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Recently much attention has been focused upon the role of the female in industry. Despite a determined effort by government, civil rights and women's groups, the female who reaches top management in business is still an exception. Although females are not a minority group, their representation in skilled, high paying jobs is minimal. In addition, even in instances where women have attained positions equal to men, their salary levels are unequal. The U. S. Dept. of Labor and U. S. Bureau of the Census statistics illustrate this discrepancy (Bass, Krussell, and Alexander, 1971-2). It has been noted, for example (Schein, 1972), that female industrial psychologists' average income in 1970 was $15,248, while males with the same training averaged $25,523. As females move into higher level positions, their income becomes more differentiated from their male counterparts. Schein's survey (1972) shows the ninetieth percentile salaries for men was $40,000, while the ninetieth percentile for women was $21,050. Furthermore, the gap between male and female income levels is increasing. Differences between average managerial and professional salaries for males versus females have increased from $1,500 in 1949 to $5,400 in 1969 (Verway, 1972). It is therefore apparent that sex discrimination is prevalent in industry.

Several factors can be cited as the cause of sex discrimination. A major source of sex discrimination stems from sociological factors prevalent in American society. Cultural influences such as child
rearing practices both in home and school may contribute to differ-
entiated role expectations for males and females. Such expectations
may result in different vocational attitudes and limited educational
opportunities for females.

These cultural factors have been offered as reasons accounting
for the large percentage of females employed in low-level, semi-skilled,
or unskilled positions in organizations (Brenner, 1972; Megargagee,
1969; Smith and Kerr, 1972). Differentiated vocational choices in
higher education can be seen in data from the 1972 census which shows
only 2.8% of college female graduates received degrees in accounting
or business as compared to 22% of male graduates. The differentiated
role expectations are reflected in numerous surveys regarding attitudes
toward females in supervisory positions (Robertson, 1973; Verway, 1972)
and are manifested in industry by a reluctance to promote females into
higher level positions (Bass, et al., 1972). Furthermore, Day and
Stogdill (1972) investigating leader behavior of male and female
supervisors note that, with equal abilities, training, and effective-
ness scores, males advanced more rapidly than females. Day and
Stogdill conclude, "...these findings suggest that slow advancement
when it occurs on the part of women supervisors is not a result of
ineffectiveness or lack of such factors as influence, predictive
accuracy, or reconciliation of conflicting demands, but a result of
their being females."

Recently, with the advent of Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission (EEOC) interest in sexual discrimination (Peterson and
Bryant, 1972) coupled with the realization that utilizing females in higher level jobs will maximize potential human resources within the organization, personnel directors throughout the country have been attempting to identify women who have management potential (Bray, 1971; Kay, 1972). Nevertheless, Kay estimates that progress toward equality of opportunity for women is three to five years behind that of racial equality. This inequality may be partially attributable to the fact that well designed, behavior-oriented research pertaining to sex discrimination in selection and performance evaluation is sparse. Rosen and Jerdee (1973) examined sex-role stereotype influence on evaluation of male and female supervisors. Their findings did not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that male supervisors are rated higher than female supervisors. However, direct comparisons between male and female supervisors depicting four different supervisory styles did show a significant difference. Ratings for male and female supervisors, using a 7 point semantic differential, were summed for each of four supervisory styles including reward, threat, helping, and dependent approaches. Holding all conditions constant for each supervisory style except for the sex of the supervisor, males were rated significantly higher than females by judges of both sexes when the reward condition was presented. Other studies, by Klein (1950) and Scheinfeld (1944) document a tendency toward prejudicial evaluation of women's work by men; and Glmer (1961) concluded that over 65% of male managers believed that women would be inferior to men in supervisory positions. Women's evaluations of other women
regarding their professional competency are also reported to be biased. Goldberg (1968) asked a group of college females to evaluate a journal article which was attributed to a male author in some cases and to a female author in other cases. Evaluations were higher when subjects believed the article was submitted by a male author.

These findings indicate that a factor other than the specified performance to be appraised, i.e. sex of the evaluatee, is involved in the evaluation process. It is therefore essential to identify sources of sex bias in both selection and performance evaluation, and to reveal which industrial methods are particularly vulnerable to sex bias.

In recent years, simulation techniques have gained prominence in industry. Unfortunately, little research exists regarding simulation techniques' proneness to sex bias. The simulation techniques of focal interest in this study, role-playing and the in-basket, have been recognized by some investigators as having satisfactory psychometric qualities (Frederiksen, 1957; Stogdill, 1969; Meyer, 1970). However, no research has been done to examine if sexual bias is present in the evaluation of in-basket and role-playing behaviors.

It was the purpose of this study to determine whether sex bias existed in the evaluation of in-basket and role-playing performances of supervisors in a fictitious organization. The study was designed to answer the following questions:
1. Is there a significant difference in ratings of leadership characteristics of a ratee due to the ratee's sex? (Is rater bias present as a function of the sex of the ratee?)

2. If bias due to the sex of the ratee is present, is it evident in ratings of both oral (role-playing) and written (in-basket) exercises?

3. If bias exists in evaluating leadership performance of male and female supervisors, is it moderated by sex of the raters, or is it independent of sex of the raters as the joint results of Gilmer (1961), Goldberg (1968), and Rosen and Jerdee (1972) suggest?

4. If bias due to sex of the rater is present, is it present in both oral (role-playing) and written (in-basket) exercises?
Method

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 45 female and 66 male undergraduate students enrolled in either Applied Psychology, Industrial Psychology, or Introductory Psychology classes at Florida Technological University.

Instruments

Two exercises were used within the context of measuring leadership skills. The first exercise required the use of an in-basket which is described by Byham (1970) as follows:

An in-basket exercise is a simulation of the contents of an office manager's in-basket. The candidate is instructed to go through the contents solving problems, answering questions, seeking information, delegating, organizing and planning, just as he (or she) might if suddenly assuming the position.

The candidate's performance is then scored by a group of trained raters.

The in-basket task utilized in this study was a modification of In-basket I found in Problems in Supervision, (Jaffee, 1968). Seventeen items were selected from the original in-basket to reduce it from a two hour task to a 55 minute task. Care was taken to retain elements related to critical leadership skills present in the original in-basket. The modified in-basket is located in Appendix A, permission to reproduce having been received from the author.

A bogus in-basket response was formulated by presenting the modified in-basket exercise to an individual who was instructed to respond as he would if he were actually taking the in-basket for
evaluation purposes. The bogus in-basket response was then altered in order to establish an average response capable of eliciting a wide range of scores from the subjects who were to evaluate the bogus response on the graphic rating scales described below. The response was then submitted to a panel of five trained evaluators unaware of the sex of the respondent or the purpose of the study for the purpose of verifying the response was in fact an average one. Mean ratings obtained from the evaluators on the four dimensions of the 6 point graphic rating scale to be described below were:

- Sensitivity $\bar{X} = 2.7$
- Organizing and Planning $\bar{X} = 3.0$
- Decision-making $\bar{X} = 2.7$
- Written Communication $\bar{X} = 2.9$

The bogus in-basket response can be found in Appendix B.

The second exercise was a video-taped presentation of a supervisor providing feedback to a male subordinate. The video-taped presentation featured two actors role-playing the assigned positions, i.e. supervisor and subordinate, in a fictitious organization. The role-players followed a fifteen minute script depicting a personnel manager (supervisor) assisting one of his division chiefs (subordinate) with problems in the division chief's section. Two tapes were originally filmed holding all conditions constant with the exception of the sex of the supervisor. A second set of two video-tapes was filmed with different actors playing the role of the supervisor. This replication was performed to enable generalizing results with respect to sex bias, thus preventing confounding produced by possible acting differences.
of the male and female supervisors. Thus sex bias which might otherwise be attributed to other differences between the first set of role-players could be correctly identified if present. Each set of video-tapes consisted of one video-tape with the role of the supervisor played by a female and one video-tape with the role of the supervisor played by a male. The role of the subordinate remained constant, as the role was depicted by the same actor in all four films.

A copy of the script is present in Appendix D.

**Dependent variables**

Both exercises in this study required subjects to rate performance of the fictitious supervisor on certain leadership skills.

Subjects were briefly trained to accurately evaluate the in-basket exercise by actually performing the task in order to recognize the behaviors involved in the decision-making process. Subjects were subsequently informed of the response deemed acceptable by the author of the in-basket (Jaffee, 1968) and asked to rate the bogus response on ten 5 point graphic rating scales each evaluating a skill relevant to leadership including preparation, rapidity, time perspective, delegation, degree of commitment, problem analysis, planning and organizing, effectiveness, attitude toward others, and written communication. A copy of these rating scales can be located in Appendix E.

The above procedure was followed with additional instructions to the subjects regarding combination of the above defined skills into the behaviors to be evaluated on the final rating form which
included four dimensions of leadership -- sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication, in compliance with the sample test used for In-basket I, in Problems in Supervision (Jaffee, 1968). Subjects were advised to combine the ratings of skills included in each leadership dimension and reinterpret the score in terms of a 6 point graphic rating scale to minimize the effects of central tendency. The original skills were combined as follows:

- **Sensitivity**: Derived from combination of ratings of time perspective, problem analysis, and attitude toward others.
- **Organizing and planning**: Derived from combination of ratings of preparation, systematic approach to problem solving, and delegation.
- **Decision-making**: Derived from combination of ratings of rapidity, willingness to make decisions,
- **Written Communication**: Derived from rater's impression of respondent's style and clarity of writing.

A copy of these rating scales can also be located in Appendix C.

The supervisor's performance on the video-tape presentation was rated on items from the revised Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which referred to behaviors exhibited in the script. The LBDQ taps two dimensions of leadership identified as:

a) **Consideration**
- Including items describing behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust and respect, and good human relations skills.

b) **Initiation of structure**
- Including items denoting the behavior of the leader in organizing and defining his/her relationships with subordinates, in defining interactions among group members, establishing ways of getting things done, scheduling, and criticizing.
The LBDQ was selected as the measuring instrument for evaluating leadership performance as it has been used to obtain descriptions of leader behavior of males and females (Stogdill and Day, 1972). No sex bias was noted on evaluations made with this instrument when males and females of equal ability were compared in a leadership rating in the military. Fleishman (1970) has adapted the LBDQ for industry referring to it as the Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD). The SBD was presented to workers in one of International Harvester Company's plants who rated their male foremen. Predictive validity correlations with supervisors' ratings of their foremen were in the 40's. Fleishman (1970) also notes that inter-rater reliabilities for the SBD are satisfactory, as are test-retest reliability coefficients, with the reliability ranging from .75 to .87 over a period of eleven months.

Forty-five items which described behaviors exhibited in the script were selected from the SBD. Each item was rated from 0 to 4, with a possible score of 104 for Consideration and 76 for Initiation of Structure. The instrument can be found in Appendix E.

Procedure

A total of 55 students from two classes, one Applied Psychology class and one Industrial Psychology class, evaluated the performance of a fictitious supervisor in the two simulated exercises, i.e. in-basket and role-playing, designed to measure leadership performance. Members of each class were randomly assigned to either
the male or female supervisor condition.

After the 55 S's were briefly trained to evaluate the in-basket, the bogus in-basket response was submitted for evaluation. Cover sheets identifying the bogus respondent as either male or female were attached to the bogus response and the material was distributed randomly to S's, yielding groups of 26 and 29 S's rating responses attributed to female and male supervisors respectively. The cover sheet denoted the sex of the respondent as follows:

This is the in-basket response made by John (Joan) Griffin. He (she) completed the task in 55 minutes. Kindly rate him (her) on the actions he (she) has taken.

The respondent was then rated on the previously described scales -- sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication.

At a later date 49 of the 55 subjects who evaluated the in-basket task but were not specifically trained to rate the role-playing exercise were randomly divided into two groups to view the first set of tapes. One group of 23 S's viewed the video-tape presentation of a male supervisor, and the second group of 26 S's viewed the female supervisor. All S's, using the SBD, then rated the performance of the supervisor whom they viewed. The person portrayed in the role-playing situation was different from the in-basket respondent as there was no interest in carry-over effects from one exercise to the other.

Another class, consisting of 56 students enrolled in Introductory Psychology, was presented only with the second set of
the video-tape performance task to insure generalizability of results. The 56 S's were randomly assigned to view either the male or female supervisory condition, resulting in 29 ratings of the male supervisor and 27 ratings of the female supervisor. Following the viewing, all S's evaluated the supervisor's performance on the SBD.

Statistical Analysis

Findings were analyzed in terms of four 2 X 2 ANOVA'S, fixed effects model, for the in-basket exercise, the independent variables examined being sex of ratee and sex of rater. Analysis using the unweighted means solution to account for unequal N's were performed on each dimension measured by the in-basket task (Winer, 1962).

Two 2 X 2 ANOVA'S (fixed effects model, unweighted means solution) were performed for each set of role-playing video-tapes. Both independent variables, sex of ratee and sex of rater, were examined on the two supervisory leadership skills measured by the SBD.
RESULTS

Effects of supervisor's sex

The major concern of this study was to determine whether sex bias existed in the evaluation of in-basket and role-playing performances of supervisors on various dimensions of leadership.

First, an attempt was made to determine whether or not there would be a statistical difference between ratings of males versus ratings of females performing on the in-basket task. Although each rater evaluated identical bogus responses, ratings on each of the four dimensions measured were not the same for responses attributed to females as for those attributed to males, but these ratings were not significantly different. The mean ratings of the leadership dimensions measured by the in-basket exercise -- sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication, along with the grand means summed across the four dimensions measured, can be found in Table 1. Analyses of variance were conducted on each of the four dimensions. Summary tables may be found in Appendix F (see Table 5 - Table 8). Results of these analyses show no significant effects of the ratee's sex on sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication when male and female supervisors are rated by a group of male versus female evaluators.

Table 2 depicts mean scores for the male and female super-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Male Rates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=12)</td>
<td>Male (n=14)</td>
<td>All (n=26)</td>
<td>Female (n=10)</td>
<td>Male (n=10)</td>
<td>All (n=20)</td>
<td>All (n=55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing &amp; Planning</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The grand means in this table are based upon the entire sample of male and female students; they are derived from individual ratings summed over the four graphic rating scales. The range on each scale was 1 - 6.
### TABLE 2

Mean Evaluations of Role-playing Leadership Skills (Role-playing I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Ratees</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Ratees</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Ratees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>32.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>51.44</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>58.07</td>
<td>55.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>88.40</td>
<td>80.94</td>
<td>83.81</td>
<td>89.80</td>
<td>88.38</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>86.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** The grand means in this table are based upon the entire sample of male and female students who viewed one of the video-tapes included in Set 1. They are derived from individual ratings summed over the two dimensions measured by the SBD (45 items each with a scoring range of 0 – 4).
visors rated on their role-playing performances in Set I. Examination of this table shows some differences in mean ratings, the male ratees scoring higher than the females on each of the two dimensions measured by the SBD -- Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Analyses of variance conducted on each dimension, however, failed to reach statistical significance.

Mean evaluations for the role-playing performances of the male and female supervisors acting in Role-playing Set II of the video-tape films are presented in Table 3. Examination of Table 3 shows that scores for these ratees were in the opposite direction from the original evaluations based upon performances in Set I of the video-tapes. The male supervisor in Set II received lower scores than the female supervisor on both dimensions of the SBD. Analyses of variance were conducted on each dimension of both sets of video-taped performances. A statistically significant difference was yielded only on the Initiation of Structure dimension in Set II (\(F = 6.332, \text{df} = 1, 52, \, p < .05\)), with the male supervisor in Set II rated significantly lower than the female supervisor on this leadership skill. ANOVA summary tables for the role-playing tasks may be found in Appendix F (Table 9 - Table 12).

These results indicate that the in-basket assessment technique is free from sex bias when a supervisor is rated by judges of both sexes; however, sex bias may exist in the evaluation of supervisory performance in role-playing situations involving skills related to
TABLE 3
Mean Evaluations of Role-playing Leadership Skills (Role-playing II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Female Ratees</th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th>Total Ratees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raters</td>
<td>Female (n=10)</td>
<td>Male (n=17)</td>
<td>All (n=27)</td>
<td>Female (n=13)</td>
<td>Male (n=16)</td>
<td>All (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>29.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>47.84</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>53.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>97.90</td>
<td>91.06</td>
<td>93.22</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>91.31</td>
<td>83.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The grand means in this table are based upon the entire sample of male and female students who viewed one of the video-tapes included in Set 2. They are derived from individual ratings summed over the two dimensions measured by the SBD (45 items each with a scoring range of 0 - 4).
initiating structure. It may therefore be concluded that bias due to sex of the supervisor is not evident in written (in-basket) exercises; however, lack of replication of role-playing results precludes drawing any definite conclusions related to the oral (role-playing) exercise.

Effects of rater's sex and sex of ratee

The second major question this study investigated was related to sex of the evaluators. An attempt was made to determine whether an interaction effect due to sex of the rater and sex of the ratee was present. Analyses performed on the four in-basket dimensions were inspected first. No statistically significant interaction effects were noted.

Next results from Role-playing Group I were examined, with no significant interactions on either Consideration or Initiation of Structure. The summary of Analysis of Variance for Role-playing Group II measuring Consideration, presented in Table 11, shows the only statistically significant interaction yielded by this study ($F = 5.675$, $df = 1, 52$, $p < .05$). Interaction effects for the other dimension measured by the SBD, Initiation of Structure, did not reach significance in data of Role-playing Group II.

Post-mortem tests (Winer, 1962) were performed to identify the nature of the interaction noted on the Consideration dimension. Results of these tests, found in Table 13, illustrate that female
raters made significant distinctions between male and female ratees
\( (F = 7.93, \text{df} = 1,52, p < .01) \), while male raters did not. Results
shown in Table 13 may be located in Appendix F. As can be seen in
Table 4, female raters' mean evaluations for female ratees were
significantly higher than the female raters' mean evaluations for
the male ratees.

Effects of rater's sex

Further data analysis examined the main effects of the
rater's sex. A significant main effect due to sex of the rater on
the dimensions measured by the in-basket was noted only for the
written communication skill \( (F = 8.173, \text{df} = 1,51, p < .01) \). Data
from the other dimensions measured by the in-basket task did not
reach statistical significance. Table 1 illustrates that females'
evaluations of written communication skills of both male and female
supervisors is lower than evaluations submitted by male raters.
The mean score given on this dimension by females was 2.81, while
the mean score submitted by males was 3.76. This result indicates
that ratings produced by the in-basket technique of evaluating
leadership skills of males and females may be influenced by
the sex of the raters when written communications skills are being
measured, with females being more conservative in their evaluation
of this dimension. A lack of statistical significance on the
TABLE 4
Mean Evaluations for Interaction Effects
Role-Playing II, Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Ratees</th>
<th>Male Ratees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Raters</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>31.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Raters</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>32.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>31.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other dimensions — sensitivity, organizing and planning, and decision-making, suggests that the in-basket is free from rater sex bias when these skills are being evaluated.

Next, analyses from Role-playing Group I were examined. Significant main effects due to rater's sex were found in ratings of the Initiation of Structure dimension \((F = 8.888, \text{df} = 1,45, p < .01)\). Table 2 shows female evaluators' mean ratings of supervisors of both sexes on this dimension to be 59.5, while male evaluators' mean ratings for both male and female supervisors was 53.1. Therefore, it may be concluded that ratings based upon performances of role-players in Set 1 on the Initiation of Structure dimension were affected by the sex of the evaluators, resulting in lower scores being submitted by the male raters.

Higher ratings submitted by female judges on the Initiation of Structure dimension were not found in the replication of the investigation of data from Role-playing Group II. No significant differences were yielded in the summary tables for either the Initiation of Structure or Consideration dimensions when examining the sex of the rater (see Appendix F, Table 11 - Table 12) for Role-playing II ANOVA results.

The above data illustrates that bias due to the sex of the rater in rating male and female supervisors is not present in the
measurement of three leadership skills measured by the written exercise (in-basket) -- sensitivity, organizing and planning, and decision-making, but is evident when male and female judges evaluate written communication skills. Inferences pertaining to proneness of the oral exercise (role-playing) to bias due to sex of the rater may not be drawn due to lack of verification between results of Role-playing I and Role-playing II.
In-Basket exercise

The most interesting finding to emerge from the present investigation is that the in-basket assessment procedure is free from bias due to the sex of the ratee when leadership skills of sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication skills are being evaluated. Use of the in-basket in industry is increasing and knowledge of this exercise's lack of ratee sex bias will enable employees to better identify females with leadership potential. Sex bias in performance appraisal, and specifically a task's inability to assess leadership potential of candidates irrespective of the ratee's sex, has been offered as a major factor responsible for the limited number of females in positions of leadership in industry. Several investigators have attempted to identify non-biased assessment techniques (Megargagee, 1961; Quinn, 1969); however, no investigations have previously been made with reference to the in-basket's proneness to sex bias. Quinn (1969) noted that supervisory ratings reflected little positive bias when characteristics of the rater and ratee were similar, i.e. males rating males, females rating females, but did not examine simulation exercises such as the in-basket.

Results from the in-basket exercise in the present study indicate that both males and females can be assessed by male and
female raters producing evaluations that are non-biased regarding sex of the ratee.

One caution must be emphasized. Evaluations were affected by the sex of the rater regarding written communication skills on the in-basket task. If it is essential to rate this quality, sex of the rater must be considered as females appear to be more conservative in their ratings than males are. The female judges tend to rate supervisors of both sexes significantly lower than male judges. Problems will develop, however, only if a subset of ratees are evaluated by women. More specifically, if female candidates judged by female raters on written communication skills are compared with male candidates evaluated by male judges, sex bias as suggested by Quinn (1969) may in fact exist, but only under this highly specific condition which can be avoided. Assuming that a limited number of women are being promoted into managerial positions, as reported by the Wall Street Journal (July 29, 1970), conservative ratings submitted by female judges may inhibit the identification of female supervisors, but only if the candidates are sexually segregated. This can be prevented if care is taken to insure that all candidates are rated by the same percentage of male and female raters when measuring the written communications dimension, resulting in a written evaluation free from sex bias. However, since few evaluators at the present time are women, the problem may not be practically important.
Lack of significance for any main effects due to sex of the ratee on the four dimensions contradicts conclusions drawn by Goldberg (1968) when he found that women are prejudiced against females when evaluating written skills. The present study shows that women will rate both females and males lower than ratings submitted by males when evaluating written communication skills, but noted no statistically significant difference between females' evaluations of male versus female ratees on the written exercise. These findings indicate that the in-basket exercise is free from sex bias due to the sex of the ratee as neither a main effect of ratee's sex nor an interaction between sex of the rater and ratee were disclosed. Thus, the in-basket can be used with confidence to identify females as well as males with leadership potential without being concerned about sex bias.

Role-playing exercise

The role-playing exercise was devised as a technique to afford the actors an opportunity to display a wide range of oral leadership skills. Results of the first set of films, as specified in the previous section, showed that the original role-playing films (Set I) were free from sex bias due to ratee, although female raters submitted significantly higher ratings for both sexes than male raters when evaluating Initiation of Structure.

Unfortunately, results from Role-playing I were not replicated. The second set of video-tapes (one male supervisor and one female
supervisor in each set) was filmed with the specific intent of enabling generalization to all male and female ratees. This was not the case. In the role-playing films of Set I, it was found that females submitted higher evaluations than males when evaluating Initiation of Structure, while in the role-playing films of Set II male raters did not submit statistically significantly lower evaluations than the female raters for this dimension. Nor were the performances evaluated by Group II free from bias due to sex of the ratee on the Initiation of Structure dimension, as they were in Group I; male ratees being rated significantly lower than females. No main effect of sex of ratee was observed on video-tapes from Set II when Consideration was evaluated, however a significant interaction effect was noted on the Consideration dimension when female raters judged male versus female ratees. The female raters evaluated female ratees significantly higher than the male ratees, while the male raters did not make this distinction. This was not present in results from Set I.

These conflicting results between ratings given by viewers of video-tape performances in Set I and video-tape performances in Set II may be attributed to several factors. The actual video-taping procedure was exceedingly poor making it impossible to produce two identical sets of tapes. Due to technical limitations, actors read their scripts, thus the simulation of an actual situation was unrealistic. The male and female ratees read their script with
equal expression in Set I; while the actors in Set II were not as well paired, nor did they read as expressively as the pair in Set I. These unequal performances might account for the differences between the two sets of evaluations from Group I and Group II and also for the higher rating given to the female supervisor than to the male on the Initiation of Structure dimension in Set II, as the female's expressions were more forceful and obvious than the male's whose performance was more natural. The reading of the script may also have confounded the ability for Consideration behaviors to be elicited by all performers equally. Acting differences between performers in Set I and Set II may also have caused a significant interaction between sex of rater and sex of ratee in Set II but not in Set I on the consideration dimension. Thus acting differences may in fact have been responsible for the disparity between results of Set I and Set II.

Another contaminating factor causing the disparity in results between Set I and Set II may have been the subjects themselves. Video-tape Set I was viewed by members of an Introductory Psychology class who were not as familiar with industrial problems as S's in Group II. Group II S's consisted of members of either Applied Psychology or Industrial Psychology classes, many of whom had prior knowledge of sex bias in assessment and who may have been aware of the purpose of the study. Thus Group II S's viewing the female supervisor may have been more prone to recognizing a female's abilities
in a leadership role requiring supervision of a male subordinate, thus their ratings may have been more objective than ratings submitted by Group I, with subjects rating the female supervisor on behaviors displayed rather than on expectations. Subjects viewing Set I who had no previous knowledge of sex bias would not respond similarly, as they would be more influenced by role expectations of a female deferring to a male.

In addition, a final problem arose when Set II was being presented which did not occur for Set I. Before S's in Group II were randomly divided to view either the male or the female supervisor (the reason for separating the group was unknown to S's), the monitor which was set up with the male supervisor's tape was accidentally turned on, thus the S's viewing the female tape may have been aware of a sex variable causing them to be more conscious of the leadership behaviors elicited when evaluating the female's performance. This mechanical accident may be responsible for Group II submitting higher female evaluations than male, and higher ratings for the female than Group I.

In view of these major flaws, results from the replicated set of films did not confirm results from Set I. The disparity between results of the two video-tape sets precludes drawing any conclusions from the role-playing portion of this study.

Conclusion

It must be noted that the subjects used in both exercises
investigated by this study were college students who may not be representative of the population ultimately using the in-basket and role-playing techniques in industry. Had this study been conducted using industrial workers, the results might have been different. As pointed out by Richards and Jaffee, "Many industrial workers have attitudes that are more conservative than the typical college student's," thus the reactions of employees to a female supervisor could be more negative.

Keeping in mind the limitations apparent in this study, certain conclusions may be drawn. Industry's need for assessment techniques which are free from sex bias is growing. Bray (1971) notes that, "...many organizations want to open up channels of advancement for women...but management hesitates because of doubts that it can accurately identify those with high potential..." The present study indicates that with regard to certain leadership skills -- sensitivity, organizing and planning, decision-making, and written communication, the in-basket exercise is free from sex bias. Caution should be used however, when ratings of written communication skills submitted by females are compared with those submitted by males, as females' ratings of ratees tend to be lower than males'.

Due to the utilization of only college students as subjects evaluating performance, the author recommends that this study be replicated in an industrial environment. Care should be taken to
minimize the flaws present in the role-playing exercise as presented in this study.

In view of the lack of proneness to sex bias present in the in-basket exercise, this instrument is recommended to be included in assessment procedures attempting to identify potential leadership qualities in both male and female candidates for supervisory positions. More research must be performed before this conclusion can be drawn for role-playing techniques.
APPENDIX A

In-Basket
INSTRUCTIONS

For purposes of this exercise each one of you is to consider himself Will Judd, shift supervisor of production of the Geometric Manufacturing and Development Company. The Geometric Company has just made you the new shift supervisor of production. Your company does research and development work in the area of atomic-powered engines and also produces a number of different engines for commercial use. You have just arrived in your new job. Mr. Walter Mason, your predecessor, died suddenly of a heart attack Friday evening. You were notified Friday at 8 p.m. of your new appointment; and, because of the need to take care of some last-minute details in your old job, you could not come to your new job until today. Today is Sunday, September 11. The situation is obviously hypothetical, but you are to work just as you would if you should find yourself in a similar situation in the future. Although the situation is artificial, with some unrealistic restrictions on the time allowed you and the methods and activities you can employ in communicating with others, the problems are real, obtained from actual situations supervisors have encountered on their jobs.

You have to leave your “office” promptly in one hour to catch a plane for an important meeting which you had committed yourself to attend before you learned of your appointment to your present position. You will be very busy during the meeting and will not be able to take along anything to work on. This meeting will keep you away both Monday and Tuesday. You are working on Sunday afternoon because you want to take care of anything that might need your attention before Wednesday.

Before coming to your office you have had about an hour’s chat with the Division Personnel Superintendent, Mr. Steve Long, who had come down to the plant just to meet you.

Mr. Walter Mason was 58 years of age at the time of his death. He had 35 years of service with the company. He was apparently in good health and did an adequate, although not outstanding, job in his position. He had been shift supervisor for the last fifteen years. One of his major difficulties was his inability to develop his subordinates to take much of the load. Mr. Long said that Mr. Steele appeared to be concerned about things that may have piled up in the office since Mr. Mason’s death. He urged that you should get on top of the job as soon as possible. Your new secretary, Miss Jane Butler, had worked as Mr. Mason’s secretary for eight years. She has a reputation in the division for being very efficient and Mr. Long indicated that she should be of much assistance to you in getting oriented.

Mr. Long had little to say about the other members of your future staff. He thought that Mr. Mason had maintained a good department, but none of the people are particularly outstanding.

Mr. Steele’s superior, Mr. Felton, is relatively young. He has many new and somewhat advanced ideas about managing people. He is aggressive and uncompromising in his demands for efficiency but is considered a warm and friendly person.

Now that you have a brief background for your new position, you are ready to go on with the exercise. Remember, the day is Sunday, September 11.

You are Mr. Judd. You cannot reach anyone for help. Your files are locked and your secretary has the key. You must work with the materials at hand. You have one hour. You will be gone Monday and Tuesday. You cannot take any of these materials with you on your trip.

Your working equipment consists of an organizational chart, a calendar, and an in-basket (pp. 9-68) containing the materials your secretary has left on your desk for your attention. These materials include letters, reports, memoranda, etc. You have an hour to do as much as you can toward taking care of the problems which the materials present. Please indicate on each item why you are taking the steps you have chosen and what you hope to accomplish.

You are requested to write down everything you decide to do. The back of each memo is left blank to provide you with enough room to record this information. Make memos to yourself about things you will want to do after you get back. Draft letters, if appropriate, for your secretary to prepare. Record (in the form of notes) what you will say on the phone, say directly to Miss Butler and others; and
what your intentions are as well as your actions. Note agenda for meetings you may want to call. Sign papers if appropriate. Everything you decide or do should be in writing. Many of these things normally would be handled more informally, but it is Sunday, you are new in your job, and you will be out of town for the next two days.
Friday Evening

Mr. Judd,

Welcome to your new job. I've gathered some material for you that I think you'll need. A lot of this is material that Mason never got to and you'll have to straighten out. Coming into a job after Mason is going to mean an awful lot of work for you as he had a way of avoiding certain crucial decisions.

Jane Butler

P.S. I'll see you when I get back from vacation.
The Geometric Company

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

August 10, 19-

To: Mr. Walter Mason
From: Wes Jones
Subject: Personnel

Please let me have this form back at your earliest convenience. I've been looking over your people and I want to promote Joe Sutton to that foreman's opening and I need your signature.

I recommend the promotion of Joe Sutton to Foreman.

__________________________
Shift Supervisor
To: Walter Mason
From: Bob Rogers
Subject: Annual increments

The following men are scheduled for bonuses if their work warrants it. Please initial each man you wish to receive the merit bonus.

Feather
Fingers
Sutton
Rollins
Jason
Calhoun
Mr. Mason,

I’d like to see you as soon as possible about a personal matter of the utmost importance.

Sutton
September 3, 19—

To: Mr. Walter Mason

From: Bob Rogers

Subject: Production hours

Please see to it that the coffee breaks of the people in your group aren't longer than 10 minutes. We're not running a country club you know.

Rogers
MEMO TO ALL MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL

You will be required to submit written requests for overtime to me personally, three days in advance of expected needs.

Copies to:

Steele  Evans  Jackson
Rogers  Smith  Wilson
Long  Mason  Marv Smith
Wilson  Jones  Helen Jones
Green  Campbell  Edwards
Mr. Mason,

I'm sick of working on the oil leak in the conveyor belt. You better put somebody else on it because I've got a bad back. If I don't hear from you by Monday I'm putting in a grievance with the union. With all the seniority I've got, you've got no right keeping me on that job.

Sutton
August 3, 19-

Mr. Walter Mason
Geometric Company
Allendale, New York

Dear Mr. Mason,

I thought you should know that one of your men is running around with a married woman in town. He drinks an awful lot and is not faithful to his wife and certainly creates a bad image for your company. I felt it was my duty to let you know this. His name is Joe Sutton.

A conscientious citizen
(Miss) Mabel Agitator
To: Walter Mason
From: Bob Rogers
Subject: Safety

By next Monday have in my office a list of safety suggestions.
Mr. Mason,

I'm going to quit my job as of the 15th of this month unless something can be done about my job. I'm going crazy putting those pieces of aluminum together without a chance to do anything else.

Nixon
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

September 8, 19—

The vacation of Jane Butler will commence September 15 through the 29th.

Approved by: ____________
Shift Supervisor
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO ALL NONMANAGEMENT PERSONNEL

No more coffee breaks until further notice. Anybody caught leaving early will be suspended.

Walter Mason

Mr. Judd,
Do you want this sent out over your signature now?

Jane
Mr. Walter Mason:

We the undersigned are strongly against the policy of giving merit bonuses. We think it is political, and an unfair way to bribe workers. We plan to take it up with the union unless it is stopped.

Feather
Sutton
Jason
Fox
Bruner
September 6, 19—

Mr. Mason,

I'll have to work overtime to finish the installation of the new conveyor belt by September 15, so I'll just plan on working overtime all next week. Three hours per day.

Al
To: Walter Mason
From: Lou Jackson
Subject: Community Relations

Dear Walter,

It has come to my attention that some of your people have been seen in some questionable areas of town. You know how important good community relations are for us. I wish you would talk to some of them and straighten this out. Their names are: Feather Fingers
Sutton
Rollins

Lou
To All Shift Supervisors:

We are planning to simplify the job of the man on the fabrication line. If each man does a smaller portion of the entire job, things should go faster because they will all be specialists. Please discuss this with your men as soon as possible.

J. C. Steele

Bob Rogan
Mr. Walter Mason,

We have gotten time on Channel 5 for a five minute interview with the typical assembly line worker. I must have the name of the man in my office by September 15. Let's have a pleasant looking, personable, and above all, upstanding individual. Somebody suggested Joe Sutton and unless I hear differently, I'll use him.

J. C. Campbell

T.V. Manager
APPENDIX B

Bogus In-basket Response
JOHN GRIFFIN

This is the in-basket response made by John Griffin. He completed the task in 55 minutes. All of his written responses are included. Kindly rate him on the actions he has taken.
This is the in-basket response made by Joan Griffin. She completed the task in 55 minutes. All of her written responses are included. Kindly rate her on the actions she has taken.
IN-BASKET RESPONSE

Sept. 11

Away until Wed.

Personnel - Mr. Long
Jane Butler - Sec.
Plant Supt. - Mr. Steele
Mr. Felton - V.P.

(from introduction) Have talk with all employees, 14th.

# 9 - 14th, Wed., Find out when Secretary returns from vacation.

#11 - O.K. Sutton for foreman.
   Ask for replacement for Jones.

#15 - Memo to Rogers to wait until I return from trip to review their work progress and reports.

#17 - Memo to Sutton asking him to see you the 15th in office.

#21 - Tell employees at meeting on 14th to abide by break rules.

#23 - On 14th, go over production schedules for deliveries and see if O.T. is needed.

#25 - Memo to Sutton that you will speak to him on Wed., 14th.

#27 - Make note to speak to him on 14th as planned previously to discuss any personal problems. In future, look for anything that may be lacking in his work or schedule.

#29 - Post memo asking for safety rules to be suggested from employees immediately.

#37 - Evaluate person for a better position as soon as possible.

#39 - Approve and sign secretary's vacation.

#49 - Ask secy. to hold until after meeting on 14th.

#53 - Schedule meeting for 15th; memos to Feather, Sutton, Jason, Fox, and Bruner to advise them of situation and ask them to wait until 15th when you will have had a chance to look into matter.

#57 - Have secy. send memo to Al to go ahead this time.
#59 - Set up appt. to follow one on merit bonus and let Finger, Feather, Sutton, and Rollins know about it.

#63 - Memo to Steele and Rogers that this will be discussed at meeting the 14th.

#67 - Give Campbell O. K. on Sutton. Don't know of anyone better right now and won't have time to investigate.
APPENDIX C

In-basket Evaluation Forms
IN - BASKET RESPONDENT DATA SHEET

NAME ___________________________ DATE ____________________
SEX ________ INSTRUCTOR ___________
COURSE ________________
MAJOR AT F.T.U. __________________
YEAR IN SCHOOL (check one)

___________ Freshman
___________ Sophomore
___________ Junior
___________ Senior
### SKILL EVALUATION FOR IN-BASKET EXERCISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires a minimum of data before making decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets lots of evidence before making decisions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slow to make up mind. Has a tendency to put off decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RAPIDITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appears to have made quick decisions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strictly a here-and-now person. Doesn't seem to consider future implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TIME PERPECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive to future implications. Demonstrates unusual foresight.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indecisive; seems unwilling to be definite. Pushes responsibility upward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DEGREE OF COMMITMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seems very decisive; Appears to take responsibility for decisions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slow to see a problem or to grasp its significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PROBLEM ANALYSIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptive, analytical. Goes right to the heart of the problem.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shows no evidence of planning before taking action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLANNING &amp; ORGANIZING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well organized, systematic. Carefully plans before taking action.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can't delegate. Does work without giving responsibility to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DELEGATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegates well. Assigns responsibility to others for getting tasks done.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not effective in getting things accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets things done through others.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disregards feelings and reactions of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too open to feelings and ideas of others.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cannot express reactions adequately in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WRITTEN COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can communicate effectively in writing.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN-BASKET EVALUATION

1. SENSITIVITY

This dimension includes time perspective, the ability to perceive future implications; problem analysis, the ability to perceive and analyze problems; and attitude toward others, the response to feelings and ideas of others.

Is highly sensitive to all aspects of the situation. / 6 5 4 3 2 1 / Demonstrates low sensitivity to all aspects of the situation.

2. ORGANIZING & PLANNING

This dimension includes preparation skills, systematic approaches to problem-solving, and ability to assign responsibility and delegate to others.

Carefully plans and organizes prior to taking action. / 6 5 4 3 2 1 / Shows no evidence of planning prior to taking action.

3. DECISION MAKING

This dimension includes rapidity, the willingness to make quick decisions given adequate data; decisiveness, the willingness to stand by one's decisions; and effectiveness in getting things accomplished.

Illustrates high degree of decision-making skills. / 6 5 4 3 2 1 / Shows no skill in making decisions.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

General impressions of person's verbal ability to communicate including style and clarity.

Can communicate effectively in writing / 6 5 4 3 2 1 / Cannot communicate effectively in writing.
ROLE - PLAYING SCRIPT

Company: Technical Personnel Corp.

President: David Adams

Vice-President -- Personnel: Alan Driscoll

Vice-President -- Sales: Ted Johnson

Personnel Manager -- Aerospace: Rudy Forster

Personnel Manager -- Commercial: Jack Jonas

Personnel Manager -- Telephone Interconnect: Lee Brydges

Background

This company employs technical personnel who are placed on assignments in clients' facilities. Employees remain on the payroll of Technical Personnel Corporation and function as specialty consultants to the clients. Positions are generally referred to as "jobs"; "resumes" are submitted by people seeking placement, and sales are referred to in terms of "job requirements". "Proposals" are submitted to potential clients who either reject or accept them. If proposals are accepted, sales reports are submitted to personnel (one of the three divisions) whose responsibility it is to fill the jobs. Salaries are minimal with large commissions paid to salesmen for jobs filled. Travel and expenses are paid -- referred to as "per diem".

Two roles are enacted:

1) Supervisor: Alan Driscoll -- providing feedback to a subordinate, the telephone interconnect personnel manager.

2) Subordinate: Lee Brydges -- There are three people in Lee's department - Lee, Ed, and Joe.
Supervisor: Good morning, Lee. How are you?
Lee: Fine, fine, thanks. Lovely day.
Supervisor: Obviously, we're not here to talk about the weather. We both know we're blessed to live in Central Florida with this gorgeous weather.
Lee: That's true. I notice that you're meeting today with just me. I wonder what happened to Jack and Rudy. Thought they'd be here, too. What's happened? Where are they?
Supervisor: Jack and Rudy are busy taking care of what they know best. We've given you the responsibility of taking care of what you know best. Namely, the Telephone Interconnect aspect of the business. As you know, this is a critical area as we've had a dropoff in aerospace and commercial sales. We've been counting heavily in the pickup of placement so we could hold our own overall, and hopefully gain.
Lee: I tell you, we're really swamped with work. I've even have my guys working overtime.
Supervisor: That sounds great; but, we measure performance with results, not with efforts.
Lee: To tell the truth, I have been noticing the people coming in late. When questioned as to why they're coming in late, they give me all sorts of excuses. I'm not sure what to do about it. I've told them I'm going to start docking them, but how can we do that? We really want a cooperative group working together, not a group under stress and duress caused by threats. Working cooperatively we can fill more requirements. I'm glad we have all the requirements in my division, but I definitely think we're under-staffed.
Supervisor: Sounds like a crock to me! I've never cared whether someone comes in at 8:30 or 9:00. The measure of performance is the amount of work they accomplish while they're here. Putting in time doesn't accomplish the work. I expect you to govern these people accordingly. Make sure the work gets done. Time is not a factor. If you have to stay til midnight every day of the week, I couldn't care less. I'm paying you, and I'm paying you WELL to do the job that has to be done. We have salesmen out there making promises that we can send people to Jamaica and to Puerto Rico, and they come back in here and you say, "Sure, we can do it". Then you let them fall flat on their faces. They're the ones who have to go out in the field and face the clients to get the business which pays YOUR salary.
Lee: Do you think that since aerospace and commercial have dropped off they can each send somebody over to help out in my department? It sure would make the load easier on my staff. They have been having some problems at home in addition to the overload at work. I'd really hate to see them quit. While personal problems aren't our concern, there's no doubt they effect output. One of my staff has been drinking a little too much. He's been seen
around town quite a bit. His work seems O.K. - the resumes he sends out seem fine; but, I was wondering if I should speak to him about it. What do you think?

Supervisor: I don't think that has anything to do with our conversation. What we're talking about is more important than this problem pertaining to only one man. I'm paying you, and paying you well for taking care of an area of responsibility. If you're not capable of taking care of your personnel and their related problems along with carrying out your other responsibilities, maybe you're the wrong person for the job.

Lee: Now you know that's not true. I feel the problems now are due to an overload that our schedule is not prepared to handle. We have been filling some jobs; and more than our department has ever done previously. The major problem is the number of unfilled jobs -- which I still feel is primarily due to being understaffed. The personal problems the men are having -- car, wife, drinking, may not be our problem; however, as soon as they effect a man's work I contend they do become our problems. I, too, have been busy trying to fill job requirements and can't really devote any time to discussing their problems with them. I had hoped to discuss this with Jack and Rudy today to see if they could spare somebody to help us over this period. Maybe you know.

Supervisor: Obviously, I know. We're in a very competitive industry, where overhead is a key factor. We cannot afford to hire more people to do the work. We must get more work out of the people we have. If they have personal problems, I've always had an open door policy, and I'd be more than happy to try to help them solve their problems, but I feel the situation today goes far deeper than that. I feel you're letting this get out of control; that you're not responding to the pressure which is to be expected intermittantly in this business.

Lee: Well, what would you have me do? I'm open to suggestions. My department has not had to respond to this much pressure before. We're really swamped.

Supervisor: Maybe that's because you let efficiency slide when there wasn't any pressure. Perhaps you've been lax in keeping up with routine work and in requiring your subordinates to work systematically.

Lee: Do you think we need more stringent guidelines?

Supervisor: I think possibly we need someone else to take care of this.

Lee: Look! I've been here seven years and never have had any major problems. Under normal conditions my department, with me in charge of three other people, has functioned satisfactorily. I realize you're having financial problems, but still feel we may be able to ease my workload with some assistance from those departments whose requirements are falling off. I'd be glad to train anyone who could be transferred.

Supervisor: That sounds good but let's look at the facts. We did $3 million commercial and only $250,000 was in Interconnect. How can you sit there and tell me you need more people than they? They're working day and night. The same is true in aerospace.
Lee: Wait just a minute! You're giving me last year's figures. If we fill all our requirements in Interconnect, we'll far exceed commercial. With a little additional staff, I feel we can do this. I know you didn't call me in here today to discuss replacing me, but rather to help locate the problem in my department. You say I shouldn't trouble myself about the personal problems of any staff, but I feel this is what's hampering their output. They seem to be seeking help from me, in that the stress of the workload is making matters worse and I had hoped that you would be of some assistance.

Supervisor: Maybe you should fire one of them and tell the other two to work that much harder or their turn would come. Maybe we can get a little more productivity that way.

Lee: Do you really think that would help?

Supervisor: It might; you know your people better than I do.

Lee: I thought the answer would be to get another person to help us out.

Supervisor: Right now, what I'm telling you is this -- You're not getting one other person. You might replace all three people, but I see no reason to provide additional manpower when the department is working inefficiently with the people you have right now. Possibly we can put these people on some kind of incentive bonus. Maybe reducing their base salary and increasing percentage of sales based on filled requirements will get them moving.

Lee: I'll look into that. What about the personal problems? Should I get involved?

Supervisor: Obviously, we're in the personnel business. All we have to sell is our image, predicated upon our staff. All we have to sell to our prospective employees are the people we already have working for us. They are our best advertisement. If we surround ourselves with incompetent, inefficient people, all we're doing is setting up more problems out in the field.

Lee: I have been satisfied with both Jim and Bill. I think I can handle this personal problem situation with them so that they come in on time and are willing to stay as late as necessary. I feel we definitely need some more resumes so that we can handle the requirements and send the clients more resumes from which to select. But, I'm not sure why we've been having such a high rejection rate. The ones we submit should fill the requirements very satisfactorily. Maybe there's a communication gap in the technical jargon of the telephone interconnect business that our salesmen aren't aware of. Do you think they may be misinterpreting some of the facts?

Supervisor: Lee, when I hired you, you professed to be an expert in this area. It's your responsibility to see that our sales staff is fully informed of all technicalities. Perhaps there have been some technical changes. There are books, courses that can be taken, people you can talk to, to keep you up to date. Let's look at this practically. Maybe there is a communication lapse here. Try going along with the salesmen next time to assess
the situation for yourself. Don't take the secondhand word of
a sales report or some verbiage that a salesman spits out at you
because he wants to get a sales commission. Go with him. I
put each department head in the three different areas on an
incentive plan. The only way you're going to make any real
money with this company is by performing. The bonus for your
department, for both you and your staff, is predicated upon the
department's output. Remember, the only way we make money is
by putting people to work and the better the people we put to
work, the better the advertisement, the longer they'll stay,
and the more satisfied the client will be and more willing to
give us renewals. On the other side of the coin, if our people
aren't happy here, they'll go to work for one of our competitors
and then where are we? We have to fill a job twice. This is
all assuming the rates are equitable. Are you having any problem
with the rates the salesmen are bringing in?

Lee: That is one of the problem areas. When we finally do get a
requirement filled, the applicant frequently is unwilling to
leave Florida. I think the problem is with the per diem rates.
The employees are willing to travel within the state but are unwi-
lling to locate elsewhere. The job in Chicago, specifically,
is really tough to fill. I've considered requesting special
recruiting money and setting up interviews temporarily in Chicago.
This would minimize per diem and moving problems; but, I know
it's competitive up there and I hate to expend the extra money.
I recall past experiences in Los Angeles and Phoenix weren't
too good, so I've rejected this idea. As you know, I'm open to
suggestion. However, the major problem, as I see it, is still
understaffing. Not only are we receiving more requirements to
fill; but also, only six percent of submitted resumes are being
accepted whereas two months ago over ten percent were being
accepted. This puts even more pressure on my department as
more work must be performed to accomplish the same results.

Supervisor: Possibly the answer is not increased resume submissions.
We're not in the resume business; we're in the personnel placement
business. Maybe you can effectively work out a joint program with
sales to come up with competitive prices to sell the job and our
ability to perform. Then we can get requirements for an X
amount of people to fill a job rather than giving the client the
option to hire individuals. Then you can hire the proper man to
fill the job and eliminate all procedures involved with resume
submission. By changing the format, you can eliminate four to
five contacts with the applicant plus the time delay involved
between initial contact and ultimate hiring. It's during this
interval that the applicant finds other alternatives and then is
reluctant to accept our offer. Perhaps the way to go is to
replace the specific commitments sales have been getting, with
general ones.
Lee: Do you want me to call a meeting with sales?
Supervisor: I think you should sit down with sales and explore the idea. It's got to cost less money per placement going this route than the other one. You've been talking to and evaluating 100 people to hire six. This alternate way could be much more productive.

Lee: Let me ask you another question then. Do you think Al and John from sales will be receptive to discussing this with me? Since you're suggesting a management change, wouldn't it be better coming from you?
Supervisor: That's not necessary. I'm sure they'd be cooperative in discussing any ideas that would increase sales, as they're strictly on a commission. Any increase in sales directly affects them and I'm sure they'd be willing to make some changes if you can explain the advantages. We're not a paper mill and if changing the approach will increase business, I'm sure they'll agree. You can even suggest our placing a man in the client's facility for a brief time, say about a week, to see if our selection is acceptable. There are several possibilities that can be explored. I'm sure you'll be able to solve the problem. You can even tell the client he isn't responsible for payment unless he is satisfied. Do you have that much confidence in your staff to take on this added responsibility? You'd really be putting our money on the line, because we'd be legally responsible for his salary even if the client rejects him after the trial period.

Lee: Since sales and I are not as familiar as you with all the legalities, wouldn't it be better for you to be present?
Supervisor: You should be familiar. You've been doing this job for seven years. There are all kinds of publications you can refer to and it's part of your job to keep abreast of things related to your job. Don't leave work every day at 5 to play handball or watch television or whatever.

Lee: You know I'm not a clock watcher.
Supervisor: That's really not the point. If your job requires familiarity with legal complications, then be familiar with them. How you get the information is your business.

Lee: Look, I'm willing to follow through with this new concept, just trying to establish the most effective method.
Supervisor: Lee, let's leave it like this. Get together with sales, formulate some guidelines, and put down some ideas. Then come back and we'll have a full blown meeting and maybe we'll be able to resolve something.
APPENDIX E

Supervisory Behavior Description
SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

Purpose of the questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items to be used to describe supervisory behavior. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe supervisory behavior as accurately as you can.

DIRECTIONS

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described.

c. DECIDE whether the supervisor (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom, (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

1. Supervisor refuses to give in when confronted with disagreement.  A B C D E
2. Supervisor does personal favors for subordinates.  A B C D E
3. Supervisor expresses appreciation for a job well done.  A B C D E
4. Supervisor is easily understood.  A B C D E
5. Supervisor demands more than can be done.  A B C D E
6. Supervisor helps subordinates with their personal problems.  A B C D E
7. Supervisor is apt to stand up for first line manager although it might result in unpopularity.  A B C D E
8. Supervisor insists things must be done his/her way.  A B C D E
9. Supervisor sees that a subordinate is rewarded for a job well done.  A B C D E
10. Supervisor rejects suggestions for change.  A B C D E
11. Supervisor is apt to change duties of first line managers without first talking it over with them.  A B C D E
12. Supervisor treats subordinates without considering their feelings  A B C D E
13. Supervisor resists changes in ways of doing things.  A B C D E
14. Supervisor has tendency to "ride" subordinates.  A B C D E
15. Supervisor has reluctance in explaining his/her actions.  A B C D E
16. Supervisor acts without consulting foremen.  A B C D E
17. Supervisor stresses the importance of high morale among employees.  A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

18. Supervisor backs up foremen in their actions. A B C D E
19. Supervisor is slow to accept new ideas. A B C D E
20. Supervisor treats subordinates as his/her equal. A B C D E
21. Supervisor criticizes a specific act rather than a particular individual. A B C D E
22. Supervisor is willing to make changes A B C D E
23. Supervisor makes subordinates feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E
24. Supervisor is friendly and can be easily approached. A B C D E
25. Supervisor puts suggestions that are made by subordinates into operation. A B C D E
26. Supervisor is likely to get the approval of the foremen on important matters before going ahead. A B C D E
27. Supervisor encourages overtime work. A B C D E
28. Supervisor tries out his/her new ideas. A B C D E
29. Supervisor rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
30. Supervisor criticizes poor work. A B C D E
31. Supervisor talks about how much should be done. A B C D E
32. Supervisor encourages slow working foremen to greater effort A B C D E
33. Supervisor waits for foremen to push new ideas before he/she does. A B C D E
34. Supervisor assigns subordinates to particular tasks. A B C D E
35. Supervisor asks for sacrifices from subordinates for the good of the entire department. A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

36. Supervisor insists that subordinates follow standard ways of doing things in every detail.

37. Supervisor sees to it that subordinates are working up to their limits.

38. Supervisor offers new approaches to problems.

39. Supervisor insists that he/she be informed on decisions made by foremen.

40. Supervisor lets others do their work the way they think best.

41. Supervisor is apt to "needle" subordinates to achieve greater effort.

42. Supervisor decides in detail what should be done and how it should be done.

43. Supervisor emphasizes meeting of deadlines.

44. Supervisor asks foremen who have slow groups to get more out of their groups.

45. Supervisor emphasizes the quantity of work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Analysis of Variance Summary Tables
(Unweighted Means Solution)
### TABLE 5
Summary of Analysis of Variance
In-Basket Exercise
Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>55.693</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.938</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6
Summary of Analysis of Variance
In-Basket Exercise
Organizing and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>65.901</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.138</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7
Summary of Analysis of Variance
In-Basket Exercise
Decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1.641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>64.608</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.745</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8
Summary of Analysis of Variance
In-Basket Exercise
Written Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>12.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.731*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>74.895</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.845</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01
TABLE 9
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Role-playing Group I
Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>17.398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>27.494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>133.776</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>4539.324</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4717.992</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Role-playing Group I
Initiation of Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>195.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>438.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.888*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>2219.329</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2854.213</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:* p < .01
### TABLE 11
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Role-playing Group II

**Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>187.459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>19.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>732.768</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.675*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>6714.551</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7653.855</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *p < .05*

### TABLE 12
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Role-playing Group II

**Initiation of Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Ratee (A)</td>
<td>625.713</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.332*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Rater (B)</td>
<td>364.168</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>339.504</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>5138.543</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6467.928</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *p < .05*
### TABLE 13

Interaction Effects for Role-playing Group II on Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Effect</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater's sex for evaluations of female ratees</td>
<td>$SS_b$ for $a_1$</td>
<td>1, 52</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater's sex for evaluations of male raters</td>
<td>$SS_b$ for $a_2$</td>
<td>1, 52</td>
<td>3.4189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee's sex on evaluations by female raters</td>
<td>$SS_a$ for $b_1$</td>
<td>1, 52</td>
<td>7.93 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee's sex on evaluations by male raters</td>
<td>$SS_a$ for $b_2$</td>
<td>1, 52</td>
<td>.3095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .01$
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