

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN  
PERCEIVED TASK LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
AND PERCEIVED INTERPERSONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
OF FIRST LINE SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY  
IN TWO UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE HALL FOOD SERVICE SYSTEMS

by

Alice Jeane Harrison

B. A., University of Kansas, 1945

Submitted to the Department of Speech  
and Drama and to the Faculty of the  
Graduate School of the University of  
Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master  
of Arts.

**Redacted Signature**

~~Instructor in charge // //~~

**Redacted Signature**

~~For the department~~

July, 1972

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank those people who made this research possible. The many faculty members who gave insight, encouragement, and interest are truly appreciated. Dr. Kim Giffin, with his combination of humor warmth and guidance, is especially appreciated and sincerely thanked.

The cooperative efforts of the Directors of Housing and the Administrative Dietitians of the Residence Hall Food Services at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas and the University of Kansas, in Lawrence, Kansas, Jean Riggs and Lenoir Ekdahl, together with the employees' of the two Residence Hall Food Service Systems, made this study possible.

Many friends and members of my extended family have given freely of their support and confidence. Recognition of their sustaining help is publicly, though inadequately, expressed. Very special thanks go to R. J. H., S. D. H., J. L. H., and K. A. H.

Finally, appreciation is expressed to Martha Jean O'Toole and Suzanne Gilbert for their help in preparing this copy. It was, often done at times which were not optimally convenient for them.

A. J. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE . . . . .	1
The General Problem Area . . . . .	2
The Specific Problem to be Investigated . . . . .	7
Definition of Major Terms . . . . .	7
The Importance of the Problem . . . . .	9
Review of the Literature . . . . .	10
Specific Aim of Study . . . . .	17
II. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	18
The Instrument Chosen . . . . .	19
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	24
III. RESULTS . . . . .	26
IV. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY . . . . .	28
Summary of Research Rationale . . . . .	28
Implications and Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	34
APPENDIX A: <u>Halpin-Winer (Short Form) Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	40
APPENDIX B: <u>Scoring Key for Halpin-Winer (Short Form) Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	44
APPENDIX C: <u>EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT</u> . . . . .	46
APPENDIX D: Raw Scores for Employee's Productivity and Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and Perceived Maintenance Behavior of First-Line Supervisor for 156 Employees. . . . .	48

	PAGE
APPENDIX E: TABLES III and IV . . . . .	56
APPENDIX F: Raw Scores for Employee's Productivity and Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisor for 55 Employees. . . . .	58

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Mean and Standard Deviation for 156 Subjects . . . . .	27
2. Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	27
3. Data for Relationship of Unit Supervisors and Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior for 55 Employees . . . . .	56
4. Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	56

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

The goals of Human Relations teaching are oriented toward an increasingly deeper understanding of the factors which are involved in creating situations for a sense of greater personal fulfillment and optimum productivity. It is a dynamic approach toward problem solving for organizational growth.

The terms productivity, efficiency, and performance of personnel have all been of concern to owners, administrators, and supervisors in food service organizations. Food service organizations have traditionally been concerned with combining and presenting food for acceptance to the customer for consumption. The actual production of raw food belongs in other realms. There has been a significant increase in number and size of industries engaged in intermediary processing, or production of convenience foods.

A convenience food is any food in which some of the labor has been done prior to its purchase by food service industries. Such products would include canned products, frozen products which may need some further processing and dry cake mixes. One of the oldest and most popular convenience foods is ice cream. The study of convenience food processing companies belongs in another area, also.

Food service industries employ, at every level, personnel who bring their own food centered emotions as consumers as well as their

extremely varied backgrounds in production experience. Because of these human factors, food service organizations may represent the focal point for combining art, science, and practice of all those engaged in service oriented organizations. The complexity of the situation challenges researchers to study the relationships of productivity in food service with some of the newer concepts from the social sciences regarding the role of the leader. The organizational supervisor in food service industries invites a study concerning leadership behavior and group dynamics.

Schein gives the following definition of an organization:

An organization is the rational coordination of the activities of a number of people for the achievement of some common explicit purpose or goal, through division of labor and function, and through a hierarchy of authority and responsibilities.<sup>1</sup>

He also gives the concept of an organization in terms of a process of imports, conversion, and exports.<sup>2</sup> Both terms, exports and goals, imply a product or service which must be inherent in the basic economic objectives of the organization. Management personnel have long been concerned with productivity of workers as an integral part of that economic concept.

#### The General Problem Area

Early studies of organizational productivity include the concepts of applied scientist-mathematicians as those concepts relate to organizations. Developing technological productivity in America usually starts with the study of Taylor's concepts. Taylor tended to separate the cerebrating and feeling man from the acting and moving man:

---

<sup>1</sup>Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 95.

Now one of the very first requirements for a man who is fit to handle pig iron . . . is that he shall be so stupid and so phlegmatic that he more nearly resembles . . . the ox than any other type . . . he must consequently be trained by a man more intelligent than himself.<sup>3</sup>

Although he simply popularized the then current thinking, there is evidence that the study of the technology and productivity aspects of organizations is many centuries old.<sup>4</sup>

Another way of studying productivity in organizations is from the standpoint of the tools of management. This approach has been, largely, the Scientific Management one which used the mathematical-scientific approach to study external organizational problems. The earlier uses of management tools were within the concept of Scientific Management but had a pre-computer approach. This approach was based on ways of subdividing work into the most elementary tasks so that each worker could specialize in one task and with management tools could be directed to even higher production.

Frank Gilbreth proposed that the efficient worker would be one whose production could be raised by teaching him economy of motion and time. Gilbreth and his wife, Lillian, systematized and popularized his ideas in the literature of the time.<sup>5,6,7</sup> Work Flow Charts for management

<sup>3</sup>F. W. Taylor, Scientific Management, (New York: Harper, 1911), p. 59.

<sup>4</sup>William W. Cooper, Harold J. Leavitt, and Maynard W. Shelly II, New Perspectives in Organization Research (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 28-38.

<sup>5</sup>Frank B. Gilbreth, Bricklaying System (New York: M. C. Clark, 1909).

<sup>6</sup>Frank B. Gilbreth, Motion Study (New York: Von Nostrand, 1911).

<sup>7</sup>Frank B. Gilbreth and Lillian Gilbreth, Applied Motion Study (New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1917).



of men and materials,<sup>8</sup> along with usage of Job Analysis, and Job Descriptions also came into use. They became components of a rational approach to the study of organizations.

The Systems Analysis was a part of the engineering approach. It has been, in the past, used to organize human and technical activity in the most efficient manner, to achieve the greatest material production, with little regard for the effects on the people. There is an emerging strategy for the Systems Analyst which incorporates behavioral sciences in the General Systems Analysis.<sup>9</sup> The model itself may be one of the largest contributions to studying organizational productivity.

The Scientific Management approach has been incorporated in the food service organizations. The use of Flow Charts, Job Descriptions, Work Sheets, Job Analyses, and Method Simplification are part of the books and manuals which have been used by food service organization management students.<sup>10, 11, 12, 13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>F. L. W. Richardson, Jr. and Charles R. Walker, "Work Flow and Human Relations," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 27 (January, 1949), pp. 107-122.

<sup>9</sup>Robert Chin and Kenneth Benne, "General Strategies for Effecting Change in Human Systems," ed. by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 2nd Ed., 1969), p. 37.

<sup>10</sup>Bessie Brooks West, LeVelle Wood, and Virginia Harger, Food Service in Institutions (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 4th ed, 1966), pp. 301-333.

<sup>11</sup>Bessie Brooks West and LeVelle Wood, Food Service in Institutions (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 3rd Ed., 1955), pp. 340-366.

<sup>12</sup>Bessie Brooks West and LeVelle Wood, Food Service in Institutions (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2nd Ed., 1945), pp. 338-366.

<sup>13</sup>Lendal H. Kotschevar, Quantity Food Production (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966), pp. 45-78.

Welch notes that in service industries, including food service industries, (though not necessarily in highly skilled service trades) the production pattern differs materially from the production pattern in most other industries. The chief difference is that in the service industries, the workers flow to the work instead of the work to the workers.<sup>14</sup>

This difference in work flow coupled with the increasingly complex society in the world<sup>15</sup> may indicate that there is a need to approach the study of productivity in food service industries in a different manner, related to supervisory leadership.

The term leadership is an illusive one. There are many definitions of leadership, but all of them imply that there must be followers. Katz and Kahn state

In other words, we consider the essence of organizational leadership to be the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization.<sup>16</sup>

In a hierarchial organization it is, often, not possible to completely separate leadership from power and authority. The organization vests power and authority in the role of the supervisor. This is usually done in food service organizations because of the expertise based on education and/or experience of the supervisor in food production. It

---

<sup>14</sup>John Welch, On the Job Training in Food Service, University of Missouri Extension Division, Manual 66, (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1966), p. 7.

<sup>15</sup>Warren G. Bennis, "Changing Organizations," ed. by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 2nd Ed., 1969), pp. 568-569.

<sup>16</sup>Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 302.

would be naive to suppose that other factors such as internal politics and nepotism never occur in food service organizations. There may be no evidence that these factors have operated in the two organizations studied, both objectively for this report and subjectively as a member of the hierarchy, (all full time employees have a Kansas Civil Service Rating) but they may be, often, found in organizations and can confuse the concepts of leadership.

It is possible that leadership, power, and authority may reside in the same supervisor. The definition of power may be referred to in five different ways: (1) Legitimate power, (2) Punishment power, (3) Reward power, (4) Expert power, and (5) Referent power which refers to the influence based upon liking or identification with another.<sup>17</sup> The concept of referent power has some congruency with leadership. They both imply that the followers or subordinates are willing to place a higher priority on the goals of a leader or an organizational supervisor than goals which had been individual personal ones.

Food service supervisors in a bureaucratic hierarchical organization may be shown to have the ability to exercise some kinds of power and/or leadership. The very survival of an organization may depend on the leadership of the supervisors. The complexity of the functions of leadership and of supervisors would seem to indicate a need for studying leadership behavior of food service supervisors.

Traditional leadership often inhibits members since people are reluctant to show their feelings of ignorance in front of an expert. That kind of leadership rarely gives people security.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 302-303.

<sup>18</sup>Carl Rogers, Client Centered Therapy, (Boston: 1951), p. 334.

There is a possibility that a supervisor can exercise desired leadership behavior by creating a climate for growth for individual employees.

#### The Specific Problem to be Investigated

There may be a strong likelihood that productivity in food service organizations can be shown to have a relationship with several factors, but this study is concerned with investigating perceived Leadership Behavior of the first line supervisors and its relation to productivity in a very specific field study. This study is an attempt to explore and determine a possible relationship between: (1) Task Behavior of the supervisor and productivity of those supervised and (2) Maintenance Behavior of the supervisor and productivity of those being supervised in the food service areas of the University Residence Halls at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas, and the University Residence Halls of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas.

#### Definition of Major Terms

In this particular field study the term productivity is used exclusive, for date, to incorporate the sum of the scores of the first two items on the Evaluation Report, DA-226, for all Kansas Classified Employees: (1) Quality of Work and (2) Quantity of Work.

This report was used since in many cases the evaluation had been completed and was a matter of record, and also the use of this standardized form is universal for all employers who participated in the study. Furthermore, those first two items are the ones that seem most relevant as a measure of productivity. Using the sum of the items, presupposes that the terms quantity of work and quality of work are of equal importance. That is the score of four for quantity of work and eight for quality of work

would be equal to the score of eight for quantity of work and four for quality of work. For purposes of this study it would be necessary for an employee to have a rating showing a high score in both categories in order to be considered a highly productive employee. The term productivity, however, is not well defined in the literature.

Task needs are classified by Harnack and Fest to include the need to define and assess the task, to gather information to study the problem, and to find criteria for solutions.<sup>19</sup> Cartwright and Zander describe task needs (goal achievement) to include the initiation of action, clarification of issues, development of procedural plan, evaluation of quality of work done, and the provision of expert information.<sup>20</sup>

Harnack and Fest define Maintenance needs (interpersonal needs) to include the achievement of harmony, release of tension, and enhancement of status.<sup>21</sup> Cartwright and Zander define maintenance needs to include keeping interpersonal needs, pleasant, arbitrating disputes, providing encouragement, stimulating self-direction, making sure minority opinions are heard, and increasing interdependency among members.<sup>22</sup> Bales confirms group as having two distinct needs which he calls task and social.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Victor Harnack and Thorrell Fest, Group Discussion Theory and Technique (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 193.

<sup>20</sup>Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 3rd edition, 1968), p. 306.

<sup>21</sup>Harnack and Fest, op. cit., p. 193.

<sup>22</sup>Cartwright and Zander, op. cit., p. 306.

<sup>23</sup>Robert F. Bales, "In Conference," Readings in Interpersonal and Organizational Communication, Ed. by Richard C. Huseman, Cal. M. Logue, and Dwight Freshley, (Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1969), p. 375.

Brilhart sees group needs (apart from individual members self-centered ones) as task needs and group building or maintenance needs.<sup>24</sup>

While a great deal of writing has been done on individual needs from the group as well as group needs in a laboratory environment, there has been less research in production centered environments. Research in such organizations has, also, indicated the present of these two basic needs.<sup>25</sup>

### The Importance of the Problem

#### Economic Urgency

Productivity in food service is now being studied from many aspects. University food service must be increasingly concerned with the economic factor since their personnel fall under Fair Labor Standards Act (the so-called 1966 amendments), which means that the minimum wage for any worker is \$1.60 per hour.<sup>26</sup> A university food service cannot continually pass on higher prices in equipment, maintenance, raw food and labor, without making the cost per student prohibitive.

#### Prospects for Precedent in Studying Food Service Industries

Whyte did a study of the restaurant industry and declares:

While a research has provided a large and rapidly growing fund of knowledge concerning the social organization of a factory, studies of other industrial and business structures are only beginning . . . .

---

<sup>24</sup>John K. Brilhart, Effective Group Discussion, (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1967), pp. 15-16.

<sup>25</sup>Cartwright and Zander, op. cit., p. 307.

<sup>26</sup>Lipman Feld, "How Wage and Hour Changes Affect Colleges," College and University Business, Vol. 50, No. 2 (February, 1971), pp. 28, 32, 36, 40.

. . . and let us have more quantitative work, but let us at last bring it to bear upon the heart of sociology, measuring the relations among individuals in their organization.<sup>27</sup>

It is possible that the investigation of relationships of employees to leadership behavior of the supervisor would show a way of quantification, generally, in other food service industries.

### Review of the Literature

#### Productivity in Food Service Minimizing Personnel

Increasing productivity in food service has been studied and discussed from many perspectives. One of the ideas which is receiving a great amount of space in journals (at least one article or abstract in each recent issue) is the use of some convenience foods. Many chains and airlines, as well as the armed services, have used convenience foods for some time.<sup>28</sup> Some food service facilities have gone to a complete system which incorporates as many of the convenience foods as possible.<sup>29, 30, 31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>William F. Whyte, "The Social Structure of a Restaurant," ed. by William B. Wolf, Management (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965), p. 219-230.

<sup>28</sup>An Institutions Magazine Special Report, "Chains and the Components of Convenience," Institutions, Vol. 67, No. 1 (August, 1970), pp. 57-72.

<sup>29</sup>Bruce Smith, "Hospital Dietary Services of the 70's," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 11 (November, 1970), pp. 37-42.

<sup>30</sup>Bruce Smith, "'Raw-To-Ready' Fact File 1: Grant Hospital," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 11 (November, 1970), pp. 43-48.

<sup>31</sup>Special Report by Food Service Editors, "Total Convenience on the College Campus," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 8 (August, 1970), pp. 35-37.

Some of the other ideas which are being studied as a way of increasing productivity are versatile equipment,<sup>32, 33</sup> centralization,<sup>34</sup> warehousing, distribution, computerization,<sup>35</sup> and work simplification.<sup>36</sup>

#### Productivity in Food Service Maximizing Personnel

There has recently been a trend toward personnel training as a way of increasing productivity. Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., in an address to the National Restaurant Association in 1969, stated that food service institutions have unusually high turnover rates, and that the price tag was between \$300-\$400 per person. He advocated more hiring, training and retraining of minority groups so that they can become supervisors and managers. He also advocates community involvement in vocational schools for training food service personnel as a way of making training programs meaningful to current needs in food service organizations.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>Jane M. Heinemeyer, "Food Production Materials Handling," Journal of American Dietetic Association, Vol. 52, No. 6 (June, 1968), pp. 491-497.

<sup>33</sup>"Versatile Equipment Helps Create Fast Food Service for Busy Employees," Commercial Kitchen and Dining Room, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer, 1970), pp. 6-7.

<sup>34</sup>David J. Hanks, "An Exclusive Report," Institutions and Volume Feeding, Vol. 68, No. 2 (January 15, 1971), pp. 39-51.

<sup>35</sup>Harvey Goodfriend, "Hot Lunch Myth is Cold Comfort If Students Won't Eat," College & University Business, Vol. 49, No. 4 (October, 1970), pp. 66, 70, 72, 74, 76, 77, and 81.

<sup>36</sup>Lynne Ross, "Work Simplification," School Lunch Journal, Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (March, 1970), pp. 34-40.

<sup>37</sup>Elmer L. Winter, "Man Power Strategy," Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969), pp. 31-34.



Henry J. Buncom, Jr., supervisor of ordering and distributing all food and supplies for Chock Full o'Nuts Company and franchise restaurants, is a black who has a B. S. Degree from Cornell School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration. He sees color as the least requirement for food service personnel, including administrative positions, and declares that, "Foremost is the importance of adequate educational preparation."<sup>38</sup>

Some of the literature, also, shows a concern for increasing productivity in food service by studying the relationships of the organization and its personnel. Sara Sloan has raised student participation in the Georgia Fulton County lunch program from 61 to 87 percent in five years by emphasizing the importance of personnel and customers (students and teachers). Mrs. Sloan has been responsible not only for attending regular meetings with Principals, she has held training workshops and fall faculty brunches. She has encouraged parent participation and student involvement.<sup>39</sup>

The Marriott Corporation which may be the first billion dollar corporation in food service has used a wide range of programs which its management insists keeps production rates high and turnover low. Some of his policies include: (1) An outstanding profit-sharing program (based on the famous Sears-Roebuck concept), (2) Participative Management, (3) An Open Door policy to all personnel, (4) A Career Progression Program

---

<sup>38</sup>Henry J. Buncom, Jr., "Opportunities for Black Youth in the Food and Lodging Industry," Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969), pp. 35-39.

<sup>39</sup>"People: The Most Important Ingredient," School and College Food Management, Vol. 6, No. 8 (August, 1970), pp. 30-34.

complete with training in human relations, and (5) Special Company Consolars and publications for the non-English speaking workers.<sup>40</sup>

Paul C. Kilborn, vice president of Host International, discusses ways of increasing productivity through people. In an address to the National Restaurant Association Seminar he notes all of the changes that may occur (increased use of computers and convenience foods) and stresses that, except for the newly employed, training, in "how-to," will need to be continuous in "why." "People are happiest and therefore most productive when they have a sense of accomplishment from their work, not just a need to work in order to survive."<sup>41</sup>

The emphasis on training continues to increase. Institutions and Volume Feeding sponsored a seminar composed of six prominent industry people to discuss training of hourly food service employees. It is the economic aspect which is of greatest concern to all, but it has affected the type of training. Now "career ladders" and "job enrichment" are terms which are of greater prominence than before.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Judith Shoen and Betsy Raskin, "Marriott: The Deliberate Changemaker," Institutions and Volume Feeding, Vol. 67, No. 6 (November 15, 1970), pp. 43-54.

<sup>41</sup>Paul C. Kilborn, "Change Will Accelerate," Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969), pp. 22-24.

<sup>42</sup>"Training Now," Institutions/Volume Feeding, Vol. 70, No. 3 (February 1, 1971), pp. 53-60.

### Leadership in Food Service

Leadership as a factor in students' reactions to foods in Residence Hall Food Service<sup>43</sup> as well as hospital patients' reactions to food<sup>44</sup> have been researched but they tended to stress public relations.<sup>45</sup>

Professional dietitians were in most positions of supervision in the University Residence Hall Food Service less than a decade ago, and still occupy many such positions. It is interesting to review some of the research on personality characteristics and interest patterns of dietitians since they often occupy higher status positions in Residence Hall Food Service.

Cleveland found that dietitians were status-conscious, and interested in achievement; that they indicated a desire to influence and manipulate others and displayed a great deal of self-confidence.<sup>46</sup>

Hornaday found that dietitians had a high preference for directing and influencing people in thoughts and activities and liked to be in positions of authority.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Jean Spencer Prideaux and Grace M. Shugart, "Students Reactions to Residence Hall Food," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 49, No. 1 (July, 1966), pp. 38-41.

<sup>44</sup>Jacob J. Feldman, "Patients Opinions of Hospital Food," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 40, No. 4 (April, 1962), p. 325.

<sup>45</sup>Margaret M. Hinkle, "The Dietary Department and Public Relations," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 33, No. 11 (November, 1957), pp. 1170-1174.

<sup>46</sup>Sidney E. Cleveland, "Personality Characteristics of Dietitians and Nurses," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 43, No. 2 (August, 1963), pp. 104-109.

<sup>47</sup>John A. Hornaday, "Interest Patterns of Dietitians," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 43, No. 2 (August, 1963), pp. 99-103.

After the 1963 publications there was a great deal of reevaluation concerning behavior of dietitians. Echols collaborated on group training aspects with Muriel G. Wagner on group training aspects of the dietetic internship program offered at the Merrill Palmer Institute, Detroit, for a number of years. Echols states:

The use of role playing to illustrate problems experienced by patients highlighted some of the issues and some of the limitations which the professional trainee experienced in trying to develop skills for working with others in groups. What was singularly unique ten years ago, as illustrated by some of the experimentation has become quite commonplace and generally accepted today.<sup>48</sup>

Echols did a comparative study of four categories of group approaches: (a) group dynamics, (b) clinical and therapeutic models, (c) social work groups, and (d) T-groups.

He finds common elements in all approaches and says that all should be growth producing.<sup>49</sup>

While the above findings may be helpful in gaining insights and stimulate more research, they do not confront the organizational relationships research needed.

Whyte did not consider the relationships between any level of supervision and employees except to note that in larger organizations the administration becomes more complex and that the greatest problem was to tie together the lines of authority with the relations that rise along the flow of work.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>Ivor J. Echols, "Comparative Group Approaches," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, Vol. 59, No. 5 (November, 1971), pp. 460-465.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Whyte, op. cit., p. 222.

The owner, administrator, manager, supervisor, and leader are becoming increasingly interesting objects of the philosophies of human value rewarding and human fulfillment organizations.

Berg and Nejelski state that administrators in food service systems will need to understand how those systems can "stimulate human expression, multiply involvement and motivation, and pay off in self-fulfillment." In the entire article there were eight references from social science literature.<sup>51</sup>

Witzky, teacher in Human Relations at the School of Hotel Administration at Cornell University, says that

. . . the job of management and manager is to create an environment conducive to the performance of acts by other individuals in order to accomplish personal as well as company goals.<sup>52</sup>

He sees the changing role of manager as one who must be concerned with all aspects of social systems.

#### Leadership in Other Organizations

Likert studied productive rates in industry in both a hierarchically managed and a participatively managed group, which he considered equal, otherwise, in the same company. He found that the productive rates increased about the same amount in both groups. In the group of participative management, however, he found less personnel turnover and absenteeism, and that attitudes improved, which have been most closely related, in the long run to employee motivation and productivity.

---

<sup>51</sup>David J. Berge and Leo Nejelski, "Administration of Food Service Systems," Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3 (November, 1969), pp. 32-40.

<sup>52</sup>Herbert K. Witzky, "The Changing Role of the Manager," Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3 (November, 1969), pp. 14-20.

Likert makes a strong advocacy for studying organizations by using measurements now available from the social sciences.<sup>53</sup>

Whyte insists that there is a place for case studies, in organizations, but there is a great need for using instruments to measure. He, also, advocates measuring attitudes as well as goal changes with changes in the relations he experiences.<sup>54</sup>

#### Specific Aim of Study

This study aims to determine any significant relationships between perceived Leadership Behavior of a first line supervisor and productivity of food service employees and Maintenance Leadership Behavior of first line supervisors and productivity of food service employees in the Residence Hall Systems at K. U. and K. S. U.

The subjects are directed to respond to questions on a scale of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, and never. Essentially the technique involves the judgement of the subjects as to the behavior of a supervisor. For example the question might read: He rules with an iron hand.

1	:	2	:	3	:	4	:	5
Always		Often		Occasionally		Seldom		Never

---

<sup>53</sup>Rensis Likert, "Measuring Organizational Performance," ed. by S. G. Huneryager and I. L. Heckmann, Human Relations Management (Chicago South-Western Publishing Company, 2nd ed., 1967), pp. 456-475.

<sup>54</sup>Whyte, op. cit., p. 230.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The goals of this study (see Chapter I) are to determine (1) whether a correlation exists between the productivity of an employee in Residence Hall Food Service at KSU and KU and his/her perception of Task Leadership Behavior of his/her first line supervisor, and (2) whether a correlation exists between productivity of an employee in the Residence Hall Food Service and his/her perception of Maintenance Leadership Behavior of his/her first line Supervisor.

#### Example of Goals

<u>Employee</u>	<u>Productivity</u>	<u>Perceived Maintenance Behavior of Supervisor</u>
A	20	75
B	18	68
C	16	60
D	14	53
E	12	45
F	10	38

---

<u>Employee</u>	<u>Productivity</u>	<u>Perceived Task Behavior of Supervisor</u>
A	20	75
B	16	60
C	12	45
D	8	30
E	4	15

### Sample

The Administrative Dietitians of the residence halls at the University of Kansas and at Kansas State University have given their enthusiastic support, as well as obtaining permission from their respective directors, for this study, since they are concerned with obtaining optimum usefulness from the available resources in all cases and are, therefore, interested in a study of productivity of personnel.

Time for personnel to complete the questionnaire is to be provided as part of workshop time. Workshop time occurs when food production is suspended because of school vacations. Since the pressure of food production is normally time-bound, and can result in an emotionally charged climate, it would seem that a workshop setting where such anxieties are removed would lend a degree of desired objectivity for employees to evaluate supervisors.

These groups were chosen because:

- (1) Willingness by administrators to make employee time available
- (2) A unique situation for food service workers in Residence hall food service to provide employment when they are not engaged in actual food production
- (3) Employee evaluations (above) to be used are ones already completed so that the likelihood of reciprocity in evaluations should be minimized, and
- (4) Employee evaluations are standardized for all Kansas Civil Service employees.

### The Instrument Chosen

The Halpin-Winer Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was developed through the Ohio State University Research Foundation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, and B. Winer, The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1954).



The short form, known as the LBDO is a revised form developed at Ohio State University by Stogdill and Coons.<sup>2</sup>

Etzioni commends the work:

One of the most extensive efforts to construct instruments which can be used for comparative-organizational studies, and to apply them to schools, factories and military units, was undertaken by the Ohio State studies. (Hemphill and Coons, 1950; Fleishman, 1953; Halpin, 1954; Stogdill and Coons, 1957) For fine discussions of the methodological involved see Selvin and Hagstrom (1960) and Zald (1960)<sup>3</sup>

This instrument requires that individuals responds to thirty questions which have been found by factor analysis to make up two basic dimensions: (1) Initiating structure and (2) Showing consideration. No pattern as to which question belongsto which dimension is readily apparent; no pattern for actual score (corrected by key) is readily apparent.

#### Administration of Instrument

All Residence Hall food service employees who attend the workshop are to be assembled together at K.S.U. The term supervisor is used exclusively to mean first-line supervisor. The following statement is to be read:

---

<sup>2</sup>R. M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957).

<sup>3</sup>Amitai Etzioni, Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press of The Macmillan Company, 1961), p. 301.

This is for a Master's Thesis. No specific information will be revealed--only the general results. This is a very private matter and should not be discussed with others.

This is "Privileged Communication": No supervisor, no administrator, no employee will know any results except for general trends.

### INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to measure leadership behavior. You are asked to judge the behavior of your supervisor against a series of descriptive scales, numbered one through five. The ANSWER SHEET indicates spaces where you are to mark by circling the number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 for each of the thirty questions. Choose the number which most closely describes the behavior.

In completing this questionnaire, please make your judgments on the basis of what these five descriptive scales mean to you and on the basis of the behavior of your supervisor.

If you feel that a particular concept indicated on the scales fits the person always, you should mark your ANSWER SHEET after the appropriate question with a 1.

If the concept fits the person's behavior never, then mark a 5 in the appropriate space.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

Work at a fairly high rate of speed. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions that are important. On the other hand, please do not be careless. There are no right or wrong answers. Be sure that every question is answered.

Write your supervisor's name at the top of the first page and your name at the bottom of the same page.

Before you turn in your questionnaires, make a final check to be sure each question is answered.

Your first-line supervisor is the supervisor who is the supervisor just above you and farthest down the line from the Administrator--the supervisor closest to you.

Now begin.

The same process is to be repeated to food service employees of residence halls are assembled at K. U. Testing of both groups should occur within a two-week period.

The total population should be in excess of one hundred people. It is inevitable that some employees will be on annual leave, sick leave, or leave without pay, so that the total number of employees in both instances will not be present. A list of all employees who have a language problem or a reading comprehension problem is to be obtained so that their questionnaires can be discarded.

The questionnaires are then to be sorted according to each supervisor's evaluations by supervisees, and scored. The grades must be sorted for Task Behavior and Maintenance Behavior according to the scoring key.

#### Measurement of Productivity

The sum of the first two items on the Employee Evaluation is to be used, as previously defined, to indicate an individual's productivity. Those items are (1) Quality of Work and (2) Quantity of Work. Each item is given a value of from zero to ten; therefore, any employee could have a summed score for productivity of from zero to twenty. It is assumed for this study that if Employee X has a score of: (1) Quality of Work = 8, and (2) Quantity of Work = 3, and that Employee Y has scores of Quality of Work = 3 and Quantity of Work = 8, that Employee X and Employee Y are equally productive Residence Hall food service employees. No implication that these factors are equal for other types of studies (or that the sum is equal to the sum of any other two items), such as trainability, reasons for demotion or promotion possibilities should be inferred.

These scores for employees are a matter of record and permission has been granted for the purpose of this study to examine the employee evaluations which are filed in the respective Housing Administrative Offices. These evaluations may not be signed by first-line supervisors, but the evaluating supervisor may privately discuss an individual's overall rating or discuss each item separately. The evaluations are then reviewed one or more times upward in the hierarchy of the Residence Hall System.

The evaluation form is used for all classified employees including repair men, clerical workers, social workers, nurses, cooks, and dietitians. It is, necessarily, very general. Many food service companies have different types of forms, but one problem inherent in any form is that it is too general or too specific. If it is too specific, then there must be a different form for each position which invalidates efforts toward a team approach. That is the person who makes salads may show low productivity if he/she does not "lend a hand" toward the evening cook. If he/she works wherever needed, then his/her productivity may actually be higher but would not fit a specific evaluation form for a salad maker. Generally speaking, this evaluation form is clear, comprehensive, and short. It is easy to fill out and easy to understand.

Two items from Employer Evaluation Report:

	<u>0 Pts.</u>	<u>4 Pts.</u>	<u>6 Pts.</u>	<u>8 Pts.</u>	<u>10 Pts.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> QUALITY OF WORK	Poor, undue number of errors	Sometimes careless and inaccurate	Meets standards of quality	Work quite carefully done	Outstanding, highly accurate
<input type="checkbox"/> QUANTITY OF WORK	Work output very low	Does less than reasonable	Work volume satisfactory	Above average producer	Unusually high output

Statistical Analysis

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run (1) between the employees scores for productivity and the LBDO (short form) scores for first line supervisors Task Behavior and (2) between the employees scores for productivity and the LBDO (short form) scores for first line supervisors Maintenance Behavior. The null hypotheses are as follows:

(1) The correlation between employees productivity scores and the LBDO scores for Task Behavior is zero and (2) The correlation between employees productivity and the LBDO scores for Maintenance Behavior is zero.

The .05 level of probability is chosen. The procedure fulfills the aims of determining if a relationship exists with perceived Task Leadership Behavior or perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of first-line supervisors and the productivity of employees in the two University Residence Hall Systems.\*

Since all Residence Hall Food Service Unit supervisors have the same hierarchical status at K. U., and since they were very concerned with productivity, they asked to be included in the study. A unit supervisor has complete charge of one entire cafeteria. It may be that the sample contained will not be very meaningful, unless it shows a different trend. If reciprocity is a factor it could conceivably produce ambiguity in any results since the unit manager signs the Civil Service employee evaluation and conducts the interview at the time the evaluation is presented to the employee.

Permission has been granted by the Residence Hall Director to enlarge the study at K. U. to have employees fill out questionnaires on

---

\*All names will be coded to preserve the guaranteed anonymity.

unit supervisors. No such permission was asked at K.S.U. since the size and complexity of their unit operations are varied to the extent that unit supervisors are unequal in the number of employees supervised, the variety in size of the units, and a variety in the number of levels of supervision.

The additional data regarding unit supervisors may be congruent with other data or may be too ambiguous to have any relevancy to the study.\* It will not be included in the body of this work, but will appear in the Appendix.

---

\*All names will be coded to preserve the guaranteed anonymity.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

The possible relationships between employee productivity and Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and productivity and Perceived Maintenance (Interpersonal) Leadership Behavior in the Residence Hall Food Service at the University of Kansas in Lawrence and at the Kansas State University in Manhattan were determined by correlation.

Initially there were 167 LBDO (short form) from both workshop groups. The administrative dietitians submitted names of any persons who were deemed incapable of dealing with the instrument, because of lack of verbal and/or language skills. The questionnaires of the six people whose names were given, were set aside and not scored. There were three questionnaires which were not counted because they were incomplete. Two were not counted because their evaluations showed no score for quantity and quality. The correlations for the remaining 156 were run at the Computation Center at K. U., using a Program of Dr. Thomas Beisecker and the G.E. 635 for correlations. (See Appendix for Raw scores.)

TABLE I  
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR 156 SUBJECTS

MEAN SCORES		
Productivity	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
13.218	57.795	60.686
STANDARD DEVIATION		
Productivity	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
2.186	7.857	9.496

TABLE II  
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

CORRELATION		
	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
Productivity	-0.139	0.097
Perceived Task Leadership Behavior		0.589

We may not reject the null hypotheses (1) That the relationship between an employee's productivity and his/her Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of the first-line supervisor is zero and (2) That the relationship between an employee's productivity and his/her Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior is zero.



## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

#### Summary of Research Rationale

Blake and Mouton have developed a nine by nine grid showing Concern for People on the Vertical axis and Concern for Production on the horizontal axis: The Grid is used for graphically showing ways in which people can assess their managerial behavior.<sup>1</sup> The grid is an attempt at conceptualizing those two factors for managerial growth. They summarize:

Pursuing excellence through mobilizing the energies of people, and bringing the behavioral dynamics of the firm under insightful management, significantly increases the likelihood of its accomplishment.<sup>2</sup>

Halpin's quadrant is a similar way to conceptualize leadership behavior. The supervisor, manager, administrator or other leader in a superordinate position is most effective when he increases both his Initiation of Structure and his Consideration. He uses the LBDO as an instrument to measure the two kinds of skill a leader needs to be most effective. That instrument focuses on Leadership Behavior rather than

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert R. Blake and Jane Srygley Mouton, Building a Dynamic Corporation Through Grid Organization Development, (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 60-61.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

Leadership, that is there is a careful distinction between the evaluation and description.<sup>3</sup> He states:

But let us remember, too, that the primary responsibility of a leader is to lead, and that by doing so he in no way becomes less democratic. The essence of leading is to Initiate Structure-in-Interaction and to orient these structures continually toward the solution of group problems and the accomplishment of the goals prescribed for the group.<sup>4</sup>

It is of interest to note, although there was no correlation between Productivity and either Leadership Behavior dimension, there was a high correlation between the two dimensions, which was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

A closer look at the mean scores, also, shows that all three scores are well above the possible mid-point. This may help to illustrate, that, as Halpin says:

The behavior of the leader and the behavior of group members are inextricably interwoven, and the behavior of both is determined to a great degree by formal requirements imposed by the institution of which the group is a part.<sup>5</sup>

It may also be that employees are primarily motivated by things beyond Leadership Behavior. That is they may be so enmeshed in The Protestant Ethic<sup>6</sup> that work is its own virtue, hence productivity would not be affected by Leadership Behavior. On the other hand they may be motivated by thinking in terms of Marlow's Hierarchy of Needs.<sup>7</sup> That is

---

<sup>3</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, "Distinctions in Leadership Functioning," ed. by C. Gratton Kemp, Perspectives On The Group Process, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), pp. 227-228.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 228.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Trans. by Talcott Parsons, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), pp. 47-78.

<sup>7</sup>Abraham H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper & Bros., 1954).

for some employees working provides a second paycheck,<sup>8</sup> and the group fulfills the needs through the social level and that the production is in and of itself, at least partially fulfilling. That is a baker probably likes to bake and is proud of the product and feels creative in the production.

Fiedler supports the theory that groups have two distinct needs. In organized groups he found that task-directed leaders who were socially distant were influential, provided the supportive function was handled by other means or through informal leaders.<sup>9</sup>

Since there was a high correlation between the dimensions of Task and Maintenance it is possible that employees needs for concern are being fulfilled from the group itself, and that the initiation structure needs are fulfilled by the administrators and/or directors. In both systems that is certainly a possibility. The organizations are small enough so that the respective Administrative Dietitians and Directors of Housing have a personal knowledge of employees.<sup>10</sup> That is employees are free to make appointments at an official level and are often visited casually, while on the job, by the Administrative Dietitian and/or Director of Housing. Sometimes the Administrative Dietitian, also, visits employees in a Task Structured way, such as viewing, smelling, and tasting a product, especially a new one.

---

<sup>8</sup>The two administrative dietitians in the respective systems studied.

<sup>9</sup>Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 313.

<sup>10</sup>The two administrative dietitians in the respective systems studied.

The implications of receiving both Maintenance Leadership and Task Leadership from some source other than the Supervisor are clear. The supervisor is perceived as powerless in Task Leadership and Maintenance Leadership; or he/she is perceived as being relatively high in both, but employees are motivated by sources outside the province of the Supervisor; or it could be that Civil Service offers a certain security to some employees whose productivity will not be changed as long as the evaluation shows a satisfactory rating. After a six month probationary period, if an employee's performance is satisfactory, he/she is put on permanent status.

After an employee has permanent status, he/she is rarely summarily fired. If an employee is fired, he/she may ask for and be granted a hearing before a Civil Service Commission, where the burden of proof for the cause for firing rests with the employer.

#### Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

Although this study did not find the correlations between productivity and either dimension of Leadership Behavior, it is possible that one exists. It is recommended that a similar study be done using such variables as length of time worked in the system, age, and sex of both employee and supervisor to see if other factors show a correlation with productivity. Some employees might be more productive after they had been in system. Some supervisors would surely exhibit different Leadership Behaviors as far as Task was concerned since it might take several weeks or months to understand the nature of all the tasks. Some older employees might not be as productive for a new or young supervisor. Some might be more productive working for one sex or the other.

It would also be interesting to have the Administrative Dietitian in each system give a measure of productivity and then to try to correlate those scores with her Perceived Leadership Behavior.

There is a need to measure satisfaction and turnover. There might be a correlation found between those two.

It would be possible to devise a scale for productivity in food service industries which went into more detail. It would need to go through a long process of testing and analyzing. It could be a factorial design using quantity and quality. It would be used exclusively for research, since it could not replace a state (any of fifty) one or a federal one. It may be that for purposes of studying productivity at a sound research level, it will be done.

There are many other ways to study employees in organizations. The case history method that Whyte did<sup>11</sup> needs to be replicated many times. Interview techniques could be employed. The "Shadow" method for studying Organizational Relations could be employed. As with any discipline, there needs to be an abundance of research using many techniques as well as field studies for the Human Relations approach to have meaningful application to food service industries.

---

<sup>11</sup>William F. Whyte, "The Social Structure of a Restaurant," ed. by William B. Wolf, Management (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965), p. 219-230.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Bales, Robert F. "In Conference," Readings In Interpersonal And Organizational Communication, eds Huseman, Richard; Logue, Cal. M.; and Freshley, Dwight, Boston, Holbrook Press, Inc., pp. 368-380.
- Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, Jane Srygley. Building A Dynamic Corporation Through Grid Organization Development. Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Bennis, Warren G. "Changing Organizations," The Planning of Change. eds. Bennis, Warren G.; Beene, Kenneth D.; and Chin, Robert, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, pp. 568-579. 2nd. Ed.
- Brilhart, John. Effective Group Discussion, Dubuque, Iowa, 1967.  
Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin. Group Dynamics, New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964 3rd. Ed.
- Chin, Robert and Benne, Kenneth, "General Strategies For Effecting Changes In Human Systems," The Planning Of Change eds. Bennis Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; and Chin, Robert, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969 pp. 32-59. 2nd. Ed.
- Cooper, William W., Leavitt, Harold J., and Shelly, Maynard W. New Perspectives In Organizational Research, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Etzioni, Amatal. Complex Organizations, New York, The Free Press of the Macmillan Company, 1961.
- Gilbreth, Frank B. Bricklaying Systems, New York, M. C. Clark, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Motion Study, New York, Nostrand, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Gilbreth, Lillian. Applied Motion Study, New York, Sturgis and Walton, 1917.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "Distinctions In Leadership Functioning", Perspectives On The Group Process, ed. Kemp, C. Gratton, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970, pp. 223-228.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Winer, B. The Leadership Behavior Of The Airplane Commander, Columbus, Ohio, Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952.

- Harnack, Victor and Fest, Thorrell. Group Discussion Theory And Technique, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology Of Organizations, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Kotschevar, Lendal H. Quantity Food Production, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966, 2nd. Ed.
- Likert, Rensis, "Measuring Organizational Performance," Human Relations In Management, Chicago, South-Western Publishing Company, 1967, pp. 456-475, 2nd Ed.
- Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Bros., 1954.
- Rogers, Carl. Client Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Taylor, F. W. Scientific Management, New York, Harper, 1911.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic And The Spirit Of Capitalism, trans. Parsons, Talcott, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Welch, John. On The Job Training In Food Service, Columbia, Missouri, University of Missouri Extension Division, 1966.
- West, Bessie Brooks; Wood, LeVelle; and Harger, Virginia. Food Service In Institutions, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966, 4th Ed.
- West, Bessie Brooks and Wood, LeVelle. Food Service in Institutions, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955, 3rd. Ed.
- West, Bessie Brooks and Wood, LeVelle. Food Service In Institutions, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1945, 2nd Ed.
- Whyte, William F. "The Social Structure Of A Restaurant," Management, ed. Wolf, William B., Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

#### Periodicals

- Berge, David J. and Nejeleski, Leo, "Administration Of Food Service Systems," Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3 (November, 1969) pp. 32-40.
- Buncom, Henry J., "Opportunities For Black Youth In The Food and Lodging Industry," Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969) pp. 35-39.



- "Chains And Components Of Convenience," Institutions, Vol. 67, No. 1 (August, 1970) pp. 57--72.
- Cleveland, Sidney E., "Personality Characteristics Of Dietitians And Nurses," Journal Of The American Dietetics Association, Vol. 43, No. 2 (August, 1963) pp. 104-109.
- Echols, Ivor J., "Comparative Group Approaches," Journal Of The American Dietetic Association, Vol. 59, No. 5 (November, 1971) pp. 460-465.
- Feld, Lyman, "How Wages And Hour Changes Affect Colleges," College And University Business, Vol. 50, No. 2 (February, 1971) pp. 28,32,36, and 40.
- Fieldman, Jacob J., "Patients" Opinion Of Hospital Food," Journal Of The American Dietetic Association, Vol. 40, No. 4 (April, 1962) p. 325.
- Goodfriend, Harvey, "Hot Lunch Myth Is Cold Comfort If Students Won't Eat," College And University Business, Vol. 49, No. 4 (October, 1970) pp. 66, 70,72,74,76 and 77.
- Hanks, David J., "An Exclusive Report," Institutions/Volume Feeding, Vol. 68, No. 2 (January 15, 1971) pp. 39-51.
- Heinemeyer, Jane M., "Food Production Materials Handling," Journal Of American Dietetic Association, Vol. 52, No. 6 (June, 1968) pp. 490-497.
- Henkle, Margaret M., "The Dietary Department And Public Relations," Journal Of The American Dietetic Association, Vol. 33, No. 11 (November, 1957) pp. 1170-1174.
- Hornaday, John A., "Interest Patterns Of Dietitians," Journal Of The American Dietetic Association, Vol. 43, No. 2 (August, 1963) pp. 99-103.
- Kilborn, Paul C., "Change Will Accelerate," Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969) pp. 22-24.
- "People: The Most Important Ingredient," School And College Food Management, Vol. 6, No. 8 (August, 1970) pp. 30-34.
- Prideaux, Jean Spencer and Shugart, Grace M., "Students Reactions To Residence Hall Food," Journal Of The American Dietetic Association, Vol. 49, No. 1 (July, 1966) pp. 38-41.
- Richardson, F. L. W., Jr., "Work Flow And Human Relations," Harvard Business Review Vol. 27 (January, 1949) pp. 107-123.
- Ross, Lynne, "Work Simplification," School Lunch Journal, Vol. 23, No. 3 (March, 1970) pp. 34-40.
- Shoen, Judith and Raskin, Betsy, "Marriott: The Deliberate Changemaker," Institutions/Volume Feeding Vol. 67, No. 6 (November 15, 1970) pp. 43-54.

Smith, Bruce, "Hospital Dietary Services Of The 70's," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 11 (November, 1970) pp. 37-42.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Raw-To-Ready Fact File: Grant Hospital," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 11 (November, 1970) pp. 43-48.

"Total Convenience On The College Campus," Food Service, Vol. 32, No. 8 (August, 1970) pp. 35-37.

"Training Now," Institutions/Volume Feeding, Vol. 70, No. 3 (February 1, 1971) pp. 55-60.

"Versatile Equipment Helps Create Fast Food Service For Busy Employees," Commercial Kitchen and Dining Room, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer, 1970) pp. 6-7.

Winter, Elmer L., "Man Power Strategy," Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1 (May, 1969) pp. 31-34.

Witzky, Herbert K., "The Changing Role Of Managers," The Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3 (November, 1969) pp. 14-20.

#### Instruments

"EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT DA226", Kansas Personnel Office

Halpin, Andrew and Winer, James. "Leadership Behavior Questionnaire," Columbus, Ohio.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Halpin-Winer (Short Form) Leadership Behavior  
Descriptive Questionnaire

## ANSWER EACH QUESTION FOR YOUR FIRST LINE SUPERVISOR

1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

2. He does personal favors for group members.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

3. He tries out his new ideas in the group.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

4. He tries to "rule with an iron hand."

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

5. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a group member.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

6. He criticizes poor work.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

7. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

8. He is easy to understand.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

9. He works without a plan.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

10. He asks that members perform particular tasks.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

11. He asks that members follow organizational lines.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

12. He finds time to listen to other members.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

13. He sees to it that members are working up to capacity.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

14. He maintains definite standards of performance.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

15. He keeps to himself.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

16. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual members.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

17. He refuses to explain his actions.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

18. He acts without consulting the group.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

19. He is slow to accept new ideas.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

20. He tries to see that the work of members is coordinated.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

21. He treats all members as his equal.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

22. He is willing to make changes.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

23. He makes members feel at ease when talking with him.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

24. He is friendly and approachable.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

25. He tries to put suggestions by the group into operation.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

26. He emphasizes meeting of deadlines.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

27. He encourages the use of certain uniform procedures.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

28. He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

29. He makes sure his part in the group is understood by members.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

30. He lets members know what he expects of them.

1	2	3	4	5
Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

APPENDIX B

Scoring Key for Halpin-Winer (Short Form)  
Leadership Behavior Descriptive  
Questionnaire



SCORING KEY FOR  
 HALPIN-WINER (SHORT FORM) LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE  
 (LBDQ)

The following items are collected to score the factor of initiation structure and the scores are tallied in the following way:

1. (5,4,3,2,1)
3. (5,4,3,2,1)
4. (1,2,3,4,5)
6. (5,4,3,2,1)
7. (5,4,3,2,1)
9. (1,2,3,4,5)
10. (5,4,3,2,1)
11. (5,4,3,2,1)
13. (5,4,3,2,1)
14. (5,4,3,2,1)
20. (5,4,3,2,1)
26. (5,4,3,2,1)
27. (5,4,3,2,1)
29. (5,4,3,2,1)
30. (5,4,3,2,1)

The following items are collected to score the factor of consideration and the scores are tallied in the following way:

2. (5,4,3,2,1)
5. (5,4,3,2,1)
8. (5,4,3,2,1)
12. (5,4,3,2,1)
15. (1,2,3,4,5)
16. (5,4,3,2,1)
17. (1,2,3,4,5)
18. (1,2,3,4,5)
19. (1,2,3,4,5)
21. (5,4,3,2,1)
22. (5,4,3,2,1)
23. (5,4,3,2,1)
24. (5,4,3,2,1)
25. (5,4,3,2,1)
28. (5,4,3,2,1)

APPENDIX C

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

20-49 = Fair  
 50-74 = Satisfactory  
 75-89 = Very Good  
 90-100 = Excellent

Rating Period: from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Agency \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_ Final Rating  

Rate 10 factors which apply to this position, 2) Give proper weight to factors rated and mark  
 Final total   0 Pts.   4 Pts.   6 Pts.   8 Pts.   10 Pts.

	0 Pts.	4 Pts.	6 Pts.	8 Pts.	10 Pts.
QUALITY OF work	Poor, undue number of errors	Sometimes careless and inaccurate	Meets standards of quality	Work quite carefully done	Outstanding, highly accurate
QUANTITY of work	Work output very low	Does less than reasonable	Work volume satisfactory	Above average producer	Unusually high output
COOPERATIVENESS	Refuses to cooperate	Frequently not cooperative	Generally works with others	Willing team worker	Exceptionally good team worker
ATTENDANCE	Habitually late or absent	Often late or absent	Usually on time and on the job	Quite prompt and regular	Always on time, rarely absent
DEPENDABILITY	Requires constant supervision	Needs frequent checks	Generally reliable	Requires little supervision	Extremely dependable
INITIATIVE	Always waits to be told	Often waits for directions	Goes ahead on regular work	Alert for ways to improve	Self reliant and resourceful
APPEARANCE	Untidy or inappropriate	Often in poor taste	Generally acceptable and appropriate	Careful about personal appearance	Well groomed and neat
CARE OF equipment	Unskillful, poor maintenance	Tends to neglect equipment	Adequate care and use	Better than adequate maintenance	Extremely careful and skillful
WORK organization	Haphazard and careless methods	Shows lack of planning	Reasonably orderly and systematic	Careful and effective planning	Exceptionally well planned
JUDGMENT	Unreliable, not acceptable	Frequently lacking	Uses good judgment	Sensible, objective decisions	Unusually quick and sound
PHYSICAL fitness	Seriously inadequate	Tires easily, below par	Meets physical requirements	Above average energy	Ideal for job
CONDUCT ON the job	Actions discredit agency		Seldom subject to criticism		Above criticism
RELATIONSHIPS TO employees, visitors, or others	Irritating or indifferent	Ineffective or lacking	Maintains normal relations	Relationships above average	Ideal attitudes and contacts
LEADERSHIP	Poor leadership, creates low morale	Inclined to direct, not lead	Usually respected by subordinates	Good leader, stimulates employees	Capable and forceful leader
IMPARTIALITY	Definite partiality	Inclined to be partial	Generally impersonal	Shows little favoritism	Completely without bias
UTILIZING personnel	Work assignments poor	Often picks wrong person	Utilizes employees reasonably well	Makes effective use of employee	Always uses the right person
TRAINING AND developing others	Instructs poorly	Lacks adequate capacity to train	Satisfactorily trains workers	Develops good workers	Does excellent training job

Comment briefly on any of the factors which materially affect employee's value to the agency. If unfavorable, suggest areas for improvement. Unsatisfactory or Excellent ratings must be justified. Use back of form for additional comments

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Rater \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

I have seen and discussed the ratings on this report. Comments of Employee

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Employee \_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation Approved: Date \_\_\_\_\_ Appt. Authority \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

Raw Scores for Employee's Productivity and  
Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and Per-  
ceived Maintenance Behavior of First-Line  
Supervisor for 156 Employees

RAW SCORES FOR PRODUCTIVITY, PERCEIVED TASK LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR,  
AND PERCEIVED MAINTENANCE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS  
FOR 156 EMPLOYEES

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
1	12	50	53
2	10	69	68
3	12	63	71
4	12	64	69
5	12	69	73
6	14	51	61
7	16	68	69
8	10	48	35
9	12	49	48
10	14	59	62
11	16	70	69
12	8	55	61
13	12	55	63
14	14	56	67
15	12	49	56
16	12	59	45
17	12	66	61
18	14	55	69
19	14	53	54

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
20	16	46	52
21	10	62	53
22	16	37	46
23	12	64	66
24	12	54	59
25	16	54	60
26	12	62	69
27	12	61	70
28	12	71	72
29	16	60	66
30	10	60	61
31	10	60	63
32	14	58	74
33	16	62	65
34	10	61	73
35	14	56	58
36	12	69	69
37	16	68	74
38	14	66	74
39	12	55	61
40	12	64	57
41	12	59	67
42	14	58	62
43	16	56	66
44	12	45	52

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
45	12	62	68
46	10	63	57
47	12	66	65
48	10	55	61
49	12	64	52
50	14	63	67
51	12	46	52
52	12	67	71
53	8	65	71
54	12	71	75
55	12	54	55
56	14	53	55
57	18	51	52
58	16	58	63
59	16	54	59
60	8	57	57
61	16	50	36
62	12	56	69
63	16	66	69
64	14	56	55
65	16	39	54
66	14	56	66
67	12	68	71
68	12	58	61
69	18	53	63

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
70	14	23	26
71	16	50	54
72	14	51	45
73	8	64	41
74	12	44	38
75	12	57	37
76	14	57	64
77	12	51	52
78	14	55	65
79	16	58	55
80	14	59	65
81	10	52	56
82	12	60	65
83	12	53	53
84	12	61	70
85	16	62	58
86	12	57	63
87	12	49	41
88	12	54	68
89	14	58	62
90	12	68	67
91	12	69	75
92	14	61	57
93	12	64	62
94	12	51	40



Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
95	12	53	40
96	16	61	57
201	14	61	63
202	12	44	69
203	10	67	70
204	14	60	62
205	14	69	64
206	16	63	68
207	14	58	64
208	16	58	75
209	16	59	66
210	16	60	75
211	16	61	68
212	12	60	61
213	16	59	59
214	12	67	66
215	12	69	63
216	14	63	65
217	14	59	62
218	16	62	64
219	12	62	66
220	12	65	66
221	8	57	51
222	14	55	68

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
223	14	55	60
224	18	61	64
225	18	55	57
226	12	52	56
227	14	60	51
228	10	62	34
229	14	46	42
230	16	50	46
231	16	62	60
232	12	54	66
233	10	39	44
234	14	62	71
235	10	58	54
236	16	53	70
237	16	51	57
238	12	56	52
239	14	50	63
240	14	69	71
241	14	55	65
242	14	63	68
243	14	58	64
244	14	37	60
245	12	65	65
246	12	63	62

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Employees	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Employees
247	14	66	69
248	12	59	58
249	16	65	67
250	14	70	60
251	14	59	59
252	12	53	75
253	10	59	64
254	12	65	63
255	12	60	66
256	16	47	61
257	14	46	54
258	16	57	63
259	16	34	57
260	12	62	71

APPENDIX E  
TABLES III and IV

TABLE III

DATA FOR RELATIONSHIP OF UNIT SUPERVISORS AND PERCEIVED  
TASK LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND PERCEIVED MAINTENANCE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
FOR 55 EMPLOYEES

MEAN SCORES		
Productivity	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
13.745	59.545	60.382
STANDARD DEVIATION		
Productivity	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
2.179	6.705	8.740

TABLE IV

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior
Productivity	-0.226	-0.082
Perceived Task Leadership Behavior		0.590

APPENDIX F

Raw Scores for Employee's Productivity and  
Perceived Task Leadership Behavior and Per-  
ceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of  
Unit Supervisor for 55 Employees

RAW SCORES FOR PRODUCTIVITY, PERCEIVED TASK LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR,  
AND PERCEIVED MAINTENANCE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF UNIT SUPERVISORS  
FOR 55 EMPLOYEES

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors
901	14	59	68
902	12	58	70
903	10	67	71
905	14	71	67
906	16	63	43
907	14	55	55
908	16	55	67
909	16	56	39
910	16	64	72
911	16	65	71
913	16	62	64
914	12	61	66
915	12	71	73
916	14	63	58
917	14	55	64
918	16	56	56
919	12	70	68
921	8	62	60

Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors
922	14	51	56
924	18	60	46
925	18	52	55
926	12	53	47
927	14	50	44
928	10	54	44
929	14	56	54
930	16	46	51
931	16	57	54
932	12	60	59
933	10	52	44
934	14	56	61
935	10	48	48
936	16	58	66
937	16	49	57
938	12	66	68
939	14	54	62
940	14	70	70
942	14	62	67
943	14	58	60
944	14	58	62
945	12	69	66
946	12	64	54
947	14	65	67



Number	Productivity of Employees	Perceived Task Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors	Perceived Maintenance Leadership Behavior of Unit Supervisors
948	14	65	56
949	16	52	60
950	14	67	61
951	14	63	64
952	12	54	69
953	10	62	63
954	12	72	69
955	12	66	65
956	16	59	70
957	14	54	59
958	16	65	71
959	16	47	53
960	12	68	67