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MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN LARGE MANUFACTURING ORGANIZATIONS IN BANGKOK

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Thailand, an agricultural heritage country, lacks industrial traditions. In recent years Thailand has attempted to develop economically through industrialization. Thus, the government has encouraged private investment including local and foreign, in companies placing emphasis on improving industrialization. Investors are motivated through tax exempt benefits, tariff protection, and a guarantee of freedom from competition. According to the present regulation, at least 51% of the total investment in any enterprise must be by local investors. Most corporations have been joint-ventures with foreign investors from the United States, Japan, The Republic of China, and some European countries.

Apparently, the enterprises that have foreign participation grow more rapidly than those locally owned. The foreign entrepreneurs bring various positive contributions to industrialization in Thailand. They provide modern technology through the establishment of modern industries. They give local employees, managers and workers,
opportunities to learn management and production techniques as more effective ways of performing their jobs.

Management is essential to organized endeavors, and for a broad working definition let us view management as an activity which performs certain functions in order to obtain the effective acquisition, allocation, and utilization of human efforts and physical resources in order to accomplish some goal.¹

When performing his role, the manager has to take into consideration not only the economic aspect of the enterprise but also the human and social side of the enterprise as well. He, therefore, has to manage for the optimum benefit of every aspect of the organizational system.

Miller viewed the emerging system of management as "Humanistic Management". He characterized Humanistic Management as:

I have coined the phrase Humanistic Management for the fourth phase of management. Humanistic management is a combination of the Scientific, Human Relations, and Participative methods. Systems are necessary for any establishment to survive; systems to forecasting, production requirements, inventory, purchasing, pricing, standardized recipes...etc., must be developed. Similarly, human relations are extremely important. Employees will respond and react better to fair and reasonable treatment. And, with participative management, you have the advantage of open communication with employees. So, by combining all three earlier systems of management, you can be a better manager.²

Management style has been one of the essential elements that help shape a company and give it direction. There are many distinguishing traits that set a manager's style: Autocratic vs. Participative, Structured vs. Informal, and Centralized vs. Decentralized. In each


industry there seems to be one management style which is found to be predominant through out industry. The person most responsible for setting a company's style is the chief executive. While participative management is most often used in establishing new management styles, chief executives do not seem to think most of it. In fact, at most companies, while operations are largely decentralized, a number of functions such as finance, legal affairs, personnel, government and public relations are still centrally controlled at headquarters.¹

Allen applied participative management with his employees. He introduced some important aspects to his company to become a Likert System Four organization. Mutual interest is key to make goals in humanistic and economic success. The interests of the employees and the company are seen as complimentary not competitive. In the corporation, employee self development became a goal for its own sake, not just to make people work harder for corporate profits. Employees should be regarded as mature and responsible adults, capable of determining work priorities for themselves, and capable of managing of their work lives.²

At present, the problem of collective bargaining in Thailand or elsewhere is more and more serious. The causes of collective bargaining between management and labor are: (1) the lack of mutual interest between the two, (2) dissatisfaction of the employees with their work and management system, and (3) production problems. One way


to decrease these causes and to solve problems is to improve management
of the organization by moving toward a participative management style.
It has been shown that allowing employees to be involved in decision-
making with factors involving production, health, and safety employees'
satisfaction and production will increase. This method of management
can help improve any type of organization regardless of its size and
place. However, in changing management style, certain considerations
must be taken. One of the significant contributors in participative
management style is Likert. Likert views management as the same process
everywhere, and the same basic principles operate in all instances.
Likert was quoted as saying:

1. Human nature basically, and in terms of inherited qualities,
is the same the world over.
2. The scientific method is the same in all nations.
3. Culture may influence the method of application of basic
   principles of management, but culture is not itself a
   basic principle of management.¹

The two trends of management-employee relations, industrial
democracy and participative management, have been growing all over the
world since World War II. Industrial organizations consist of material
and human resources. Human resources are the more complex resources
with which management must work. To gain the full use of all available
resources, both management and workers should try to increase shared
decision-making. This will help increase employees' mental satisfaction
and employees' commitment to the job and the organization. For the

¹David G. Bowers, Systems of Organization: Management of the
p. 108.
employees to be satisfied with the job and organization, physical satisfaction and mental satisfaction are needed.

Despite the differences between industrial democracy and participative management, both models are based on the assumption that those at the bottom of an organizational hierarchy should take part in managerial decision-making. Both models seek to increase harmony in the human, and social side of the enterprise. Both models work for profit maximization. The two models have three types of relationships. First, they can be compensatory; if we have one, we do not need the other. Second, one can complement the other. Each approach can reinforce the other. The key to mutual support between the two approaches lies in the extent that participative management results in self-planning, self-direction, and self-control. A major factor in the effectiveness of industrial democracy will be the extent to which it fosters development and implementation of participative management style at all levels in the organization. Third, differential application can be used in such a way that each can be applied to different aspects of management worker relations. Each may be best utilized for different aspects of managing the firm for certain kinds of problems.¹

The Asia Conference on "Industrial Democracy", held in Bangkok was convened to discuss workers' participation and personnel policy. The following statement represents the theme of the Conference.

. . .The emphasis of workers' participation schemes in Asia countries will be less on decisions concerning investment, production, finance and economic management and more on those

aspects of management decision-making which are of direct practical and day-to-day relevance to the workers. I should therefore like to propose that you consider whether the immediate objective of workers' participation schemes in Asian countries should not be in the area of personnel policy and personnel practices.

What is personnel management in essence? Personnel management is nothing more nor less than the substitution of rules and objective criteria for arbitrariness, favouritism and injustice. In Asia, as everywhere else, workers are of course concerned about their pay, but they are also concerned about the rating of their job in comparison with that of their colleagues. They are concerned about job security, about their chances of advancement and promotion, about their career prospects, their eating facilities, etc. Workers expect their efforts to be rewarded by objective schemes linking payment, productivity and results. They want to see that in the maintenance of discipline and order, objective criteria for sanctions are applied and that they are given a chance to defend themselves against allegations of misbehavior. They want to have an influence on the determination of working hours, on safety measures and the operation of welfare facilities. They expect to be treated by their superiors with respect and justice.

... The question is not whether such disputes are lawful or unlawful, or whether they are justified or not. The fact is that there are so many areas of personnel practices in which disputes, confrontation and protest could be avoided by associating the workers with the decisions concerned.¹

The argument was that the workers lacked education and technical know-how needed to be functional participants. It was stated that:

One major argument which Asia employers advanced against workers' participation is that a large portion of the workforce in a number of Asian countries is illiterate and that, in a general way, workers do not possess the technical know how and understanding without which workers' participation simply cannot function. This argument cannot easily be dismissed: it must be taken very seriously. Workers' education programs are surely one means to overcome this obstacle, but the acquisition of skill and knowledge must go hand in hand with experience, and experience certainly cannot be

acquired in a single day. Workers' participation in Asia is, and must be, a gradual process.¹

The amount of worker participation in the decision-making process in private enterprises in Thailand in reality is limited. Phlpatanakul expressed it as follows:

In the private sectors, where the board of directors is comprised of share holders, the master-servant relationship strongly remains. The employers feel that they are the sole owners of the business, and, therefore, there is no justification in having the employees participate in co-determination or the decision-making process. . .²

The labor union movement in Thailand indicates the need for mutual understanding between labor and management. It seems to be following the pattern of the human relations movement and the harmony in management style that are developing in the United States. Mayo and Roethlisberger discuss the human relations movement in American industrial management.

The human relationists and their behavioral descendants were to bring about a substantial number of amendments to previously held concepts of management. Among them were: (1) an increasing emphasis on the social, group-belonging needs of man; (2) the desire to enlarge and enrich jobs to dispel the discouraging side-effects of over-specialization of labor; (3) a marked decline in the emphasis on the hierarchy of authority and a call for "bottom up," participative management; (4) an increasing recognition of the informal side of the organization and the role of worker sentiments and informal activities; and finally, the development of means to study the interaction of the formal and the informal organizations.

. . .Management was exhorted to turn its attention to the social side of man, to get people involved, and to thereby couple worker satisfaction and higher productivity. Social

¹Ibid., p. 31.

man may have been born at Hawthorne, but his nurturance and elementary education were at Yale, Harvard, Michigan, M.I.T., Illinois, and Ohio State.\(^1\)

**Need for the Study**

The human relations movement in Thailand industrial management indicates the need for further research in this field to find harmony in industry and to accomplish success in management. "Every aspect of a firm's activities is determined by the competence, motivation, and general effectiveness of its human organization. Of all the tasks of management, managing the human component is the central and most important task, because all else depends upon how well it is done."\(^2\)

The generalizability of the utilization in developing nations of Western Hemisphere theory and research in industrial management has been doubted. The following quote exemplifies this doubt.

Knowledge, and its methods of acquisition, are not commodities like our material exports which are traded upon the international market place. The dissemination and acquisition of knowledge is inextricably interwoven into the fabric of the culture and, thus, is associated with the value domain of the culture it represents. Human experience is contextually dependent and can only be understood within the contexts it occurs (Mishler, 1979). . . \(^3\)

Some believe that attitudes, beliefs, and value systems among organizations in different cultural settings affect the behavior of members within the organizations. Therefore, management practices may

---

\(^1\) Wren, *The Evolution of Management Thought*, p. 344.


need to vary from one cultural setting to the other. "A cross-cultural look at organization structure might suggest that more authoritarian cultures would have organizations in which control and decision-making are more centralized than in less authoritarian cultures."¹ This study was conducted to determine the difference in behavioral pattern if any between the manufacturing organizations of Thai culture with those in the United States. Negandhi and Robey state the need for studies like this one.

. . . There is a real need to develop an approach which can help us to understand the total organization—how it reacts to the socio-political environment, how the value systems of workers influence management style, how organization structure affects members, and a host of other significant questions. Essentially we are faced with these questions in studying any organization, but the task now becomes one of extending organization theory to encompass cross-national and cross-cultural considerations. . . ²

Concepts of management and organizational theory proposed by Likert and his associates were utilized in this study. Reddin indicated that we are desperately in need of a general theory of organization which concerned with effectiveness and outputs has resulted in designing organizations, motivating employees, and training personnel.³

The number of multinational corporations (MNCs) in Thailand is increasing rapidly. These MNCs bring not only new technologies of production to Thai industries, but also new management techniques. By


²Ibid., pp. 17-18.

interviewing key persons of all the companies included in this study, all of the MNCs and some local companies claimed that they utilize the participative management technique at some levels of the organizations. Many management personnel in Thailand have been influenced in the democratic or participative way of management by obtaining education abroad. Investigations of the effects of culture on managerial style and organizational effectiveness in Thailand are needed.

Statement of the Problem

This research study investigated the managerial style and the organizational effectiveness of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok. The primary purpose was to determine the managerial style compared with the effectiveness of the organization. The researcher had established nine questions to be answered from this research which were stated as:

1. What were the managerial styles employed by those who were in charge of managers in the large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok?

2. Was there a predominate or common style of managerial leadership among them? What was it?

3. How were these styles and management system related to the organizational effectiveness?

4. What was the most effective managerial style for these organizations?

5. Was there an existence of participative managerial style? How was it related to the effectiveness of the organization?
6. Was there the existence of more participative managerial style at the higher organizational levels?

7. Was there a desire for more participation in management and work concerned decisions in general?

8. Was there a difference in managerial style and organizational effectiveness among managers of different educational levels; and how were the managerial style and effectiveness criteria related to the educational variable?

9. Were there differences in managerial styles among the different departments in the organizations?

**Definition of Terms**

*Managerial style:* the behavior patterns adopted by an individual manager in his efforts to attain organizational goals.

*Management systems:* the generalized overall management style which organization members perceive being used throughout the total organization. It is the general pattern of management in which we see the organization as a whole system.

*Leadership:* the process whereby the work is accomplished by subordinates.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study attempted to identify the managerial leadership styles of the large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok. The study was limited to the private sector of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok which employed one thousand or more employees. The subject areas of this study are: 1) to analyze leadership styles of the
managers of the organizations; 2) to find the relation between the styles and the organizational effectiveness as perceived by members of the organizations: department managers, supervisors, and workers; and 3) to identify differences in style and effectiveness among managers with various levels of education (the relationship between managerial style and education; between effectiveness and education.)

Organization of the Study

The dissertation was organized into five chapters. Chapter I contains the introduction. Chapter II contains a synthesis of the related literature and research. It describes the theories and research on managerial style, participative management, research on management style of some Asian countries, organizational effectiveness concepts and theory, and the measurement of the managerial style and organizational effectiveness. Chapter III includes the research methodology, design, and hypotheses for the study. It also describes the population, sample, data collection, and statistical procedures used. Chapter IV contains the research findings. Chapter V contains a summary of the research procedures, the findings, and recommendation for further research studies.
CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed review of theory and associated research in managerial leadership style and organizational effectiveness. The synthesis of related literature was organized and presented in 4 sections: Management Style Theory and Research, Participative Management, Management Style Implicated with some Asia countries, and Organizational Effectiveness and Measurement.

Management Style Theory and Research

The human relations movement had its most recognizable beginnings in the work of Lewin and his associates and in the Western Electric studies, as characterized by Mayo. The human relations movement and its variations are currently represented in the work of McGregor, Argyris, and Likert. These three writers describe the managerial and supervisory styles and practices which result in a viable organization and in increased satisfaction and performance on the part of subordinates.1

Research studies on managerial leadership style focusing on the relationship of managerial behavior and group or organizational effectiveness and measurement.

effectiveness have been conducted to determine which style was best for an organization as a whole. Based on the research results, no one universal conclusion could be made. Even though some of them were alike in conceptualization and meaning, each researcher used different terminology. The published results were presented in one of the three topical headings: Trait, Behavioral, or Situational Theory approach.

**Trait Approach**

The early studies of leadership encompassed the traits of the leaders. It was believed leaders had differentiated characteristics from those of the followers in such features as: intelligence, personality, physical characteristic, supervisory ability, and social traits. For a person to be a leader, he needed ratings on these traits superior to his followers. Carroll and Tosi explained this viewpoint.

The underlying premise of the trait approach to leadership is that leadership is an attribute of personality, that a certain identifiable trait or collection of traits makes a person effective as a leader, and that better organizational results can be obtained by selecting as leaders those who have these identifiable qualities.¹

For years, however, researchers have not been able to validate these beliefs about leadership. Traits alone could not predict leadership.

First, the list of potentially important traits was endless. Second, trait test scores were not consistently predictive of leader effectiveness. Traits did not operate singly, but in combination, to influence follower. Finally, the patterns of effective behavior depended

largely on the situation. The leadership behavior which was effective in one place might be ineffective in others.¹

Behavioral Approach

In the behavioral theme, the managerial leadership behavior theories that have been most widely publicized and utilized in practice appear to be numerous, starting with the early study of leadership style within the framework of the democratic and autocratic structure. The relative advantages (in terms of several dependent variables in organizational behavior such as productivity, turnover, absenteeism, morale, etc.) of democratic over authoritarian styles of supervision are frequently cited in the literature.²

Lewin, Lippitt, and White were the first researchers who reviewed behavioral styles of the formally appointed positional leader as Autocratic, Participative, or Laissez Faire. These managerial styles were described by Carroll and Tosi in the following manner.

1. Autocratic or Dictatorial. The leader makes all decisions and allows the subordinates no influence in the decision-making process. These supervisors are often indifferent to the personal needs of subordinates.

2. Participative or Democratic. These supervisors consult with their subordinates on appropriate matters. They allow their subordinates some influence in the decision-making process. In addition, this type of supervisor is not punitive and treats his subordinates with dignity and kindness.


3. Laissez Faire or Free Rein. Supervisors in this group allow their group to have complete autonomy. They rarely supervise directly, so the group makes many of their on-the-job decisions themselves.¹

The results of early research were important but not conclusive regarding participation theory. Zimmerman related his beliefs:

"...The experiment was designed and carried out to study the effects of leader behavior on hostility and aggression, not to study productivity at all. No direct, objective measure of productivity was included. Thus, Filley and House (4) conclude that no determination can be made as to which style produced higher productivity.

Lewin, Lippitt, and White did find differences in the amount of aggressive behavior, tension, group cohesion, hostility, and instances of scapegoating. While these findings should not be ignored, further questions are in order. . .²"

Other researchers identified leadership dimensions, "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration", as two of the most important dimensions of leadership.³ These two dimensions are discussed by Gibson as:

"Initiating structure involves behavior in which the leader organizes and defines the relationships in the group, tends to establish well-defined patterns and channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done, and consideration involves behavior indicating friendship, mutual trust, respect, warmth and rapport between the leader and follower."⁴

Hershey and Blanchard discussed two instruments called Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) and Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The LBDQ was completed by the leaders'
subordinates, supervisors, or peers, but the LOQ was completed by the leaders themselves.\textsuperscript{1} The findings from the studies showed that effective leadership performances were high on both dimensions. However, the relationship of these two factors of the leader to performance and satisfaction of the subordinates varied from one study to another. Some of the inconsistencies were due to the fact that there were very different organization settings where these studies were conducted.\textsuperscript{2}

The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan conducted studies of leadership style by locating clusters of characteristics that seemed to be related to each other and various indicators of effectiveness. The studies identified two concepts called Employee Orientation and Production Orientation. These two dimensions parallel the concepts of the authoritarian and democratic leader behavior.\textsuperscript{3} In the studies conducted, employee orientation was used to describe the behavior of a supervisor which indicated a concern for "human relations."

Human relations was used to indicate that the supervisor considered his subordinates as human beings of intrinsic importance, took an interest in them, and accepted their personal needs. Production Orientation emphasized a concern that employees were the means for getting work done and the production and technical aspects of the job.


\textsuperscript{3}Hersey and Blanchard, \textit{Management of Organizational Behavior}, p. 93.
The two orientations were conceived to be at opposite poles of the continuum.¹

There have been significant empirical, theoretical, and practical studies conducted on the topic of organizational effectiveness. Many empirical results were found from the leadership studies in office, railroad settings, and in service industries.²

At the Research Center for Group Dynamics, Cartwright and Zander reinterpreted the two dimensions of leadership behavior from the findings of the Ohio State and the Michigan Research Center studies into two leader behavior dimensions of group functions. Their accumulated results of leadership functions were described as:

1. **Group Maintenance Functions.** Behavior that keeps interpersonal relations pleasant, resolves disputes, provides encouragement, gives the minority a chance to be heard, stimulates self-direction, and increases interdependence among members.

2. **Goal Achievement Functions.** Behavior that initiates action, keeps members' attention on the goal, develops a procedural plan, evaluates the quality of work done, and makes expert information available.³

Argyris indicated that the basic properties of the formal organization kept individuals immature and prevented them from self-actualization; he found four basic properties of the formal organization to be the cause of the problem.

---


First, the specialization of labor limits individual initiative, chokes off self-expression, and requires an individual to use only a few of his abilities. . . Second, the chain of command assumes that efficiency is a result of arranging the parts so that power and authority are lodged at the top and so that through a definite hierarchy of authority the top can control the bottom of the organization. The impact of this is to make the individuals dependent upon and passive toward the leader. The individual has little control over his working environment, develops a short time perspective, and is made dependent by the incentive and control systems. Third, the unity-of-direction principle means that the path toward the goal is directed and controlled by the leader. Problems develop when these work goals do not involve the employee, when he is not allowed to define his own goals in terms of his inner needs. Finally, the span-of-control concept tends to decrease the amount of self-control and the time perspective of the individuals at the bottom of the ladder. By limiting the number of subordinates under one manager, closer control may be exercised and this presupposes immaturity of these individuals.  

McGregor expressed human nature and human behavior in terms of Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumed that most people disliked work, preferred to be directed, had little desire for responsibility, had little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems, wanted safety need above all, and were motivated by money, fringe benefits, and the threat of punishment. The manager following the Theory X model structured, controlled, and closely supervised his subordinates.  

Theory Y assumed that people could be basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. The individual goals could be best achieved by directing his efforts toward accomplishing organizational goals. Therefore, the manager should be supportive and facilitating.

---

1 Wren, The Evolution of Management Thought, pp. 446-448.

2 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, pp. 54-57.
McGregor implied that most people had the potential to be mature and self-motivated. Thus, he supported Theory Y to be the better style of management.¹

McGregor, challenged management to provide a work climate which subordinates had chances to mature as individuals and as members of the organization by satisfying their own needs while working toward organizational effectiveness. McGregor believed that management based on the assumptions of Theory Y would be more profitable for both the individuals and the organization.² Hersey and Blanchard expressed this viewpoint when they stated:

"It is also being found over and over again that broadening individual responsibility is beneficial to both the worker and the company. Giving employee the opportunity to grow and mature on the job can help him satisfy more than just physiological and safety needs, which in turn motivates him to use more of his potential in accomplishing organizational goals."³

Blake and Mouton created another theory of managerial leadership style, the Managerial Grid. The Grid approach attempted to avoid the extreme on dimension style, but integrating both of the two dimensions: Concern for People and Concern for Production. It was the assumption of Blake and Mouton that "people and production concerns are complimentary, rather than mutually exclusive"⁴ and Blake and Mouton advocated that scoring high on both dimensions would be the ideal style of management.

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., pp. 60-64.
³Ibid.
To develop the grid chart, place the Concern for People dimension on the vertical axis and the Concern for Production dimension on the horizontal axis. There could be five styles.

The 1,1 supervisory style shows little concern for either production or employees; it is the equivalent of the laissez-faire supervisory style described earlier. The 1,9 supervisor has high employee concern but little concern for performance, while the 9,1 supervisor has little concern for employees but places strong emphasis on performance. The 5,5 supervisor is a compromiser; he places only moderate emphasis on satisfying employee needs and on achieving satisfactory levels of performance. (Blake and Mouton feel this is the most common supervisory style.) Finally, there is the 9,9 supervisory pattern, in which there is high emphasis on achieving both employee needs and high levels of performance. The 9,9 supervisor is able to integrate employee needs and organizational needs with a team-building approach.\(^1\)

Blake and Mouton in a grid arrangement showed how leadership style could move along the building of team work, self-direction and control, and designing work structures to get commitment to the work and organization from its participants. A basic aim, therefore, was to promote the conditions that integrated creativity, high production, and high morals through concerted team action.\(^2\)

Likert described five conditions for managers to use to be successful with an effective supervisory style.

Likert's first condition is the principle of supportive relations. Likert explained that: "it provides an invaluable guide in any attempt to apply the newer theory of management in a specific plant or organization, can be briefly stated: the leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive

\(^1\)Carroll and Tosi, *Organizational Behavior*, pp. 227-228.

and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance."\(^1\)

On the basis of the social belonging need, most people need recognition, support, security, and favorable reactions from the belonging group. Under those conditions they are actually motivated to behave according to the group values and goals.

The second condition of Likert's effective supervisory behavior is "Group Methods of Supervision". Likert described this condition as:

"Management will make full use of the potential capacities of its human resources only when each person in an organization is a member of one or more effectively functioning work group that have a high degree of group loyalty, effective skills of interaction, and high performance goals."\(^2\)

The third condition, "High Performance Goals", was described by Likert:

"If a high level of performance is to be achieved, it appears to be necessary for a supervisor to be employee-centered and at the same time to have high performance goals and a contagious enthusiasm as to the importance of achieving these goals."\(^3\)

The fourth condition, "Technical Knowledge", was described by Likert:

"The leader has adequate competence to handle the technical problems faced by his group, or he sees that access to this technical knowledge is fully provided. This may involve bringing in, as needed, technical or resource persons. Or he may arrange to have technical training given to one or more members of this group so that the group can have available the necessary technical know-how when the group discusses a problem and arrives at a decision."\(^4\)

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 104.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 8.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 171.
Likert stated that the fifth condition for leadership effectiveness behavior is the ability of the leader in "Coordinating, Scheduling, and Planning." Likert stated:

"The leader fully reflects and effectively represents the views, goals, values, and decisions of his group in those other groups where he is performing the function of linking his group to the rest of the organization. He brings to the group of which he is the leader the views, goals, and decisions of those other groups. In this way, he provides a linkage whereby communication and the exercise of influence can be performed in both directions."\footnote{Ibid.}

Likert studies of management systems are clearly expressed in the emergence of the System 4 Management Theory. The four management systems range on a continuum from System 1 through System 4, and they are arranged consecutively as: Exploitive Authoritative, Benevolent Authoritative, Consultative, and Participative Group systems. Each management system represents the dominant characteristics of an organization and human being interaction in that organization. Likert avocated that the most effective system of management was System 4, namely Participative Management System; and the best supervisory style was participative, since it could provide the way to obtain the full use of human resources. Likert explained that any organization can be improved by gradually moving toward System 4 from whatever management system that organization is using at the time. He also identified that the more the organization applies the degree of participation in decision making and the five principle conditions for effective leader behavior, the more it will move toward System 4 management. The four management systems proposed by Likert are described as:
System 1. Management having no confidence or trust in subordinates. The bulk of the decisions and the goal setting of the organization are made at the top. Subordinates are forced to work with fear, threats, punishment, and occasional rewards. The little superior-subordinate interaction which takes place is usually with fear and mistrust. The control process is highly concentrated in top management, and informal organization generally develops which opposes the goals of the formal organization.

System 2. Management has condescending confidence and trust in subordinates such as in the master and servant relationship. The bulk of the decisions and goal setting of the organization are made at the top, though many decisions are made within a prescribed framework at lower levels. Rewards and some actual or potential punishment are used to motivate workers. The control process is still concentrated in top management, but some is delegated to middle levels.

System 3. Management has substantial but not complete confidence and trust in subordinates. Subordinates are permitted to make minor decisions at lower levels. Communication flows both up and down the hierarchy. Rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement are used to motivate. There is a moderate amount of superior-subordinate interaction, often with a fair amount of confidence and trust. Significant aspects of the control process are delegated downward with a feeling of responsibility at both higher and lower levels. An informal organization may develop, but it may either support or partially resist goals of the organization.

System 4. Management is seen as having complete confidence and trust in subordinates. Decision making is widely dispersed throughout the organization. Communication flows not only up and down the hierarchy but among peers. Workers are motivated by participation and involvement in developing economic rewards, setting goals, improving methods, and appraising progress toward goals. There is extensive, friendly superior-subordinate interaction with a high degree of confidence and trust. The informal and formal organizations are often one and the same. Thus, all social forces support efforts to achieve stated organizational goals.¹

Bowers and Seashore found four dimensions of leadership behavior associated with satisfaction and performance when they studied forty

agencies of an insurance company. The four dimensions of leadership behaviors were described by Bowers and Seashore as:

1. **Support.** Behavior that enhances someone else's feelings of personal worth and importance.

2. **Interaction Facilitation.** Behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships.

3. **Goal Emphasis.** Behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal or achieving excellent performance.

4. **Work Facilitation.** Behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning, and by providing resources such as tools, materials, and technical knowledge.¹

Leadership was conceptualized in terms of four social process functions which were the basic structures of behavior for an effective leader. The performance of these functions was proposed not only for the supervisor but might be provided by anyone in a work group for anyone else in that work group. Through leadership behavior, the supervisor set the pattern of the mutual leadership which subordinates supply each other.²

**Situational Theory Approach**

Situational theorists suggest that there is no one best style effective for all situations in any organization. A number of styles can be chosen to appropriately and effectively operate an organization. One style may be effective for the organization while the others may not, it depends on the situation.

¹Bowers and Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," p. 604.

²Ibid., pp. 604-606.
"The organizational situation also influences the supervisory approach. The degree of crisis and the type of work are but two possible situational factors which could be important. For example, in an emergency where a decision is quickly needed, it may be unwise to use a "participative" approach, since this would take undue time."\(^1\)

Fiedler, in his Contingency Model of Leadership, identified three situational characteristics which determine the managerial style for effective leadership.

1. Leader-member relations, which refer to the amount of trust and how well-liked the leader is.

2. Task-structure, which refers to the extent to which the job is defined. High task structure refers to well-defined jobs in which each aspect is spelled out. Low task structure is present where job requirements are unclear and ambiguous.

3. Position power, which is a function of the formal authority structure; that is, whether or not an individual has the right to reward, sanction, evaluate, or promote those who work for him."\(^2\)

Fiedler concluded that "the appropriateness of the leadership style for mixing group performance is contingent upon the favorableness of the group task situation."\(^3\)

Fiedler found that the task oriented style was best in the situation where Leader-member relations were either very good or very bad. Under some of the moderately unfavorable conditions, the leader had to use the people oriented style to motivate his subordinates to become involved in attempts to deal with an ambiguous task or to win their supports.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Carroll and Tosi, *Organizational Behavior*, p. 228.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 230.


\(^4\) Carroll and Tosi, *Organizational Behavior*, pp. 229-231.
Vecchio conducted an empirical examination of the validity of Fiedler's model of leadership effectiveness. Vecchio concluded that the results of his analysis failed to support the model.¹ Vecchio believed that the model failed was due to the lack of generalizability.²

Hersey and Blanchard extended Fiedler's contingency model by adding the third dimension, effectiveness dimension. The tridimensional model integrated the leadership style with situational demands of the environment. Hersey and Blanchard concluded that:

...The Life Cycle Theory of Leadership which we have developed is based on a curvilinear relationship between task and relationships and "maturity". This theory will attempt to provide a leader with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of maturity of one's followers.³

Managerial style should move from high task-low relationship, to high task-high relationship, to high relationship-low task, and finally to low task-low relationship.⁴

**Participative Management**

Perhaps the most comprehensive research based position on participative management has been developed by Likert, who assembled and integrated evidence supporting the effectiveness of "System 4" or


²Ibid., pp. 203-205.


⁴Ibid.
participative management. Before further discussion on the participation or participative management style, the meaning of this term should be stated.

The behavioral approach is participative management. It is face-to-face, informal sharing of decision making at the work place. It is "shop-floor democracy". It is an informal arrangement between managers and subordinates whereby managers—through indoctrination, training, organizational policy, social pressure, or other means involve their subordinates in consensual decision making about matters of importance to all concerned.2

There are four specific means of effect and four corresponding results of participative management style which Sashkin identified as:

At least four specific means of effect can be identified:

1. Improved flow and use of information; this is an effect on quality.

2. Increased psychological commitment of workers; workers' acceptance is increased through participation.

3. Learning through behavioral practice. Those involved in a participative approach develop skills in applying the approach; this is an effect on behavioral process.

4. Development of shared norms and values among organization members, facilitating collaborative efforts; this is an effect on organizational process.3

Four corresponding outcomes of participation are associated with each of the means:

1. Improved quality. Better information flow and use can clarify tasks and task goals, and produce qualitatively better decisions, problem solutions, or change plans.

---


2. Increase in workers' commitment and acceptance of goals, decisions, problem solutions, or changes through a sense of "ownership" (having been involved in the goal-setting, decision making, problem-solving, or change activity). This outcome increases the likelihood that goals, etc., will be effectively implemented.

3. Support of the participative approach and continuance of its effects over time, as a result of learning through behavioral practice: this represents the behavioral process effect.

4. Increased adaptive capacity of the organization. Development of shared norms and values may lead to more effective use of inter-dependency relations among organization members, through an organizational process based on collaboration, as opposed to win-lose conflict. Seashore (personal communication) has described the operation of this outcome as "discovering, testing, and changing the boundaries of issues and activities that rest on shared values, trustworthiness of the purposes of others".

Likert avocated System 4 management for solving organizational conflict between management and workers. As a result of using this management style, Likert found that the relation of management and workers were improved. In one of his studies Likert found:

...within one year's time there was a 28 percent increase in productivity, scrap was cut to less than one-fourth of the previous level, and there was a substantial decrease in "committeeman calls" and written grievances. (A "committeeman call" is a demand by a worker that a union representative is not present, the worker will not listen or talk.) The reduction in committeeman calls and written grievances reflects a substantial reduction in the hostility and conflict that had existed in this department prior to its shift toward System 4.¹

In comparing results obtained from other countries, Likert found that in most highly industrialized nations, the management system is more toward System 4. In less industrialized nations the management system

is more toward System 1. Likert also found that there were no differences in age, education, seniority, or party membership among respondents.¹

According to Likert, the manager who employed participative management strategy is more effective than the one employing authoritative style. By introducing the time concern, Likert pointed out that:

. . . a manager with high technical competence and high performance goals who uses System 1 or 2 and puts pressure on the organization for high production and low costs through such procedures as tight budgets, across-the-board budget cuts, personnel ceilings, and tight or tightened standards can achieve impressive productivity and financial results over the short run. . . the human organization's productive capability will deteriorate under this kind of manager. As a consequence, over the long run the favorable productivity and earnings usually are not sustained. The profit and loss statements for that short-run period were, of course, spurious since the profits reported were larger than the actual true earnings for that period (Likert, 1973a). The length of time over which these spuriously high earnings can be achieved, i.e., the "short run," varies with the size of the organization. In small organizations, this time span can be one to three years; in medium sized organizations the range is likely to be about three to five years. In large corporations, the "short run" can be ten years or even longer.²

In the United States, the mean company management system is between System 2 or 2½. Likert found that System 4 organization is 20 to 40 percent more productive and profitable than the average operations. Likert says:

"When an organization shifts from System 2 to System 4, there will be improvement in its performance and its capacity to resolve conflicts constructively; corresponding sizable improvements are occurring in productivity, earnings, and other performance measurements including in employee satisfaction, internal teamwork, and union management relationships."³

¹Ibid., pp. 88-93.
²Ibid., pp. 95-98.
³Ibid., p. 98.
The desired characteristics of System 4 management which differs from the other systems are described by Likert.

1. Greater confidence by superiors in subordinates.
2. More freedom felt by subordinates to talk to their superiors.
3. More frequent seeking and use of subordinates' ideas.
4. Use of involvement rather than threats.
5. Mutual confidence and trust in interactions rather than condescension by superiors and fear by subordinates.
6. Greater participation by subordinates in decisions related to their work.
7. Productivity, cost, and other accounting data used by departments for self-guidance rather than by top management for punitive purposes.
8. Widespread feeling of responsibility for achieving the goals of the organization.
9. Mutual expectations that each person will do the job well and help others, and;
10. Cooperative attitudes to achieve goals rather than covert resistance to them and restriction of output.

Management Style Implications in Selected Asian Countries

The introduction of participative management styles into developing countries creates problems which need to be resolved. The situation is described by Glen and James.

The managers, engineers, and other professionals operating under these systems are the "cream of the crop", since there are often competitive examinations for appointment to management positions. The educational level is very high, with much of the education coming either from western school or from western-influenced schools in India. Many of the textbooks are of American origin. Management Science techniques are known by many but applications do not appear

\[1\] Ibid., p. 94.
to be widespread. Thus, we have knowledgeable, able managers having difficulties in using modern techniques in complex industrial-social-political situations.¹

Negandhi and Prasad express the need for environmental change and the change in management before participation in management will be widespread.

While there are many avenues along which such transmission can be undertaken, it has been recognized that there are various social, cultural, and other obstacles which will be in the way. Pessimistic though it may sound, unless there is a perceptible change in the philosophy of the owner-managers and their top salaried managers, the efforts may not yield fruitful results. One may find individuals who are imbued with knowledge of management theory and techniques acquired painstakingly but unable to effectively apply them in a work environment such as it prevails in a large number of industrial enterprises in underdeveloped countries.²

In attempting to transmit advanced management know-how into Burma, Chewning found an acceptance of technological advancement but a rejection of management improvement.³

Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter conducted a research study on the attitudes of managers in fourteen countries including two Asia nations, India and Japan. They found that almost every manager in the fourteen countries held negative perception of the average individual's capacity for initiative and leadership; at the same time these managers felt that participative method was more effective than traditional direct method. Comparisons were made in the attitudes of managers of different

¹Thaddeus M. Glen and Charles F. James, Jr., "Difficulties in Implementing Management Sciences Techniques in a Third World Setting," Interfaces 10 (February 1980): 41.


levels, sizes of companies, and ages, which were used as independent variables. The findings showed that half of the instance the higher level managers had more participative or democratic attitudes, whereas in the other half the higher level managers had more authoritarian attitudes. In India lower level managers had more participative attitudes. Managers of larger companies advocated a more positive attitude toward participative style. Age did not seem to have a strong effect on attitude toward managerial practices.¹

Negandhi conducted a research study on leadership styles in three kinds of companies: American subsidiaries, Japanese subsidiaries, and local companies of Taiwan. He evaluated leadership styles at three different levels as top manager, middle manager, and supervisor levels on four leadership styles: Consultative, Autocratic, Bureaucratic-autocratic, and Paternalistic-autocratic. Bureaucratic and Paternalistic were autocratic; however, a Bureaucratic leader attempted to influence subordinates by emphasizing rules, regulations, and procedures outlined in a company manual, while a Paternalistic leader assumed the "father figure" and had strong personal and emotional ties with subordinates. The results of this study were presented in Table 1.²

The typical pattern in management styles of developing countries is the family oriented style; dominant attitudes toward authority, responsibility and subordinates are shaped in large part by values


### TABLE 1  
**LEADERSHIP STYLES AT THREE MANAGERIAL LEVELS IN TAIWAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Top Manager</th>
<th>Middle Manager</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic-autocratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic-autocratic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = American Subsidiaries (n=9)  
B = Chinese Local Companies (n=11)  
C = Japanese Subsidiaries (n=7)

inherent in the joint family system.\(^1\) Massie and Luytjes explained the predominant characteristics of the Chinese management approach in Singapore and Malaysia.

1. The head of the family is the chief executive of the business unit. The eldest son is next in the organization hierarchy.

2. The Chinese businessman places a high value on independence, seldom welcoming outside help or investment, and on family solidarity and loyalty.

3. Authority is based on age and is usually absolute. Subordinates are not expected to question the viewpoints of superiors. Group decision making, therefore, plays a minor role.

4. The Chinese approach to management places little emphasis on specialisation or functionalisation. Each worker or manager is expected to be independent and not rely on anyone else. The tendency, therefore, is toward simple line organizations and broad spans of control.\(^2\)


Jumnoung\textsuperscript{1} conducted a study utilizing Likert's organizational characteristic profile questionnaire to measure eight organizational variables. He administered the questionnaire survey to the trainees of Rubber Replantation Aid Funds before and after the workshop (after they had been backed to work for five months). The eight measured organizational variables were: leadership, character of motivation, character of communication, character of interaction–influence, character of decision making, character of goal setting or ordering, character of control, and performance goals and training. His findings were that the managerial style implied in the ORRAF was predominately System 3, Consultative style. The measurement of the organizational profile after the workshop showed some increasing value of most organizational variables even though the management system was still in System 3. The score results were summarized in Table 2. This table was adapted by taking only needed variable scores from research results prepared in Tables 5-1 to Tables 5-16 of Jumnoung's report.\textsuperscript{2}

Abdulrahman A. Al–Jafary conducted a study in which he identified the predominant management styles of the upper levels of management in ten largest multinational petrochemical companies operating in the Arabian Gulf region. Al-Jafary examined the relationship between the use of a participative management style (System 4) and departmental effectiveness. Al-Jafary found that the predominant management style in these organizations was the consultative or System 3, and that the

\begin{itemize}
\item Ibid.
\end{itemize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Variables</th>
<th>Before Workshop</th>
<th>After Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction-Influence</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting or Ordering</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Goals and Training</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score scale for management system: System 1 = 1-5, System 2 = 6-10, System 3 = 11-15, System 4 = 16-20.
participants desired a more participative management system. Al-Jafary found a direct positive relationship between System 4 and the effectiveness of the organizations in his study. He also indicated that there was no regional difference effecting the perception of the management system and the organizational effectiveness of these organizations.¹

**Organizational Effectiveness and Measurement**

A measure of effectiveness is a correlate or a predictor of true value; when the true value is high, the measure of effectiveness tends to give a high score or high probability and when the true value is low, the measure of effectiveness tends to give a low score or low probability.² A model created to measure effectiveness by employing multivariate criteria can yield the better analysis of the prediction over the univariate measurement. The multivariate model is a more meaningful approach to measure the organizational effectiveness.³

Steers reviewed seventeen models of organizational effectiveness. Steers found that, of all the evaluation criteria utilized in these research models, the most widely used one included Adaptability-flexibility, Productivity, Job satisfaction, Profitability, and Resource acquisition consecutively. According to Steers, "effectiveness can best be examined by jointly considering three related concepts: 1) the notion

¹Abdulrahman A. Al-Jafary, "Management Systems and Organizational Effectiveness in Selected Multinational Organizations in the Arabian Gulf Region" (Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Oklahoma, 1979).


of goal optimization, 2) a system perspective, and 3) an emphasis on human behavior in organizational settings.\(^1\)

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick proposed three aspects to be evaluated in the effectiveness model, a person-process-product model of managerial effectiveness.

"The person in the model refers to the individual manager's characteristic traits and abilities, while the product is in terms of organizational results such as profit maximization and productivity. The process is the manager's on-the-job behavior and activities. In measuring and evaluating managerial effectiveness, organizations have tended to focus on either the person or the product. The process has not received the same attention because it is unclear what constitutes effective managerial behavior. All three components, person-process-product, need to be understood in evaluating the effectiveness..."\(^2\)

According to Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, organizational effectiveness is an all-encompassing concept which includes a number of component concepts of the organization as a system. Organizational effectiveness must reflect the entire circle of input, process, and output and must reflect the relationship of its organization and the environment. The criteria used by Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly in measuring organizational effectiveness included production, efficiency, and satisfaction in short run dimension, adaptiveness and development in the intermediate dimension, and survival in the long run dimension. Survival is the final determination of effectiveness. The short run criteria are more concrete, specific, verifiable, and objective than the intermediate ones, adaptiveness and development. The survival of an

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 4.

organization is measured by the indicators of the measurement of both the short run and intermediate criteria. The effective organization must achieve the proper relationship among the criteria within a given time period and the optimal balance of performance over time.¹

Mott measured organizational effectiveness by employing multi-criteria method. He defined organizational effectiveness as the ability of an organization to mobilize its central power to produce, to adapt with the change, and to cope with the unexpected emergency situations. Mott's criteria of measurement are: 1) productivity as the quantity of product, the quality of product, and the efficiency of producing (use least resource to produce most production); 2) adaptability as symbolic adaptation (anticipate in advance about the problem and find alternative solutions for it, and also staying abreast of new technologies and methods applicable to the activities of the organization) and behavioral adaptation (prompt acceptance of solutions, and prevalent acceptance of solutions); and 3) flexibility.² Thus, according to Mott, effective organizations can produce efficiently, adapt more effectively to the change, and be more flexible to cope with emergency situations than other similar organizations.

Mott recommended the use of an instrument measure of organizational effectiveness that was developed by researchers at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, instead of using productivity data collected from or by the organization being studied. Mott emphasizes that productivity data can be misleading.

¹Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, Organizations, pp. 60-68.

First, although measures of productivity can reflect the past effectiveness of an organization in adapting to problems and coping with emergencies, they tell us nothing about its viability now or in the future. Second, raw productivity measures exclude considerations of quality and production efficiency. Even unit-cost measures are inadequate because an organization with lower unit costs may actually be devoting inadequate resources to activities that might enhance future effectiveness. Measures of turnover and absenteeism are inadequate as measures of effectiveness; at best, they are indicators.  

Mott concluded that the effectiveness index resulted from using this subjective measurement as a valid and inexpensive measure except when responses reflect outmoded standards. It is important to obtain measures of unit effectiveness from several sources, in order to ensure a clear estimate of the validity of the self-appraisal measurement.  

Negahdhi states that it is erroneous to use economic indices to measure management effectiveness, especially in underdeveloped countries where seller's market conditions are widely prevalent. Negandhi proposed behaviorally oriented measures of effectiveness as suggested by Argyris, Likert, and others to be used with underdeveloped countries. As a result of studies involving effectiveness criteria with the influences of environmental factors, Negandhi concludes:  

Of the various environmental factors, the economic and legal conditions were more important than the socio-cultural variables. The impact of socio-cultural variables on management practices and effectiveness is hard to ascertain. From our limited study, all we can say is that such an impact is rather over-emphasized in the literature. More meaningful research in this area is urgently needed.  

To determine organizational effectiveness Likert recommends measuring three categories of variables: causal, intervening, and end-result. Likert described each of the categories.

The "causal" variables are independent variables which determine the course of developments within an organization and the results achieved by the organization. These causal variables include only those independent variables which can be altered or changed by the organization and its management. General business conditions, for example, although an independent variable, is not included among the causal list. Causal variables include the structure of the organization and management's policies, decisions, business and leadership strategies, skills, and behavior.

The "intervening" variables reflect the internal state and health of the organization, e.g., the loyalties, attitudes, motivations, performance goals, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision making.

The "end-result" variables are the dependent variables which reflect the achievements of the organization, such as its productivity, costs, scrap loss, and earnings.\(^1\)

It is believed by Likert that the intervening variables are produced largely by the causal variables and have an influence upon the end-result variables. Likert offers the following explanation.

"Attempts by members of the organization to improve the intervening variables by endeavoring to alter these variables directly will be much less successful, usually, than efforts directed toward modifying them through altering the causal variables. Similarly, efforts to improve the end-result variables by attempting to modify the intervening variables will usually be less effective than changing the causal variables.\(^2\)

Human organization of an enterprise can be measured by a number of key dimensions of causal and intervening variables. The causal


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 77.
variables refer to managerial leadership and organizational climate. Likert suggests using the following elements to measure the dimensions of managerial leadership and organizational climate:

**Managerial Leadership:**

- **Support:** Friendly; pays attention to what you're saying; listens to subordinates' problems.
- **Team Building:** Encourages subordinates to work as a team; encourages exchange of opinions and ideas.
- **Goal emphasis:** Encourages best efforts; maintains high standards.
- **Help with work:** Shows ways to do a better job; helps subordinates plan, organize, and schedule; offers new ideas, solutions to problems.

**Organizational Climate:**

- **Communication flow:** Subordinates know what's going on; superiors are receptive; subordinates are given information to do jobs well.
- **Decision-making practices:** Subordinates are involved in setting goals; decisions are made at levels of accurate information; persons affected by decisions are asked for their ideas; know-how of people of all levels is used.
- **Concern for persons:** The organization is interested in the individual's welfare; tries to improve working conditions; organizes work activities sensibly.
- **Influence on department:** From lower-level supervisors, employees who have no subordinates.
- **Technological adequacy:** Improved methods are quickly adopted; equipment and resources are well managed.
- **Motivation:** Differences and disagreements are accepted and worked through; people in organization work hard for money, promotions, job satisfaction, and to meet high expectations from others and are encouraged to do so by policies, working conditions, and people.¹

The intervening dimensions are measured by the variables of peer leadership, group process, satisfaction. Likert describes these variables as:

**Peer Leadership:**

**Support:** Friendly; pays attention to what others are saying; listens to others' problems.

**Goal emphasis:** Encourages best efforts; maintains high standards.

**Help with work:** Shows ways to do a better job; helps others plan, organize, and schedule; group shares with each other new ideas, solutions to problems.

**Team building:** Encouragement from each other to work as a team; emphasis on team goal; exchange of opinions and ideas.

**Group Process:**

Planing together, coordinating efforts.
Making good decisions, solving problems.
Knowing jobs and how to do them well.
Sharing information.
Wanting to meet objectives.
Having confidence and trust in other members.
Ability to meet unusual work demands.

**Satisfaction:**

With fellow workers; superiors; jobs; this organization compared with others; pay; progress in the organization up to now; chances for getting ahead in the future.¹

Strong emphasis has been placed on measuring causal and intervening variables rather than end-results. Likert expresses measurement as follows:

"End-results usually provide neither adequate information about the causes of the undesired results nor the best clues to guide decisions to solve them or prevent them. Only the

¹Ibid., p. 10.
causal and intervening variables provide information correctly describing the current internal state of the organization as a human enterprise. Especially important are the causal variables, which provide data enabling one to predict with reasonable accuracy the future trends in the organization.\textsuperscript{1}

An effective summary of the viewpoints on measuring organizational effectiveness has been succinctly stated by Likert.

\ldots Measurements of current earnings, production, and similar variables all ignore any changes that may have occurred in the human component of a department or firm and the subsequent impact these changes will have on the firm's performance and profitability.

When human component changes are taken into consideration, relatively consistent patterns of relationships generally emerge. Until investigators pay attention to these changes, their studies will continue to lead to erroneous conclusions on the best style of leadership or management.\textsuperscript{2}

Summary

The literature on managerial styles present three approaches (Trait, Behavioral, and Situational Approach) in describing the differences in managerial leadership styles and effectiveness. Human relation theorists proclaim the participative management style as the best style for managing organizations. Giving employees more freedom at work, allowing them to become more involving in decision-making, and broadening individual responsibility can help increase employees satisfaction with and commitment to their work. The participative management style will increase adaptive capacity for the organization, and develop shared norms and values which lead to more effective use of interpersonal relationships among organizational members.

\textsuperscript{1}Likert, \textit{The Human Organization}, p. 130.

In determination of organizational effectiveness, Likert identified three categories of measurable variables: causal, intervening, and end-result. Causal variables are the independent variables which can be altered by the organization and its management. Causal variables include the structure of the organization, management policies, and leadership strategies and behavior. The intervening variables refer to the internal state and health of the organization: loyalty, attitude, motivation, performance goals, and member interaction. The end-result variables are the dependent variables which indicate the achievement of organizational effectiveness. Measure of the end-results can be achieved by measuring the causal and the intervening variables. The most widely used evaluation criteria for measuring organizational effectiveness are adaptability-flexibility, productivity, and satisfaction.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design and methodology used in this study. The chapter includes an explanation on each of the following topics: research questions, research model, hypotheses, survey instruments, population and sample, survey methodology and data collection, and measurement and statistical analysis procedures.

Statement of the Problem
This research study investigated the managerial style and the organizational effectiveness of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok. The primary purpose was to determine the managerial style compared with the effectiveness of the organization. The researcher had established nine questions to be answered from this research which were stated as:

1. What were the managerial styles employed by those who were in charge of managers in the large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok?

2. Was there a predominate or common style of managerial leadership among them? What was it?

3. How were these styles and management system related to the organizational effectiveness?
4. What was the most effective managerial style for these organizations?

5. Was there an existence of participative managerial style? How was it related to the effectiveness of the organizations?

6. Was there the existence of more participative managerial style at the higher organizational levels?

7. Was there a desire for more participation in management and work concerned decision in general?

8. Was there a difference in managerial style and organizational effectiveness among managers of different educational levels; and how were the managerial style and effectiveness criteria related to the educational variable?

9. Were these differences in Managerial styles among the different departments in the organizations?

**Research Model**

The research model of this study was developed from Likert's organizational system model and Mott's organizational effectiveness model. The model consists of 4 categories of variables described as: demographic variables, independent (or causal) variables, intervening variables, and dependent (or effectiveness) variables. Figure 1 shows the model with the 4 categories and their relationships.

The demographic variables are those variables as age, education, and experience which are multifactor variables of each individual.

The independent variables are those which are described as causal variables by Likert. They are managerial leadership and organizational climate as shown in the Figure 2.
FIGURE 1

RESEARCH MODEL
CATEGORIES OF VARIABLES

Demographic Variables

Independent (Causal) Variables

Intervening Variables

Dependent (Effectiveness) Variables
FIGURE 2
MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE VARIABLES

| INDEPENDENT VARIABLES | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| **Managerial Leadership** | **Organizational Climate** |
| 2. Team Building | 2. Decision-Making |
| 3. Goal Emphasis | 3. Concern for People |
| 5. Involvement | 5. Technological Adequacy |
| | 6. Motivation |

The intervening variables, as described by Likert, are used to measure the internal state of the organization. Intervening variables are categorized as peer leadership and group process in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3
PEER LEADERSHIP AND GROUP PROCESS VARIABLES

| INTERVENING VARIABLES | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| **Peer Leadership** | **Group Process** |
| 1. Support | 1. Planning & Coordinating |
| 4. Team Building | 4. Sharing Information |
| | 5. Meeting Objective |
| | 6. Confidence & Trust in Group |
The dependent variables or the organizational effectiveness variables are identified as satisfaction and those criteria defined by Mott as: productivity, adaptivity, and flexibility. The dependent variables included in this study are shown in Figure 4.

FIGURE 4

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>Self-Assessing</th>
<th>Top Management Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adaptivity</td>
<td>2. Adaptivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flexibility</td>
<td>3. Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Satisfaction</td>
<td>4. Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses

There were 6 major hypotheses tested with data collected in this study.

Hypothesis I: The managerial style employed by managers of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok is between Benevolent authoritative (System 2) and Consultative (System 3). The predominant (common) style of managerial leadership is the Benevolent authoritative.

Hypothesis II: There is a trend of more participative management at the higher levels of management; therefore, the higher manager uses a more participative management style.

Hypothesis III: There is no difference in managerial style among different departments in the organization.

Hypothesis IV: There is a desire for more participation in management as perceived by members at the three levels of the organization.
A. There is a desire for more participation in management at the worker level.

B. There is a desire for more participation in management at the supervisor level.

C. There is a desire for more participation in management at the department manager level.

**Hypothesis V**: As perceived by the members of the organization, the relationships between the management system and the effectiveness of the organization can be related as:

A. The closer the management style approximates System 4, the greater the satisfaction in the organization.

A-1. There is a positive correlation between satisfaction of members at level 1 and the management style as perceived by level 1 people.

A-2. There is a positive correlation between satisfaction of members at level 2 and the management style as perceived by level 2 people.

A-3. There is a positive correlation between satisfaction of members at level 3 and the management style as perceived by level 3 people.

B. The closer the management style approximates System 4, the greater the adaptability of the organization.

B-1. There is a positive correlation between adaptability of members at level 1 and management style as perceived by level 1 people.

B-2. There is a positive correlation between adaptability of members at level 2 and management style as perceived by level 2 people.

B-3. There is a positive correlation between adaptability of members at level 3 and management style as perceived by level 3 people.

C. The closer the management style approximates System 4, the greater the productivity of the organization.

C-1. There is a positive correlation between productivity of members at level 1 and management style as perceived by level 1 people.
C-2. There is a positive correlation between productivity of members at level 2 and management style as perceived by level 2 people.

C-3. There is a positive correlation between productivity of members at level 3 and management style as perceived by level 3 people.

Hypothesis VI: There is a positive relationship between education of department managers and the effectiveness of the organization, as perceived by members of the organization at all three levels.

Survey Instruments

Two questionnaires were utilized to collect the data for this study. One questionnaire contained 97 items, 83 of which were selected from the Survey of Organizations questionnaire, a standardized instrument which was developed by the Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.\(^1\) The Survey of Organizations questionnaire has been used to test satisfaction. Eight of the questions were selected from a questionnaire standardized by Mott.\(^2\) Mott used his instrument to measure adaptability and productivity. Six questions were included to collect demographic information from the respondents. This questionnaire was administered to department managers, supervisors, and workers.

The other questionnaire was administered to the top manager of the organization and was used to collect data to determine the effectiveness of each department studied. This questionnaire consisted of the eight


\(^2\)Mott, The Characteristics of Effective Organizations.
organizational effectiveness questions from the questionnaire developed by Mott.\textsuperscript{1} Six items were included to collect demographic information.

Both of the instruments were translated by two professional translator companies in Bangkok, and the researcher was the coordinator or these translations. The translated questionnaires from each company were reviewed and chosen for the best of each item in Thai language by the researcher. The final copies of the questionnaires were sent to each company for official approval as well as to the American Consular General in Bangkok. Copies of the questionnaires in English and Thai are shown in Appendix A.

**Population and Sample**

The population for this study included privately owned manufacturing companies in Bangkok which employed 1,000 or more persons. The data regarding the names of companies and the number of employees was obtained from the Research and Planning Division of the Department of Labor, Ministry of Interior, Bangkok, Thailand. There were 66 organizations which employed 1,000 or more. The number and categories of manufacturing organizations in Bangkok were included in Table 3. The three different types of manufacturing organizations were listed as private enterprises, state enterprises, and other. The organizations included in the population of the study had headquarters established in Bangkok.

From the 53 possible companies, a sample size of 10 was randomly selected. In each organization, 4 levels of organizational members were

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
## TABLE 3
NUMBER OF MANUFACTURING ORGANIZATIONS IN BANGKOK, CATEGORIZED BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Organizations</th>
<th>100-299</th>
<th>300-499</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1,000 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private enterprises</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State enterprises</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total included organizations which employed less than 100 employees.
2. This category included small manufacturing businesses which were owned by associations established in Bangkok.

used. They were the top manager, the department manager, the supervisor, and 3 workers who reported to the supervisor selected for the study. The supervisors and workers were randomly selected from each department. The numbers of participants at each level in each organization are shown in Table 4. Three digits of numbers were placed in each cell. The first digit represents the number of department managers, the second represents the number of supervisors, and the third represents the number of workers which belonged to the department. There were 63 departments in the 10 organizations. As displayed in Table 4, there were 4 departments in the first company, 7 in the second, 4 in the seventh, 3 in the eight, 5 in the nine, and 5 in the tenth organization.

In 63 departments of the ten organizations, there were 315 respondents: 63 department managers, 63 supervisors, and 189 workers. There were 5 respondents in each department, 1 department manager,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Repairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Level represented in the sample.
Departments and numbers of personnel at each.
supervisor, and 3 workers except in the marketing department of company number 7 and accounting and finance departments of company number 8. Of the 315 respondents 311 were local Thai people. Three respondents were Japanese and 1 respondent was from South America.

The top management of each company, to whom these department managers reported directly, was asked to evaluate the effectiveness of each department. The number of top management as the evaluator of each company was shown in Table 5. It was also shown the positions held by those top managements and their nationalities. There was only one manager for each company, except in companies number 5 and 6. There were two top managers evaluating different departments in 5, and 4, in 6. There were a total of 14 top managers responding to the survey questionnaires for evaluating the effectiveness of each department in ten companies. The total sample size of 329 respondents was used which included members from all 4 levels of these organizations.

Table 6 contains demographic factors for the 10 companies. The ownership of the 10 companies was listed as American subsidiary, Canadian subsidiary, Japanese subsidiary, or Thai company. The kinds of products produced by the companies included in the sample were gas, motorcycles, automobiles, electronic appliances, construction supplies, shoes, medical supplies, and textiles.

Survey Methodology and Data Collection

The names of 10 companies were randomly selected from the population of 53 manufacturing companies in Bangkok employing more than 1000 persons. The researcher went to Bangkok in December of 1979 to conduct the data collection process.
TABLE 5

TOP MANAGEMENT BY COMPANY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Number of Tm.</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Position Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Board of Director and Management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Board of Director and Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>President Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Director of Administration Division Director of Factory I Director of Factory II Director of Factory III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Vice President and Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval was obtained from the management of each company for collecting the data. Appointments were made with the managers of each company to explain the purpose of the research and the data collection process. Specific times were arranged with the manager in each company for administering the questionnaires. At the appointed time in each company, the respondents were assembled in one room. The respondents included the department manager, a supervisor and randomly selected workers. The questionnaires were distributed and a complete instructions were given before the respondents started answering the questionnaire.
TABLE 6

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS FOR COMPANIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Number</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Employees at Headquarters</th>
<th>Employees at Factory</th>
<th>Company Established Since</th>
<th>Type of Ownership</th>
<th>Number of Departments Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>American Subsidiary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Thai Subsidiary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Japanese Subsidiary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Thai Subsidiary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Japanese Subsidiary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Thai Subsidiary</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Japanese Subsidiary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Japanese Subsidiary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Canadian Subsidiary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Thai Subsidiary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the respondents were requested to answer all the questions. Each completed questionnaire was checked by the researcher to make sure every item was completed before each respondent left the room.
On the same day, the second questionnaire designed to evaluate the effectiveness of each department was administered to the top executive of the company, whom was asked to evaluate the effectiveness of each department.

For coding purposes numbers were assigned to represent the levels at which the respondents worked. The codes were worker at level #1, supervisor at level #2, manager at level #3, and top manager at level #4. Numbers were also assigned to departments: personnel 1, marketing 2, accounting and finance 3, production 4, maintenance and repair 5, quality control 6, warehouse 7, purchasing 8, and engineering and product development 9. The companies were numbered 1 through 10 in the sequence data was collected.

The completed questionnaires were kept in confidence by the researcher. The data from all the questionnaires were coded and transferred to data sheets and brought back to the University of Oklahoma for analysis.

**Statistical Analysis Procedures**

The SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences\(^1\) was used to facilitate the analysis of the data gathered. The statistical procedures used to analyze the data and test the hypotheses changed with hypothesis being tested.

According to Likert, mean scores are used to determine the management system and managerial style which are ranged on a continuum from System 1 to System 4. "System 1 covers the range from 1.0 to 1.99,  

System 2 covers 2.00 to 2.99, System 3 covers 3.00 to 3.99, and System 4 covers 4.00 to 4.99. Therefore, the statistical procedure used to test Hypothesis I was mean scores of managerial leadership and organizational climate variables which are the independent variables.

The two way analysis of variance was used to test Hypotheses II and III, to see whether there is a difference in management style at different levels or different departments.

Mean scores and T-tests were used in testing Hypothesis IV. Mean scores of the actual and ideal styles of management as perceived by worker, supervisor, and manager were calculated, and the T-test was used to test the different of the means scores for these paired observations.

Pearson correlation was used to test Hypothesis V and VI, to determine the relationships for these three sets of variables: demographic, independent (causal), and dependent (effectiveness). Hypothesis V was tested to determine the correlation between the two variables: management system, and organizational effectiveness. Hypothesis VI was tested to determine the correlation between the education of department manager and the effectiveness variables.

**Measures**

Individual items of data collected on the questionnaire were grouped together in accordance to the dimensions of variables they were designed to measure. Correlation and reliability among these items were utilized for the purpose of grouping these items into 15 indices.

1Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, p. 36.
The indices were used to measure the dimensions of managerial leadership, organizational climate, peer leadership, group process, adaptability and flexibility, productivity, and satisfaction. All the items of the research instrument corresponding the indicium (dimension) to be measured are presented in Appendix B.

The findings of the correlation and reliability tests of the indices used to measure managerial leadership and organizational climate were included in Table format in Appendix C. Pearson correlation coefficients and coefficient alphas on the diagonal are shown in the Table format in Appendix C. The indices used to measure intervening dimension were reduced to two indices: peer leadership and group processing. Peer leadership included the four indices: peer support, peer goal emphasis, peer help with work, and peer team building. Group processing included planning and coordinating effort, makes good decisions and solves problems, knows the job sell, sharing information, wants to meet objectives, responses to unusual work demand, and confidence and trust. Nine indices were used to measure the effectiveness dimension: adaptability, productivity, and satisfaction of people at level 1, 2, and 3. The indices are shown with reliability alphas and individual correlations in Table 7. The mean and standard deviation of the indices are included in Table 8.
### TABLE 7

**RELIABILITY ALPHAS FOR EFFECTIVENESS MEASUREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at less than 0.05 (p<0.05)
** Significance at less than 0.01 (p<0.01)
*** Significance at less than 0.001 (p<0.001)
# TABLE 8
**Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Alphas of the Measuring Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Indices</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causal Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Leadership</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervening Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Leadership</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Processing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Adaptability</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Adaptability</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Adaptability</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The purposes of this chapter are to present the finding of the research study and the analysis of data. The findings were organized and presented as responses to testing each hypothesis. The hypotheses were developed to find answers to the questions proposed in the statement of the problem (in Chapters I and III).

Managerial Style

Hypothesis I stated that the managerial style utilized by the manager of the organization is between Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) and Consultative (System 3), and that Benevolent Authoritative is the most prevalent. According to Likert, as described in the statistical procedures in the last part of Chapter III, mean scores and standard deviation of each variable will be used to justify the management system and managerial style of the organizations. The two dimensions of variables described as causal variables, managerial leadership and organizational climate, will be used to describe the management system and managerial style. Table 9 shows the mean scores and standard deviation of these variables for the ten organizations, as perceived by each level: department manager, supervisor, and worker. The average
Table 9 presents the mean score and the management system of each organization, as perceived and reported by respondents at each level. The management system of each organization, as perceived by its members, was in System 3 except for organization 7. The average of the mean scores ranged from 2.93 to 3.74. Only organization 7 has the management system indicated as Benevolent Authoritative, System 2. The average mean score for organization 7 was 2.93, only .07 from being evaluated as a System 3.
### TABLE 10

**MEASUREMENTS FOR THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OF EACH ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Management System Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Average Mean</th>
<th>MS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Number</td>
<td>Management System Level</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Average Mean</td>
<td>MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis I can be accepted. The managerial style employed by managers of the organizations was between the Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) and the Consultative (System 3). However, the most predominate is not the Benevolent authoritative style as stated in the hypothesis.

The mean scores of the management systems for the 10 organizations were compared with the norms published for the United States. The United States norm means are slightly higher than the means for the 10 companies in Thailand. The data for comparing the management system of the organizations in Thailand and The United States was organized and presented in Table 11.

**Managerial Style at Different Levels**

Hypothesis II proposed that the higher the level of the participant in the organization, the closer the managerial style was to System 4. Two way analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis.
### TABLE 11

**MEAN SCORES AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF THE LARGE MANUFACTURING ORGANIZATIONS COMPARED WITH THE UNITED STATES NORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker (36.51% Blue collar worker)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total respondents of 240, 48 respondents at each level in the first four departments of each organization were used in this analysis. The results of the analysis were presented in Tables 12, 13 and 14. Table 12 presents the means of management system indices at each level. Table 13 presents the matrix means of managerial leadership and organizational climate by level and department. Table 14 shows the findings of analysis of variance of management system indices of the three different levels. Only two indices, Support and Organizational Climate, are significant at the 0.038 and 0.008 levels. This means that the managerial leadership and organizational climate approximate System 4 at the higher organizational levels. The remaining variable indices of the management system dimensions are not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis II was rejected. The management systems were not significantly different at different level of the organizations.

Managerial Style Among Different Departments

Hypothesis III, stated that there was no difference in the managerial style among different departments in the 10 organizations. It was implied that the management system and management styles are the same for every department in the organization, and that the mean scores of management system indices fall into the same range of the continual system. Hypothesis III was restated as:

\[ H_3 \quad MS_1 = MS_2 = MS_3 = MS_4 \]
\[ H_0 \quad MS_1 \neq MS_2 \neq MS_3 \neq MS_4 \]
### TABLE 12

**MEANS OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INDICES FOR EACH LEVEL OF THE ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership:</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13

**MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MEANS BY LEVEL AND DEPARTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Leadership of Each Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate of Each Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INDICES FOR
THE THREE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimensions</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at p = 0.038
** Significance at p = 0.008

The analysis of variance, using the means of management system dimension of the first four departments of the organizations were used to test Hypothesis III. The four departments of each organization were: personnel, marketing, accounting and finance, and production. The sample size used in this analysis was 240 respondents (n=240) for 48 departments of the 10 manufacturing companies.

In Table 15 the means of the management system indices of the respondents according to each department were presented. The findings of the analysis of variance of these indices were included in Table 16. The results of the analyses were not significantly different. Therefore, the Hypothesis III (H₃), is accepted, but the null hypothesis (H₀) was rejected.
### TABLE 15
MEANS OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INDICES BY DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership:</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16
MEASUREMENTS FOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INDICES FOR THE FOUR TYPES OF DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimension</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership:</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual and Ideal Style of Managerial Leadership

Hypothesis IV stated that there was a desire for more participation in management of the organization as perceived by members at all three levels of the 10 organizations. According to this hypothesis, the ideal style for all members of the organization should be more participative than exists in the present conditions. Hypothesis IV was restated as:

A. There is a desire for more participation in management at the worker level.

\[ H_{4A} \quad M_a - M_i < 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad M_a - M_i > 0 \]

B. There is a desire for more participation in management at the supervisor level.

\[ H_{4B} \quad M_a - M_i < 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad M_a - M_i > 0 \]

C. There is a desire for more participation in management at the department manager level.

\[ H_{4C} \quad M_a - M_i < 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad M_a - M_i > 0 \]

The T-test was used to test for differences between the means of the paired observations and the results were organized and placed in Table 17. The T-values indicated that there was a significant difference between each pair of observations, the actual and ideal style, at the .001 level. It is also shown that between each pair of ideal and actual style, the mean of ideal style is greater than the actual style. The respondents desired more participative management at each organizational level; worker, supervisor, and department manager. These findings mean that the null hypotheses \( H_0 \) at all three levels were rejected, but that hypotheses \( H_{4A}, H_{4B}, \) and \( H_{4C} \) were accepted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Leadership</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>-8.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>-9.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>-16.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>-17.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at p<0.001.
Relationship Between Management Systems and Organizational Effectiveness

Hypothesis V stated that there was the positive relation between the management system and the effectiveness of the organization, as perceived by members of the 10 organizations. Hypothesis V was restated as:

A. Positive correlation between satisfaction and management style as perceived by level one, two, and three people;

\[ H_{5A} \quad r_{sm} > 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad r_{sm} = 0 \]

B. Positive correlation between adaptability and management style as perceived by members at all three levels; and

\[ H_{5B} \quad r_{sm} > 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad r_{sm} = 0 \]

C. Positive correlation between productivity and management style as perceived by members at all three levels.

\[ H_{5C} \quad r_{sm} > 0 \]
\[ H_0 \quad r_{sm} = 0. \]

The management style of management systems was measured by management systems dimension indices, managerial leadership and organization climate. The effectiveness of the organization was measured by effectiveness dimension indices, adaptability, productivity, and satisfaction. The Pearson correlation coefficients for these two sets of variables were used to test Hypothesis V. The correlations for all indices are shown in Table 18. All of the correlation coefficients were positive and were significant at the 0.01 (P<0.01), except the correlation coefficient for organizational climate and productivity at level three (department manager). This correlation was significant at probability of 0.021, which is less than 0.05 level of significance. The findings
TABLE 18
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS AND EFFECTIVENESS DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimension</th>
<th>Effectiveness Dimensions</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3 (n=63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 (n=63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1 (n=189)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at less than 0.05 (P<0.05)
** Significance at less than 0.01 (P<0.01)
*** Significance at less than 0.001 (P<0.001)

mean that H₅A, H₅B, H₅C should be accepted. The null hypothesis (H₀) must be rejected at all three levels. Therefore, there is a positive relationship between the management systems and organizational effectiveness, as perceived by the respondents of 10 organizations.

**Relationship of Department Manager's Education and Organizational Effectiveness**

Hypothesis VI stated that the relationship between the amount of education of the department managers and the effectiveness of the organization as perceived by respondents at all three levels of the 10
organizations was positive. The hypothesis was restated as:

\[ H_6 \quad r_{ee} > 0 \]

\[ H_0 \quad r_{ee} = 0 \]

The variable indices used to measure the effectiveness were Adaptability, Productivity, and Satisfaction at all three levels. Table 19 contains the Pearson correlation coefficients for the education variable and the effectiveness indices at each level. There was no relationship between the education of the department manager and adaptability at the department managers level (level 3). There was no relationship between the amount of education for the manager and productivity at his own level. There were high positive correlations at the supervisor level and low positive correlations at the worker level. The relationships of the manager's education and satisfaction showed a low positive correlation at the manager level, a low negative correlation at the supervisor level, and a high positive correlation at the worker level. All relationships were positive correlations except satisfaction at the supervisor level, which was a low negative correlation (-0.05), at 0.349 level of significance. Productivity at the supervisor level and satisfaction at the worker level showed positive correlation coefficients which were significant at probability of 0.002 and 0.027 respectively.

The Null Hypothesis was accepted. Hypothesis VI (H6) was rejected even though there were positive relationships among them. These findings shows education of the department manager is not a good predictor for organizational effectiveness.

Since there were found to be positive relationships, Multiple Regression Analysis was run on the data to determine the relationships of management
TABLE 19
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR DEPARTMENT MANAGER EDUCATION AND EFFECTIVENESS DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability - Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity - Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction - Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P=0.027
** P=0.002

systems and the education of managers with the effectiveness of the organization. The finding from the multiple regression analysis was included in Table 20. Adaptability of the worker (level 1) was best predicted by a combination of the leadership of his supervisor (ML2), his department manager (ML3), the organizational climate of his level (OC1), and of his supervisor level (OC2). Adaptability of the supervisor (level 2) was best predicted by the combination of ML2, OC1, OC2, and education. The best predictor of adaptability of the department manager was Managerial leadership (ML3). Production for level 1 was best predicted by the combination of ML1 and OC1. The productivity of level 2 was best predicted by ML2, OC2, OC3, and education. The productivity of level 3 was best predicted by the combination of ML1 and ML3. The satisfaction of level 1 was best predicted by the combination of OC1, OC3, and education. The satisfaction of level 2 was best predicted by ML1 and OC2. The satisfaction of level 3 was best predicted by the combination of ML3, OC1, OC3, and education. The degrees of freedom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager's education</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple regression (R)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression Square (R²)</td>
<td>6.13**</td>
<td>15.61**</td>
<td>36.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at P<0.05 level
** Significance at P<0.01 level
and the F values for the BETA of these criteria at each level are shown with the statistical significance levels in Table C-6, C-7, and C-8 in Appendix C.

The question "Was there a difference in managerial style and organizational effectiveness among managers of different educational levels?", was asked in the statement of problem for which a hypothesis was not developed. The question was answered with the data which were collected. The findings were: there was a lack of relationship between managerial style and educational levels of managers; and there was a lack of relationship between organizational effectiveness and educational levels of managers.

Table 21 presents the relationships of education with managerial style and education with the effectiveness of the organizations at the department manager and supervisor levels. The Pearson correlation coefficients were not statistical significance. The results were that there were no relationships among these variables. Therefore, there are no difference in managerial style and organizational effectiveness among managers of different educational levels; and the managerial style and effectiveness criteria are not related to the education variables.

Conclusion

The managerial style employed by manager of the large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok was between System 2, the Benevolent authoritative, and System 3, the Consultative style. The findings include the manager at three levels of the organization, the top manager, department manager, and supervisor. The managerial style of top manager,
TABLE 21
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR EDUCATION WITH MANAGERIAL STYLE AND THE EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Department Manager</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education-Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.02 (P=0.443)</td>
<td>-0.12 (P=0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.00 (P=0.490)</td>
<td>0.07 (P=0.305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Adaptability</td>
<td>0.00 (P=0.498)</td>
<td>-0.13 (P=0.161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Productivity</td>
<td>0.00 (P=0.499)</td>
<td>0.06 (P=0.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.02 (P=0.453)</td>
<td>-0.18 (P=0.084)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually is one of the directors or presidents of the company, was perceived by department manager. The managerial style of department manager was perceived his subordinate as a supervisor. The supervisory style of a supervisor was expressed by the perception of the workers, as his subordinates.

The findings from testing Hypotheses II and III show that there were no significant differences in managerial leadership style among the top 3 personnel levels (top manager, department manager, and supervisor) nor among different types of departments in the organizations. However, the finding of testing Hypothesis IV shows that there is a significant difference in managerial style between the actual style and the ideal style as perceived by the department managers, supervisors, and workers. The ideal style was close to System 4 which means that these people want to work in the more participative system.
In testing the Hypothesis V, it was found that the managerial leadership style and the organizational effectiveness are correlated in the positive relationship. This finding implied that the closer the managerial styles or management systems were to System 4, the more effective the organization is.

The relationship of the education of department manager and the effectiveness at all three levels, as perceived by the personnel at each level, was not correlated. The amount of education of the manager did have an effect on the productivity of the supervisors at level 2, and the satisfaction of the workers at level 1.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restatement of Problem

This research study investigated the managerial style and the organizational effectiveness of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok. The primary purpose was to determine the managerial style compared with the effectiveness of the organization. The researcher had established nine questions to be answered from this research which were stated as:

1. What were the managerial styles employed by those who were in charge of managers in the large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok?

2. Was there a predominate or common style of managerial leadership among them? What was it?

3. How were these styles and management system related to the organizational effectiveness?

4. What was the most effective managerial style for these organizations?

5. Was there an existence of participative managerial style? How was it related to the effectiveness of the organization?

6. Was there the existence of more participative managerial style at the higher organizational levels?

7. Was there a desire for more participation in management and work concerned decisions in general?

8. Was there a difference in managerial style and organizational effectiveness among managers of different
educational levels; and how were the managerial style and effectiveness criteria related to the educational variable?

9. Were there differences in managerial styles among the different departments in the organizations?

The data for this study was obtained by administering questionnaires to employees of the organizations. The two forms of questionnaires used in the study contained questions from the Survey of Organizations (University of Michigan) and Mott's effectiveness survey questionnaire. The two questionnaires were translated into the Thai language.

The sample of 10 large manufacturing organizations were randomly selected from the total population of 53 manufacturing organizations which employed 1,000 or more employees and were established in Bangkok. The data were collected in April and May, 1980. The data were collected at four personnel levels: top manager, department manager, supervisor, and worker. Each top manager evaluated the effectiveness of each department under his authority. Each department manager described management systems at his level, the managerial style of the top manager, and the effectiveness of his department. Each supervisor identified the management system at his level, the managerial style of the department manager, and the effectiveness of his division. Each worker was asked to describe the management system at his level, the supervisory style of his supervisor, and the effectiveness of his work group. After the data were collected, the statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. The findings from these analysis were used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses in this study.
Findings

Managerial Style

The managerial styles of the three hierarchical levels were analyzed in this research project. They were the managerial styles of the top manager, the department manager, and the supervisor. The managerial style of the top manager ranged from the Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) to the Participative Style (System 4).

The managerial styles of department managers ranged from the Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) to the Consultative (System 3). The mean scores of management system ranged from 2.81 to 3.81.

The supervisory styles of the supervisors in the 10 organizations ranged from the Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) to the Consultative Style (System 3). The mean scores of management systems ranged from 2.74 to 3.48. The finding indicated that the predominant management system of the large manufacturing organization in Bangkok was System 3, the Consultative Style.

Managerial Style at Different Levels

Even though the mean of management systems tended to be higher at the higher level of management; the finding indicated that there was no difference among managerial styles of the top manager, the department manager, and the supervisor. The Consultative Style was found to be predominant at all three levels.

Managerial Style Among Different Departments

There was no difference in managerial styles among departments of the 10 organizations. This finding does not support the finding
from the Lawrence and Lorsch research. They found differences among the different departments in organizations.

**Actual and Ideal Style of Managerial Leadership**

The respondents in the 10 organizations perceived the actual management system as System 3, and the actual style of managerial leadership as the Consultative Style. However, they all desired a more participative management system. Therefore, the ideal style of managerial leadership at all three levels was System 4 (the Participative Management Style).

The department managers perceived the actual management system mean as 3.56 (System 3), and they desired to have the ideal management system mean as 4.15 (System 4). The supervisors perceived the actual management system mean as 3.48 (System 3), and the ideal management system mean as 4.11 (System 4). The workers perceived the actual management system mean as 3.36 (System 3), and the ideal management system mean as 4.14 (System 4).

**Relationship Between Management System and Organizational Effectiveness**

The relationship between management system and organizational effectiveness was clearly tested in the Hypothesis V. The management system dimensions, managerial leadership and organizational climate, as perceived by each personnel level of the organization, was positively correlated with the effectiveness criteria: adaptability, productivity, and satisfaction. There were positive relationships at all three levels between the management system and the organizational effectiveness identified as: adaptability-flexibility, production, and satisfaction.
Relationship of Department Manager's Education and Organizational Effectiveness

Hypothesis VI tested the relationship between the department manager's education and the organizational effectiveness at all three levels. The data revealed that the department manager's education had no relationship with his/her managerial style. The data showed that the combination of managerial styles and the department manager's education could provide a better predictor in the organizational effectiveness than education alone. At each level, different combinations of indices should be used to predict the effectiveness.

Recommendation for Further Research

Further research could be conducted to compare different types of organizations including multinational organizations. The central production thrust may affect the results of similar research. Organizations should be studied to discover whether there are any differences in the findings among various sizes of organizations. Future research should be conducted to compare organizations which operate with more or less advanced technology. Such research would reveal the effect of technology on the management systems and the relationship of management systems with effectiveness.
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Letter Asked for Permission to Use the Questionnaire

P.O. Box 2161
Norman, Oklahoma 73070
October 1, 1979

Center for Research on Utilization of
Scientific Knowledge
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan Organizational
Development Research Program

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student at The University of Oklahoma, and I am writing my dissertation on a study of managerial leadership style and organization effectiveness of large manufacturing organizations in Bangkok, Thailand.

Dr. Larry K. Michaelsen, one of my doctoral committee members gave me the advice to use the SURVEY OF ORGANIZATIONS (Copyright 1974, the University of Michigan). Therefore, I would like to ask for permission to use parts of the questionnaire, and I have to translate them into my language, Thai.

I am greatly appreciated your attention to my request.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs. Pattarawalai Wongruangwisarn)
October 9, 1979

Mrs. Pattarawalai Wongruangwisarn
P. O. Box 2161
Norman, Oklahoma  73070

Dear Mrs. Wongruangwisarn,

This letter is in response to your letter of October 1, 1979 in which you asked for permission to translate parts of the Survey of Organizations questionnaire into Thai. The Organizational Development Research Program agrees to let you translate all or part of the questionnaire into Thai. We ask that you send us a copy of the translated questionnaire as well as any reports which may be generated from the study.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,
Dear Mrs. Wongruangwisarn,

This letter is in response to your letter of October 1, 1979 in which you asked for permission to translate parts of the Survey of Organizations questionnaire into Thai. The Organizational Development Research Program agrees to let you translate all or part of the questionnaire into Thai. We ask that you send us a copy of the translated questionnaire as well as any reports which may be generated from the study.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

Linda Mehlman
Organizational Development Research Program
Room 5064 ISR
(313) 764-6108

enc: SOO questionnaire
Letter requesting assistance in gathering data

เรื่อง  ขอความร่วมมือในการศึกษาการจัดการและการทำงานของคนงานในโรงงาน

เรียน  ผู้อำนวยงานฝ่ายการพัฒนาระบบ

ท้ายที่มาเรื่อง  นางพัชร์วัลย์ วงษ์เรืองวิศวะ  เป็นผู้ที่มีหน้าที่บริหารงานของมหาวิทยาลัยใน
ส่วนที่เกี่ยวข้องในการศึกษาการจัดการ ขอให้ตั้งคณะในการศึกษาการจัดการที่มีความเป็นทุนนิยมและประสิทธิภคในกิจการ
จัดการที่เกี่ยวกับโรงงานในประเทศไทย  ทำศึกษาวิจัยเกี่ยวกับการจัดการ  การบริหารงาน
บุคคลในโรงงานและการจัดการของคนงาน เพื่อเป็นข้อมูลในการจัดการ และที่จะจ่ายาจ่ายข้อมูลอย่างเป็น
จำนวนมาก  จึงขอความร่วมมือและช่วยเหลือในการบริหารงานดูแลการทำพร้อมที่จะ
ให้บังคับเรื่องนี้พร้อมกับงานที่เกี่ยวข้องเกินกว่า ๑,๐๐๐ คน ให้สนับสนุนให้จ้างเรื่องให้ทำการศึกษาแล้ว

จึงเรียน  ความยินดีที่จะให้การสนับสนุน

ขอแสดงความนับถืออย่างสูง

(นางพัชร์วัลย์ วงษ์เรืองวิศวะ)
Letter requesting cooperation

กรมโรงพยาบาลภูทอกนริม

เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือในการข่าวข้อมูลของโรงพยาบาล

เรียน

คุณนายกสหวัสดี วงศ์เรืองวิศวพล ผู้อFelเก้าปั่นที่ 11 มหาวิทยาลัยอตะจีทาง
ศรีมุนีวิทยา มีความประสงค์จะส่งข่าวข้อมูลต่าง ๆ เพื่อวัฒนธรรมเป็นอุปนิสัยและประสานการทำงาน
การจัดการของโรงพยาบาลในประเทศไทย เพื่อทำให้พยาบาลที่รักษาภูทอกนริม

กรมโรงพยาบาลภูทอกนริม จึงเรียนมาเพื่อขอความร่วมมือในการจัดส่งข้อมูลต่าง ๆ
ตามที่จะพิจารณาเห็นสมควร ทั้งนี้ นางกสหวัสดี วงศ์เรืองวิศวพล จะเป็นมหาวิทยาลัยสำนักงานระเบียบ
คง ๆ ควบคุมงาน.

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(ลงชื่อ)

กองควบคุมโรงพยาบาล.

โทรศัพท์ 02-288-4444
Questionnaires and Instructions in Thai  
with Documents showing validity
การสำรวจ ความเป็นผู้นำและประสิทธิผล ในด้านการจัดการ

แบบสำรวจนี้ออกแบบมาเพื่อต้องการเรียนรู้ว่า ตนเองทำงานร่วมกันอย่างไร วัสดุประสงค์ก็คือ เพื่อนำเอาข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามมาศึกษา เพื่อวิจัย "ความเป็นผู้นำและประสิทธิผลในด้านการจัดการ" ในงานที่ทำงานและผู้มาทำงานมาติดต่อกันอยู่ในระบบเทมมุน

เพื่อให้การศึกษาข้อมูลนี้เกิดประโยชน์ ขอให้ท่านตอบคำถามแต่ละข้ออย่างจริงจัง เคร่งครัดและตรงไปตรงมา เพื่อที่จะเป็นไปได้ แบบสำรวจนี้ไม่ใช่แบบทดสอบ และไม่มีค่าตอบที่ถูกหรือผิดแต่ยังไงใด

ข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามนี้ใช้เป็นข้อมูลเพื่อวิจัย อาจเป็นการเรียนรู้ในระบบจัดการ ซึ่งจะรวมถึงการศึกษาในระบบจัดการเพื่อให้ได้ประสิทธิภาพสูงสุด และเป็นให้แก่ผู้ใช้ที่มีความสนใจ ท่านอาจนำไปใช้ข้อมูลข้อที่ต้องการในแบบสอบถาม
KINGDOM OF THAILAND
City of Bangkok
Embassy of the United States of America

I, Eugene C. Zajac, Vice Consul of the United States of America, at Bangkok, Thailand, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that on this 31st day of January, 1980, before me personally appeared Arunee Chongsiriwathana, personally known and known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the annexed translation, and she duly acknowledged to me that she prepared the same.

WITNESS WHEREOF I hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Consular Section, American Embassy, at Bangkok, Thailand this 31st day of January, 1980.

Eugene C. Zajac
Vice Consul of the United States
I am personally known and known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the annexed translation, and duly acknowledged to have been prepared.

WITNESS WHEREOF I hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Consular Section, American Embassy, at Bangkok, Thailand this 31st of January, 1980.

[Signature]

[Seal]

[Name: Eugene C. Zajic]

Vice Consul of the United States of America
ข้อแนะนำ

1. คุณสามารถตอบได้โดยการเลือกด้วยเครื่องคอมพิวเตอร์ ถ้าไม่มีคำตอบที่ตรงกับคำตอบของคุณให้ใช้คำตอบที่ใกล้เคียงที่สุด

2. กรุณาตอบคำถามทุกข้อตามล่าสุด

3. ขอให้ระลึกเสมอว่า คุณคำตอบของการศึกษาในเรื่องนี้ คืออยู่กับการตอบคำถามของคุณอย่างตรงไปตรงมา จะไม่มีการระบุถูกหรือผิดในคำถาม

4. ให้ใส่เครื่องหมายกรอก圆满ตัวเลขที่เป็นคำตอบที่เหมาะสมที่สุด

5. หมายถึง: แบบสอบถามนี้ ถามเกี่ยวกับผลต่างๆในส่วนงานของคุณ ในจำนวนนี้คามาถามเกี่ยวกับผู้ป่วยโรคและกลุ่มผู้ร่วมงานของคุณ คำถามต่างๆที่เกี่ยวกับผู้ป่วยโรคดังกล่าว หมายถึงบุคคลที่ทำงานในตรงกับคุณ เป็นคนที่ทำงานงานตรงต่อเนื่อง ล่า้วนทำตามที่เกี่ยวกับผู้ป่วยโรคที่เกี่ยวข้อง ดังกล่าวที่เกี่ยวกับกลุ่มผู้ร่วมงานนั้น หมายถึงบุคคลที่เกี่ยวกับผู้ป่วยโรคที่เกี่ยวข้อง หรือผู้ร่วมงานที่ทำงานตรงต่อผู้ป่วยโรคบุคคลคนเดียวกันท่าน

6. กรุณาตอบคำถามอย่างชัดเจนที่สุด:

หมายเลขอ้างอิง

หมาย เลขบริษัท______________

หมาย เลขแผนก______________

หมาย เลข ระดับตำแหน่ง______________
1. น้อยมาก
2. น้อย
3. พอดี
4. มาก
5. มากเป็นพิเศษ

1. โดยทั่วไป บริษัทมีความสุขในการใช้ชีวิตการทำงานหรือปฏิบัติงาน ?
2. บริษัทให้ความสนใจอย่างจริงจังในการพัฒนาการและเพื่อความสุขของพนักงาน ?
3. บริษัทมีความพยายามที่จะปรับปรุงสภาพการทำงานให้ดีขึ้นมากน้อยเพียงไร ?
4. ที่มาความต่างๆของบริษัทได้จัดซื้ออย่างเหมาะสมมากน้อยเพียงไร ?
5. ข้อมูลที่ได้รับเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับความรู้ของแผนกชิ้นหรือการผลิตเพื่อทำงานอย่างเหมาะสมมากน้อยเพียงไร ?
6. มีข้อมูลเพียงสุ่มบัตรพิสูจน์ทางที่ชัดเจนซึ่งอยู่ในแผนกชิ้นหรือการปฏิบัติงาน ?
7. บริษัทมีการอภิปรายกับพนักงานของแผนกเพื่อแก้ไขปัญหาที่เกิดขึ้นในแนวทางที่ดีที่สุดที่จะแก้ไขไปได้ ?

4. ในทุกๆด้าน ท่านมีความพอใจในกลุ่มผู้ร่วมงานของท่านเพียงไร ?
5. ในทุกๆด้าน ท่านมีความพอใจในชีวิตประจำวันของท่านเพียงไร ?
6. ในทุกๆด้าน ท่านมีความพอใจในงานของท่านเพียงไร ?
7. ในทุกๆด้าน ท่านมีความพอใจในบริษัทนี้เพียงไร ?
๒. ท่านมีความพอใจในเงินเดือนอย่าง ท่านพอใจไม่ เมื่อพิจารณาถึงความสามารถ และความสามารถทั่วการของ ท่านที่ให้กับงาน ๑ ๒ ๓ ๔ ๕

๓. ท่านรู้สึกพอใจต่อความภักษาหน้าของท่านในบริษัทนี้ เสี่ยงใจ ซึ่งเป็นอย่างไร ๑ ๒ ๓ ๔ ๕

๔. ท่านรู้สึกพอใจเรื่องโอกาสที่ท่านจะก้าวหน้าไปในบริษัทนี้ในอนาคต ๑ ๒ ๓ ๔ ๕

๕. มีการปฏิบัติอย่างถูกต้องความแตกต่างและความขัดแย้ง ทางanismทางงานที่จะแบ่งต่างๆ ในบริษัทนี้

๑. ความขัดแย้งต่างๆ อยู่ตามที่ได้รับการหักเหลี่ยม ปฏิเสธ หรือ ปฎิเสธ

๒. ความขัดแย้งต่างๆ อยู่ตามที่ได้รับการหักเหลี่ยม ปฏิเสธ หรือ ปฎิเสธ

๓. บางครั้ง ความขัดแย้งต่างๆ ได้รับการยอมรับ และมีการพิจารณาภักษา แต่บางครั้งก็ได้รับการ หลีกเลี่ยง

๔. ความขัดแย้งต่างๆ โดยปกติถูกผิดการยอมรับว่า เป็นสิ่งจำเป็นและสมควร และมีการพิจารณาภักษา

๕. ความขัดแย้งต่างๆ ผู้มีอำนาจได้รับการยอมรับว่า เป็นสิ่งจำเป็นและสมควร และมีการพิจารณาภักษาเสมอ

๖. ท่านไม่พนักงานในบริษัทจึงทำภักษาภักษาภักษาอย่างเก่ารัชชิน?

๑. เสี่ยงเพื่อกระทำการแทนงานของตนเอง และไม่ให้ถูกออก จากงาน

๒. เพื่อกระทำการแทนงานของตนเอง และเพื่อเงิน

๓. เพื่อกระทำการแทนงานของตนเอง เพื่อเงิน และเพื่อการ เสื่อมศักดิ์ศรี

๔. เพื่อกระทำการแทนงานของตนเอง เพื่อเงิน เพื่อการ เสื่อมศักดิ์ศรี และเพื่อต้องการปฏิบัติงานให้เสร็จเป็น ที่พอใจ

๕. เพื่อกระทำการแทนงานของตนเอง เพื่อเงิน เพื่อการ เสื่อมศักดิ์ศรี เสื่อมศักดิ์ศรี เพื่อปฏิบัติงานให้เสร็จเป็น ที่พอใจ และ เพราะว่าผู้นั้นภักษาคนอื่นในกลุ่มงานของตนเอง ทางวิธีคะแนน
33. ท่านเพิ่มเติมเพื่อนกับงานประจำวันอย่างท่านมากน้อยเพียงใด?

34. มีสิ่งมาจากที่พักอาศัยเมื่อถึงงานในบริษัท, (เช่น บุคคล นโยบาย หรือสถานะทางคลุม) ที่ถ้ากระทบต่อท่านอย่างยากขึ้นแล้ว ผ่านนโยบายเพียงใด?

โดยทั่วไป บุคคลในกลุ่มต่อไปนี้มีผล หรือ ดีหรือพอต่อความเป็นไปในแผนของท่าน มากน้อยเพียงใด?

34. ผู้ส่งบุญบุพเพสวดถกำเนิด (เช่น หัวหน้ากองงาน หัวหน้าที่ว่าไปในสาจากงาน) 1 2 3 4 5

35. ผู้จัดการระดับสูง (เช่น ประธานบริษัท รองประธานบริษัท สำนักนายอย่างใหญ่) 1 2 3 4 5

36. พนักงานหัวหน้า (ถ้า บุคคลที่ไม่มีผู้คนย้างบุญบุพเพ) 1 2 3 4 5

37. ผู้จัดการระดับกลาง (เช่น ผู้จัดการแผนก ผู้จัดการเขต) 1 2 3 4 5

38. วัตถุประสงค์ต่างๆ ถูกกำหนดขึ้นในบริษัทอย่างไร?

1. แจ้งให้ทราบโดยไม่ใช่โอกาสให้ชัดเจน หรือ ออกความเห็น

2. แจ้ง และอธิบายให้ทราบ และเปิดโอกาสให้ชัดเจน

3. ผู้ชมตั้งคำถามว่าขึ้น แปรการปรึกษากับผู้ได้ยิ่งบุญบุพเพ และบางครั้งมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงที่จะกำหนดต่อมา

4. ผู้ชมตั้งคำถามว่าเพื่อเรียนโดยเฉพาะ และจะปรึกษากับผู้ได้ยิ่งบุญบุพเพ เพื่อเรียนให้เห็นว่าชัดเจนสัก

5. วัตถุประสงค์ต่างๆ ถูกกำหนดให้บุคคลที่เกี่ยวข้องทราบ และวัตถุประสงค์ให้เห็นว่าชัดเจนจะถูกกำหนดขึ้นโดยการปรึกษาว่า กำหนดของผู้ยิ่งคุณบุญบุพเพ และผู้ให้ยิ่งคุณบุญบุพเพ

1. น้อยมาก
2. น้อย
3. พอสมควร
4. มาก
5. มากเป็นฟิวเจอ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. นั่นหมาย</th>
<th>2. น้อย</th>
<th>3. พอสมควร</th>
<th>4. มาก</th>
<th>5. มากเป็นที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>๒๔. การสอดสนองต่างๆในบริษัท กระทำไปโดยการใช้ข้อมูลที่เพียงพอและถูกต้องหรือถูกผิดพลาดกันไหม?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>๒๕. เมื่อมีการตัดสินใจไม่ตรงไปได้มีการขอให้บุคคลที่จะได้รับผลจากการตัดสินนั้นออกความคิดเห็นมาก่อนเหรอไหม?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>๒๖. ถ้ามีผู้ไม่เห็นบุคคลในระดับใดของบริษัท ย่อมมีความรู้ความสามารถที่จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อผู้ที่ตัดสินได้ เพื่อที่จะได้ทราบลักษณะความรู้ความสามารถเพื่อให้คู่กรณี ผู้ที่ตัดสินได้มีการตัดสินข้อมูลให้ผู้ซึ่งได้มีส่วนร่วมรู้ถึงทางการผ่านมาถึง窒息ไหม?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านให้ความเป็นกันเองและง่ายต้องการเข้าหมายมาก่อนเหรอไหม?

๒๗. ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านเป็นอย่างไร?

๒๘. ท่านอยากให้เป็นเช่นไร?

เมื่อกำลังตัดสินทุกคนที่ต้องการเข้าใจให้ความสนใจจะต้องใช้ความสามารถที่ผ่านมาถึง窒息ไหม?

๒๙. ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านเป็นอย่างไร?

๓๐. ท่านอยากให้เป็นเช่นไร?

ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านมีความเสียใจที่จะรับฟังพิจารณาของท่านมาก่อนเหรอไหม?

๓๑. ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านเป็นอย่างไร?

๓๒. ท่านอยากให้เป็นเช่นไร?

ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านมีคะแนนที่ให้ท่านดำเนินความมั่นคงอย่างเต็มที่มาถึง窒息ไหม?

๓๓. ผู้มีคุณสมบัติของท่านเป็นอย่างไร?

๓๔. ท่านอยากให้เป็นเช่นไร?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. ค่าตอบคงไว้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ปัจจุบันเป็นตัวอย่างการตัดสินใจบางอย่างที่จะกระทำทะเบียนแสดงถึง
กิจกรรมของท่าน ผู้ที่มาตั้งบัตรการตัดสินให้ท่านในเรื่องต่างๆ
อ่านตอบอย่างไร ก่อนที่จะมีการตัดสินยุติทุกภาค

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21. บุคคลที่มีความสามารถในการตัดสินนั้นให้มาที่ท่านในกลุ่มงานของ
ท่านหรือไม่? |   |   |   |   |   |
| 22. ซูมความเห็นและข้อคิดคำพังท่ามีความถูกในกลุ่มงานของ
ท่านหรือไม่? |   |   |   |   |   |
| 23. ประชุมกับกลุ่มผู้ใช้ได้รับข้อมูล หน่วยงบประมาณที่ต้องจ่าย
มากกว่าที่กัน เพือหาข้อมูลที่ดีที่สุด? |   |   |   |   |   |

สำหรับคำถามนี้ สำหรับคำถามนี้ กลุ่มงาน หมายถึง บุคคลที่ซื้อโดยตรง
กับที่ต้องจ่ายที่สุด Trênที่เดียวกัน

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านมีความเป็นกันเองและทำงานต่อการเจ้า
จากนายหรือโดยไม่ใช่?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

เมื่อทำงานเพียงกันบุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่าน หาให้ความสนใจ
ในผลกระทบของท่าน มากน้อยเพียงใด?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านมีความเห็นใจในการรับฟังปัญหาของ
ท่านมากน้อยเพียงใด?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่าน ที่การสนับสนุนเช่นกันและกันให้ท้า
ให้ในความพยายามอย่างเดียวเพื่อมากน้อยเพียงใด?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านอาจใช้มาตรฐานที่ต้องในการปฏิบัต
หน้าที่มากน้อยเพียงใด?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านเข้าทำหน้าที่บริการท่านที่พึงพอใจ
มากน้อยเพียงใด?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. ช่วยกันเป็นอย่างไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. ทำนายกันให้เป็นเช่นไร?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านให้คุณมี ... ท่านต้องการ ... กำหนดแผน ... ท่านจะสามารถวางแผน ... ท่านได้?

๒๖. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?

๒๗. ท่านอยากให้เป็นอย่างไร?

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านต่างมีจุดทำให้ท่านสนับสนุน ... กันเพื่อให้ ... ท่านหมายเป็นกลุ่ม ... ท่านได้?

๒๘. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?

๒๙. ท่านอยากให้เป็นอย่างไร?

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านมีการนำสิ่ง ... ตุ่ม ... ร่วมของกลุ่ม ... ท่านได้?

๓๐. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?

๓๑. ท่านอยากให้เป็นอย่างไร?

บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านมีการแตกเป็นระดับความท้าทายและ ... ท่านได้?

๓๒. ปัจจุบันเป็นอย่างไร?

๓๓. ท่านอยากให้เป็นอย่างไร?

๓๔. กลุ่มงานของท่านมีการวางแผนร่วมกันและประสาน ... ได้ ... ท่านได้?

๓๕. กลุ่มงานของท่านมีการสานสิ่งและเกี่ยวข้องหลายๆ ... ได้ ... ท่านได้?

๓๖. บุคคลในกลุ่มงานของท่านรู้ว่า ... ท่านมาถึงเป็นประโยชน์ ... ท่านได้?

๓๗. มีการป้องกันข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับเหตุการณ์ ... และสถานการณ์สังคมๆ ... ท่านได้?

๓๘. กลุ่มงานของท่านมีความสามารถในการจัดการมาน้อยเป็น ... ที่ต้องการบรรลุเป้าหมายผู้จ้างตามความส歆รื่น?

๓๙. กลุ่มงานของท่านสามารถจัดงานนอกเหนือจากปกติได้ ... ท่านได้?

๔๐. ท่านมีความสามารถสื่อสารงานนอกเหนือจากปกติได้ ... ท่านได้?

๔๑. ท่านมีความสามารถสื่อสารงานนอกเหนือจากปกติได้ ... ท่านได้?
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43. เครื่องใช้และชิ้นประกอบอื่นๆที่ต้องใช้ในการทำงาน ที่เกี่ยวข้องกับ หน้าที่ที่ทำ ต้องมีและมีประสิทธิภาพ แล้วให้การบริการจ่ายตาม หน้าที่ต้องใช้หรือไม่?

1 2 3 4 5

44. อบอุ่นของที่นอนที่นอนในยามไหน?
1. อยู่กับพ่อคุณมี
2. อยู่กับพ่อคุณเหมือน 30 ปี
3. อยู่กับพ่อคุณ 35 ปี
4. อยู่กับพ่อคุณ 40 ปี
5. อยู่กับพ่อคุณ 45 ปี
6. อยู่กับพ่อคุณ 50 ปี
7. อยู่กับพ่อคุณ เกินกว่านั้น

45. ท่านมีการสัมภาษณ์ระดับไหน?
1. ไม่สมควรสัมภาษณ์
2. สมควรสัมภาษณ์
3. สัมภาษณ์เป็นการสัมภาษณ์แบบที่ไม่ได้รับ
4. สัมภาษณ์เป็นการสัมภาษณ์แบบที่ไม่ได้รับ
5. สัมภาษณ์เป็นการสัมภาษณ์แบบที่ไม่ได้รับ
6. ระดับสัมภาษณ์ที่สูง
7. ระดับสัมภาษณ์ที่ต่ำ
8. ระดับสัมภาษณ์ที่ต่ำ

46. ในระยะเวลาที่ท่านก้าวเดินไป (จนกระทั่งอายุ 25 ปี) อ่านไหนท่านออกซิออกอุ่นใน ข้อต่อมาที่?
1. ที่ท่านพ่อ
2. ที่ท่านมาร์
3. ที่ท่านได้
4. ที่ท่านรู้
5. ที่ท่านรู้
6. ที่ท่านรู้
7. ที่ท่านรู้

47. บุคคลในแผนของท่านสามารถทำได้เป็นอย่างไรในกรณีที่ต้องมีการติดต่ออย่างที่ต้อง เกิดขึ้นได้ในอนาคต เพื่อจะได้ที่ทางทั้งกลับไมให้เกิดอันตรายหรือทำให้ผลการทาง ระดับเดิมอยู่ที่สุด?
1. ไม่เป็นประทีษทิพ ในกรณีติดต่อ
2. ทำให้ไม่ค่อยดี
3. ทำให้ดีขึ้น
4. ทำให้ก็ได้
5. สามารถทำได้เพิ่มมาก

กรุณาแนบแนวนอนเป็นลายกัน
43. เมื่อเวลาฉุนพล วิธีการใหม่ๆในการจัดการงาน เศรษฐมูลค่าเพิ่มและวันหยุด 
ใหม่ผู้ใดถูกพบ เป็นข้าพเจ้าในการปฏิบัติงาน บุคคลในแผนกของท่านสามารถทำได้ 
เพื่อให้บริการให้ทันต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านี้ ซึ่งมีผลต่อวิธีการดำเนินงาน 
ของเขามา?
1. ไม่ให้ประสบหน้าที่ในการปรับตัวให้ทันได้
2. ทำได้ไม่ดีที่สุด
3. ทำได้พอได้
4. ทำได้ดี
5. สามารถปรับตัวให้ทันต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงได้ตามที่

44. เมื่อมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงเกี่ยวกับงานประจำวันหรือด้านเศรษฐกิจเพิ่มขึ้นขึ้น บุคคล 
ในแผนกของท่านสามารถดูดด้วยและปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลงนั้นๆโดย
เร็วที่สุด?
1. ตัวมากสุดของดูดด้วยและปรับตัวได้ทันที
2. ต่อข้างข้าง
3. เร็วพอได้
4. สามารถปรับได้เร็ว แต่ไม่ทันทันที
5. ตัวมากสุดของดูดด้วยและปรับตัวได้ทันที

45. บุคคลในแผนกของท่านที่พร้อมที่จะสอนด้วยและปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลง 
เหล่านี้ มีข้อดีอย่างไร 
1. โอ๊ตมเต็มขึ้น
2. แทบเท่ากัน
3. ยังคงอยู่ที่เดิม
4. มากกว่าขึ้น
5. ต้องการที่จะสอนด้วยและปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านี้

46. เมื่อกิจกรรมติดตามขึ้น เริ่ม รายการต่างๆจะทำอย่างรวดเร็วขึ้น ก้าวหน้าการถูกเปลี่ยน 
ให้เร็วขึ้น หรือ ความคืบหน้าของงานจะดีขึ้นไป เหล่านี้เป็นคุณ อยู่ในบริการให้บริการ 
เงินดีอย่างมาก บางทีผู้จัดการต่างๆไม่สามารถที่จะทำได้ดีขึ้นมาเท่าที่นี้ได้ว่าเร็ว และเป็น 
ผลสำเร็จต่อการลูกงานอื่นๆ บุคคลในแผนกของท่านสามารถจัดการกับสถานการณ์เหล่า 
นี้ได้ที่เร็วที่สุด?
1. พวกเขานี้ไม่มีประสบภัยในบริการจัดการกิจกรรม
2. พวกเขานี้ทำได้ไม่ดีที่สุด
3. พวกเขานี้ทำพอได้
4. พวกเขานี้ทำได้ดี
5. พวกเขาจัดการได้ดีมากในกิจการกิจ
๓๒. ช่วยให้คิดอย่างรอบคอบ เกี่ยวกับผลงานที่ทำมา และผลงานของคนอื่น ๆ ในแผนกรอบ ท่าน ฉันให้คิดหลายขั้นตอน ที่จะมีวิธีของบุคคลที่ท่านรู้จักในแผนกรอบท่านว่ามีผลงาน มากน้อยเพียงไร?
1. ผลงานของพวกเขามีเยอะมาก
2. ผลงานค่อนข้างน้อย
3. ปรับกลาง
4. ต่อเนื่องดูง
5. ดูมาก

๓๓. ตามความเห็นของท่าน ผลผลหรือทรัพยากรที่ทำโดยบุคคลที่ท่านรู้จักในแผนกรอบท่านนั้น ถือเป็นการทำงานเพียงใด?
1. ผลลัพธ์ และบริการ ของพวกเขามีคุณภาพมาก
2. คุณภาพไม่ดีเท่าที่ควร
3. คุณภาพพอใช้
4. คุณภาพดีที่สุด
5. คุณภาพดีมาก

๓๔. บุคคลในแผนกรอบท่านดูเหมือนจะได้รับผลอย่างเต็มที่จากสิ่งต่าง ๆ ที่เขามอง (เช่น เงิน บุคคล เครื่องมือเครื่องใช้ ฯลฯ) หรือเปล่า นั้นก็ต้อง พวกเขามีการใช้งานอย่าง นิยมประชิยิที่เพียงใด?
1. ไม่มีประสิทธิภาพในการทำงานเลย
2. ไม่ค่อยมีประสิทธิภาพ
3. มีประสิทธิภาพพอถ่อมมา
4. มีประสิทธิภาพสูง
5. มีประสิทธิภาพสูงมาก

กรุณาตอบคำถามเพิ่มเติมที่แยกไว้ในแผนตารางห้า ในช่องคำตอบก่อนล่างนี้

๓๕. ๓๖. ๓๗. ๓๘. ๓๙.
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
๔๐๐. ๔๐๑. ๔๐๒.
๔๐๓. ๔๐๔. ๔๐๕.
๔๐๖. ๔๐๗. ๔๐๘.
๔๐๙. ๔๑๐. ๔๑๑.
๔๑๒. ๔๑๓. ๔๑๔.
๔๑๕. ๔๑๖. ๔๑๗.
๔๑๘. ๔๑๙. ๔๒๐.
๔๒๑. ๔๒๒. ๔๒๓.
๔๒๔. ๔๒๕. ๔๒๖.
๔๒๗. ๔๒๘. ๔๒๙.
๔๓๐. ๔๓๑. ๔๓๒.
๔๓๓. ๔๓๔. ๔๓๕.
๔๓๖. ๔๓๗. ๔๓๘.
๔๓๙. ๔๔๐. ๔๔๑.
๔๔๒. ๔๔๓. ๔๔๔.
๔๔๕. ๔๔๖. ๔๔๗.
๔๔๘. ๔๔๙. ๔๕๐.
๔๕๑. ๔๕๒. ๔๕๓.
๔๕๔. ๔๕๕. ๔๕๖.
๔๕๗. ๔๕๘. ๔๕๙.
๔๖๐. ๔๖๑. ๔๖๒.
๔๖๓. ๔๖๔. ๔๖๕.
๔๖๖. ๔๖๗. ๔๖๘.
๔๖๙. ๔๗๐. ๔๗๑.
๔๗๒. ๔๗๓. ๔๗๔.
๔๗๕. ๔๗๖. ๔๗๗.
๔๗๘. ๔๗๙. ๔๘๐.
๔๘๑. ๔๘๒. ๔๘๓.
๔๘๔. ๔๘๕. ๔๘๖.
๔๘๗. ๔๘๘. ๔๘๙.
๔๙๐. ๔๙๑. ๔๙๒.
๔๙๓. ๔๙๔. ๔๙๕.
๔๙๖. ๔๙๗. ๔๙๘.
๔๙๙. ๔๑๐๐. ๔๑๐๑.
๔๑๐๒. ๔๑๐๓. ๔๑๐๔.
๔๑๐๕. ๔๑๐๖. ๔๑๐๗.
๔๑๐๘. ๔๑๐๙. ๔๑๑๐.
๔๑๑๑. ๔๑๑๒. ๔๑๑๓.
การสำรวจ ความเป็นผู้นำและประสิทธิผล ในด้านการจัดการ

แบบสำรวจนี้ออกแบบมาเพื่อวิจัยเกี่ยวกับสภาวะธุรกิจในเอเชีย ซึ่งจะให้กับผู้นำงาน
ในบริษัทย่อยเท่านั้น เพื่อดูว่าการเรียนรู้ว่า ตนเองทำงานร่วมกันอย่างไร ข้อมูลล่าสุดที่มี
เพื่อนำเอาข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามตามการศึกษา เกี่ยวกับ "ความเป็นผู้นำและประสิทธิผลในด้าน
การจัดการ" ในธุรกิจและอุตสาหกรรมต่างๆ ในทุ่งทะเลทราย

เพื่อให้การศึกษาข้อมูลนี้เกิดประโยชน์ ให้ท่านตอบคำถามแต่ละข้ออย่าง
ซึ่งจะเป็นเครื่องมือ และตรงไปตรงมาที่สุดเท่าที่จะเป็นไปได้ การสำรวจนี้ไม่ใช่การทดสอบ
และไม่มีตัวตอบที่ผิดถูกหรือผลลัพธ์อย่างใด

ข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามที่ได้จับการตอบเร็วขึ้นแล้ว จะถูกประมวลเป็นความสับ
ข้อมูลที่ได้จากบริษัทที่ และบริษัทอื่นๆ จะถูกนำมารวมเข้าด้วยกัน และเพื่อให้แน่ใจว่าเป็น
ความสับข้อมูลเท่าจริง ซึ่งของบริษัทและผู้答卷แบบสอบถามจะไม่ถูกระบุไว้ในส่วนใดๆของ
รายงานนี้
I, .................................................., Consul of the United States of America, at Bangkok, Thailand, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that on this 31st day of January, 1980, before me personally appeared ...........................................

Arunee Chongritwathanasri

personally known and known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the annexed translation, and she duly acknowledged to me that she prepared the same.

I WITNESS WHEREOF I hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Consular Section, American Embassy, at Bangkok, Thailand this 31st day of January, 1980.

..................................................,
Consul of the United States of America

..................................................
scribed to the annexed translation, and duly acknowledged to

she

she

prepared the same.

WITNESS WHEREOF I hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal

of the Consular Section, American Embassy, at Bangkok, Thailand this

21st day of January, 1960.

Eugene C. Zajac

Consul of the United States of America
หมายเลขสอบ ____________

หมายเลขประจำตำแหน่ง ____________

ข้อแนะนำ

1. ค่าตามส่วนมาก สามารถตอบได้โดยการเลือกตอบเพียงค่าตอบเดียว ถ้าไม่มีค่าตอบที่ตรงกับการเลือกคำตอบให้ใช้ค่าตอบที่ใกล้เคียงที่สุด

2. กรุณาตอบคำถามถูกต้องเต็มทุกคิ้ว

3. ขอให้ระบุเลขคำตอบ อย่างน้อย 3 ข้ออยู่งนักการตอบคำถามของท่านอย่างจริงใจตามมา จะไม่มีการระบุของจานท่านในผลตอบ

4. กรุณาใจเครื่องหมายตอบคำถามให้เป็นคำตอบที่เหมาะสมที่สุด

5. ถามข้อท่านตอบในแบบไหน?

   1. 25 ปี หรือ ต่ำกว่า
   2. 26 ปี ถึง 30 ปี
   3. 31 ปี ถึง 35 ปี
   4. 36 ปี ถึง 40 ปี
   5. 41 ปี ถึง 45 ปี
   6. 46 ปี ถึง 50 ปี
   7. 51 ปี หรือ เกินกว่า

6. ทำมีการศึกษาอยู่ระดับไหน?

   1. ไม่จบชั้นสมัยศึกษาตอนตน
   2. จบมัธยมศึกษาตอนตน
   3. ศึกษาระดับมัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย แต่ไม่จบ
   4. จบมัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย
   5. ศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี แต่ไม่จบ
   6. จบระดับปริญญาตรี
   7. ศึกษาระดับปริญญาโท แต่ไม่จบ
   8. จบระดับปริญญาโท

7. วางแผนอีกจุ้บหนึ่ง ทำมีความรู้สึกพอใจในผลงาน และความก้าวหน้าของการทำซักหนึ่ง เกี่ยวอะไร?

   1. พอใจมาก
   2. พอใจน้อย
   3. ที่พอใจและไม่พอใจ
   4. พอใจ
   5. พอใจมาก

8. กรุณาตอบคำถามในแบบสอบถามที่แน่นอน สำหรับหัวข้องานแต่ละแผนภูมิในบริบทนี้
แผนก

กรุณาให้เครื่องหมายลงมือลงตัวเวลานี้เป็นค่าตอบที่เหมาะสมที่สุด

1. บุคคลในแผนกนี้สามารถทำได้หรือไม่ในการทำตรวจป้องกันต่างๆที่อาจเกิดขึ้นได้ในอนาคต ถ้าจะให้หลากหลายป้องกันไม่ให้เกิดขึ้นหรือทำให้ผลการระบุระลอกเปลี่ยนแปลง?
   1. ไม่มีประสิทธิภาพในการคาดการณ์
   2. ทำได้มีข้อเสีย
   3. ทำได้พอใช้
   4. ทำได้ดี
   5. สามารถทำได้เต็มที่

2. เมื่อเวลาผ่านไป วิธีการไม่ ๆ ในการจัดงาน เครื่องมือเครื่องใช้ และวิธีการใหม่ ๆ ได้ถูกพัฒนา เพื่อขับเคลื่อนในการปฏิบัติงาน บุคคลในแผนกนี้สามารถทำได้หรือไม่ในการประดิษฐ์ให้ทันต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านี้ ซึ่งมีผลต่อวิธีการดำเนินงานของเรา
   1. ไม่มีประสิทธิภาพในการประดิษฐ์ทันที่
   2. ทำได้มีข้อเสีย
   3. ทำได้พอใช้
   4. ทำได้ดี
   5. สามารถประดิษฐ์ให้ทันต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงได้เต็มที่

3. เมื่อมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงเกี่ยวกับแผนงานประจวบคบบ้านเครื่องมือเครื่องใช้ บุคคลในแผนกนี้สามารถออกด้วย และปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลงนั้น ๆ ได้รวดเร็วเพียงใด?
   1. สามารถออกด้วยและปรับตัวได้ดีมาก
   2. ค่อนข้างช้า
   3. เร็วพอใช้
   4. สามารถปรับได้รวดเร็ว แต่ไม่ถึงกับดีมาก
   5. สามารถออกด้วยและปรับตัวได้ดีมาก

4. บุคคลในแผนกนั้น ๆ รู้ว่าจะสนองตอบและปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านี้ มีความ
   รวม สามารถเปลี่ยนแปลงได้?
   1. มีอยู่น้อยกว่าครึ่งมาก
   2. เกือบครึ่งหนึ่ง
   3. ส่วนใหญ่ที่จะได้
   4. มากกว่าครึ่งหนึ่งมาก
   5. ถือได้ว่าทุกคนพร้อมที่จะสนองตอบและปรับตัวให้เข้ากับการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านั้นได้
แผนก______________________(ต่อ)

๕. เมื่อเกิดการถูกเรียกขึ้น เช่น รายการต่างๆ หรือต่างๆ มีผลต่อ กำหนดการคุณสมบัติให้เรียก
ขึ้น หรือ ความต้องการของงานขาดค่อนไปหน้าที่เป็นต้น ย่อมเป็นเหตุให้งานเพิ่มขึ้นมากถูก
บุคคลมีงานเสริมการจัดการกับเหตุการณ์เหล่านี้ได้ดีแล้ววิวัฒนา และเป็นผลสู่การรักษาเกลุม
งานอื่นๆ บุคคลในแผนกนี้สามารถจัดการกับสถานการณ์เหล่านี้ได้ดี เช่นไร ?

1. พวกเขามีประสิทธิภาพในการจัดการกับจุดเจ็บ
2. พวกเขามีไม่ปลอดภัย
3. พวกเขามีโทษ
4. พวกเขามีได้ดี
5. พวกเขามีการได้มากในการจัดการกับจุดเจ็บ

๖. ขอให้คิดถึงจ่ายบุคคล เกี่ยวกับผลงานที่บุคคลในแผนกนี้ทำ ขอให้คิดหลายด้าน ถึงผลงาน
ของบุคคลในแผนกนี้จะมีผลงานมากน้อยเพียงไร ?

1. ผลงานของพวกเขาน้อยมาก
2. ผลงานต่อมาน้อย
3. ผลงานกลาง
4. ต่อมากขึ้น
5. ดุลยภาพ

๗. ตามความเห็นของท่าน ผลิตหรือบริการที่ทำโดยบุคคลในแผนกนี้ มีคุณภาพเพียงไร ?

1. ผลิตผล และบริการ ของพวกเขามีคุณภาพดี
2. คุณภาพไม่ได้ที่ที่ควร
3. คุณภาพพอใช้
4. คุณภาพดี
5. คุณภาพดีมาก

๘. บุคคลในแผนกนี้จะมีพื้นฐานที่จะต้องยอมรับได้ตามที่ส่งต่างๆ เข้ามายุ่ง (เช่น เงิน บุคคล
เครื่องมือเครื่องใช้ ฯลฯ) หรือเปล่า ไม่มีกิจ พวกเขามีข้อจำกัดบางประลิทธิภาพ
เพียงไร ?

1. ไม่มีประสิทธิภาพในการทำงานเลย
2. ไม่ต่อถึงประสิทธิภาพ
3. มีประสิทธิภาพพอสมควร
4. มีประสิทธิภาพสูง
5. มีประสิทธิภาพสูงมาก
Questionnaires with instructions

SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

This survey instrument is designed to learn about how people work together. The aim is to use the information to study managerial leadership and organizational effectiveness in large manufacturing businesses in Bangkok.

If this study is to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as thoughtfully and frankly as possible. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

The information from completed questionnaires will be processed by automated equipment which summarizes the answers in statistical form so that individuals can not be identified. To ensure complete confidentiality please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire.
INSTRUCTIONS

1. Most questions can be answered by choosing one of the answers. If you do not find the exact answer that fits your case, use the one that is closest to it.

2. Please answer all questions in order.

3. Remember, the value of the study depends upon your being straightforward in answering this questionnaire. You will not be identified with your answers.

4. Mark the appropriate answer by circling the number of the answer you want to give.

5. Definitions: This questionnaire asks about a lot of different aspects of your work. Among these are questions about your supervisor and your work group. The questions about your supervisor refer to the person to whom you report directly and the questions about your work group refer to all those persons who report to the same supervisor.

Please fill in the blanks below:

Company number _________
Division number _________
Level number _________
NOTE: Read these answer categories over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions by circling the number of the answer you want to give.

1. To what extent is this organization generally quick to use improved work methods?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

2. To what extent does this organization have a real interest in the welfare and happiness of those who work here?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

3. How much does this organization try to improve working conditions?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

4. To what extent are work activities sensibly organized in this organization?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

5. How adequate for your work group is the information it gets about what is going on in other departments or shifts?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

6. How receptive are people above your supervisor to ideas and suggestions from your work group?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

7. To what extent does this organization tell your work group what it needs to know to do its job in the best possible way?
   1 = To a very little extent
   2 = To a little extent
   3 = To some extent
   4 = To a great extent
   5 = To a very great extent

8. All in all, how satisfied are you with the persons in your group?
   1 = Very dissatisfied
   2 = Somewhat dissatisfied
   3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   4 = Fairly satisfied
   5 = Very satisfied

9. All in all, how satisfied are you with your supervisor?
   1 = Very dissatisfied
   2 = Somewhat dissatisfied
   3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   4 = Fairly satisfied
   5 = Very satisfied
10. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job? 1 2 3 4 5
11. All in all, how satisfied are you with this organization? 1 2 3 4 5
12. Considering your skills and the effort you put into the work, how satisfied are you with your pay? 1 2 3 4 5
13. How satisfied do you feel with the progress you have made in this organization up to now? 1 2 3 4 5
14. How satisfied do you feel with your chances for getting ahead in this organization in the future? 1 2 3 4 5
15. How are differences and disagreements between units or departments handled in this organization?

1. Disagreements are almost always avoided, denied, or suppressed
2. Disagreements are often avoided, denied, or suppressed
3. Sometimes disagreements are accepted or worked through; sometimes they are avoided or suppressed
4. Disagreements are usually accepted as necessary and desirable and are worked through
5. Disagreements are almost always accepted as necessary and desirable and are worked through

16. Why do people work hard in this organization?

1. Just to keep their jobs and avoid being chewed out
2. To keep their jobs and to make money
3. To keep their jobs, make money, and to seek promotions
4. To keep their jobs, make money, seek promotions, and for the satisfaction of a job well done
5. To keep their jobs, make money, seek promotions, do a satisfying job, and because other people in their work group expect it
17. To what extent do you enjoy performing the actual day-to-day activities that make up your job?

1 = To a very little extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To some extent
4 = To a great extent
5 = To a very great extent

18. To what extent are there things about working here (people, policies, or conditions) that encourage you to work hard?

1 = Little or no influence
2 = Some
3 = Quite a bit
4 = A great deal
5 = A very great deal of influence

IN GENERAL, HOW MUCH SAY OR INFLUENCE DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS OR PEOPLE HAVE ON WHAT GOES ON IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

19. Lowest level supervisors (foreman, office supervisors, etc.)

1 = Little or no influence
2 = Some
3 = Quite a bit
4 = A great deal
5 = A very great deal of influence

20. Top managers (president, vice presidents, heads of large divisions, etc.)

1 = Little or no influence
2 = Some
3 = Quite a bit
4 = A great deal
5 = A very great deal of influence

21. Employees (people who have no subordinates)

1 = Little or no influence
2 = Some
3 = Quite a bit
4 = A great deal
5 = A very great deal of influence

22. Middle managers (department heads, area managers, etc.)

1 = Little or no influence
2 = Some
3 = Quite a bit
4 = A great deal
5 = A very great deal of influence

23. How are objectives set in this organization?

1 Objectives are announced with no opportunity to raise questions or give comments
2 Objectives are announced and explained, and an opportunity is then given to ask questions
3 Objectives are drawn up, but are discussed with subordinates and sometimes modified before being issued
4 Specific alternative objectives are drawn up by supervisors, and subordinates are asked to discuss them and indicate the one they think is best
5 Problems are presented to those persons who are involved, and the objectives felt to be best are then set by the subordinates and the supervisor jointly, by group participation and discussion
24. In this organization to what extent are decisions made at those levels where the most adequate and accurate information is available?  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To some extent  
4 = To a great extent  
5 = To a very great extent

25. When decisions are being made, to what extent are the persons affected asked for their ideas?  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To some extent  
4 = To a great extent  
5 = To a very great extent

26. People at all levels of an organization usually have know-how that could be of use to decision-makers. To what extent is information widely shared in this organization so that those who make decisions have access to all available know-how?  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To some extent  
4 = To a great extent  
5 = To a very great extent

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 27 THROUGH 53 ABOUT THE PERSON YOU IDENTIFIED. SUPERVISOR MEANS THE PERSON TO WHOM YOU REPORT DIRECTLY. FOR THE FOLLOWING SET OF ITEMS: PLEASE READ EACH QUESTION AND THEN ANSWER HOW IT IS NOW, AND HOW YOU'D LIKE IT TO BE.

How friendly and easy to approach is your supervisor?

27. This is how it is now:  
1 2 3 4 5

28. This is how I'd like it to be:  
1 2 3 4 5

When you talk with your supervisor, to what extent does he pay attention to what you're saying?

29. This is how it is now:  
1 2 3 4 5

30. This is how I'd like it to be:  
1 2 3 4 5

To what extent is your supervisor willing to listen to your problems?

31. This is how it is now:  
1 2 3 4 5

32. This is how I'd like it to be:  
1 2 3 4 5

How much does your supervisor encourage people to give their best effort?

33. This is how it is now:  
1 2 3 4 5

34. This is how I'd like it to be:  
1 2 3 4 5
To what extent does your supervisor maintain high standards of performance?

35. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
36. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent does your supervisor show you how to improve your performance?

37. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
38. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent does your supervisor provide the help you need so that you can schedule work ahead of time?

39. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
40. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent does your supervisor offer new ideas for solving job-related problems?

41. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
42. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent does your supervisor encourage the persons who work for him to work as a team?

43. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
44. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent does your supervisor encourage people who work for him to exchange opinions and ideas?

45. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
46. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

47. To what extent do you feel your supervisor has confidence and trust in you? 1 2 3 4 5
48. To what extent do you have confidence and trust in your supervisor? 1 2 3 4 5

49. To what extent does your supervisor handle well the technical side of his job—for example, general expertness, knowledge of job, technical skill needed in his profession or trade? 1 2 3 4 5
50. To what extent does your supervisor do a good job of representing your work group to other units? ("Represent" means telling others about what your group has done and can do, as well as explaining the problems facing it and its readiness to do things.)

WHEN IT IS NECESSARY FOR DECISIONS TO BE MADE THAT AFFECT YOUR WORK GROUP, TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR SUPERVISOR DO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING BEFORE FINAL DECISIONS ARE MADE?

51. Provide the members of your work group with information about the decisions.

52. Ask for opinions and ideas from members of your work group.

53. Meet with his subordinates as a group, present problems that must be solved and work with the group to find solutions.

IN THE QUESTIONS BELOW, WORK GROUP MEANS ALL THOSE PERSONS WHO REPORT TO THE SAME SUPERVISOR.

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

54. This is how it is now:

55. This is how I'd like it to be:

When you talk with persons in your work group, to what extent do they pay attention to what you're saying?

56. This is how it is now:

57. This is how I'd like it to be:

To what extent are persons in your work group willing to listen to your problems?

58. This is how it is now:

59. This is how I'd like it to be:
How much do persons in your work group encourage each other to give their best effort?

60. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
61. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent do persons in your work group maintain high standards of performance?

62. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
63. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent do persons in your work group help you find ways to do a better job?

64. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
65. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent do persons in your work group provide the help you need so that you can plan, organize and schedule work ahead of time?

66. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
67. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent do persons in your work group offer each other new ideas for solving job-related problems?

68. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
69. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

How much do persons in your work group encourage each other to work as a team?

70. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
71. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

How much do persons in your work group emphasize a team goal?

72. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
73. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent do persons in your work group exchange opinions and ideas?

74. This is how it is now: 1 2 3 4 5
75. This is how I'd like it to be: 1 2 3 4 5
76. To what extent does your work group plan together and coordinate its efforts? 1 2 3 4 5

77. To what extent does your work group make good decisions and solve problems well? 1 2 3 4 5

78. To what extent do persons in your work group know what their jobs are and know how to do them well? 1 2 3 4 5

79. To what extent is information about important events and situations shared within your work group? 1 2 3 4 5

80. To what extent does your work group really want to meet its objectives successfully? 1 2 3 4 5

81. To what extent is your work group able to respond to unusual work demands placed upon it? 1 2 3 4 5

82. To what extent do you have confidence and trust in the persons in your work group? 1 2 3 4 5

83. To what extent are the equipment and resources you have to do your work with adequate, efficient, and well-maintained? 1 2 3 4 5

84. Into what age bracket do you fall?
   1 25 years or under
   2 26 years to 30 years
   3 31 years to 35 years
   4 36 years to 40 years
   5 41 years to 45 years
   6 46 years to 55 years
   7 56 years or over

85. How much schooling have you had?
   1 Some grade school
   2 Completed grade school
   3 Some high school
   4 Completed high school
   5 Some college
   6 Completed college
   7 Some graduate school
   8 Completed graduate school
86. While you were growing up, say until you were twenty-five, what part of the country did you live in for the most part?

1. Bangkok
2. North
3. South
4. East
5. West
6. Northeast
7. Central

87. How good a job is done by the people in your division in anticipating problems that may come up in the future and preventing them from occurring or minimizing their effects?

1. They do a poor job in anticipating problems
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a very good job
5. They do an excellent job in anticipating problems

88. From time to time newer ways are discovered to organize work, and newer equipment and techniques are found with which to do the work. How good a job do the people in your division do at keeping up with these changes that could affect the way they do their work?

1. They do a poor job of keeping up-to-date
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a good job
5. They do an excellent job of keeping up-to-date

89. When changes are made in the routines or equipment, how quickly do the people in your division accept and adjust to these changes?

1. Most people accept and adjust to them very slowly
2. Rather slowly
3. Fairly rapidly
4. They adjust very rapidly, but not immediately
5. Most people accept and adjust to them immediately

90. What proportion of the people in your division readily accept and adjust to these changes?

1. Considerably less than half of the people accept and adjust to these changes readily
2. Slightly less than half do
3. The majority do
4. Considerably more than half do
5. Practically everyone accepts and adjusts to these changes rapidly
91. From time to time emergencies arise, such as crash programs, schedules moved ahead, or a breakdown in the flow of work occurs. When these emergencies occur they cause work overloads for many people. Some work groups cope with these emergencies more rapidly and successfully than others. How good a job do the people in your division do at coping with these situations?

1 They do a poor job of handling emergency situations
2 They do not do very well
3 They do a fine job
4 They do a good job
5 They do an excellent job of handling these situations

92. Think carefully of the things that you produce in your work and of the things produced by those people who work around you in your division. Thinking now of various things produced by the people you know in your division, how much are they producing?

1 Their production is very low
2 It is fairly low
3 It is neither high nor low
4 It is fairly high
5 It is very high

93. How good would you say is the quality of the products or services produced by the people you know in your division?

1 Their products or services are of poor quality
2 Their quality is not too good
3 Fair quality
4 Good quality
5 Excellent quality

94. Do the people in your division seem to get maximum output from the resources (money, people, equipment, etc.) they have available? That is, how efficiently do they do their work?

1 They do not work efficiently at all
2 Not too efficient
3 Fairly efficient
4 They are very efficient
5 They are extremely efficient

ON SEPARATE SHEETS YOU WILL FIND ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS. PLEASE ANSWER THEM IN THE SPACES PROVIDED BELOW.

95. 1 2 3 4 5

96. 1 2 3 4 5

97. 1 2 3 4 5
98. 1 2 3 4 5
99. 1 2 3 4 5
100. 1 2 3 4 5
101. 1 2 3 4 5
102. 1 2 3 4 5
103. 1 2 3 4 5
104. 1 2 3 4 5
105. 1 2 3 4 5
SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

This instrument is designed to be used with the information from the questionnaires given to other members of your organization to learn about how people work together. The aim is to use the information to study managerial leadership and organizational effectiveness in manufacturing businesses in Bangkok.

For the data in this study to be analyzed, it is important that you answer each question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

The information from this questionnaire and other questionnaires completed by members of your organization will be kept completely confidential. Data from your organization will be combined with data from other organizations. The name of your organization will not be used in the research report.
INSTRUCTIONS

1. Most questions can be answered by choosing one of the answer choices. If you do not find the exact answer that fits your case, make a decision on the answer that is most accurate.

2. Please answer all questions in order.

3. Remember, the value of the study depends upon your being straightforward in answering this questionnaire. You will not be identified with your answers.

4. Please mark the appropriate answer by circling the number in front of the choice you want to give.

5. Into what age bracket do you fall?
   1. 25 years or under
   2. 26 years to 30 years
   3. 31 years to 35 years
   4. 36 years to 40 years
   5. 41 years to 45 years
   6. 46 years to 50 years
   7. 51 years to 55 years
   8. 56 years or over

6. How much schooling have you had?
   1. Some grade school
   2. Completed grade school
   3. Some high school
   4. Completed high school
   5. Some college
   6. Completed college
   7. Some graduate school
   8. Completed graduate school

7. How satisfied you are with the progress made in your organization up to now?
   1. Very dissatisfied
   2. Somewhat dissatisfied
   3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   4. Fairly satisfied
   5. Very satisfied

8. Please complete a copy of the attached questionnaires for each division in your organization.
Division.

Please mark the appropriate answer by circling the number in front of the choice you want to give.

1. How good a job is done by the people in this division in anticipating problems that may come up in the future and preventing them from occurring or minimizing their effects?

1. They do a poor job in anticipating problems
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a very good job
5. They do an excellent job in anticipating problems

2. From time to time newer ways are discovered to organize work, and newer equipment and techniques are found with which to do the work. How good a job do the people in this division do at keeping up with these changes that could affect the way they do their work?

1. They do a poor job of keeping up-to-date
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a good job
5. They do an excellent job of keeping up-to-date

3. When changes are made in the routines or equipment, how quickly do the people in this division accept and adjust to these changes?

1. Most people accept and adjust to them very slowly
2. Rather slowly
3. Fairly rapidly
4. They adjust very rapidly, but not immediately
5. Most people accept and adjust to them immediately

4. What proportion of the people in this division readily accept and adjust to these changes?

1. Considerably less than half of the people accept and adjust to these changes readily
2. Slightly less than half do
3. The majority do
4. Considerably more than half do
5. Practically everyone accepts and adjusts to these changes readily
5. From time to time emergencies arise, such as crash programs, schedules moved ahead, or a breakdown in the flow of work occurs. When these emergencies occur they cause work overloads for many people. Some work groups cope with these emergencies more rapidly and successfully than others. How good a job do the people in this division do at coping with these situations?

1. They do a poor job of handling emergency situations
2. They do not do very well
3. They do a fine job
4. They do a good job
5. They do an excellent job of handling these situations

6. Think carefully of the various things produced by the people in this division, how much are they producing?

1. Their production is very low
2. It is fairly low
3. It is neither high or low
4. It is fairly high
5. It is very high

7. How good would you say is the quality of the productions or services produced by people in this division?

1. Their products or services are of poor quality
2. Their quality is not too good
3. Fair quality
4. Good quality
5. Excellent quality

8. Do people in this division seem to get maximum output from the resources (money, people, equipment, etc.) they have available? That is, how efficiently do they do their work?

1. They do not work efficiently at all
2. Not too efficient
3. Fairly efficient
4. They are very efficient
5. They are extremely efficient
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45, 51, 52, 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td>28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23, 24, 25, 26, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72, 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td>55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73, 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Process</td>
<td>76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>87, 88, 89, 90, 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>92, 93, 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>87, 88, 89, 90, 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>92, 93, 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>87, 88, 89, 90, 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>92, 93, 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Systems Indices</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal emphasis</td>
<td>.51* (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with work</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Leadership</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at <0.001.
Analysis of Data from Two Smaller Organizations
(Not Included in the Population)

**TABLE C-2**

MEASUREMENTS FOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF THE SMALLER ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Average Mean</th>
<th>MS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML/OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data from Two Smaller Organizations  
(Not Included in the Population)

**TABLE C-3**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF**  
**THE THREE LEVELS (Smaller Organizations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management System Dimension</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data from Two Smaller Organizations
(Not Included in the Population)

**TABLE C-4**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS (Smaller Organizations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Systems Dimension</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data from Two Smaller Organizations
(Not Included in the Population)

TABLE C-5

T-TEST FOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL STYLE
OF MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP (Smaller Organizations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Leadership</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-6.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-2.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-8.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Style</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>-7.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at P<0.05
** Significance at P<0.001
TABLE C-6

BETA WITH DEGREE OF FREEDOM (DF) and F VALUE (F)
FOR EFFECTIVENESS AT LEVEL 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adaptable DF = 4.58</th>
<th>Productive DF = 2.60</th>
<th>Satisfaction DF = 3.59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETA F</td>
<td>BETA F</td>
<td>BETA F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.31 5.23**</td>
<td>0.33 5.76**</td>
<td>0.77 97.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.50 17.85**</td>
<td>0.33 5.76**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>-0.15 0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.12 0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.14 1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12 2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.13 2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.55 0.59</td>
<td>0.59 0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.30 0.34</td>
<td>0.34 0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.13** 15.61**</td>
<td>36.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at P<0.05
** Significance at P<0.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8.95**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager's</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.68**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at P<0.05
** Significance at P<0.01
TABLE C-8
BETA WITH DEGREE OF FREEDOM (DF) AND F VALUE (F) FOR EFFECTIVENESS AT LEVEL 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adaptability DF = 1,61</th>
<th>Productivity DF = 2,60</th>
<th>Satisfaction DF = 4,58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>21.08**</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager's Education</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.08**</td>
<td>5.37**</td>
<td>9.07**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at P<0.05
** Significance at P<0.01