidence upon which to base decisions regarding these issues.

The second reason for selecting library managers as subjects relates to the investigator's background and interest. While the research should improve the understanding of management in general, it will have a direct impact upon library science, which is one of the researcher's specializations. The researcher is, in fact, presently employed as a professor of library science. Thus, the study ought to contribute both to management thought and to librarianship.

**Primary Subject Group.**

The nature of this research called for two groups of subjects: library managers and their immediate subordinates. Library managers are designated as the primary group and consist of top management executives in line positions within libraries. Top management is here defined as directors and associate or assistant directors. A line position, as used in this study, is limited to positions directly involved in processing material or serving patrons. In libraries line positions are generally called technical service and public service functions. Staff positions responsible for personnel, planning, or other support type activities are explicitly excluded from this study.
The objective in restricting subject selection in this fashion was to control for extraneous variables. By utilizing only top level line managers and their subordinates a more homogeneous sample was obtained. This reduces the likelihood of variations caused by work environment or techniques. It is, of course, impossible to completely control these factors in a survey of this sort; however, partial control is achieved through homogeneous grouping. Homogeneity was also enhanced through the choice of secondary subjects and in the selection of libraries.

Secondary Subjects Group.

The research design required that the secondary group be made up of immediate subordinates of the first group. The following procedure was employed in selecting subjects. Each library director was sent a managerial philosophy questionnaire and a form asking that the director list by name and position all members of his professional staff who report directly to him (Appendix C). If there were any positions with a rank of associate or assistant director on the list, managerial philosophy questionnaires were sent to them, along with a form for listing names and positions of their subordinates. Subordinates were then chosen from each list supplied by top managers.

In order to achieve homogeneity and a balanced rating for each manager, the following guidelines were applied in selecting subordinate subjects. If a library was divided into two divisions with each division being headed by a person with a rank of department
head, behavioral questionnaires were sent to each of them (Appendix D). If a library was divided into two main divisions, then further divided into departments with an associate or assistant director in charge of the divisions and department heads in charge of departments, behavioral questionnaires were sent to these department heads.

The following priority was followed in selecting department heads within each division. In a technical service division, questionnaires were sent first to the head of acquisitions, second to the head of cataloging, and third to the head of serials. In a public service division questionnaires were sent first to the head of circulation, then to the head of reference. If reference services were divided by subject with several departments, questionnaires were sent first to the head of humanities, second to the head of social sciences, then to the head of physical sciences, and fourth to the head of government documents.

This selection process resulted in one unavoidable problem. There were some cases in which it was not possible to obtain any behavioral rating on a library director. In situations where a director's immediate subordinates were associate or assistant directors and department heads reported to these associate/assistant directors, the associate/assistant was given only the philosophy questionnaire. Consequently, there was no one to rate the director's behavior.

In all cases from two to four behavior questionnaires were sent for each manager being studied. The priorities were used for situations in which a position was vacant or not clearly designated
as a department. When more than one rating was received for a manager, the results were pooled and the mean score was used in the analysis. All questionnaires were given a numerical code which made it possible to match behavioral ratings with a specific manager's philosophy score.

Selection of Libraries.

Libraries were selected on the basis of university membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In order to achieve an adequate and more uniform sample only those colleges and universities with an enrollment of 5,000 or more as reported in the 1972/73 Proceedings of the association were included in the study. In an effort to attain further homogeneity, branch and departmental libraries such as law and medicine were excluded. Seventy-two schools met these criteria. Two of the libraries, however, lacked either a permanent or an acting director. Therefore, a total of 70 libraries were eligible for inclusion in the study. Because the number was relatively small, all of the libraries were included in the investigation.

Gathering the Data

A total of 70 managerial philosophy questionnaires were mailed to the directors of libraries within the study group. Thirty-seven questionnaires were returned. A follow-up letter was sent to each
director who had not replied. This produced eighteen additional responses for a total of 55. The rate of return from directors, therefore, was 78.6 per cent. Seven of the directors declined to respond and two questionnaires were unusable. Lack of time was the reason most frequently cited for declining to respond.

Managerial philosophy questionnaires were also sent to 41 associate/assistant directors. Thirty-two usable responses were returned for a rate of 78.0 per cent. Attempts to elicit further response were ineffective. A total of 78 managerial philosophy responses was, therefore, analyzed.

Supervisory behavior questionnaires were mailed to 167 immediate subordinates of directors and associate/assistant directors who responded to the managerial philosophy questionnaire. One hundred-twelve of these subordinates responded to the initial mailing. A follow-up letter resulted in 22 additional returns for a total of 134. This is a response rate of 80.2 per cent. Thirteen of the returns were not usable. Therefore, 121 supervisory behavior questionnaires were analyzed.

**Summary**

In order to determine whether managers' philosophy of management tends to affect their behavior and their subordinates' job satisfaction, a group of library managers and their immediate subordinates was surveyed. A philosophy index was developed and administered to the managers. Their subordinates were then queried on a second instrument to obtain a measure of the managers' behavior
and a measure of the subordinates' satisfaction with their job. The processes and procedures employed in selecting subjects, developing the instruments, and collecting the data have been explained in this chapter. In the following chapter results of the data analysis are presented.
Thus far, the emphasis in this study has been focused on defining a problem and presenting a means of investigating that problem. In this chapter attention is shifted to the analysis of data gathered in the investigation. The material will be presented in two parts. First, the data will be studied to determine what relationships, if any, exist between library managers' philosophy of management and the manner in which these managers perform their managerial roles. In this section the data are also examined to ascertain whether or not any relationship exists between library managers' philosophy of management and their subordinates' job satisfaction. The second part of this chapter contains an analysis of the impact of various demographic and organizational factors upon managerial philosophy, managerial behavior, and employee job satisfaction. This part of the study will be largely exploratory.

**Relationship Between Managers' Philosophy, Managers' Behavior, and Subordinates' Job Satisfaction**

Two hypotheses have been submitted regarding the variables under consideration. The first hypothesis states that there is a direct and positive relationship between managers' self-expressed philosophy of management and the behavioral ratings given them by their
subordinates. Similarly, the second hypothesis postulates a direct and positive relationship between managers' self-expressed philosophy of management and the extent of job satisfaction expressed by their subordinates.

In order to test these hypotheses, a group of managers was asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire designed to measure their Human Resource philosophy of management. Their subordinates were then asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire constructed to measure the managers' Human Resource behavior and the subordinates' job satisfaction. These data have been correlated using product moment correlation methods. A significance level of .05 was selected for testing the significance of the correlation. The results appear below.

Results

Seventy-eight managers and 121 subordinates returned usable questionnaires. Three sets of scores were computed on the basis of the responses to the questionnaire. A respondent's philosophy score was obtained by summing his weighted responses and dividing by the number of responses. If more than three items were not answered, the questionnaire was discarded. The maximum possible score is five.

Behavioral scores were derived in the same fashion. The scale, however, permits a maximum score of seven. Satisfaction scores were computed on the basis of three responses. The result is actually a
measure of dissatisfaction; a score of zero being no dissatisfaction. Lower scores, therefore, indicate greater satisfaction.

In calculating a correlation coefficient, each manager's philosophy score was paired with the behavioral score and the satisfaction scores obtained from his subordinates. Descriptive statistics for these variables are presented in Appendix E. In several instances no response was received from a manager's subordinates. Therefore, the number of pairs of scores used in the correlation is 56.

Three correlation coefficients were calculated from the scores. The principal interest in this study is, of course, the relationship between philosophy and the two other variables. It was predicted that philosophy would be directly related to behavior and satisfaction. According to the research design explained in Chapter III, there should be a positive correlation between the philosophy scores and the behavior scores. The correlation between philosophy scores and satisfaction scores, on the other hand, should be negative since low satisfaction scores indicate greater satisfaction. The coefficients are given in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

**SUMMARY OF INTERCORRELATIONS**

\(N = 56\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>(-.24)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-.77^*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level
The results, as indicated in Table 1, reveal two points. First, it appears from the correlations that behavior and satisfaction are not significantly related to philosophy. Neither of the correlations are significant at the required .05 level. It must, therefore, be concluded that the low correlations of -.24 for behavior and .18 for satisfaction are probably the result of chance. A second point revealed by the coefficients is that neither of the correlations is in the predicted direction.

The correlation between philosophy scores and behavior scores is negative. This means that managers who scored high on Human Resource philosophy were rated low on Human Resource behavior. That is, the more a manager believed in and valued active subordinate involvement in organizational affairs the more he tended to restrict such involvement. The positive correlation between philosophy scores and satisfaction scores implies that subordinates' job satisfaction decreased as their supervisors' Human Resource philosophy increased. Both of these outcomes are, of course, inconsistent with the theory expounded in the first part of this study.

In an effort to gain further insight into the various relationships among these three variables additional analysis was undertaken. In their review of research into employee job satisfaction both Herzberg\(^1\) and Vroom\(^2\) show a number of instances in which satisfaction

---


was found to be related to supervisory behavior. With this in mind, a correlation was computed for managers' behavior and subordinates' satisfaction. As shown in Table 1, the resultant coefficient was found to be -.77, significant at the .001 level.

Upon discovering this relationship it then occurred to the researcher that the inverse relationship between philosophy and satisfaction might have been influenced by the behavioral factor. To test this theory a partial correlation was computed for philosophy and satisfaction, controlling for behavior. This produced a correlation of -.02, which was in the right direction but not significant at the .05 level. It may be concluded, therefore, that there is little or no relationship between these managers' philosophy and their subordinates' job satisfaction.

It should perhaps be mentioned that while both the behavior scores and the satisfaction scores were obtained through the same instrument these two scores are not of necessity related. It is possible to derive negative as well as zero correlations from the responses to the questionnaire. Moreover, the subjects were not aware of the precise nature of the scale. The instrument, therefore, can measure each variable independently.

Factors Which May Have Influenced the Results.

It appears from the initial results that the two hypotheses must be rejected in favor of the null hypothesis of no relationship between management philosophy and the two other variables. Before rejecting the hypotheses, however, several factors should be examined to determine whether they may have influenced the results. As mentioned
earlier, survey research is vulnerable to various types of errors, especially those resulting from nonresponse. Another potential weakness in the research design used in this study is the possibility of a halo effect. Finally, the results are accurate only if the instruments used to gather the data are valid and reliable. Each of these factors is discussed below.

Nonresponse

The most serious limitation to survey research is lack of response. In this study considerable effort was made to obtain as large a response as possible. As mentioned in Chapter III, the rate of return for managers was 78 per cent. Eighty per cent of the subordinates returned their questionnaires. According to Erdos, an 80 per cent response is generally satisfactory.\(^3\) Even with a high rate of return, however, there is still a possibility of nonresponse bias. As a further check, therefore, any questionnaires which were returned unanswered were examined to determine the reason for declining to answer the questionnaire.

Eight managers returned unanswered questionnaires. Four of these managers gave lack of time and/or unstable conditions within their libraries as the reason for not participating in the study. In three instances the questionnaire was found to be confusing or difficult to answer. The eighth questionnaire was returned because the library had no director at the time.

Only four subordinates returned incomplete questionnaires with an explanation. Two of them gave lack of time as the reason for not completing the questionnaire. In one case the subject considered the questionnaire an invasion of privacy. The fourth subordinate felt that she had not been in her position long enough to give an accurate response.

It appears from these explanations that lack of time was a principal reason for not completing the questionnaires. If this was also the major reason for nonresponse then the results would probably not differ appreciably. There is, of course, no way of knowing why 20 to 23 per cent did not respond. On the basis of the explanations given above, however, it is probably safe to assume that a higher rate of return would not alter the results substantially.

Halo Effect

A second potentially confounding factor in the research design relates to the method of measuring managers' behavior. Subordinate rating of supervisor's behavior was selected as the best means of measuring managers' behavior because it was judged that subordinates would provide the most accurate assessment of specific practices. This approach allows for the intrusion of a halo effect in the ratings. A halo effect is defined by Kerlinger as "... the tendency to rate an object in the constant direction of a general impression of the object."[1]

Several researchers have pointed to the potential risks of using methods which are open to a halo effect. Vroom and Mann caution researchers to be aware of its hazards. Halpin found inconsistencies in ratings provided by school superintendents' superiors as opposed to the ratings given by the superintendents' subordinates. However, he was not able to show that one was more accurate than the other.

It isn't possible to determine the extent of halo effect in this study. The only thing which can be said is that there is probably a certain degree of it present in the data. The results, therefore, are accepted with the knowledge that if there is excessive halo effect in the responses then the outcome may be biased. A final conclusion can only be reached through additional research.

The Instruments

Another factor which may have influenced the results is the instruments used in the study. In all research it is necessary that the data gathering instruments be both valid and reliable. Validity refers to whether or not an instrument measures what it is designed to measure. Goode and Hall present four approaches to validation of scales such as the ones used in this investigation. These include:


logical validation, jury opinion, known group, and independent
criterion. The questionnaires were subjected to logical validation
and a form of jury opinion in that scholars, managers, and librarians
were consulted in the construction of the instruments.

The second requirement of an acceptable instrument is reliability.
By reliability it is meant that the instrument produces consistent
results. Ferguson recommends four methods of estimating reliability.\(^8\)
The four are: test-retest, parallel-forms, split-half, and internal
consistency. In testing the reliability of the philosophy scale both
the split-half and the internal consistency methods were used. It was
not possible to apply the split-half technique to test the second
instrument because the satisfaction measurement was obtained through
computation using three separate responses. Therefore, the internal
consistency method was employed.

The split-half correlation between even and odd questions on the
philosophy scale is .65. When corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula
the correlation is .77, significant at the .01 level. While there is
no required correlation necessary for substantiating reliability, .77
would be considered adequate.

In applying the internal consistency method of testing the
reliability of the philosophy scale the procedure employed was
correlation of each item score with the mean score for the entire

\(^8\)George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and
Instrument. These correlations are presented in Table 2. The coefficients range from .34 to .62 and all of them are significant at the .01 level. On the basis of these two tests it may be concluded that the philosophy scale is reliable.

**TABLE 2**

CORRELATION OF ITEM SCORES WITH MEAN SCORE FOR ALL ITEMS ON PHILOSOPHY SCALE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level

To test the reliability of the behavior/satisfaction instrument the same internal consistency technique described above was employed. In this case, however, each item was tested on three questions: (1) to what degree does a supervisor engage in a particular behavior, (2) to what extent should he behave that way, and (3) how important is the behavior to the subordinate. Table 3 contains the three sets of correlations for each item. The scores within the three groups are somewhat variable. However, they are all significant at the .01 level. Correlations range from .46 to .80 on the does measurement, .37 to .69
on the *should* scale, and .35 to .77 on the *importance* rating. While greater consistency would be more desirable, it may be deduced that the scale is reliable.

**TABLE 3**

**CORRELATION BETWEEN DOES, SHOULD, AND IMPORTANCE SCORES AND INDIVIDUAL ITEM SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Does</th>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level

**Implications.**

In view of the analysis presented above it appears that the management philosophy of those managers surveyed in this study is not related to their managerial behavior or their subordinates' job satisfaction. The correlation between the managers' philosophy and subordinates' satisfaction was quite low at .18. When the behavioral variable was partialed out this correlation was further reduced to -.02.
It isn't possible to evaluate this outcome in terms of other empirical research because no evidence of any similar studies has been found. On the basis of these findings, however, the theory that management philosophy has a direct impact upon subordinate satisfaction is certainly questionable. It may be that subordinates are concerned about their managers' attitudes and values regarding their role in the organization. In this study, however, they were effected more by the actual behavior of their supervisors then by the philosophy of these supervisors.

The results of the philosophy/behavior correlation also pose questions regarding the theory that philosophy has a direct impact upon behavior. A correlation of -.24 was not significant at the .05 level. It indicates that the relationship is negative but probably the result of chance. This outcome is, of course, contrary to the theory presented in Chapters I and II. In this case, however, there is some evidence which supports a counter theory. Several researchers have found inconsistencies in the theory that philosophy influences behavior directly. There are also indications that the relationship between the two variables may be negative.

Likert, for example, has documented cases in which managers responded one way when asked to describe their preferred approach to management, but another way when describing their actual approach. In studying managers' attitudes toward different approaches, he found, "... there is a large discrepancy between the management system those managers see their companies using and the management
system they would like their companies to use. Likert concludes that many managers do not follow a System IV or Human Resource approach because they do not fully understand it.

A similar view is presented by Miles. He has discovered that managers often respond in favor of participative management, but do not believe that subordinates have the ability or initiative to participate effectively. He concludes that these managers are expressing inconsistent ideologies.

From another perspective Halpin has found that school superintendents scored higher on ideal leader behavior than on actual behavior. Regardless of whether their behavior was reported by the superintendents themselves, members of their school board, or subordinate staff, behavioral scores were lower than the superintendents ideal scores. In correlations between ideal and real behavior, Halpin obtained mixed results. He reports comparisons between educational administrators and aircraft commanders in which half the correlations were significant and half were not significant. He concludes that ideals are objectives which may be difficult to attain.

Additional support for the lack of association between managers' philosophy and behavior is provided by research relating to attitude-behavior consistency. There are a number of studies which demonstrate that behavior often deviates considerably from expressed attitudes.

---


Kiesler and his associates present evidence on both sides of the issue.\(^{12}\) They maintain that the question is not whether behavior will be consistent with attitudes, but under what conditions are they consistent.

In summarizing this portion of the analysis two points must be emphasized. First, the data indicate that, for these managers, philosophy is not directly related to their behavior or their subordinates' job satisfaction. While there are certain limitations inherent in the research design, considerable effort was made to minimize these limitations. The second point is that the research also indicates that managers' philosophy is no simple phenomenon. It is likely that a person's philosophy affects his behavior in some way. However, considerable research will be required before the precise nature of the relationship is fully understood.

**Demographic and Organizational Factors Related to Philosophy, Behavior, and Satisfaction**

The research was designed with the objective of controlling as many extraneous variables as possible. However, in survey research of this type only a limited number of variables can be effectively controlled. Therefore, additional analysis was undertaken in order to determine whether or not demographic or organizational factors might tend to influence managers' philosophy, managers' behavior, or subordinates' job satisfaction. Eight factors which have been found to affect attitudes and behavior in various ways were selected.

for study. The eight elements include: age, work experience, tenure in present position, size of organization, sex, education, position, and professional orientation.

Consideration was given to formulating hypotheses regarding the manner in which these factors might effect the three variables under consideration. However, an examination of the literature revealed that factors such as age, sex, experience, and position often influenced attitudes and behavior in unpredicted ways. In an extensive review of research involving the relationship between organizational structure, job attitudes, and job behavior, Porter and Lawler found considerable variation in the relationships. Similarly, in studies of managers' philosophies, Yoder found no consistent pattern of relationship between managers' philosophy and various demographic and organizational factors. On the basis of these results, therefore, no hypotheses were advanced.

There are several approaches which could be used to test whether or not philosophy, behavior, or satisfaction are appreciably affected by the factors named above. Analysis of variance, the difference between means, and correlation techniques could all be employed to determine whether different groups score differently on the three variables. Product moment correlation, however, can provide the information without having to categorize the data into


arbitrary groupings. For example, correlation can indicate whether managers' philosophy tends to vary with age, even when using raw data for age. This capacity was considered important in this study because there was no sound basis for grouping subjects by several of the factors under consideration. For this reason, product moment correlation was selected for analyzing the relationships in this part of the study.

**Managers' Philosophy.**

As mentioned earlier, philosophy scores were available for 78 managers. Descriptive data on the demographic and organizational factors for these managers appear in Table 4. Of the eight factors studied, sex and age require little explanation. Sex was examined to determine whether any differences in philosophy, behavior, or satisfaction might result from differences in sex. The age factor was included to ascertain whether younger subjects differ from older ones.

Work experience, in this investigation, refers to total years of professional library experience. Similarly, tenure relates to number of years in present position. Size of organization consists of the size of the total institution, as measured by student enrollment.

Education was analyzed in terms of subjects' advanced degrees. Responses indicated that all of the subjects possessed the masters degree or equivalent. In addition, some subjects held degrees beyond the masters. These include a second masters, a sixth year certificate, or the doctorate. In studying this factor, therefore, subjects were
TABLE 4

DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR MANAGERS COMPLETING PHILOSOPHY QUESTIONNAIRE (N = 78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (000)</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male---------</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Director</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female-------</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Master only</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>More than Master</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categorized into two groups to determine whether more education influenced philosophy, behavior, or satisfaction. One group consists of librarians with only the masters degree. The second group is made up of subjects who have earned more than the masters degree.

Position, in this study, relates to the specific post held by a subject. Two levels of managerial positions were included in the study, (1) directors and, (2) associate or assistant directors. Analysis was undertaken to ascertain whether level of position affected the three primary variables.

The last factor is called professional orientation. In an effort to determine if a broad interest in professional issues tended to influence philosophy, behavior, or satisfaction, subjects were asked to list the professional organizations to which they belong. Responses indicated that some subjects joined only local associations while others belonged to national organizations as well. Respondents, therefore, were divided into two groups; (1) those who belonged only to local associations, and (2) those who belonged to national associations.

Each of the above factors was correlated with the three variables of interest in order to discover if any significant relationships existed. The correlation coefficients for managers' philosophy are presented in Table 5.

The first impression created by the grouping of coefficients is that demographic and organizational factors have very little impact upon these managers' Human Resource philosophy. The only factors
TABLE 5
CORRELATION BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS (N = 78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Experience</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Orientation</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which show a significant relationship are library experience and age. The correlations are negative which means that as age and experience increase, managers' Human Resource philosophy scores decrease. Another way of viewing the correlations is that younger and less experienced managers are more Human Resource oriented than older managers and managers with more experience.

It isn't possible to determine from this study why younger and less experienced managers are more Human Resource oriented. There are, however, a number of reasons why this might be so. It may be that younger managers have received more exposure to Human Resource concepts in their studies. Another possible explanation is that less experienced managers may be more idealistic than managers who have faced difficulties on the job. It is also conceivable that these two factors are themselves interrelated in such a way that the correlation of one with philosophy is producing the correlation of
TABLE 6
DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR MANAGERS RECEIVING BEHAVIORAL RATINGS
(N = 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>45.17</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (000)</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male---------</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Director</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female-------</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Master only-----</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>More than Master</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the other. Any of these conditions could account for the higher Human Resource philosophical orientation of these managers. Clearly, more research is needed into this issue.

**Managers' Behavior.**

Behavioral ratings were obtained for 56 library directors or associate/assistant directors. Table 6 contains descriptive data regarding these managers. As in the case of manager philosophy, correlations were computed for the eight factors and managers' behavioral ratings. The results are shown in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Experience</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Orientation</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations indicate that there are no significant relationships between managers' behavior and any of the factors under consideration. It may, therefore, be concluded that none of the factors had any appreciable influence upon the managerial behavior of the library managers studied in this investigation.
## TABLE 8

DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR SUBORDINATES COMPLETING SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
\[(N = 121)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (000)</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Processing------</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Male-------------------</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services------------</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female-----------------</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local----------------------</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Master only------------</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National-------------------</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>More than Master------</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Subordinates' Job Satisfaction.

The same eight factors were examined for influence upon subordinates' job satisfaction. The positional category, however, is somewhat different for subordinates. All of the subordinates work at essentially the same organizational level. However, subjects were drawn from two different departments which have considerably different work requirements. In terms of position, therefore, subordinate job satisfaction was analyzed to ascertain whether librarians working in technical processing operations were more or less satisfied than librarians performing public service functions.

One hundred twenty-one subordinate questionnaires were analyzed. Descriptive data for these subjects are presented in Table 8. Correlation coefficients for satisfaction and the eight factors are given in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Orientation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
CORRELATION BETWEEN SATISFACTION AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS
(N = 121)
Here again, most of the correlations are quite low. Two of them, however, are significant at the .05 level. These are position and size of organization. The fact that position is negatively correlated with satisfaction means that the librarians in this study who work in public service positions are significantly more satisfied with their job than the librarians in technical service positions. As mentioned previously, it is not the intent of this study to determine how or why these factors affect satisfaction, but rather to explore certain relationships as a basis for further study. In discovering this relationship, however, a review was made of the literature to ascertain whether any previous research reported similar results. No relevant findings were located. The conclusion, therefore, is that further research should be directed toward determining if, indeed, librarians in public service positions are generally more satisfied with their job than librarians working in technical processing positions.

Considering the relationship between size of organization and job satisfaction, the negative correlation indicates that as the organizations increase in size, dissatisfaction decreases. Stated positively it means that satisfaction is greater in larger organizations. This result corresponds with findings of Mary D. Herrick in which more librarians working in universities and large colleges expressed satisfaction than librarians working in small colleges.15

---

The result also corresponds with conclusions reached by Porter and Lawler in which managers at upper-middle levels were more satisfied if working in large organizations. These librarians were in department head positions which consisted of middle management levels. A possible reason for such an outcome is that larger organizations may provide more or better perquisites than smaller institutions. It may also be that large organizations furnish greater status value. Further research into these questions could prove profitable.

Summary

In this chapter, data collected from a group of library managers and their subordinates were examined to determine whether or not these managers' philosophy tended to influence their behavior or their subordinates' job satisfaction. It was found that neither the behavior of the library managers nor the job satisfaction of their subordinates were directly related to the management philosophy of the managers.

Further analysis to ascertain whether or not selected demographic and organizational factors were related to managers' philosophy, managers' behavior, or subordinates' job satisfaction produced several associations. The analysis revealed that younger managers and managers with less experience scored higher on Human Resource philosophy than older managers and more experienced managers. A second discovery was that none of the demographic or organizational factors were related to

---

\[16\] Porter, op. cit., p. 41.
managers' behavior. Finally, the data indicated that librarians in public service positions were more satisfied with their jobs than librarians in technical processing positions. Also, librarians in larger organizations were more satisfied than those in smaller institutions.

In closing it should be recalled that in Chapter II the point was made that three studies using Likert's Profile of Organizational Characteristics each discovered that library managers generally employed a System III approach to management. A System III style is basically a consultative rather than participative type of management. As Miles points out, it is analogous to a Human Relations approach.

According to the Profile, a System III manager has substantial, but not complete trust in his subordinates. He uses some employee involvement as a means of motivating workers. He consults with subordinates about decisions, but his subordinates have only limited


20Likert, op. cit.

influence in the decision process. Furthermore, in a System III situation, goals are established and control exercised primarily at upper levels rather than throughout the organization.

In this study, similar results were obtained. The managers in this investigation received a mean philosophy score of 3.80 out of a possible 5.00 and a mean behavior score of 5.36 out of a possible 7.00 (Appendix E). This suggests that the managers are generally Human Relations oriented. They demonstrated some confidence in their subordinates, but did not fully believe in them. In addition, they provided only limited opportunities and encouragement for subordinates to develop objectives and participate in decision making. In general, therefore, the results of this research coincide with the discoveries of the other three studies.

Further implications of these findings will be considered in the next chapter. In Chapter V, conclusions and recommendations will also be presented.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Management scholars have for many years urged managers to develop a philosophy of management as a guide to their behavior and as a means of enhancing employee job satisfaction. Yet, little is known of the actual relationships among these variables. Generally the advice is based upon assumptions rather than upon empirical evidence. There are some research efforts which have studied manager attitudes, values, and beliefs. However, these studies usually presume that behavior is directly related to beliefs and attitudes. The same is true of employee satisfaction research. Little effort is made to ascertain whether or not these variables are directly related.

In recent years these presumptions have come under question. Dale Yoder has found that managers are not always consistent in their attitudes and theories regarding management practices. He observes that, "... individual managers often take positions that are not internally consistent." Similar results were discovered by Roberts, Miles, and Blankenship. They conclude from their study

that, "leadership attitudes are clearly not as closely related to leadership behavior, (employee) satisfaction, and performance as these three variables are to each other."\(^2\)

These apparent contradictions to the general view of the philosophy/behavioral satisfaction relationships suggested a need for further study. This investigation, therefore, was formulated and designed to examine the relationships more closely. The specific objective established was to determine whether or not a group of managers' philosophy of management was directly related to their managerial behavior and their subordinates' job satisfaction.

A literature review provided a foundation for an empirical analysis. The review disclosed that three philosophies have dominated management thought in this century. They are called Classical Management, Human Relations Management, and Human Resource Management. Each of the philosophies employs a normative approach and, consequently, prescribes definite behavioral patterns. The view which each philosophy has toward employees also suggests different effects upon employee satisfaction. In conducting the empirical analysis, therefore, it was necessary to select one philosophy and analyze the three variables on the basis of this philosophy. The Human Resource philosophy was chosen for two reasons. First, research evidence indicates that it is the most effective approach

---

to management. The second reason for using the Human Resource philosophy is that this approach to management seems to be attracting more followers, especially among library managers, the subjects of the empirical analysis.

The empirical analysis consisted of an assessment of a group of library managers' philosophy and behavior, and their subordinates' job satisfaction. The data were obtained through a mail survey using self-administered paper and pencil instruments. Scores on the three variables were then correlated to determine relationships. Data on selected demographic and organizational factors were also acquired and analyzed for possible relationships with the three major variables. The results of the analysis are discussed in the concluding section.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from the study. In presenting the conclusion, discussion is organized into two sections. First, attention is directed toward the three major variables; managers' philosophy, managers' behavior, and employees' job satisfaction. The discussion is then shifted to consideration of conclusions related to the demographic and organizational factors.

Conclusions Relevant to Philosophy and Behavior.

The results of the empirical analysis reveal that, for this group of library managers, there is little or no relationship between their management philosophy and their managerial behavior. The correlation between the variables is low and negative, but not
statistically significant. The hypothesis of a direct, positive relationship was, therefore, rejected in favor of the null hypothesis of no relationship.

This outcome, of course, conflicts with the general view presented in management literature. However, it does agree with the findings of Yoder\(^3\) and Roberts and her associates.\(^4\) The results also coincide with observations of Halpin and Likert.

In a study of school superintendents Halpin found that these administrators' actual behavior differed from their concept of ideal behavior. He concludes that, "evidence from this inquiry and findings from an earlier Air Force study show that the leader's description of his own leadership behavior and his concept of what his behavior should be have little relationship to others' perception of his behavior."\(^5\) A similar conclusion is expressed by Likert. In discussing his studies of managerial attitudes he notes, "their actual behavior, in some instances, may not be fully in accord with the point of view they express."\(^6\) In each of these cases managers are behaving contrary to their philosophy. Correlations between the two variables would, therefore, be negative or insignificant.

\(^3\)Yoder, op. cit.
\(^4\)Roberts, op. cit.
Further indications of inconsistency between philosophy and behavior may be found in attitude studies. It is generally accepted in attitude theory that inconsistencies exist between the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of attitudes. Kiesler summarizes several studies which report inconsistencies between cognitive and behavioral elements of attitudes.\textsuperscript{7}

It is not clear why managers, as well as others, behave contrary to their expressed views of proper or appropriate behavior. As mentioned previously, management theorists have made only limited effort to study this issue. Attitude theorists, on the other hand, have directed substantial attention toward such studies. However, they have not been very successful in isolating specific reasons for the discrepancies. The following comments are, therefore, offered as possible explanations for inconsistency between managers' philosophy and behavior.

1. Managers may be unable to behave according to their philosophical convictions. Situational factors may prevent them from following certain practices. Contingency theory as well as attitude theory suggest that various external forces can impede a manager from employing certain procedures. Lack of resources, insufficient time, and inadequate control over various factors all limit the extent to which a manager is able to behave as he would like.

2. Managers may not behave according to their philosophy because they don't know how. Beckhard illustrates cases in which

managers are willing to delegate more authority and allow subordinates to exercise greater control over their work, but they don't know how to go about doing it.  

3. Managers may express viewpoints without firm conviction. Under those circumstances they may not feel compelled to follow their expressed position. Sprague and Taylor contend that a person's philosophy may be explicit or implicit. An implicit philosophy is one in which little thought has been devoted to formulating the philosophy. Perhaps, in such instances a person simply expresses the conventional or popular view and is not committed to supporting the philosophy.

4. A fourth possible explanation for inconsistency between managers' philosophy and behavior is suggested by Blake and Mouton. They maintain that managers sometimes adopt a facade to mask their real intentions. According to these authors, such managers generally exhibit inconsistent managerial styles and behavior.

It isn't possible to determine from this study the extent to which any of these factors explain the low negative correlation obtained in the study. The aim of the research was not to determine

---


the causes but simply to discover if any relationship existed. The only conclusion which can be made, therefore, is that no significant relationship exists.

Conclusions Relevant to Philosophy and Satisfaction.

The results of the empirical analysis reveal a definite lack of relationship between library managers' philosophy of management and their subordinates' job satisfaction. When the effect of behavior is removed through partial correlation, the resultant correlation between philosophy and satisfaction is near zero. There is, on the other hand, a very high correlation between the managers' behavior and their subordinates' satisfaction.

The outcome is contrary to the stated hypothesis. However, the hypothesis was formulated on the basis of limited empirical evidence. No studies have been found which attempt to relate employee satisfaction directly to manager philosophy or attitudes. Likert's research indicates a relationship. However, the research does not clearly show a direct link between attitudes and satisfaction. It must be concluded, therefore, that satisfaction is more closely related to the behavior than to the philosophy of the manager.

Conclusions Relevant to Demographic and Organizational Factors.

The analysis of the effect of eight demographic factors upon manager philosophy, manager behavior, and employee satisfaction shows that such factors have only limited impact upon the three variables. It was found that the younger managers and managers with less
experience have a significantly higher Human Resource orientation than their counterpart. However, no relationships were found between the demographic and organizational factors and the library managers behavior.

Considering employee satisfaction, it was found that librarians working in public service positions were significantly more satisfied than librarians working in technical service positions. Also, librarians working in larger organizations were more satisfied than those in smaller institutions.

In bringing this conclusion section to a close it should be noted that the limited scope of the subject group makes it difficult to draw any firm generalizations regarding these conclusions. The empirical analysis applies to academic librarians employed in the southeastern section of this country. Caution should, therefore, be exercised in inferring that the results apply to other groups. However, it would seem reasonable to presume that the outcome would not differ greatly for other academic librarians in similar positions. Furthermore, other evidence cited suggests that the conclusions may extend to other groups outside libraries. Additional research, however, would be needed to confirm broader generalizations.

**Recommendations**

In essence, this study is basically exploratory. The recommendations, therefore, pertain to further research rather than specific action. Clearly additional research is required in order to determine if similar results apply to other managers and their subordinates. If it is found that there is a general lack of relationship or a negative
relationship between managers' philosophy and their behavior, further research should also be undertaken to discover why managers do not behave in accordance with their philosophy. Such a study should take into account situational factors which might prevent managers from following their philosophy.

It is also recommended that further study be directed toward determining what factors influence managers' philosophical development. The evidence that younger managers and less experienced managers express stronger Human Resource orientations than their counterparts calls for more analysis. Further research should be directed toward ascertaining what factors contribute toward this outcome.

A third area in which more research is recommended relates to subordinate job satisfaction. The study indicates that librarians working in public service positions are significantly more satisfied than librarians working in technical service positions. Research should be undertaken to determine if this condition is true in other types of libraries. It is also recommended that efforts be directed toward determining why one group is more satisfied than the other.

A fourth suggestion for more research involves the discovery that employees in larger organizations were more satisfied than those in smaller institutions. This finding corresponds with results obtained from studies of other types of organizations. However, it is not yet clear why larger organizations contribute to greater satisfaction. Additional research may be able to locate the source of satisfaction.
In conclusion, it is suggested that other forms of research be utilized in studying these issues. Any analysis of situational factors would require greater control over such factors. Small groups or organizational experiments should allow greater control. An interview approach would also provide more information than was possible to obtain in this study. With the foundation which this study provides, further inquiry into these issues should increase our knowledge and understanding of the forces which affect management. In this way we can improve the effectiveness of our managers and organizations.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF LIBRARIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY
Pilot Study Libraries

West Virginia University
Oklahoma State University
Marshall University
Lehigh University
Washington University
University of Arkansas
Saint Louis University
University of Dayton
University of Tulsa
Central State University of Oklahoma
Arkansas State University
University of Maryland
Towson State College
Southwest Missouri State University
Northwest Missouri State University
Southeast Missouri State University
University of Missouri at St. Louis
Central Missouri State University
University of Missouri at Kansas City
University of Oklahoma
Northeastern State College of Oklahoma
Participating Libraries

University of Alabama In Birmingham
University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa
Auburn University
University of South Alabama
Troy State University
Florida State University
Florida Technological University
University of Florida
University of South Florida
Emory University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern College
Georgia State University
University of Georgia
West Georgia College
Eastern Kentucky University
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville
Morehead State University
Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge
University of New Orleans
Louisiana Tech University
McNeese State University
Northeast Louisiana University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Mississippi State University
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi
Appalachian State University
Duke University
East Carolina University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Clemson University
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Tennessee Technological University
University of Houston
Lamar University
North Texas State University
Southern Methodist University
Southwest Texas State University
Stevens Institute of Technology
Texas A & M University
Texas Christian University
University of Texas at Arlington
Texas Tech University
Old Dominion University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
University of Virginia
APPENDIX B

STATEMENTS ADMINISTERED TO PILOT GROUP
Difference Score

2.4 Decisions are likely to be less effective if employees are allowed to share in the process.

1.4 Each employee should be allowed to participate in the setting of his own performance goals.

1.2 Employees are more effective if they are given specific instructions and close direction.

1.2 Few employees are capable of exercising creativity.

1.2 A manager should not encourage employees to question the way in which a job is done.

1.2 The potentialities of the average employee are far above what is being realized in our organizations.

1.2 Managers are responsible for employee apathy.

1.2 Managers are always better qualified to make decisions about how a job is best accomplished.

1.2 The average employee is motivated more by monetary rewards than by any other incentive.

1.0 A manager should strive to develop a continually expanding degree of employee self-direction.

1.0 Employees will be challenged if they are allowed to exercise self-control.

1.0 Conflict should not be allowed in work situations.

1.0 Managers are responsible for under-utilization of employee talent.

1.0 Managers should let employees do their work the way they think best.

1.0 Employees will be challenged if they are allowed to exercise self-direction.

1.0 Dissatisfaction, complaints and absenteeism result when workers are asked to do too much.

1.0 Avoidance of responsibility is learned through the job situation.
Authority is the most appropriate means for obtaining commitment to organizational objectives.

Employee lack of initiative results primarily from blocked opportunity.

Managers should allow employees considerable freedom in their work.

There is no need for a manager to explain his actions to his employees.

Participation in decision making should depend upon position.

Managers should permit employees to use their own judgement in solving problems.

Employees should not be allowed to alter their jobs.

Few employees are qualified to improve their jobs.

Decisions would be likely to decline in quality if employees were allowed greater participation in decision making.

Employees should be allowed to participate only in minor decisions related to their jobs.

A manager should encourage employees to develop self-control.

Employees would exercise more initiative if given the opportunity.

Allowing employees greater discretion is too costly.

A manager should be willing to accept changes suggested by employees.

Employees will be more satisfied if they have an opportunity to more fully utilize their talents.

A manager should attempt to create an environment that challenges employees to contribute to the full extent of their abilities.

A manager is boss and should rule with an iron hand.

Most employees lack the imagination to improve their jobs.
Managers should continuously encourage employees to develop and utilize their talents.

A manager loses control if he asks employees for advice.

Persuasion is an ineffective means for obtaining commitment to organizational objectives.

It isn't important that an employee understand the reasons behind a manager's decision.

A manager should be willing to accept procedural changes made by employees.

Employees could increase their contribution by increasing their ability.

Allowing employees to have a say in decisions only results in disagreement.

Managers should allow employees greater participation because it would make their job easier.

A manager who demonstrates concern for his subordinates is soft.

Most employees lack the initiative to contribute effectively in improving their jobs.

If a person is satisfied with his work he will generally be more productive.

A manager should specify exactly how a job should be done.

A manager does not have enough time to see that employees develop and expand their abilities.

Employees should be allowed to modify the techniques and procedures required in their jobs.

If a person is able to attain high productivity, he is likely to be more satisfied with his job.

Managers should assist employees in improving their work.

Managers should devote greater effort to discovering how to utilize employee potentialities.

Employees should not be allowed to participate in important decisions.
Managers should establish a system of communication which would enable employees to contribute to the planning process.

Most employees are only interested in putting in their time and collecting their pay check.

Managers should design work so as to permit employees to utilize their full potential.
APPENDIX C

PHILOSOPHY QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear

I am engaged in a study of management philosophies and practices of library administrators. The study also examines job satisfaction of librarians in various professional positions. As a library manager you, no doubt, recognize the significance of these issues and appreciate the need to expand our understanding of them.

Will you, therefore, please participate in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and giving me permission to query members of your professional staff? I assure you all responses will be kept in the strictest confidence. No individual replies will be released to anyone.

It should take less than fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire. An immediate response would be greatly appreciated. A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Should the envelope be misplaced, your reply may be returned to:

P. Grady Morein,
Associate Professor
Box 19374
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Please feel free to include observations or make comments regarding any part of the questionnaire. I will be most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

P. Grady Morein
1. Please give the full title of your present position?

2. How long have you had your present position?

3. How long have you been involved in library work at a professional level?

4. What is the date of your birth?

5. Are you? ______ Male ______ Female

6. Please list all degrees you have earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what professional organizations do you belong? (e.g. A. L. A., State or regional library association, A. A. U. P., American Historical Association, etc.)
The following list of statements reflect differing points of view regarding the role or function of managers and employees in an organization. Please indicate what YOU think about each statement. This is not a test. No particular response is either right or wrong. Your first impression will probably be the best.

Record your reaction to each item by drawing a circle around the symbol which best expresses your position. Use these alternatives:

SA - Strongly Agree  
A - Agree  
U - Undecided  
D - Disagree  
SD - Strongly Disagree

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 1. MANAGERS SHOULD PERMIT EMPLOYEES TO USE THEIR OWN JUDGEMENT IN SOLVING PROBLEMS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 2. EMPLOYEES WILL BE CHALLENGED IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXERCISE SELF-CONTROL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 3. EMPLOYEES ARE MORE EFFECTIVE IF THEY ARE GIVEN SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS AND CLOSE DIRECTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 4. EACH EMPLOYEE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SETTING OF HIS OWN PERFORMANCE GOALS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 5. A MANAGER SHOULD NOT ENCOURAGE EMPLOYEES TO QUESTION THE WAY IN WHICH A JOB OUGHT TO BE DONE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 6. AVOIDANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY IS LEARNED THROUGH THE JOB SITUATION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 7. MANAGERS SHOULD LET EMPLOYEES DO THEIR WORK THE WAY THEY THINK BEST.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 8. EMPLOYEE LACK OF INITIATIVE RESULTS PRIMARILY FROM BLOCKED OPPORTUNITY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 9. EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO ALTER THEIR JOBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 10. AUTHORITY IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE MEANS FOR OBTAINING COMMITMENT TO ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 11. MANAGERS SHOULD ALLOW EMPLOYEES CONSIDERABLE FREEDOM IN THEIR WORK.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 12. PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING SHOULD DEPEND UPON POSITION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 13. MANAGERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR EMPLOYEE APATHY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 14. MANAGERS ARE ALWAYS BETTER QUALIFIED TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT HOW A JOB IS BEST ACCOMPLISHED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 15. DECISIONS WOULD BE LIKELY TO DECLINE IN QUALITY IF EMPLOYEES WERE ALLOWED GREATER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 16. FEW EMPLOYEES ARE QUALIFIED TO IMPROVE THEIR JOBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 17. A MANAGER SHOULD STRIVE TO DEVELOP A CONTINUALLY EXPANDING DEGREE OF EMPLOYEE SELF-DIRECTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 18. THE POTENTIALITIES OF THE AVERAGE EMPLOYEE ARE FAR ABOVE WHAT IS BEING REALIZED IN OUR ORGANIZATIONS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 19. A MANAGER SHOULD SPECIFY EXACTLY HOW A JOB SHOULD BE DONE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD 20. FEW EMPLOYEES ARE CAPABLE OF EXERCISING CREATIVITY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I hereby grant P. Grady Morein permission to query members of the professional staff of this library in matters related to his study of management philosophies and job satisfaction.

Signed ______________________________ Date ____________________

Position _____________________________________________________

Library _______________________________________________________

Please list by name and position members of your professional staff who report directly to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please use additional sheets if necessary)
Letter to Librarians

Dear

I am engaged in a study of management philosophies and practices of library administrators. The study also examines job satisfaction of librarians in various professional positions. As a library manager you, no doubt, recognize the significance of these issues and appreciate the need to expand our understanding of them.

Will you, therefore, please participate in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me as soon as possible? The research has been explained to your library director. He has given permission to query members of the professional staff. I assure you all responses will be kept in the strictest confidence. No individual replies will be released to anyone.

It should take less than fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire. An immediate response would be greatly appreciated. A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Should the envelope be misplaced, your reply may be returned to:

P. Grady Morein,  
Associate Professor  
Box 19374  
North Carolina Central University  
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Please feel free to include observations or make comments regarding any part of the questionnaire. I will be most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

P. Grady Morein
1. Please give the full title of your present position?

______________________________________________________________

2. How long have you had your present position? _________________

3. How long have you been involved in library work at a professional level? _____________________________________________

4. What is the position of your immediate supervisor?
   --- Director
   --- Associate or Assistant Director
   --- Other (please specify) ______________________________________

5. What is the date of your birth?_______________________________

6. Are you? _______Male  Pemale

7. Please list all degrees you have earned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. To what professional organizations do you belong? (e.g., ALA, State or regional library associations, AAUP, American Historical Association, etc.)

   ___________________________________________________________
LISTED BELOW ARE SEVERAL STATEMENTS RELATING TO SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR. CAREFULLY READ EACH STATEMENT AND RESPOND TO EACH ITEM ON THE BASIS OF:

A) TO WHAT DEGREE DOES YOUR SUPERVISOR PRESENTLY PRACTICE THIS BEHAVIOR?

B) TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK YOUR SUPERVISOR SHOULD PRACTICE THIS BEHAVIOR?

C) HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS BEHAVIOR TO YOU?

EACH RESPONSE IS TO BE MADE ON A SEVEN-POINT SCALE, WHICH WILL LOOK LIKE THIS:

(MINIMUM): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (MAXIMUM)

PLEASE PUT A MARK (X) ABOVE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE THAT REPRESENTS THE AMOUNT OF BEHAVIOR AS YOU PERCEIVE IT. LOW NUMBERS REPRESENT LOW AMOUNTS, AND HIGH NUMBERS REPRESENT HIGH AMOUNTS. FOR EACH ITEM PLACE AN (X) ABOVE ONE NUMBER ONLY.

1. MY SUPERVISOR ALLOWS ME TO MODIFY TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES IN MY JOB.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)

2. MY SUPERVISOR PERMITS ME TO ASSIST IN SELECTING PERSONNEL TO WORK UNDER ME.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)

3. MY SUPERVISOR ENCOURAGES ME TO DEVELOP AND EXPAND MY ABILITIES.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __:__ (max)
4. **MY SUPERVISOR PLACES EMPHASIS ON RESULTS AND ENCOURAGES ME TO DEVELOP THE MEANS FOR ATTAINING THEM.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

5. **MY SUPERVISOR PERMITS ME TO DECIDE IMPORTANT ISSUES RELATED TO MY JOB.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

6. **MY SUPERVISOR ENDEAVORS TO PROVIDE ME THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO IMPROVE MY WORK.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

7. **MY SUPERVISOR DEMONSTRATES A CONCERN THAT BOTH THE ORGANIZATION AND ITS MEMBERS ACHIEVE THEIR OBJECTIVES.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

8. **MY SUPERVISOR SOLICITS MY IDEAS IN DEVELOPING ORGANIZATIONAL PLANS.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

9. **MY SUPERVISOR REMOVES OBSTACLES WHICH MIGHT INTERFERE WITH MY WORK.**

   a) To what degree does he now do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   b) To what extent should he do it?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)

   c) How important is this to me?  \( (\text{min}): \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{3}{4} ; \frac{5}{6} ; \frac{7}{7} ; (\text{max}) \)
10. MY SUPERVISOR PERMITS ME TO MAKE CHANGES IN LONG-TERM POLICIES RELATED TO MY DEPARTMENT.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)

11. MY SUPERVISOR FURNISHED ME ACCESS TO INFORMATION NEEDED TO PARTICIPATE IN FORMULATING ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)

12. MY SUPERVISOR GRANTS ME AUTHORITY TO SETTLE MAJOR PROBLEMS WITHIN MY DEPARTMENT.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)

13. MY SUPERVISOR PROMPTS ME TO DEVELOP OBJECTIVES FOR MY DEPARTMENT.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)

14. MY SUPERVISOR ENCOURAGES ME TO SPEAK OUT ON ALL ISSUES AFFECTING MY WORK.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)

15. MY SUPERVISOR ACCEPTS AND IMPLEMENTS SUGGESTIONS WHICH I MAKE.
   a) To what degree does he now do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   b) To what extent should he do it? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
   c) How important is this to me? (min): \[
   \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{5}
   \](max)
APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PHILOSOPHY,
BEHAVIOR, AND SATISFACTION
MEASUREMENT
### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PHILOSOPHY MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive Statistics for Behavior Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SATISFACTION MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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