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ABSTRACT

This study examines the moderating effects of two task variables—task structure and leader discretion—on the relationship between leader self-monitoring and the organizational outcomes of subordinate satisfaction, commitment, and job performance. It was hypothesized that task structure would be a negative moderator of the leadership-organizational outcomes relationships, whereas leader discretion would be a positive moderator. That is, leader self-monitoring would be significantly correlated with measures of subordinate satisfaction, commitment, and job performance when task structure was low and leader discretion was high. Data were collected from 58 upper-middle level managers of a large chemical processing plant, their 58 immediate superiors, and the 268 subordinates of these managers. Moderated regression analysis was performed. No significant main effects nor interaction effects were found. Moderator subgroup analysis was performed as a supplemental analysis and provided modest support for the hypotheses of the study. Moderately significant correlations were obtained between leader self-monitoring and organizational outcomes for low task structure and low leader discretion subgroups. Implications of the findings for leadership research are discussed.
INTRODUCTION

There is perhaps no other area of study in the field of organizational psychology that has received as much empirical attention while resulting in so little accumulated knowledge as has leadership. Leadership's elusiveness as a scientific construct has resulted in a growing number of researchers doubting its viability as an area of empirical investigation and has left both practitioners and academicians frustrated (Greene, 1977; Miner, 1975; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977; Pfeffer, 1977). After his comprehensive review of the leadership literature, Stogdill (1974) was left to conclude that:

It is difficult to know what, if anything, has been convincingly demonstrated by replicated research. The endless accumulation of empirical data has not produced an integrated understanding of leadership (p. vii).

The quest for understanding leadership has gone from the search for traits, to the attempt to identify and classify the actual behaviors of leaders, to the more recent focus upon the "contingencies" of the leadership situation (see appendix A for a historical review of leadership as scientific construct). The scientific scrutiny of leadership in the attempt to simplify and reduce the phenomenon to its basics has added nothing to — and arguably has even hindered — our understanding of its true essence which may lie in its subtleties and nuances. As Mitroff (1978) contends, "all the important problems are ill-structured, fuzzy things that researchers have yet to identify" (p.127).
The tendency to narrowly conceptualize leadership for the sake of parsimony and to focus upon its easily measured components may have resulted in a paradigm that is too restrictive and hence, ineffectual in its attempt to predict or explain the phenomenon. Increasingly, the adequacy of even the most sophisticated contingency models is being questioned because of their poor predictive power (Bass, 1981; McCall & Lombardo, 1978). The narrow perspective of traditionally formulated models leaves open to question whether the empirical data they have amassed amount to anything more than being "the correct solution to the wrong problem" (Pondy, 1978, p. 88).

PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to help reconcile the intuitive appeal of the leadership construct with the dearth of research evidencing its great impact on organizational outcomes (Bass, 1981; Korman, 1966). For example, the average correlation between effectiveness and such leader characteristics as ability, aptitude, interests, and personality factors range from .25 to .30 (Ghiselli, 1966; Guion & Gottier, 1965; Sales, 1966; Stogdill, 1974). In sum, less than 10 percent of the variance in outcomes is accounted for by the traditional leadership paradigm (Bass, 1981, Hunt, 1984). Pfeffer (1977) cites empirical evidence to support his contention that leadership competence accounts for very little variance in organizational outcomes; that is, who occupies the leadership position is of little relevance (see also,
In spite of such disappointing evidence, the study of leadership continues because of the compelling nature of the argument that leaders do indeed matter.

The proposed research intends to shed some light on the issue of the relevance of leadership to important organizational outcomes. The contention is that leadership can significantly impact some organizational outcomes but only when certain organizational conditions are present (leader control over the leadership situation) and when the leader possesses certain skills or traits (self-monitoring).

In fulfilling the stated purpose of this research, a conceptual model is proposed which integrates two general leadership perspectives --- one old and one new. The first and more recent development in the leadership literature has a cognitive thrust and will be discussed under the rubric of attribution theory. The second perspective reflects the resurgence of interest in the old trait approach to leadership (e.g., House, 1977; Fiedler & Leister, 1977). Specifically, the role of the social psychological construct of self-monitoring in leadership effectiveness will be discussed.

**Conceptualization of Leadership**

Before unfolding the leadership model being proposed, the concept must be defined. Katz and Kahn's (1978) view of
organizational leadership as "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization" (p. 528) fits well with the model's conceptualization. Compliance as the valued organizational outcome determined by leadership is being hailed as an important new issue (Hunt & Larson, 1977; Greene, 1977). Specifically, the effective leader is able to obtain "incremental" compliance in the form of important organizational outcomes such as greater loyalty and commitment, increased cooperation, and greater satisfaction with supervision.

Unlike other traditional organizational outcomes such as group performance or productivity and job satisfaction which may be affected by variables other than leadership (Campbell, 1977), incremental compliance is a "purer" dependent variable. Greene (1977) goes so far as to assert that:

High performance on the part of the subordinate, beyond some minimally acceptable performance level, may be of little interest to the leader or organizational members including higher management. What they, or the leader specifically, may be most interested in is compliance, which may be either of a work or nonwork-related nature (p. 59).

It seems that the system is quite capable of dealing with those who perform below acceptable standards by dismissal, demotion, or retraining; therefore, minimally acceptable performance by organizational members should be a given. The value of leadership from an organizational perspective is in
evoking attitudes and behaviors that cannot be mandated (viz., loyalty, commitment, cooperation, and satisfaction).

**Attribution Theory**

Numerous studies (Ilgen & Fuji, 1976; Mitchell, 1970) have found that subordinates' descriptions of leader behavior are often unrelated to descriptions by independent observers or to descriptions by leaders themselves of their behaviors. It seems that subordinate ratings of leader behavior may reflect the subordinate's "social" reality rather than objective reality. The descriptions of leader behaviors are by-products of the subordinate's perceptual filtering process and, therefore, may be susceptible to the distortions, biases, and other inaccuracies inherent therein. For example, research has indicated that such characteristics as the rater's sex, personality, and similarity to the leader may bias their perceptions and hence, their ratings of leader behavior (Butterfield & Bartol, 1977; Durand & Nord, 1976; Weiss, 1977; Mitchell, Larson & Green, 1977; Rush, Thomas & Lord, 1977).

In a recent study by Lord, Binning, Rush, and Thomas (1978), both leader behavior (initiating structure) and performance cues (group performed well or poorly) were experimentally manipulated. Subjects viewed a videotape of the group's activities and rated the leader's performance on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The results showed a highly significant main effect for performance cues. That is, ratings of leader
behavior were affected by performance information independent of
the actual behavior exhibited by the leader. Moreover, these
arbitrary contextual variables (performance cues, sex of the
leader) biased ratings of behavior even when subjects had clear,
direct behavioral information for making accurate ratings.
Therefore, in applied settings in which behavioral information
will probably be more ambiguous, perceptions are likely to be
influenced even more by contextual variables.

Attribution theory has been suggested as a theoretical
framework for explaining these research findings (Green &
Mitchell, 1979; Calder, 1977; Pfeffer, 1977). According to
Calder, one of the theory's leading proponents, leadership is
essentially a perceptual phenomenon. As Lombardo and McCall
(1982) assert, being labeled as an effective leader is a matter of
perceptual consensus. Leadership is an inference based upon the
extent to which the leader's behavior and characteristics conform
to the observer's implicit leadership theory (i.e., the observer's
assumptions about how leaders should act); only when the two are
congruent will the label of leader be applied (Eden & Leviatan,
1975; Calder, 1977). The research evidence accumulating for
attribution theory demonstrates the need for a paradigmatic shift
to a more cognitive emphasis. The leader as perceived object
seems to be an important piece of the leadership puzzle in need of
greater scrutiny.
A better understanding of leadership, therefore, may be attained by focusing upon the labeling process or how a person comes to be seen as an effective leader, rather than by trying to delineate the "actual" behavior of leaders. The contention is that to the extent the person symbolizes the group's attitudes, beliefs, and norms regarding leader behavior (i.e., fits their implicit leadership theories), that person will be perceived as an effective leader and obtain compliance, regardless of behavior.

As Calder asserts, most of our implicit theories concerning leadership are "fuzzy" and ill-defined. The fact that we may not be able to define leadership, but we all know it when we see it, serves only to underscore the construct's elusiveness. Scientific attempts to delineate the phenomenon are further confounded by the fact that the behaviors and characteristics of the leader used for its inference varies across situations and by the fact that the evaluation of that evidence is subjective. The more ill-defined the implicit leadership theory of the observer because of the ambiguity of the situation, the more the observer's perceptions will be susceptible to influence by indirect, superficial, and even irrelevant evidence. However, for those situations in which the appropriate leader behaviors and requisite skills are better defined, the evaluation of the evidential behavior becomes less subjective and less prone to bias.

In summary, a person will be perceived as an effective leader if that person is able to fulfill the role-expectations of his
Moreover, the specific skills or characteristics necessary to meet the role-expectations of the group may, and probably will, vary by situation.

**Self-Monitoring Trait**

Despite the intuitive appeal of the trait approach to leadership, strong and consistent empirical evidence has been lacking (Stogdill, 1948, 1974; Barlund, 1962). However, the abandonment of the search for personal characteristics related to effective leadership may have been premature. In a recent reanalysis of Barlund's (1962) data on leader emergence, Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) concluded that "leadership is much more stable across situations than our introductory texts would indicate" (p. 685). They estimated that this trait or personality characteristic accounted for between 49 and 82 percent of the variance in leader emergence.

While not identifying "the" leadership trait accounting for such a large percentage of the variance, Kenny and Zaccaro did propose that:

Persons who are consistently cast in the leadership role possess the ability to perceive and predict variations in group situations and pattern their own approaches accordingly. Such leaders may be highly competent in reading the needs of their constituencies and altering their behaviors to more effectively respond to these needs (p. 684).

The social psychological construct of self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974, 1979) seems to be particularly relevant to the
conceptualization of leaders as socially perceptive and skilled at impression management. High self-monitors are adept both at reading social cues to determine which behaviors are appropriate and at regulating their self-presentation to fit the particular situation. The high self-monitor can be described as someone who is situation sensitive, whereas the low self-monitor's behavior and self-presentation is more a direct, true reflection of his/her inner states and disposition. At best, the high self-monitor can be viewed as flexible and adaptive and at worst, as superficial and shallow. Such value judgments, however, will be avoided in this proposal.

Self-monitoring's relevance to leadership lies in the way in which it meshes with the concept of an effective leader as someone who fulfills the role-expectations of his group thereby eliciting a leadership attribution. High self-monitors' sensitivity to situational cues and to the expressive behavior of relevant others and their ability to project the desired image should increase the probability of their being perceived as effective leaders.

Organizational Contingencies

The construct of self-monitoring alone is not sufficient to fully explain effective leadership. Certain situational factors must be integrated into the framework to more fully understand organizational leadership. Situational contingencies will set constraints and determine the value of various kinds of leadership skills. A proposed moderator of the relationship between
self-monitoring and follower compliance is the degree of "control which the environment affords to the leader" (Chemers, 1984, p. 105). At a minimum, the leadership situation must allow for influence if the leader is to have an impact. As structural properties of the organization come to reduce the need for judgment calls and second-guessing by establishing explicit and comprehensive policies and procedures, in essence, "substitutes for leadership" (Kerr & Jermier, 1978) have been established. Under such conditions, leadership as defined by the model is no longer possible.

Two aspects of this global dimension of leader unilateral control over the leadership situation are task structure and leader discretion. Each will be discussed in turn.

**Task Structure.** Self-monitoring skills should be at a premium in unstructured situations in which the group task is more abstract and, therefore, specific task behaviors required for good performance are difficult to define. It is under these conditions that the group's implicit leadership theory is most blurred and, hence, most susceptible to bias. Such situations are ideal conditions for high self-monitors to make full use of their impression management skills and sensitivity to others' expectations to manipulate the group's perception of them as effective leaders; for high self-monitors, appearing "leader-like" is easiest in such ambiguous situations.
Conversely, as the group task becomes more structured and requisite skills become more identifiable, the group's implicit leadership theory becomes better defined. Under these conditions, performance evaluations become more objective and perceptions less susceptible to manipulation. The importance of self-monitoring skills alone is diminished and is replaced by the need for more specific, technical knowledge. Specifically, it is hypothesized that the self-monitoring skill of the leader is significantly correlated with follower compliance but only for unstructured tasks.

**Leader Discretion.** The supervisor's use of discretion, defined as his "freedom or authority to make decisions and choices, and power to make judgments or to act" (Gast, 1984, p. 350), may be the variable that best differentiates situations in which effective leadership (as defined by the model) is possible from those in which it is not. Only when organizational conditions enable leaders to exercise discretion is effective leadership possible. Substitutes for leadership in the form of rigid, formal policies can severely restrict the leader's ability both to influence and be influenced by his followers. As noted by Moses (1979), research must "study leaders who are first accurately identified as leaders before attempting to build theories of leadership behavior" (p. 28). Not all supervisors or managers are leaders, and "the ease with which leadership is treated as a synonym for management and supervision" (Dubin, 1979,
p. 225) may be one of the major reasons for the field's lack of cumulative knowledge of any real practical value.

Leader discretion has been described as "one of the most fascinating recent developments in leadership research" (Gast, 1984, p. 347) and has been incorporated into such new leadership theories as Hunt and Osborn's (1980) Multiple-Influence Model of Leadership (See also Stewart, 1982; Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980. To date, however, the empirical evidence has been limited (Hunt & Osborn, 1982). More importantly, these theories share the realization that leaders' exercise of discretion is a central component of organizational leadership. It has long been recognized that there are situations in which supervisors are leaders by title only, either because they voluntarily abdicate their right to exercise discretion, or more likely, because there are systemic factors that place constraints on their authority. The concept of leader discretion may be an important variable in increasing the understanding of leadership and in increasing the predictive power of leadership models.

More specifically, leader discretion is pertinent to the proposed model in that it, like low task structure, allows for leaders to influence the leadership situation. Only when the organization affords leaders freedom to act and exert some degree of control over the situation can leaders make full use of their self-monitoring skills. If the leader's behavior is so narrowly prescribed as to limit his/her behavioral options, so too is the
leader's potential to influence followers negated. Leaders'
self-monitoring skills, therefore, are most valuable when
organizational constraints on leader discretion are at a minimum;
leaders must be given enough latitude to manipulate perceptions
and to influence the attributions of observers.
HYPOTHESES

To recapitulate the conceptual model proposed, the essence of true leadership is the ability to obtain follower "incremental" compliance, in the form of such organizational outcomes as loyalty, commitment, and satisfaction with supervision (see figure 1). The leader who is a high self-monitor should be particularly skilled at meeting role-expectations of his followers and thereby obtaining this incremental compliance. There are, however, organizational variables that moderate this relationship. Specifically, the relationship between self-monitoring skills and follower compliance should be strongest when organizational substitutes for leadership are not present. "Substitutes for leadership" (Kerr & Jermier, 1978) that structure and restrict the leadership situation undermine the leader's potential impact and ability to influence followers. The relationship between self-monitoring and follower incremental compliance is thus postulated as:

HYPOTHESIS 1: (a) Supervisor's self-monitoring scores will be positively related to measures of subordinates' commitment and satisfaction with supervision but only for unstructured tasks (i.e., task structure is a negative moderator of this relationship). No relationship between self-monitoring scores and individual or group outcomes should exist for highly structured tasks.

(b) Supervisors' self-monitoring scores will be positively related to measures of subordinates' commitment and satisfaction with supervision when leader discretion is high (i.e., leader discretion is a positive moderator of this relationship).
**LEADER CHARACTERISTICS**

- Self-monitoring skills

**ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLE (1)**

- **task structure**
  - decision verifiability
  - goal clarity
  - goal path multiplicity
  - solution specificity

**ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLE (2)**

- leader discretion
  - determining what task the employee will do
  - setting quotas
  - establishing rules and procedures
  - determining how work exceptions are to be handled

**FOLLOWER COMPLIANCE**

- loyalty
- cooperation
- commitment
- satisfaction with supervision

---

Figure 1. Conceptual Model of Leadership
Self-monitoring and the criterion variables should be unrelated when discretion is low.

Because of its widespread acceptance by leadership researchers as an important outcome variable, group performance ratings were obtained. Following the model's logical progression, the relationship between leader's self-monitoring skill and group performance is hypothesized as:

HYPOTHESIS 2: (a) Supervisor's self-monitoring scores will be positively related to measures of group performance but only for unstructured tasks (i.e., task structure is a negative moderator of this relationship). No relationship between self-monitoring scores and group performance outcomes should exist for highly structured tasks.

(b) Supervisors' self-monitoring scores will be positively related to measures of group performance when leader discretion is high (i.e., leader discretion is a positive moderator of this relationship). Self-monitoring and the criterion variable should be unrelated when discretion is low.

In accordance with the attribution perspective, which is a fundamental part of the proposed model, it is hypothesized that attributions to the leader are more likely to be made when there are no alternative explanations of the observed behavior (Calder, 1977). Specifically, group performance is more likely to be attributed to the leader when substitutes for leadership are absent and the leader's self-monitoring skills are high.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Subordinates will be more likely to rate the leader as the important determinant of the work unit's performance when the leader is a high self-monitor and (a) the task is unstructured or (b) leader discretion is high.
As mentioned in the introduction, the concept of incremental compliance is adapted from Katz and Kahn's conceptualization of leadership as "influential increment." Their assertion is that leaders gain this influential increment through the use of referent power and, to a lesser extent, expert power rather than through the use of reward, punishment, or legitimate power. It is this ability to use more than a formal role in relating to subordinates that differentiates the very effective supervisor from the less effective (Katz & Kahn, 1978). This assertion will be tested in the proposed research by assessing subordinates' reasons for complying with their supervisors. Specifically, French and Raven's (1960; 1974) bases of social power will be used for measuring the reasons given by subordinates.

HYPOTHESIS 4: Those subordinates expressing high commitment and satisfaction will be more likely to cite the referent and expert power of the supervisor as reasons for complying. Those subordinates expressing less commitment and satisfaction will be more likely to cite legitimate, punishment or reward power as reasons for complying.
METHOD

Sample

Data were collected from 58 upper middle managerial personnel, their 58 superiors, and their 268 subordinates employed by a large, international chemical manufacturing plant. Paper-and-pencil questionnaires were distributed via company mail, along with stamped, addressed envelopes for their return. Assurances of anonymity and confidentiality were given. An approximate response rate of 60% was obtained. Little sociodemographic data were available because most subjects felt that they could be identified too readily based on the information requested. With persistent rumors of massive layoffs in the organization, the climate was one of suspicion and apprehension. There is a real possibility that the study participants were not randomly selected by the organization as instructed. Instead, there is some indication that only their better employees may have been selected to participate. In addition, the subjects may have been less prone to be critical of the organization or their jobs, and their responses may have been more favorable given the threat of layoffs.

Measures

Paper-and-pencil questionnaires were utilized to obtain measures of the variables.
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE:

The questionnaire completed by the supervisors (see Appendix C) contained the following measures:

1. **Self-Monitoring Scale.** The revised self-monitoring scale developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) was used to measure this variable. The 13-item revised scale was specifically developed to overcome the "gap between the construct of self-monitoring and its operationalization in (Snyder's) Self-Monitoring Scale" (Briggs, Cheek & Buss, 1980, p. 686). Snyder's self-monitoring scale appears to measure variables other than those hypothesized to be components of the construct (e.g., extraversion and other-directedness). Moreover, these variables compete with each other making it difficult to interpret the total score on Snyder's scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Briggs, Cheek & Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980). Lennox and Wolfe, therefore, concluded that the "Snyder's measure demonstrably lacks fidelity to the construct and exhibits fundamental psychometric weaknesses" (p. 1350).

The revised self-monitoring scale reflects Snyder's 1979 definition of self-monitoring as consisting of two characteristics: Ability to modify self-presentation and sensitivity to the expressive behavior of others. Internal consistency reliability of 0.75 has been reported for the 13-item scale.

2. **Leader's Exercise of Discretion.** This variable was measured with Van de Ven and Ferry's instrument which
operationalizes discretion in terms of the authority supervisors have in making job-related decisions. Specifically, supervisors indicate the amount of authority they have in (1) determining what tasks the employee will do, (2) establishing rules and procedures, (3) setting quotas, and (4) determining how work exceptions are to be handled. Coefficient alpha of 0.81 has been reported by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) indicating good internal consistency reliability.

3. Task Structure. The following four scales of Shaw's system (1963) used in Fiedler's contingency theory research operationally defines task structure:

1. Decision verifiability. The degree to which the correctness of decisions can be demonstrated.

2. Goal clarity. The degree to which the requirements of the task are clearly stated.

3. Goal path multiplicity. The degree to which the goal can be reached by a variety of procedures.

4. Solution specificity. The degree to which there is more than one correct solution.

SUBORDINATE QUESTIONNAIRE:

The questionnaire completed by the subordinates (see Appendix D) contained the following measures:

1. Satisfaction with Supervisor. The 4-item format adopted by Rice, Instone & Adams (1984) was used. The items assess the (1) degree of satisfaction with the work relationship with the leader, (2) the extent to which the leader listened to the subordinate's suggestions and recommendations, (3) the extent to
which the leader allowed the subordinate to make decisions, and
(4) the competence of the leader.

2. Supervisor Commitment. The instrument measuring this
variable is an adaptation of Porter and Smith's (1970)
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. It is a 15-item, 7-point
scale questionnaire in which subordinates indicate their level of
commitment by responding to such statements as their willingness
to put forth extra effort to help the supervisor succeed, loyalty
to the supervisor, willingness to recommend the supervisor as
someone to work with, concern about the organizational fate of the
supervisor, etc.

The original scale is a measure of organizational commitment.
In utilizing the instrument as a measure of leader commitment, the
word organization replaced the word supervisor. This commitment
instrument incorporates components of the variable that are
congruent with the other outcomes outlined in the model (e.g.,
loyalty and cooperation). The coefficient alpha of the original
scale has been reported to range from 0.82 to 0.93. The scale's
convergent and discriminant validity has also been found to be
more than adequate.

3. Reasons for Complying. This scale is an adaptation of the
one used by Bachman, Smith & Slesinger (1966). The items match
the bases of social power of French and Raven (1960). Subordinate
compliance as a function of the leader's (1) referent power, (2)
reward power, (3) expert power, (4) coercive power, or (5)
legitimate power was assessed.
4. **Attributions.** The format of this scale is adopted from Rice, Bender & Vitters (1980) and requires subordinates to estimate the percentage of the work unit's total productivity that is the result of efforts by (1) the leader and (2) the subordinates. The scores must sum to 100%.

5. **Absenteeism.** Subordinates' self-reports of their absenteeism rates were obtained.

6. **Turnover Intention.** Subordinates' self-reports of their likelihood of voluntarily leaving the organization were obtained.

**SUPERIOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE:**

The questionnaire completed by each supervisor's immediate superior (see Appendix E) contained the following measures:

1. **Work-Unit Performance Rating.** This scale assessed the work group on such dimensions as quantity of work, quality of work, number of innovations or new ideas, reputation, goal attainment, efficiency, and group morale.

2. **Leader Effectiveness Rating.** Superiors' evaluations of the overall effectiveness of the supervisors were assessed.

3. **Attributions.** This is the same scale included in the subordinate questionnaire. The scale requires superiors to estimate the percentage of the work unit's performance that is the results of efforts of (1) the leader and (2) the subordinates.
RESULTS

Correlation Matrix

Prior to testing the hypotheses, the interrelationships among all variables in the study were examined to assess the degree of multicollinearity. These intercorrelations are presented in Tables 1 and 2, along with the means and standard deviations of each variable. The moderator variables—task structure and leader discretion—are significantly intercorrelated. However, the correlations are indicative of less than 14% shared variance. Thus, each of the two task variables has a substantial proportion of unshared variance and is used separately as a moderator.

Insert Tables 1 & 2 about here

Moderated Regression Results

According to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, a significant relationship exists between leaders' self-monitoring scores and organizational outcomes, when (a) task structure is low and (b) leader discretion is high. The existence of these relationships between self-monitoring and key organizational and group outcomes was tested using moderated regression analyses. Each dependent variable was regressed on a set of predictor variables consisting of the self-monitoring measure, each of the task variables (task structure and leader discretion), and the cross-product of self-monitoring and the task variable. Moderator effects are
### TABLE 1
CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES FOR SUPERIORS' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader discretion</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Task structure</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Company tenure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quantity</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innovations</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reputation</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Goal attainment</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Efficiency</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Morale</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Attribution</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervisor effectiveness</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall work unit performance</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
<td>0.78***</td>
<td>0.69***</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES FOR SUBORDINATE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader discretion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Task structure</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover rate</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Company tenure</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisor satisfaction</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Co-worker satisfaction</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervisor attribution</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supervisor commitment</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Company commitment</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Referent power</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Expert power</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (continued)
CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES FOR SUBORDINATE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Reward power</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Coercive power</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Legitimate power</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Absenteeism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Turnover intention</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated by a significant increase in explained variance when the cross-product term is added.

The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 3 and 4. No significant main effects are indicated for the self-monitoring measure nor for the two task variables. In addition, the interactions of self-monitoring with each of the task variables were added to the model but did not have any significant effect on the explained variance.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

 Moderator Subgroup Method Results

Explanations for the lack of support for Hypotheses 1 and 2 were considered. One of the more plausible explanations is that variance was restricted for key variables of the model thereby reducing the size of the correlation coefficients. Specifically, range restriction appears to be a problem for the central organizational variable, task structure (standard deviation of only .30). Also, most of the subordinate response variables are highly skewed (exceeding the skewness criterion of .80 arbitrarily set); specifically, the mean responses for all 3 of the satisfaction measures and for both of the commitment measures are very high. The dependent variables supplied by the superiors are less inflated.
# TABLE 3
MODERATED REGRESSION RESULTS
USING SELF-MONITORING, TASK STRUCTURE, and LEADER DISCRETION—SUPERIORS' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Group Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, TS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, TS, SMTS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, DISC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, DISC, SMDISC</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total R²(sm, ts, sm x ts):
- effectiveness = .08
- attribution = .01
- performance = .04

Total R²(sm, disc, sm x disc):
- effectiveness = .03
- attribution = .04
- performance = .07
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## TABLE 4
MODERATED REGRESSION RESULTS
USING SELF-MONITORING, TASK STRUCTURE,
and LEADER DISCRETION - SUBORDINATES' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable:</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Supervisor Commitment</th>
<th>Company Commitment</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variable</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, TS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, TS, SMTS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, DISC</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM, DISC, SMDISC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total R²(sm, ts, sm x ts):
1. Satisfaction = .00
2. Attribution = .02
3. Supervisor commitment = .01
4. Company commitment = .01
5. Absenteeism = .01

Total R²(sm, disc, sm x disc):
1. Satisfaction = .01
2. Attribution = .01
3. Supervisor commitment = .02
4. Company commitment = .02
5. Absenteeism = .02
The moderator subgroup method was employed as a supplemental analysis to better reveal subtle relationships in the data. For each of the two moderator variables, the sample was divided into high and low subgroups by dichotomizing at the midpoint of the task structure and discretion scales (e.g., High and low task structure subgroups and high and low discretion subgroups). This division resulted in small sample sizes in both subgroups (n's of 6 and 22 respectively), indicative of the skewed distribution on the moderator variables. Within each subgroup, the relationship between self-monitoring and each of the dependent variables was evaluated. As shown in Tables 5 and 6, the moderator subgroup method does offer insight regarding the relationship between self-monitoring and the dependent variables. Table 5 shows that a correlation of .75 (p ≤ .10) is obtained between self-monitoring skills and superiors' ratings of work-unit performance, as outlined in Hypothesis 2a. A similar modest relationship was found between self-monitoring skills and subordinates' ratings of commitment to supervisor (r = .36, p≤ .10), as outlined in Hypothesis 1a. To obtain such large correlations with such small sample sizes is very encouraging, suggesting that the null results
were a function of the restricted distribution on the moderators.

Insert Tables 5 & 6 about here

Examination of the low leader discretion subgroups offers interesting results regarding Hypotheses 1b and 2b of the study. Marginally significant correlations were obtained between supervisors' self-monitoring scores and superiors' ratings of supervisor effectiveness ($r = .45, p < .10$). In addition, a marginally significant correlation was obtained between self-monitoring measures and superiors' ratings of overall work unit performance ($r = .43, p < .10$).

No strong support was found for Hypotheses 3a and 3b which state that subordinates are more likely to rate the leader as the important determinant of the work unit's performance (i.e., make a leader attribution) when the leader is a high self-monitor and the task is unstructured or when discretion is high (see Tables 5 & 6). Moreover, the sign of the regression coefficients are in the opposite direction from that predicted.

Strong support was found for Hypothesis 4 which states that those subordinates expressing high supervisor commitment and satisfaction are more likely to cite the referent and/or expert power of the supervisor as reasons for complying rather than coercive or legitimate power. Highly significant positive correlations were obtained between the leader's use of referent
### TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-MONITORING AND ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES BASED UPON SUPERIORS' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Low Task Structure Subgroup</th>
<th>Low Discretion Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader effectiveness</td>
<td>.61 (n=6)</td>
<td>.45* (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader attribution</td>
<td>-.05 (n=6)</td>
<td>-.35 (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group performance</td>
<td>.75* (n=6)</td>
<td>.43* (n=18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>High Task Structure Subgroup</th>
<th>High Discretion Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader effectiveness</td>
<td>.13 (n=52)</td>
<td>.05 (n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader attribution</td>
<td>-.12 (n=52)</td>
<td>-.00 (n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group performance</td>
<td>.02 (n=50)</td>
<td>-.02 (n=39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p*.10
TABLE 6
CORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-MONITORING AND ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME VARIABLES BASED UPON SUBORDINATES' RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Low Task Structure Subgroup</th>
<th>Low Discretion Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Satisfaction with supervision</td>
<td>.21 (n=22)</td>
<td>.04 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader attribution</td>
<td>-.32 (n=22)</td>
<td>.01 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment to supervisor</td>
<td>.36* (n=22)</td>
<td>.09 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment to organization</td>
<td>.10 (n=22)</td>
<td>.14 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>High Task Structure Subgroup</th>
<th>High Discretion Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Satisfaction with supervision</td>
<td>.01 (n=245)</td>
<td>.02 (n=192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader attribution</td>
<td>.08 (n=241)</td>
<td>.05 (n=189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment to supervisor</td>
<td>.07 (n=243)</td>
<td>.10 (n=192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment to organization</td>
<td>.04 (n=243)</td>
<td>.00 (n=192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10
power and subordinates' commitment \( (r = .44, p < .0001) \) and satisfaction with supervision \( (r = .44, p < .0001) \). Conversely, significant negative correlations were obtained between satisfaction \( (r = -.17, p < .001) \) and commitment \( (r = -.16, p < .001) \) measures and the leader's use of legitimate power. Also, strong positive correlations were found between legitimate power and self-reported absenteeism \( (r = .51, p < .0001) \) and turnover intention \( (r = .21, p < .001) \).

**Summary**

Moderated regression analyses failed to support Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. However, Hypothesis 4 was supported by the data.

The moderator subgroup method as a supplemental analysis was helpful in elucidating the reason strong significant results were not obtained for Hypotheses 1 and 2. These analyses revealed small sample sizes for the low task structure and low leader discretion subgroups. Thus, it may have been the restriction on range of the moderators that precluded significant findings. Consistent with this rationale, marginally significant correlations were found, supporting Hypotheses 1a and Hypothesis 2a.
DISCUSSION

The results of the study, using conventional regression analyses, offer no support for the relationships hypothesized. Thus, the author must entertain the possibility that the hypotheses are incorrect. However, given the moderator variables range restriction problem encountered, relationships would be almost impossible to discern. Moreover, the results of supplemental analyses (i.e., moderator subgroup analyses) are quite encouraging and will comprise the bulk of the discussion.

Task Structure

The moderator subgroup analysis results modestly suggest that task structure negatively moderates the relationship between supervisor self-monitoring skill and important organizational outcomes. Under low task structure conditions, the subordinates of high self-monitoring supervisors report greater commitment to their supervisor and receive higher work-unit performance ratings from their supervisor's superior. Given the significant negative correlation between commitment to supervisor and subordinate absenteeism found in this study, commitment is viewed as an important "bottom-line" variable. Thus, in the low task structure subgroup, relationships between leader self-monitoring and two important organizational variables were found. Obviously, the moderating effect of task structure on the relationship between leader self-monitoring skills and organizational outcomes is worthy of future examination.
Leader Discretion

Leader discretion as an important organizational variable is a relatively new development, having been subjected to only limited empirical investigation (Hunt & Osborn, 1982; Gast, 1984). Leader discretion is incorporated into the proposed model as an additional organizational variable to tap the global dimension of leader unilateral control over the leadership situation. Along with decreased task structure, increased leader discretion in making job-related decisions was viewed as a necessary condition for the relationship between leader self-monitoring skills and organizational outcomes to emerge. Interestingly, the data suggest that the leader's self-monitoring skills are related to leader effectiveness ratings and group performance ratings when leader discretion is low, not high as hypothesized. This finding is surprising, but several explanations might be considered. First, the negative moderating effect of leader discretion on the relationship between self-monitoring and organizational outcomes may exist for this particular sample because of some unique characteristic inherent in the jobs comprising the sample or of this organization as a whole, indicating a generalizability problem.

A second explanation involves the validity of the construct of leader discretion as measured by the Van de Ven and Ferry
instrument. Evidence of the psychometric soundness of the Van de Ven and Ferry instrument is lacking, and the construct's intuitively incongruent, positive (r = .33) rather than negative relationship with the more established organizational variable of task structure makes the construct validity issue relevant.

The third explanation involves a post hoc reinterpretation of this aspect of the model. The model as originally proposed posits that leader self-monitoring skill is at a premium when the leadership situation is ambiguous and hence, role-expectations are unclear. Under these conditions, evaluation of leader effectiveness is likely to be more subjective and more prone to bias, thus making the impression management skills of the high self-monitoring leader quite valuable. An unstructured task condition is suggested as the key organizational variable assessing the ambiguousness of the leadership situation; high leader discretion is suggested as a supplemental measure. However, the data indicate that it is when the leader has limited discretion regarding job-related activities and decision making that the high self-monitor's ability to manipulate perceptions is most important.

In retrospect, however, it is conceivable that situations in which leaders' freedom to make job-related decisions is sharply curtailed (i.e., low discretion conditions) are the very situations in which their ability to manipulate perceptions and to manage impressions are most important. It is when leaders have
little actual authority that their self-monitoring skills are most valuable as tools of influence. When leaders do not have much discretion to make job-related decisions, they must rely upon interpersonal skills to obtain subordinate compliance. With the benefit of hindsight, the compelling logic of this explanation is readily apparent. Regardless of one's interpretation, however, the results of this study clearly indicate that leader discretion is an organizational variable worthy of further investigation.

Leader Attribution

The hypothesis that group performance is more likely to be attributed to the high self-monitoring leader rather than to the group when the task is unstructured and leader discretion is high did not receive statistical support.

Reason for Compliance

Katz and Kahn's position that leaders gain greater subordinate compliance through the use of referent power rather than through the use of their formal role as supervisor was supported by the data. Strong positive relationships between the leader's use of referent power and subordinates' satisfaction, commitment to the supervisor and commitment to the organization were found. Also, the leader's use of referent power is associated with reduced absenteeism among subordinates. Conversely, leaders' use of legitimate power to obtain subordinate compliance is associated with lower subordinate satisfaction with supervision, less commitment to supervisor, greater absenteeism, and increased likelihood of turnover.
Conclusion

While the findings of the study are very encouraging, a caveat should be issued. The relationships found under low task structure and low leader discretion conditions are based upon quite small sample sizes. This fact is interesting because such large correlations (albeit, of modest statistical significance) were found in spite of this major limitation on statistical power. However, the external validity of the negative moderating effects of task structure and leader discretion on the relationship between leader self-monitoring and organizational outcomes is difficult to establish based on such small sample sizes. The small sample size, however, may reflect Robert Dubin's contention that contrary to the prevailing belief of leadership researchers, "leadership is a rare phenomenon, not a common one in organizational behavior" (p. 226). Still, a stronger test of the model would be obtained with a less homogeneous sample. Future research should ensure heterogeneity through more differentiated sampling strategies.

Lastly, an understanding of the climate of the organization from which the sample was taken may be helpful in interpreting the results of the study. A substantial, across-the-board layoff both of salaried and hourly employees occurred within weeks of dissemination and collection of the questionnaires. Clearly, rumors and speculation were rampant at the time of the study. The suspicion that the subordinates' responses may have been
artificially inflated is justified, given this climate of uncertainty; subordinates may have been less likely to criticize their supervisors or the organization, with the threat of layoffs hanging over their heads. Such skewness in the subordinate response variables resulted in range restriction for key dependent variables, further reducing the likelihood of detecting significant relationships.

The fact that even moderately significant results were found, given the many limitations encountered, is accepted as indication of the basic soundness of the hypotheses and of the utility of further study of the model.
IMPLICATIONS

The theoretical value of the model lies in its potential to help bridge the gap in the leadership literature between the commonsense notion of traits and the lack of strong, consistent empirical support for such a perspective (Stogdill, 1974; Bass, 1981). The acceptance of self-monitoring as "the" leadership trait provides new insight into the trait approach, for self-monitoring is inherently different from traditional leadership traits. Self-monitoring at its best consists of skills that are subtle and not readily appreciated by observers. The hallmark of a true high self-monitor is inconsistency in behavior across situations, thus making it a difficult trait to discern.

As Snyder contends:

High self-monitoring individuals are particularly sensitive to social and interpersonal cues to situational appropriateness. However, their attitudes and behavior are virtually uncorrelated with each other. To predict their actions, one would seek information about characteristics of their situations . . . It is as if the psychology of the high self-monitoring individual is the psychology of their situation (1979, p. 113).

Therefore, the attempt to infer underlying dispositions and attitudes of a high self-monitor based upon his/her behavior is misguided. The concept of the high self-monitoring leader fits perfectly with Snyder's position that "what people say and do may be the products of deliberate and strategic attempts to create images appropriate to particular situational contexts and to
appear to be the right person in the right place at the right time" (1977, p. 86). Like leadership, self-monitoring is a construct which is both complex and subtle, making it an elusive object of scientific scrutiny.

The proposition that self-monitoring is "the" leadership trait leads one to conclude that leaders if not born certainly possess skills that are developed and refined over a long period of time. The effectiveness of training leaders, therefore, is questionable. However, it must be noted that leadership is only one component of the managerial role. Management is usually conceptualized as being broader in scope, encompassing a variety of roles and duties of which leadership is only one. The importance of leadership to manager effectiveness probably varies across managerial positions. The value of self-monitoring assessment as a selection device probably also varies as a function of the particular managerial position.

A leader-match perspective is a more pragmatic one to embrace. The effectiveness of managers low in self-monitoring skills can be bolstered by enhancing "substitutes for leadership" in the form of increased structure and more explicit policies and procedures. Systemic factors can be put into place to help compensate for inadequate self-monitoring skills of managers. So while task structure may be dysfunctional because it undermines the potential impact of managers who possess the requisite skills (i.e., self-monitoring), such structure may be a functional
organizational characteristic for those managers who are lacking in these skills.

The theoretical and practical implications of the model are multifold. The contention that leadership is a viable scientific construct and that who is in the leadership position does matter is tempered with the recognition that there are constraints and limitations on the impact a leader has on important organizational outcomes. Therefore, to the most fundamental leadership question of whether leadership significantly influences organizational variables, the answer remains "it depends."
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Review of Leadership Research
The evolution of leadership as a scientific construct has been a process characterized by false starts, missteps, and dead ends. The leadership construct's historical development has been described as haphazard, resulting in little cumulative knowledge (Bass, 1981). Leadership's history as the object of scientific inquiry can be divided into three periods: (1) the trait period, (2) the behavior period, and (3) the contingency period.

**Trait Approach**

The earliest study of leadership involved the search for the personality traits that differentiated leaders from followers and effective leaders from ineffective ones. The trait period roughly covered the period from 1910 to World War II and reflected the "Great Man" theory of leadership (Stogdill, 1971; Bass, 1981). Typical trait studies included measures of personality and physical characteristics such as dominance, self-confidence, height, I.Q., masculinity, and appearance.

Stogdill's 1971 comprehensive reviews of trait studies led him to conclude that no reliable and coherent pattern existed. As he stated:

> The total weight of evidence presented in this group of studies suggests that if there are general traits which characterize leaders, the patterns of such traits are likely to vary with the leadership requirements of different situations (1971, p.62).
Bass's 1981 update of Stogdill's work resulted in essentially the same conclusions being drawn. No set of universal leadership traits could be identified. For some traits such as height, consistent results were found; however, the size of the correlations were always modest (e.g., $r = .30$), and the existence of the relationship added little to the understanding of the leadership phenomenon. Still, for other traits, contradictory results were obtained; leadership traits found to be important for one sample were unimportant for another.

In spite of the plethora of nonsignificant and contradictory research results, a resurgence of scientific interest in the trait approach has recently emerged. House's development of a "Theory of Charismatic Leadership" (1977), for example, is a clear return to the trait approach. Other researchers such as Bass, Burns, Dubin, Tosi, and Sayles have expressed the importance of charisma as a leadership characteristic. Only House, however, has formulated a theoretical model of charismatic leadership. Unfortunately, no empirical evidence of the model's validity has been offered.

**Behavior Approach**

With the disappointing results of the trait period, emphasis shifted to the study of the behaviors and behavioral styles of leaders. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) became the rating scale of choice for leadership researchers.
This research tack proved fruitful in that two reliable behavioral dimensions were identified. The two dimensions of consideration and initiating structure consistently were found to account for most of the variation in leader behavior. Attempts to find strong, consistent relationships between the two leader behavior dimensions and key organizational and group outcomes, however, proved less successful. Modest relationships between consideration and subordinate satisfaction were often, but not always, found. In addition, consistent, strong relationships between the two behavioral dimensions and group performance or productivity measures proved more difficult to establish.

The most recent blow to the behavior approach has come from the research in implicit leadership, with its distinctly cognitive thrust. A number of studies indicate that the implicit leadership theories of raters influence their ratings of leader behavior (Eden & Leviatan, 1975; Lord, Binning, Rush, & Thomas, 1978; Downey, Chacko & McElroy, 1979). With these findings, it became clear that the attempt to ensure objective ratings by focussing only on the overt behavior of leaders may be hopeless. Thus, the results of studies utilizing behavioral rating scales are, at the very least, suspect if not totally inaccurate.

Contingency Approach

The need for more sophisticated models which integrate characteristics of the leader and of the situation became
Increasingly apparent. The fruitless search for the one "best" behavioral style or leadership trait gave way to the contingency approach. The hallmark of the contingency approach is the position that the most effective behaviors or personality characteristics of the leader varied with the situation; situational parameters were incorporated into the leadership model.

Fred Fiedler's controversial leadership theory was the first of the contingency models articulated (Fiedler, 1964, 1967). Fiedler's key situational parameter is the amount of control inherent in the leadership situation. Situational control is based upon measures of task structure, leader-member relations, and the leader's position power. The leader characteristic of importance is orientation of the leader towards either the task or relationships with subordinates, as measured by Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale. Criticism of the model has been directed at it's predictive validity, the LPC scale and it's interpretation, and the appropriateness of the situational variables (Chemers, 1984; Ashour, 1973; Mitchell, Biglan, Oncken, & Fiedler, 1970; Graen, Alvares, Orris, & Martella, 1970). Research on the model has been extensive but with inconsistent results. The results of Strube and Garcia's recent meta-analytical investigation of Fiedler's model, however, suggest that predictions of the theory are supported by data from past
studies. Unfortunately, the model's lack of a well-developed theoretical base makes interpretation of even strong support difficult.

Several other contingency-oriented models have been advanced. Among these are Vroom and Yetton's Normative Decision Theory. This model includes the leader's decision-making style (autocratic, consultative, or group), as the key leader characteristic, and the situational parameter consisting of (1) the expected support of decisions made and (2) the amount of structured, clear information available for making decisions. Most of the research on the model has been criticized because of it has been basically descriptive in nature. That is, the research compares what leaders say they do with what the model says they should do. The results of descriptive tests of the model offer some support for the hypotheses of the model.

A better test of the model determines whether leaders actually perform better (i.e., are more successful) when they follow the theory than when they do not. The results of such normative tests of the model are encouraging but limited (Vroom and Jago, 1978; Jago and Vroom, 1977).

Path-Goal leadership theory is another contingency model. As outlined by this approach, the leader's role is to provide subordinates with guidance and rewards necessary for satisfaction and performance. The leader must do what is necessary to clarify
paths to the goals and to make the goals desirable. Which leader behavioral style is appropriate is contingent upon such factors as the task demands, the environmental pressures, and the personal characteristics of the subordinates.

The typical Path-Goal study examines the relationship between leader's consideration and initiation of structure behaviors and job satisfaction and performance. Various task and subordinate characteristics have been incorporated into the model as moderators to improve its predictive accuracy. As a whole, the results of the research are equivocal. With the question raised about the psychometric soundness of the Ohio State scales (e.g., the LBDQ) used extensively in Path-Goal research, drawing strong conclusions from the research may be unwarranted.

Modifications of the Contingency Paradigm

The contingency approach has been criticized for being too narrow in focus, for not appreciating the dynamic, transactional nature of leadership, and for its generally poor predictive accuracy (Morgan and Lombardo, 1978; Hunt, 1984).

George Graen's Vertical Dyad Linkage model (VDL) places emphasis on the transactional nature of leader–subordinate relationships. It is theorized that the leader's unique relationship with each individual subordinate influences important outcomes. Specifically, those subordinates involved in a positive exchange relationship with the leader (i.e., a member of the
in-group) are hypothesized to have higher satisfaction and lower turnover than subordinates in the out-group (Graen and Cashman, 1975; Graen and Schieman, 1978). To date, the research has been consistent with predictions of the model but not very extensive.

Attribution theories of leadership, articulated by such researchers as Green and Mitchell (1979) and Calder (1977), represent a radical research trend in leadership (Hunt, 1984). This new paradigm emphasizes the role of perception and cognition in the leadership process. How causal explanations of the behavior of others are derived is of primary interest in the study of attributions. Specifically, the Green and Mitchell model focusses on leaders' perceptions and the attributions they make about the behavior of subordinates. Calder's theory emphasizes the perceptions of subordinates and other observers of the behavior of leaders and the attributions made about whether the behaviors are indicative of true or effective leadership. The nucleus of attribution theories of leadership is the notion that leadership is purely a product of the perceptions of the observer, rather than a phenomenon that is really "out there" (Calder, 1977). The implications of such a perspective are far-reaching. All previous research that has relied upon the observations of subordinates and others to rate the behaviors of leaders becomes suspect. If the attributional perspective is valid, these ratings are a reflection of the social realities of the observers rather
than the actual behaviors of leaders and, therefore, are of questionable validity (Mitchell, 1979).

The Future of Leadership Research

James Hunt (1984) has proposed that the trends in leadership research will essentially parallel those trends in the field of organizational behavior as a whole, as outlined by Cummings (1980). Research trends are described as falling into two categories. The focus of research taking the conservative approach will be on the following:

1. Improving the construct validity of key leadership research constructs.
2. More carefully selecting and measuring dependent variables.
3. Applying new longitudinal and experimental research designs.
4. Using multivariate statistical analysis more often and more appropriately.

The focus of radical approaches is as follows:

1. Studying organizations as social constructions of reality.
2. Treating the symbolic nature of management as process.
3. Considering processes linking different levels of analysis.
In summary, future leadership research is expected either to focus on the refinement and extension of the contingency paradigm or to place a more cognitive slant on this currently dominant paradigm to compensate for its innate inadequacy in providing true understanding of the leadership phenomenon (Hunt, 1984). Reflecting the sentiment of some researchers, an even more extreme possibility is the complete abandonment of leadership as an area of empirical investigation (Miner, 1975; McCall and Lombardo, 1978). More likely, improving the more conventional leadership models and embracing new, radical approaches to the study of leadership will provide interesting results. The two perspectives are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and the most fruitful approach may be one which is able to meld the two. This study is an attempt to do just that; specifically, this model attempts to incorporate radical concepts (e.g., attribution theory) into a traditional contingency framework.
APPENDIX B

Cover Letter and Demographic Data Sheet
This questionnaire is part of a survey being conducted throughout your organization. The purpose of the survey is to learn more about how various jobs and work groups are structured and how supervisors and subordinates work together. The results of the survey will be used for research purposes only.

Your answers are strictly confidential and anonymous. You are not required to place your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Your responses will be grouped with those of other people, and no one individual will be identified.

If this survey is to be useful, it is important that you answer each question honestly. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers.

This questionnaire was developed and the research is being conducted by a group of organizational psychologists at Louisiana State University. Your organization has approved the survey and encourages your participation.

After completing your questionnaire, return it in the stamped, addressed envelope provided and mail it directly to the LSU researchers. No one in your organization will see your completed questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Tanya C. Clemons
Department of Psychology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Background Information

The following items are important for coding and analysing the information you have provided to us. Once again, we want to assure you that all information is confidential. When you have finished the questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided and mail directly to us. No one in the organization will see your completed questionnaire.

1. Name of the department within Dow Chemical for which you work:
   
2. Name of the office or unit within your department for which you work:
   
3. Number of years with Dow:
   
4. Number of years in your present position:

NOTE: The code number on this questionnaire will be used as a method of grouping questionnaires into appropriate work units. The names of specific individuals cannot be ascertained via this code number.
APPENDIX C

Supervisor's Questionnaire
**SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I am conversing with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I can usually tell when others consider a joke in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. When I feel that the image I am portraying is not working, I can readily change it to something that does.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I can usually tell when I have said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>-3-</td>
<td>-4-</td>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.

   -0-  -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

11. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from the person's manner of expression.

   -0-  -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

12. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.

   -0-  -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

13. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.

   -0-  -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

      Supervisory Discretion

How much influence do you have in making each of the following decisions about your subordinate's work?

1. Determining what tasks they will perform from day to day:


2. Setting quotas on how much work subordinates have to complete:

   -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

3. Establishing rules and procedures about how subordinate's work is to be done:

   -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

4. Determining how work exceptions are to be handled:

   -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-
**Task Structure**

Evaluate the following general aspects of your work unit's tasks:

1. The degree to which the correctness of job-related decisions can be demonstrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>QUITE</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>BIT</td>
<td>GREAT</td>
<td>DEAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The degree to which the requirements of the task are clearly stated.

   | -0- | -1- | -2- | -3- | -4- | -5- |

3. The degree to which the goal can be reached by a variety of procedures.

   | -0- | -1- | -2- | -3- | -4- | -5- |

4. The degree to which there is more than one correct solution.

   | -0- | -1- | -2- | -3- | -4- | -5- |

**Turnover**

In the past year, what has been the turnover rate within your work unit (i.e., the percentage of your subordinates quitting their jobs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Subordinate's Questionnaire
SUBORDINATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Satisfaction with Supervisor

How satisfied are you with the following:

1. Your work relationship with your supervisor.
   
   [-1-] Not at all satisfied
   [-2-] Somewhat unsatisfied
   [-3-] Indifferent
   [-4-] Somewhat satisfied
   [-5-] Very satisfied

2. The extent to which your supervisor listens to your suggestions and recommendations.
   
   [-1-] -2- -3- -4- -5-

3. The extent to which your supervisor allows you to make decisions.
   
   [-1-] -2- -3- -4- -5-

4. The competence of your supervisor.
   
   [-1-] -2- -3- -4- -5-

Other Satisfaction Measures

1. In general, how satisfied are you with your present job (i.e., the work itself)?
   
   [-1-] Very unsatisfied
   [-2-] Somewhat unsatisfied
   [-3-] Indifferent
   [-4-] Somewhat satisfied
   [-5-] Very satisfied

2. How satisfied are you with the friendliness and cooperation of your co-workers?
   
   [-1-] -2- -3- -4- -5-

Attribution

What percentage of your work group's total performance is due to the efforts or abilities of the following:

1. Your SUPERVISOR:
   
   [-1-] 0%
   [-2-] 20%
   [-3-] 40%
   [-4-] 60%
   [-5-] 80%
   [-6-] 100%

2. The WORK GROUP:
   
   [-1-] 0%
   [-2-] 20%
   [-3-] 40%
   [-4-] 60%
   [-5-] 80%
   [-6-] 100%

*NOTE: The responses to 1 and 2 must sum to 100%
Commitment to Supervisor

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help my supervisor be successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO, strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither nor agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES, strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I talk up my supervisor to my friends as a great supervisor to work for.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

3. I feel very little loyalty to my supervisor

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for my supervisor.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

5. I find that my work values and my supervisor's work values are very similar.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

6. I am proud to tell others that I work for my supervisor.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

7. I could just as well be working for a different supervisor as long as the type of work were similar.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

8. My supervisor really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

9. I am extremely glad that I was selected to work for my supervisor over other supervisors in the Company.

   -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-  

10. Often, I find it difficult to agree with my supervisor's policies on important matters relating to the work unit.

    -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7-
11. I really care about the organizational fate of my supervisor (i.e., I want him/her to do well and go far in the company).

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

12. For me, my supervisor is the best of all possible supervisors to work for

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

**Organizational Commitment**

1. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this **organization** be successful

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

   NO, Moderately Slightly Neither Slightly Moderately YES, strongly disagree disagree agree agree strongly DISAGREE AGREE

2. I talk up this **organization** to my friends as a great organization to work for

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this **organization**

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

4. I find that my values and the **organization's** values are very similar

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

5. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this **organization**

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

6. This **organization** really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

7. I am extremely glad that I chose this **organization** to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

8. I really care about the fate of this **organization**

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-

9. For me, this is the best of all possible **organizations** for which to work

   -1-   -2-   -3-   -4-   -5-   -6-   -7-
Reasons for Complying

The main reason that I comply with the requests of my supervisor is:

1. Because I like and identify with my supervisor.
   -1- No, very little
   -2- Somewhat
   -3- A large part of the reason
   -4- Very much
   -5- Yes

2. Because my supervisor is knowledgeable about the job.
   -1- No
   -2- Somewhat
   -3- A large part of the reason
   -4- Very much
   -5- Yes

3. Because my supervisor can reward me for complying.
   -1- No
   -2- Somewhat
   -3- A large part of the reason
   -4- Very much
   -5- Yes

4. Because my supervisor can punish/discipline me for not complying.
   -1- No
   -2- Somewhat
   -3- A large part of the reason
   -4- Very much
   -5- Yes

5. Because my supervisor has the right to tell me what to do because of his/her position or title.
   -1- No
   -2- Somewhat
   -3- A large part of the reason
   -4- Very much
   -5- Yes

Absenteeism

On the average, how many days of work do you miss in a 6-month period?

-1- 0-3
-2- 4-5
-3- 6-7
-4- 8-9
-5- 10-12
-6- more than 12

Turnover Intentions

How likely are you to quit your present job within the next 3 months?

1 extremely unlikely
2 quite unlikely
3 somewhat unlikely
4 somewhat likely
5 quite likely
6 extremely likely
APPENDIX E

Superior's Questionnaire
WORK UNIT'S PERFORMANCE RATINGS

1. In relation to other comparable units, how does this unit rate on each of the following:

   a. **Quantity** or amount of work produced?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-
      Far  Somewhat  About  Somewhat  Far
      BELOW  below  AVERAGE  above  ABOVE
      AVERAGE  average  average  AVERAGE

   b. **Quality** or accuracy of work produced?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

   c. **Number of innovations** or new ideas introduced by the unit?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

   d. **Reputation** for work excellence?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

   e. **Attainment** of unit production or service goals?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

   f. **Efficiency** of unit operations?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-

   g. **Morale** of unit personnel?

      -1-  -2-  -3-  -4-  -5-
2. What percentage of this work unit's total performance is due to the efforts or abilities of each of the following:

a. The unit's supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The subordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The responses to a and b must sum to 100%:

a. _____%

+ b. _____%

= 100 %

3. In general how effective a leader is this unit's supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely Quite Somewhat Quite Somewhat Extremely
INEFFECTIVE ineffective ineffective effective effective EFFECTIVE
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