

A WORKING PAPER
FROM

The Center for Sociological Research
Department of Sociology



STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

ORGANIZATIONAL TASK PERFORMANCE
IN MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS*

Anne M. McMahon
Patricia Barchas
Elizabeth Cohen
Polly Hildebrand
Mary Fennell

Technical Report #58

Laboratory for Social Research
Stanford University

*This research was sponsored by the Center for Research on Women; it was funded by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Spencer Foundation; other phases of the work were made possible, in part, by an award from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation. We gratefully acknowledge the generous support of these agencies. We also want to thank Mirriam Roson, Mary Paulson, Sue Crissman, Richard Torres, Christie Timberlake and Anne Evans for their invaluable assistance on this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Overview	3
Argument	5
The Research	11
Operationalizing the Task Procedure: Division of Labor . . .	12
The Task.	13
The Experimental Procedures	14
Data Collection - Coding Procedural Acts.	15
Data Collection - Operationalizing Differentiation.	15
Data Collection - Quality of Performance.	16
Results.	16
The Division of Labor: Sharply Differentiated.	17
Undifferentiated Division of Labor.	18
Weakly Differentiated Division of Labor with a Specialist . .	18
Differentiated Divisions of Labor	19
Division of Labor and Quality of Performance.	21
Interpretation	22
Construct Validity of Division of Labor Types	23
Division of Labor and Task Performance.	27
Implications for Men and Women at Work	29
Footnotes.	32
References	39
Appendices	41

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

	Page
Table I. Distribution of Procedure Statements by Sex of Group	34
Table II. Quality of Performance: Average of Highest Individual Score in the Group, Average Group Score, and Group Gain Score by Sex of Group.	35
Table III. Group Gain Scores by Patterns of Division of Labor by Sex of Group.	36
Figure 1. Graph of Group Gain Scores Ordered by Size of Score for Male and Female Groups	37
Figure 2. Scattergram of Group Gain Score by Type of Division of Labor.	38

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I Coding Manual for Procedural Acts, and Scoring Sheets	41
a. Scoring Sheet for Gain Scores for Desert Survival Task. . .	51
b. Task and Process Statements Scoring Sheet	52
c. Procedural Scoring Sheet.	53
d. Claims of Expertise Scoring Sheet	54
e. Frequency Uses for Each Item Scoring Sheet.	55
II-a Post-Session Questionnaire	56
II-b Post-Session Interview Schedule.	61
III The Expert Ranking and Rationale.	65

ABSTRACT

This paper reports an argument and some preliminary findings about the consequences of features of a formal organizational setting for the way in which a group goes about solving a task delegated to it by that organization. The argument applies to groups of any composition but is specified here for its distinctive implications for groups of different sex composition. In brief, we argue that although both men and women expect to adopt the same division of labor for task solution, the absence in female groups of a clearly legitimate incumbent for a particular differentiated leadership role causes them to develop alternative modes of structuring their interaction.

Ten male groups and ten female groups (each of size 4) were given a group discussion task. Their interaction was video-taped and coded for acts relating to the procedures developed by the group for solving the task. Although not a strict test of the argument, the research produced results supportive of the argument. We produced and described clear differences between the way male and female groups organize themselves for task solution: these differences seem more strongly related to quality of task solution than does sex-of-group.

The paper concludes with a discussion of the validity of the results, their implications for the argument, which now needs a strict test, and a brief consideration of the implications of this line of reasoning for the everyday work setting.

ORGANIZATIONAL TASK PERFORMANCE IN MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

Introduction

We began the investigation reported here with a broad set of concerns about the nature of sex-related differences in group settings and the conditions under which they obtain. Are there distinctively female and distinctively male modes of group functioning? If so, why? Are these modes differentially related to quality of task solution? When women move into positions of authority in organizations, do they require special leadership training in order to function effectively in those positions? If so, is training aimed at counteracting the status effects associated with mixed sex interaction sufficient or are there other processes at work in that setting which make effective female incumbency of such positions more problematic than effective male incumbency? Our review of the literature did not result in reliable or consistent identification of sex-related differences with respect to such questions. We cannot evaluate with any confidence whether or not the disparate studies are actually dealing with a single phenomenon or even a set of phenomena theoretically related to each other.¹

In order to develop a coherent framework with which to address our questions, we found it necessary to identify a particular set of differences in group functioning which are sex-related and to specify the conditions under which we believe those differences occur. Thus, we will begin this paper by presenting our argument about the consequences of a formal organizational setting for the way in which a group goes about

solving a task delegated to it by that organization. This is a setting of practical importance and it is the setting in which most experiments occur. Although the argument applies to groups of any composition, we specify and empirically investigate it for all-female and all-male group interaction. That empirical focus insures that we will not confuse the consequences of the argument we propose with those produced by status processes which may occur in mixed-sex groups.

A decided advantage of the argument presented here is its ability to offer new tools of intervention to organizations employing women or other minority groups. Unlike the traditional explanations based on sex role socialization, the structural explanation of male/female interaction differences allows an organization to ensure the full utilization of all its personnel's capabilities through readily implemented interventions. Such intervention strategies would consist of straightforward changes in structural arrangements rather than attempting the re-socialization process implied by the explanation of differential sex role socialization.

After presenting our argument, we report the results of our first empirical investigation. The research reported here does not constitute a strict test of the argument; rather it was aimed at accomplishing three purposes each of which is essential to developing a strong test of the argument at a later time. First, the research was conducted to determine whether we can in fact produce the set of differences we expect. Second, the data aided in developing and evaluating a coding scheme developed to permit us to describe these differences. Third, the research was intended to produce the observed differences on a task

which itself produced sex differences on quality of performance; we wanted to have pilot information about how the differences in group functioning we produce might be related to differences on quality of performances.

Overview

When groups try to solve a problem, they adopt some particular division of labor for performing the task; the particular division of labor adopted may or may not be especially effective in producing good solutions to the task on which they are working. In an organizational setting, we believe that male and female groups are likely to adopt different divisions of labor. Further, we believe that there are other behavioral differences associated with male and female groups that are a reflection of the type of division of labor with which the group works.

We begin, then, by placing the task group in an organizational setting. We are specifically concerned with how groups solve task problems when the task is delegated by a formal organization² but when the way to solve the task has not been specified by the delegation.

More formally:

- 1) There is a face-to-face group which has been delegated a task by a representative of a legal-rational authority system, and
- 2) Solving the task delegated to the group requires reciprocal interdependence.

The first condition limits the context in which the group interaction occurs to a formal organization which has legitimate jurisdiction over the task. We do not require that the group members be members of the organization but only that the delegator be so, and that the members

recognize him/her as legitimately acting as a representative of the organization in delegating the task.

The significance of our second condition is that it constrains our argument to a class of tasks to which we are certain it applies. By reciprocal interdependence, we mean that each member's contribution to task solution is contingent upon other members's task performance. The actions of each member must be adjusted to the actions of one or more of the other members (Thompson, 1967, p. 55).

Given these conditions, we argue that several features which are usually found in formal organizations trigger expectations which are both anticipatory and normative concerning how the members of the group are to divide their labor and concerning who are legitimate incumbents of the various roles in that division of labor. Most organizations use a system of two roles highly differentiated from each other in terms of authority rights; i.e., one role has extensive and exclusive authority rights and that role typically has a single incumbent. Group members in an organizational setting expect that they will and should develop a similar division of labor in carrying out the task given them. We believe that both males and females hold these expectations.

However, it is also the "usual case" in our society that white males are incumbents of authority roles. Male groups, then, should adopt the expected division of labor because they have legitimate incumbents for the authority role. In general, there is nothing systematic to block male actors from adopting the expected role system; they have only to decide which of them should hold the authority role. Females, however, are not generally expected and do not generally expect to hold

authority positions. Therefore, in the absence of specific evidence of legitimacy, women will not attempt to occupy the authority role nor will they be expected to do so. In our society, then, men are legitimate holders of authority roles unless there is evidence to the contrary. Females, however, are legitimate only if there is evidence in favor of their incumbency.

By framing the problem in organizational terms, it is possible to formulate conditions under which behavior differences may occur. By emphasizing structural features rather than traits or attributes of individuals, it is possible to capture behavior differences which hold across a variety of settings. Although we are concentrating upon male and female groups, the argument, in its most general form, should apply to other groups (e.g. blacks, Americans of Spanish-speaking heritage). That is, the argument applies to the legitimacy of any individual entering a position which is generally held by people with different attributes than the ones he or she possesses (e.g. male nurses and male secretaries). Having presented our main ideas, we now turn to a more formal development of the theoretical framework with more thorough definition of central concepts.

Argument

In any task group, there are two classes of problems the members must solve. They must, of course, solve the problems defined by the explicit task assigned to the group. To do that, they must solve a second set of problems concerning the procedures the group will follow in solving the tasks. These procedures include: a) ordering of the task sub-units, b) establishing a method for allocating time and energy

to the sub-units and for moving from one to another, c) developing ways to deal with uncertainty and disagreement and for determining when a particular unit of the task has been finished. This second set of problems we shall call Task Procedure problems. We are distinguishing these problems from Task Content problems which have been the conventional focus of small group studies of task performance (Bales, 1950; Berger et al, 1966, 1974).

One way to solve both the procedural and the task content problems of the group is to develop a two-role division of labor in either or both of these areas such that there is one role with a single incumbent which has authority rights over issues in a particular area (procedural or task content) and another role with one or more incumbents which does not have authority rights. For instance, in the procedural area, one person can direct other members of the group as to how to organize themselves for task solution. This is, we believe, the way most formal organizations in Western society function.

Weber asserts that if a differentiated division of labor (two roles as described above) develops with respect to task content, the member of the group who is most competent will be perceived as the appropriate occupant of that authority role. However, there is no compelling reason to believe that competence is a necessary criterion for legitimacy in the procedural area (unless, of course, the two divisions of labor overlap). We do not believe that competence is the only criterion used in making such judgements. Our argument deals primarily with how factors other than competence affect the legitimacy of role incumbents. Since we do not know how competence interacts with these other effects, our

focus is on the procedural division of labor, rather than on task content.³

The primary assumption we make is that empirically usual events in the context within which the group is operating shape the expectations of the group members about how the task will and should be solved. Not all empirical regularities activate expectations. We have tried to spell out the features of empirical regularities which are able to produce expectations, both anticipatory and normative:

If an event is known to be empirically usual in the organization which legitimates the task, and if the event is part of a set of acts which define the organization, then the event will activate expectations consistent with that event which are both anticipatory and normative.

There are two such empirical regularities that are of particular interest to us here:

- 1) With respect to procedures for task solution, organizations characteristically have a two-role system highly differentiated from each other in terms of authority rights.
- 2) In formal organizations in this society, incumbents of roles with authority rights are usually white men.

On the basis of these regularities and our initial assumption, we expect the following:

In the absence of specific directions from the organization delegating the task, group members will expect to develop a division of labor with two roles highly differentiated from each other on authority rights over Task Procedure.

We expect this proposition to hold for both male and female groups, if initial scope conditions are met. In the overview of the argument we made a distinction between "legitimate" incumbents of an authority role and incumbents who were not legitimate. It is essential to define

our use of this concept in a specific and limited fashion because of the various ways it is used in the literature.

By "legitimate" we mean that the incumbents of offices in the organization delegating the task will consider the event proper and legal and would support it as such if called upon. We do not mean to connote with this term that the group members will approve of, agree with, or "like" the event in any other way or that they believe the organization would consider the event the best one possible. The distinction is similar to that made by Dornbusch and Scott (1975) between "authorized" and "endorsed." The judgment by group members that an event is legitimate means that the judges believe incumbents of offices with authority rights over the event or over the person who caused the event will "authorize" the act after the fact.

Because of the empirically usual relationship between the incumbent's sex and the authority distribution in a division of labor we hypothesize that:

A male incumbent of an authority role will be viewed as legitimate unless there is evidence to the contrary.

The particular exercise of an authority role by a male incumbent will be viewed as legitimate unless there is evidence to the contrary.

Given our definition of legitimacy, evidence which calls into question the legitimacy of an incumbent exists if the organization fails to support the incumbent or any of his/her acts when called upon. Our propositions are somewhat different for the case of females.

A female incumbent of an authority role will be viewed as questionably legitimate unless there is evidence of legitimacy.

The particular exercise of an authority role by a female incumbent will be viewed as questionably legitimate unless there is evidence of legitimacy.

Evidence of favor of legitimacy exists if the organization explicitly delegates the incumbent and/or the incumbent's actions, or if the organization explicitly supports the incumbent's acts.

Note that by the above definitions, evidence of competence is not automatically evidence of legitimacy. Our argument does not yet specify what the exact relationship between competence and legitimacy is. It suggests to us that either or both of two states of affairs could be the case. First, if the organization makes use of competence issues in giving or withholding evidence of legitimacy, then evidence of competence will be treated as evidence of legitimacy. Second, it could be the case that in our society evidence of competence is so frequently and usually employed by organizations in granting and withholding evidence of legitimacy that special competence is automatically expected to be a necessary condition of legitimacy for an incumbent of an authority position (according to our assumption on page 6). The literature is not definitive with respect to distinctions such as these (Weber, 1947; Evan and Zeldith, 1961; Gouldner, 1954). Generally, the literature suggests that if there is more than one member who would be a legitimate incumbent of a leadership role, relative competence will sometimes determine which of those members actually assumed the position (Bales, 1950; Berger et al, 1966, 1974). However, that literature predicts an "emergent" leader resulting from a period of time during which members are making relative evaluations of each other. There are some studies which suggest that the leadership role, even in groups with no apparent status distinctions among the male members, is filled almost instantly--precluding the idea of an emergent leader (Fisek and Ofshe, 1970).

The issues this discussion raises are complex ones which we cannot resolve now. Still, we feel that our argument is important if only because it suggests such issues for study in a manner not accomplished by other literature. Is it the case that there are multiple criteria of legitimacy, and that members attempt to somehow aggregate the information they have about each other on all of the criteria so as to arrive at some idea of a "most legitimate" incumbent? Our argument does not preclude this; however, it tends to suggest instead that any member who violates any criterion of legitimacy is automatically excluded from consideration for the position at issue. Thus, for females, competence evidence (whether or not it is itself a criteria of legitimacy) does not provide evidence of legitimacy since her status in an authority position is questionable on another criteria. The case for male groups, however, is more complex. Given a set of members who cannot automatically be excluded from consideration, under what conditions will the members attempt to determine who would be the "most legitimate" incumbent and under what conditions will they accept anyone among that set who "volunteers."

Since we cannot yet settle these issues (nor even address them definitively with evidence at the moment), it is important that our preliminary investigation avoid confounding effects due to competence with effects due to sex. Although we can never be certain that such confounding did not occur, we can at least require that the role which we define as highly differentiated on authority rights over task procedure be one which occurs early in the group interaction, and we can attempt to ensure that all members of a group are homogenous with respect to characteristics which are known to produce competence evaluations. Assuming that our

experimental procedures are successful in accomplishing this, we assume that all the members of male groups are legitimate incumbents of the authority role in the procedural division of labor the members expect to adopt. We expect, then, that male groups will generally adopt a procedural division of labor with two roles one of which is highly differentiated from the other in terms of authority rights over task procedure and that there will be a single incumbent of the authority role. In female groups, all of the women have questionable status as legitimate incumbents of an authority role. Therefore, even though women initially expect to adopt the same division of labor with respect to procedural leadership as men, unless it is explicitly defined and filled by the organization (in this case, by the experimentors), female groups will tend not to develop that division of labor. In no case will we make any predictions about which of the members in the group will occupy an authority position; however, we will look to see whether the apparent incumbent of such a role (if there is one) is viewed by the other members as more "competent" at the task.

The Research

In order to evaluate the argument just proposed, we need to operationalize the particular procedural division of labor we predict for males and to devise an appropriate empirical setting to investigate the phenomenon. The data reported here constitute the results of a pilot study aimed primarily at evaluating our ability to accomplish those ends. This research had two other purposes, both exploratory. The first was to gain preliminary information about the other divisions of labor with

respect to procedure which might occur, particularly in female groups. We simply hypothesize what they will not do; we are unable, a priori, to derive sophisticated descriptions of the type of divisions of labor they will develop. We hoped that these results would provide us with empirical information about that issue. Second, we wanted to conduct this research using a task which was known to produce sex differences on quality of performance in order to see whether the groups' division of labor was related to performance differences. The task we selected is described in detail later.

Operationalizing the Task Procedure: Division of Labor

We presented a task to ten male and ten female groups and recorded the group interaction on videotape. The tapes were coded for frequency and type of task procedure statements made by each actor. All acts which explicitly or implicitly dealt with the organization of the groups' time and behavior for solving the task were coded. The distribution of those tasks over the members describes a division of labor. The particular division of labor we predict that male groups will adopt has the following properties:

- 1) There is one role which is
 - a) sharply differentiated from the other role in terms of overall frequency of initiating task procedure acts,
 - b) differentiated from the other role in terms of frequency of initiating task procedure acts which are explicit,
 - c) differentiated from the other role in terms of frequency of initiating task procedure acts which are directive-- i.e., which contain an order either for the solution to a problem or for the behavior of some other member(s) of the group; and

- 2) that role has a single occupant--i.e., there is one and only one member of the group who exhibits behavior as described in (1) and this person does so during both the first and second half of the group discussion; and
- 3) there is only one other role in the group--i.e., the other three members are undifferentiated with respect to each other by any of the criteria in (1) above.

Using these criteria, i.e., the distribution of procedural acts in a group and differences among the members on types of procedural acts, we can identify a completely undifferentiated division of labor with respect to procedural leadership. It is one in which none of the members are differentiated from each other with respect to overall frequency of task procedure acts or with respect to any particular class of those acts.

If our reasoning is sound:

- 1) the two-role division of labor highly differentiated on authority over task procedure occurs more frequently in male groups than in female groups; and
- 2) male groups will use more explicit statements in the task procedure area than female groups, while female groups would use more implicit statements in the task procedure than male groups.

Finally, we expect the various procedural divisions of labor to have some relationship to the quality of the group solution, even though this issue is not central to the main tenets of our argument.

The Task

We required a task which had rich opportunities to study procedural acts as well as one for which the quality of the group's solution could be ascertained. We also wanted the task to be such that it was very difficult for the members to make competence distinctions within the same-sex

group. The task we chose was the Desert Survival Task (Hall, 1971); it has an optimal answer as given by a panel of experts. This feature allowed us to compare the quality of a solution to the sex-composition of the group and to the form of division of labor selected by the group.

The Experimental Procedures

Forty males and forty females participated in the study. All were recruited from 30 classes at Stanford University. Participants were grouped homogenously by age and sex to avoid effects due to visible status characteristics. All participants were Caucasian, and they varied in age from 18 to 30. The members of each four-person group were strangers to each other or slight acquaintances.

The 20 four-person groups were presented the Desert Survival Task. That task asks the participants to imagine themselves in the desert with their downed aircraft along with 15 items salvaged from the wreck. Subjects are asked to rank order the items in terms of their usefulness for survival. This task is used for training work groups on the superiority of group to individual solutions. Data available from the task developers suggest that women obtain better group scores than men.

Before working in a group, each participant was given a description of the Desert Survival Task and a deck of 15 cards representing the items to be ranked. Subjects were asked to make individual rankings of the items in terms of their usefulness to survival.

After the individual task was completed, the groups were assembled to work on the same task in small rooms. Each group was again read the task situation and instructions. They were told that they had unlimited time in which to complete the task and they must reach agreement through

consensus (i.e., they were not permitted to vote). They were reminded that the task has an optimal solution (as determined by a panel of expert rankers) and that they were being videotaped. After the group indicated they were finished, each participant was interviewed and paid.

Data Collection--Coding Procedural Acts

A videotape of each group's discussion was separately coded by two coders and crosschecked for reliability. All verbal communication concerning the task procedure was coded as either "implicit" or "explicit" statements. Implicit procedure statements function to organize the discussion without referring directly to issues of procedure. (The most common item in this category was a "change of topic" discussion-- which was not accompanied by such direct phrases as "I think we should move on..." or "Let's discuss this next...") Explicit procedure statements directly refer to issues of procedure. They were further classified into three categories: "directive," "question," and "residual". The Explicit Directive category included those statements containing an order for group's procedure or for the behavior of the group's member(s). The category Explicit Question contains direct questions concerning group procedure; they are questions requiring answers. All other explicit statements on procedure (i.e., those which were not directives or questions) were placed in the Explicit Residual category. We remind the reader that only statements concerning task procedure were coded. (See appendix for scoring instructions.)

Data Collection--Operationalizing Differentiation

Two members are considered undifferentiated from each other if the difference between their frequency of initiating procedure acts was three

acts or fewer. We considered a difference of four or five acts the minimum number necessary to define 2 members as differentiated from each other.

"Sharply differentiated" refers to a difference greater than or equal to twice the minimum (i.e., a difference of 9 or more acts).

Data Collection--Quality of Performance

Each individual's ranking of the fifteen items as to their importance for survival, obtained prior to interaction, was compared to the expert ranking; individual scores were obtained by summing the absolute differences between the expert and the individual rankings; thus a low score indicates a ranking of the items which closely agrees with the expert ranking. This same procedure was used to produce a score for each group's ranking, obtained by the group prior to cessation of interaction, (called a group score). A Gain Score is the difference between the group score and the average of that group's four individual scores.

Results

Table I reports the distribution and group average for each of our coding categories by sex of group.

Table I here

In male groups, the average number of explicit procedure statements (combining all three categories of explicit statements: directives, questions and residuals) was 29.8; the mean number of implicit procedure statements was 2.2. Female groups averaged 22.9 explicit statements and 3.1 implicit statements. In male groups the mean number of explicit directives per

group was 13.6 while in female groups the mean was 8.8. Male groups also averaged a greater number of explicit questions than female groups. The proportion of statements in the explicit residual category is similar in both male and female groups. We take the pattern of the results in Table I to be consistent with our argument.

The Division of Labor: Sharply Differentiated

We defined a very strong operationalization of the division of labor we predict for male groups. We assumed that the minimum difference between any two members which can be a reliable difference is 4 or 5 acts; and we required that this division of labor have one role whose occupant differed from all of the other members by twice that number of acts and that the occupant of that role differ at least minimally from the other members in the various sub-categories of procedure acts. That is, we defined one role which dominates overall frequency of procedure acts and its sub-categories. More precisely, we required that:

- a) one and only one member be sharply differentiated (differ by 9 or more acts) from each of the other members in the group on overall frequency of initiating procedure acts; and
- b) that member be differentiated from each of the other members (by 5 or more acts) on frequency of initiating explicit procedure acts, directive procedure acts, and at least one of the remaining categories of procedure acts (questions, residual, implicit), and that in the remaining two categories no other member have an initiation rate greater than this member's; and
- c) the occupant of this role be stable during both the first and second half of the group's interaction; and
- d) the other three members occupy the same role--i.e., they are undifferentiated from each other (by 5 or more acts) on overall frequency of initiating procedure acts and on every coding sub-category of procedure acts.

Four of the twenty groups met all the above criteria; three were male groups and one was a female group. The difference between the most active

initiator of procedure acts and the least active initiator ranged from 12 to 23 acts for these four groups.

Undifferentiated Division of Labor

Next we defined a completely undifferentiated division of labor in which we required that all members be undifferentiated from each other.

We placed a group in this division of labor if:

- a) when the members were rank ordered by overall frequency of initiating procedure acts, no two adjacent ranks differed by more than five acts, and
- b) no member differed from all other members by more than three acts within any coding sub-category of procedure acts, and
- c) the most frequent initiator of procedure acts did not hold that rank during both the first and second half of the interaction.

Five of the groups met these criteria exactly; two were female groups and three were male groups. The difference between the most active initiator of procedure acts and the least active initiator ranged from 3 to 8 acts for these five groups.

Weakly Differentiated Division of Labor with a Specialist

Applying these same criteria to the remaining eleven groups (which were neither sharply differentiated nor undifferentiated), we observed what appears to be another type of division of labor. In five groups, when the four members were rank-ordered on overall frequency of initiating procedure acts, the most active of the four was a "specialist". A member is a specialist if the greatest proportion of his or her procedure acts falls in a single coding category (e.g. directive acts, questions) and that member's frequency of initiating acts in that category is differentiated from each of the other member's acts in that category. More

exactly, for each of these five groups:

- a) the member who was the most frequent initiator of procedure acts was a specialist; and
- b) that member was so specialized during both the first and second half of the group's interaction, although that member was not necessarily the most active initiator of procedure acts during both the first and second half of the discussion; and
- c) the specialist was not the most active initiator in any of the other categories of procedure acts; and
- d) there was no other specialist in the group; and
- e) no member was sharply differentiated from any other member and there was one and only one weak to moderate differentiation in the group (i.e., no two ranks differed from each other on frequency of procedure acts by nine or more acts and one pair of ranks were differentiated from each other by 4 to 8 acts.)

These five groups were all female groups. No member in any of the other 15 groups was a specialist. The difference between the most active initiator of procedure acts and the least active member ranged from 6 to 11 acts for these five groups.

Differentiated Divisions of Labor

Five of the remaining six groups were characterized by the following properties:

- a) the most active initiator of procedure acts was most active during both the first and second half of the discussion; and
- b) that member was also the most active initiator in three of the four categories of procedure acts; and
- c) no two adjacent ranks were sharply differentiated from each other and there was at least one instance of weak to moderate differentiation (i.e., a difference of 4 to 8).

Two of these five groups were female groups and three were male groups.

The difference in number of procedure acts between the most active and the least active member ranged from 7 to 12 acts for these five groups.

One male group fits none of the four divisions of labor exactly. Even allowing for several coding errors, this group does not approximate either the highly differentiated division of labor or the division of labor with a specialist. The most active initiator of procedure acts was not stable during both halves of the discussion, so it does not fit the criteria for the division of labor last described. Ranks 2 and 3 are differentiated by 7 acts which violate our criteria for a completely undifferentiated division of labor. For purposes of the rest of our data analysis, we will include this group in the category it seems best to approximate by our judgment--the undifferentiated division of labor category. However, where it is important, we will note that this case does not exactly fit the conditions for that category.

Table II here

Table II shows the performance scores on the task by sex of group. It displays the mean and range of the highest individual scores in the group, the group scores, and the group gain scores. The average score of the best individual scores for both males and females is 50.8; however, the female groups show a significantly higher average gain score than males (11.35 for females as compared with 4.87 for males). For both sexes, the variance of gain scores is wide.

Figure 1 displays group gain scores ordered by size of score for male and female groups. Gain scores for female groups varied from one to twenty-five; those for male groups varied from negative six to sixteen.

Figure 1 here

In short, the data indicate that the task we selected did indeed produce a quality measure which is related to sex-of-group, as we had hoped.

Division of Labor and Quality of Performance

Table III here

Table III lists the four procedural divisions of labor we observed and displays the distribution of sex-of-group and gain scores associated with each. Female groups dominate the division of labor with the highest gain scores and male groups dominate those with the lowest scores. Moderate gain scores are associated with a completely undifferentiated division of labor and both sexes developed that pattern. Figure 2, Scattergram of Group Gain Scores by Type of Division of Labor, graphically displays the relationship between gain scores and pattern of procedural division of labor with lowest gain score through the highest scores.

Figure 2 here

We investigated the data for confounding effects. No systematic relationship was found between length of group discussion and group score or gain score, or between seating position and either group score or rate

of initiation. In addition there was no consistent pattern between the original score of the most active participant and group score. The average number of total acts and the average percent of total acts which were procedure acts are not different by division of labor, sex-of-group, or gain score.

Interpretation

Experimental procedures were successful in producing the expected differences between male and female work groups. There were only four groups with a highly differentiated procedural role according to our stringent criteria of sharp differentiation and stability over time of incumbency; three of these groups were male. The use of directive procedural statements was more characteristic of male groups than female groups. The findings that women were less likely to make directive moves and that there was only one female group with a sharply differentiated procedural leader are consistent with the basic argument that women will avoid volunteering for such a leadership role.

Female groups should not be thought of as typically undifferentiated in contrast to male groups. Only two female groups met the criterion of "non-differentiation"; four male groups were described this way. A most interesting pattern which emerged in five female groups was that of a weakly differentiated division of labor with a specialist. In these groups one person appears to specialize in one and only one of the kinds of procedural acts, almost as if this person were deliberately playing a partial leadership role. None of the male groups developed such a specialist; in all cases the most active man in the procedural area was uniformly active across the procedural sub-categories.

Groups with a specialist were associated with the highest gain scores and did much to account for the finding that female groups on the whole show greater gain scores than male groups. The understanding of what makes for quality performance is greatly enhanced by finding that division of labor predicts group gain scores better than sex of groups. A specialized leadership role may facilitate the exchange of ideas and knowledge in such a way that the group becomes the beneficiary on creative problem-solving tasks. In contrast, having a differentiated procedural role which is unspecialized was associated with the weakest gain scores. These groups had weaker gain scores than even the undifferentiated groups.

Despite these promising results, the data do not constitute a test of the idea that the division of labor with respect to procedure is causally related to quality of performance. Nor are these data a test of our argument about how legitimacy affects men and women so as to produce the patterns associated with procedure which we have called "divisions of labor". Only one of the patterns, that one with a highly differentiated "procedural leader," was described in advance of data collection. The others were derived from applying the basic concepts to the observed patterns. Some of these may not actually represent stable states of a division of labor, but may mean that the group is still in the process of developing a division of labor. Alternatively, some of the patterns may reflect conflict.

Construct Validity of Division of Labor Types

There are two issues of construct validity raised by the analysis:

1) it is possible that the patterns are an artifact of the coding scheme since we present no independent evidence that they represent phenomena; 2) it is possible that the coding scheme is essentially another measure of the "emergent task leader", a product of competence evaluations according to Berger (Berger et al., 1966, 1974). We have some information on both issues.

For the first issue we can examine the post-experimental questionnaire where the subjects selected the group member who "did the most to guide the discussion".⁴ We can compare our measure of a differentiated role in the procedural area with the members' post-session judgements about who did the most to guide the group. If the participants in all the groups make the same judgements as the coding scheme, results are unlikely to be a coding artifact.

In the groups completely undifferentiated with regard to procedure, there was no consensus on who did most to guide the group. In three out of four of the groups sharply differentiated with respect to procedure, all three members identified the procedure leader as the person who did most to guide the discussion. In the fourth sharply differentiated group (the lone female group in this pattern), all three members disagreed with the coding and identified a low-active member as having done most to guide the group. Thus in two patterns (the undifferentiated and the sharply differentiated) the subjects' perceptions generally agreed with the behavioral coding scheme.

The other two patterns did not show clear-cut results. Half the groups agreed with the coding scheme and the other half failed to show consensus amongst themselves. Failure to agree with our judgement about procedural

leadership occurred most often in female groups. Of the eight female groups (all the female groups outside the undifferentiated category), only four groups were in consensus about who was the procedure leader and only three of those agreed with us on the matter. Since it may be that females avoid selecting a differentiated member as a leader because of legitimacy problems, it is difficult to determine the implications for construct validity of the low agreement between the women's judgements and our coding of procedural behavior.

With respect to the second issue of construct validity, all the groups were scored for the number of task content acts made by each actor in addition to the procedural scoring. If the procedural coding is essentially another measure of emergent task leadership, we would expect the procedure leader (when there is one) to hold top rank on task initiation and to be chosen with a fair degree of consensus as the person who contributed the best ideas and had the most knowledge.

Of the four sharply differentiated groups, there was only one in which the procedural leader was also a differentiated task leader (a male group).⁵ In this group, however, members showed no consensus on competence (i.e., best ideas, most knowledge). In the other three groups, the procedural leader was one of two equally active members on task, but in no case did the members pick the procedural leader as most competent. The two male groups were agreed in picking the other active member who was not the procedural leader. The female group showed no consensus in their competence evaluations.

In the groups which were completely undifferentiated on procedure, there was also no differentiated task leader; two members were more active

than the other two. There was no consensus on who was the most competent.

Of the five female groups with a specialist, two of the specialists were also top rank on task acts; but there was no agreement among the members' competence evaluations. In the other three groups, the specialist took on every rank on task acts except rank one; and in all three, the most active woman on task was identified by the group as having the best ideas and the most knowledge.

Finally, in the differentiated groups, there was no consensus on competence in any of the groups. In three of these groups the procedure leader was also task leader; in the other two, the procedure leader was one of two equally active members on task acts.

We conclude from the above analysis that our coding system and our classification system do not appear to be artifactual. When we can identify a division of labor which is sharply differentiated with respect to procedure, the members of those groups generally agree with us; when we define a group as being undifferentiated with respect to procedure, the members have no consensual pattern of agreement about who did most to guide the discussion. We also conclude that the process we are identifying is different from the general notion of an emergent task leader who is believed to have special competence and who contributed ideas judged to be good ones by the other group members.

It seems to us that both a competence-based process and the one we describe are probably occurring in these groups, that each may be the basis of a division of labor, and that the two divisions of labor may or may not overlap. The groups which were undifferentiated on procedure were also relatively undifferentiated on frequency of task acts, and the

members did not agree in their competence evaluations of each other. In the other three divisions of labor, however, when the procedure leader was also differentiated on number of task content acts, the members were not consensual in their competence evaluations. When the procedure division of labor did not also describe the task content division of labor, the groups with a procedure specialist seemed to have a differentiated leadership role in the task content area as well; i.e. the most frequent initiator of task acts was not the specialist and was clearly differentiated from the next active member, and the other three members were likely to agree that she was the most competent at the task. When the two divisions of labor did not overlap in differentiated groups without a specialist, the most active member on task content was not clearly differentiated and the next most active member was always the procedure leader. When the members of these groups were consensual in their competence evaluations, they selected the task leader, and the likelihood that they were consensual seemed related to how sharply differentiated the procedure leader was.

This suggests that the presence of a differentiated procedure role does not depend on an emergent consensus about relative competence. Indeed, even when the occupant of such a role is also differentiated in the task content area, he/she is not judged to be the most competent member. Clear consensus on competence seems to occur only when the task content division of labor is quite distinct from the procedure division of labor.

Division of Labor and Task Performance

Nothing in our argument dealing with legitimacy and the group's division of labor informs us about the consequences of the division of

labor for task performance. We believe that the interaction dynamics of the particular division of labor sometimes affect quality of task solution.

The results reported here suggest that the division of labor on procedure may account for the observed sex-differences on quality of performance, but they do not test that idea nor do they test our interpretation of the effects of the division of labor. An alternate interpretation, for example, is that only the five high-scoring female groups were able to arrive at a "legitimate" division of labor. Legitimacy, then, not the dynamics of the particular form of the procedure division of labor, may account for the findings on task score. We cannot, with these data, determine the accuracy of competing interpretations. That is a job for our next empirical inquiry.

We do, however, have interview data which gives us some information on the possible dynamics by which the division of labor on procedure might affect task quality. We asked members whether they felt the others in their group were more or less confident of the group's final decision than they were. We were interested in the degree to which the members had shared perceptions of each other's confidence. We also asked the members to rank order a number of items concerning group process (e.g. getting agreement),⁶ in terms of their importance to the group and in terms of their importance to themselves during the discussion. Here the strategy of analysis was to examine the degree to which perceptions of members matched those of the others in their group on either or both rank orders.

With respect to confidence in the group's final decision, each group with a specialist described themselves as having three members who were equally confident of the decision and a fourth member (the least active)

who was somewhat less confident. In the undifferentiated groups and the differentiated groups, the members agreed that the group had a two-two split with respect to confidence in the final decision--two people being more confident than two others. The answers to this question from members of groups with sharply differentiated divisions of labor tended to identify a split on confidence in the group, but there was no agreement among them about who was more or less confident.

With respect to the ranking of the items on group process, virtually all members of every group indicated that the importance of the items to the group was the same as the importance of the items to themselves.⁷ However, in all but the five groups which developed a procedure specialist, there was no pattern of actual agreement about how these items were ranked. Thus, only the members of these five groups in fact agreed among themselves on what was important to them individually and on the fact that this importance was shared by the whole group.

In review, the results of both analyses suggest to us that the procedure division of labor may well have direct consequences for task solution. In all but the groups with a specialist, the group may have terminated the task solution process before even three of the members had reached consensus. In two divisions of labor, the group concluded their discussion even though they knew that two members of the group were not as confident of the decision as two others. In the second set of results, the specialist division of labor was the only one which showed agreement among the members on both rank-orderings.

Implications For Men and Women at Work

We have been able to demonstrate differences between the way male

and female groups work in an organizational setting. We have argued that these differences occur because no female can legitimately take up the expected leadership role. The design of this study did not specifically test the legitimacy explanation but demonstrated the phenomenon.

The next step will be an experiment designed to show that we can modify observed differences by manipulating the legitimacy of the procedure leadership role, particularly in female groups. If we are correct, when the organization provides evidence for the legitimacy of a woman as an incumbent of the differentiated procedure role there should be no differences between the sex-groups on this dimension.

If we are able to support this line of argument, the implications for the work setting are significant. Because the problem is legitimacy rather than the lack of leadership skills, intervention takes the shape of changing the way the organization defines and delegates authority to the work group rather than remedial training for the women who supposedly lack skills due to their sex role socialization. In everyday work settings, women who are as competent as their coworkers nevertheless find themselves dealing simultaneously with status and legitimacy problems. The mixed-status work group reflects male dominance both as a result of the operation of differential competence evaluations due to status and as a result of differential legitimacy for male and female incumbents of leadership roles. Interventions may well have to attack both these problems if women are to be effective as leaders in mixed-sex work situations.

Another set of implications is suggested by the apparent superior problem-solving ability on the type of task represented in our study in groups we have described as having a specialist in the procedural area.

This mode of group organization was associated with the largest group gain scores and was used exclusively by women. This limited leadership role deserves further investigation; it may turn out to resemble that of the "facilitator" now employed in professional situations where maximum group input and creative "brainstorming" is desired. It is not, according to the procedural scoring system, **synonymous with emotional leadership.** Understanding the best mode of group organization for the type of task is a general problem having implications for groups of any composition. When the task is one requiring a strongly differentiated procedural leader (as when there is strong time pressure), legitimacy may have to be manipulated by the organizational authority in order for women (or other minorities) to assume the leadership role. When the task is one requiring creative problem solving and maximum interchange, male groups and mixed sex groups may need instruction on alternative ways to deal with task procedure in order to optimally deal with task content problems.

FOOTNOTES

¹The literature on "sex differences" can be sorted into two classes of findings. First, there are those based on data gathered on mixed-sex groups (Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956; Strodtbeck, James and Hawkins, 1957; Zander, 1969); we agree with Lockheed and Hall (1975) that these findings are best explained by theories describing the effects of status processes. There is a second set of studies reporting differences between men's and women's behavior in same-sex interaction (Exline, 1962, a, b; Allen and Crutchfield, 1963; Oskamp and Pulman, 1965; Rapoport and Cham-mah, 1965; Bass, 1967; Julian, 1969; Rubenstein, 1970; Wiley, 1973; Wisenthal, Endler and Geller, 1973; Lockheed and Hall, 1975; Weil and Sobieszek, 1976). The empirical generalizations in this literature are presented as unconditionalized assertions; and as unconditionalized assertions, they conflict with each other. At present, there is no way to judge which experimental situations are comparable and which are not; and thus it is impossible to determine the general conditions which govern the findings. See Fennell et al., 1977, for a lengthier discussion of this literature.

²For our purposes, an organization is an explicitly coordinated set of activities (i.e., offices) forming an ongoing division of labor around at least one definite purpose (Barnard, 1938). A formal organization is an organization which has a legal-rational authority system, i.e., an explicit distribution of decision-making rights and social-control rights legitimated by law and governed by norms of rationality (Henderson and Parsons, 1947).

³It is important to point out that the distinction made here between task content and procedural divisions of labor is not equivalent or similar to the distinction between task leadership and socio-emotional leadership made in much of the small groups literature. We did not investigate this latter type of division of labor. In our research we have categorized some groups as possessing a "completely undifferentiated division of labor" with respect to the procedural area. The reader should be aware of the fact that such a categorization does not preclude the existence of differentiated divisions of labor along either the task content or socio-emotional lines. The reader may best grasp the behaviors scored as procedural by examining the coding scheme. (See appendix.)

⁴The members replied to the questions by ranking each of the other three members on the appropriate criteria; they did not rank themselves.

⁵Since there are 10 to 15 times more task acts than procedure acts, we used a different set of numbers to judge whether or not two members were differentiated. We arbitrarily judged that differences up to and including 10 were not likely to be reliable and that differences greater than 20 probably were reliable differences.

Footnotes (Cont.)

⁶The following were to be ranked in terms of their importance to the group as a whole and to the subject:

- presenting own ideas
- listening to others' ideas
- getting agreement
- bringing the discussion to close
- winding up with the best possible ordering of the items

The following factors were to be ranked in terms of their importance in determining the final ranking reached by the group:

- the way in which the discussion proceeded
- the amount of relevant knowledge of group members
- the decision to walk out or stay with the plane
- the personal characteristics or manner of group members

⁷There is one exception to this. The most active initiator of procedure acts in groups in the differentiated category were not likely to report agreeing with the rest of the group on the importance of the items.

Table I
 Distribution of Procedure* Statements
 by Sex of Group

	Sex of Group			
	Male (N=10)		Female (N=10)	
	Total	Average per Group	Total	Average per Group
Implicit	22 (6.8%)**	2.2	31 (11.92%)	3.1
Explicit				
Directives	136 (42.5%)	13.6	88 (33.84%)	8.8
Questions	84 (26.25%)	8.4	63 (24.42%)	6.3
Residuals	78 (24.3%)	7.8	78 (30.0%)	7.8
Total				
Explicit	298 (93.12%)	29.8	229 (88.07%)	22.9
Procedural	320 (100.00%)	32.0	260 (100.00%)	26.0

* The proportion of procedure acts to total number of task acts was not different by sex of group. For male groups, procedure acts were 7.4% of the total acts, for females, the number is 6.3%.

** (%) = of total procedural statements.

Table II

Quality of Performance:

Average of Highest Individual Score in the Group, Average Group Score, and
Group Gain Score by Sex of Group

	SEX OF GROUP	
	Male	Female
<hr/> <u>Highest Individual Score</u> <hr/>		
Range	36-62	30-68
Mean	50.8	50.8
<hr/> <u>Group Score</u> <hr/>		
Range	48-68	36-64
Mean	57.4	55
Median	55	60
<hr/> <u>Gain Score</u> <hr/>		
Range	-6-16	1-25
Mean	4.87	11.35
Median	6.4	13
<hr/>		

Table III

Group Gain Scores by Patterns of Division of
Labor by Sex of Group

Type of Pattern of Division of Labor	Group Gain Score by Sex of Group	Average Group* Gain Score
I Highly Differentiated	Male	0.5
		6.0
		7.0
	Female	2.0
II Undifferentiated	Male	16.00
		6.7
		9.0
		6.0
	Female	6.5
	7.5	
III Weakly Differentiated Specialist	Female	13.0
		14.0
		17.0
		23.0
		25.0
IV Differentiated	Male	-6.0
		-1.5
		5.0
	Female	4.5
		1.0

*Mean Gain Score for Male Groups = 4.87; Mean Gain Score for Female
Goups = 11.35. Overall Mean Gain Score = 8.11.

The male group which had a Gain Score of 16 did not fit any of the four
patterns exactly (see Text for discussion). We list the group in the
category it best approximates but report two averages for that category;
the starred average included this group, the other number is the average
without this group.

Figure 1

Graph of Group Gain Scores Ordered by Size of Score for Male and Female Groups





Figure 2
Scattergram of Group Gain Score by Type
of Division of Labor



REFERENCES

- Allen, V. S., and R. S. Crutchfield. 1963. "Generalization of Experimentally Reinforced Conformity". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 67 (October): 326-33.
- Bales, R. F. 1950. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Bass, B. M. 1967. "Social Behavior and the Orientation Inventory: A Review". Psychological Bulletin 68 (November): 260-92.
- Barnard, C. 1938. Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Berger, J., M. Zelditch and B. Anderson. 1966. Sociological Theories in Progress: Vol. 1. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Berger, J., T. Connor and M. Fisek. 1974. Expectations States Theory. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Dornbusch, S. and W. R. Scott. 1975. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evan, W. M. and M. Zelditch. 1961. "A Laboratory Experiment on Bureaucratic Authority". American Sociological Review 26 (December): 883-93.
- Exline, R. V. a: 1962. "Need Affiliation and Initial Communication Behavior in Problem-Solving Groups Characterized by Low Interpersonal Visibility". Psychological Reports 10 (February): 79-89.
- _____ b: 1962. "Effects of Need for Affiliation, Sex and the Sight of Others Upon Initial Communications in Problem-Solving Groups". Journal of Personality 30 (December): 527-56.
- Fennell, M., P. Barchas, E. Cohen, A. McMahon and P. Hildebrand. 1977. "An Alternative Perspective to Sex Differences in Organizational Settings: The Process of Legitimation". Sex Roles: A Journal of Research (in press).
- Fisek, M. H. and R. Ofshe. 1970. "The Process of Status Evolution". Sociometry 33 (September): 327-346.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1954. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

References (Cont.)

- Hall, J. 1971. "Decisions, Decisions, Decisions". Psychology Today 5 (November): 51-4, 85-8.
- Henderson, A. M. and Talcott Parsons (eds.). 1947. Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Julian, J.W. 1969. "Effects of Prior Group Support on Conformity". Journal of Social Psychology 77 (April): 189-96.
- Lockheed, M. E. and K. P. Hall. 1975. "Sex as a Status Characteristic: The Role of Formal Theory in Developing Leadership Training Strategies". Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association. San Francisco (August).
- Oskamp, S. and D. Perlman. 1965. "Factors Affecting Cooperation in a Prisoner's Dilemma Game". Journal of Conflict Resolution 9 (September): 359-74.
- Rapoport, A., and A. M. Chammah. 1965. "Sex Differences in Factors Contributing to the Level of Cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 2 (December): 831-38.
- Rubenstein, F. 1971. "A Behavioral Study of Pollution: The Role of Perceived Instrumentality in an Externality Situation". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Strodtbeck, F. L. and R. D. Mann. 1956. "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations". Sociometry 19 (March): 3-11.
- Strodtbeck, F. L., R. M. James and C. Hawkins. 1957. "Social Status in Jury Deliberations". American Sociological Review 22 (December): 703-19.
- Thompson, J. 1967. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Weil, H. and B. Sobieszek. 1976. "Communications and Consensus in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game". Unpublished article, University of Rochester.
- Wiesenthal, D. L., N. S. Endler and S. H. Geller. 1973. "Effects of Prior Group Agreement and Task Correctness on Relative Competence Mediating Conformity". European Journal of Social Psychology 3 (June): 193-203.
- Wiley, M. G. 1973. "Sex Roles in Games". Sociometry 36 (December): 526-41.
- Zander, A. 1969. "Students' Criteria of Satisfaction in a Classroom Committee Project". Human Relations 22 (March): 195-207.

APPENDIX I

CODING MANUAL FOR PROCEDURAL ACTS, AND SCORING SHEETS

Coding Manual for Male and Female Work Group Project

March 1976

P. Hildebrand

School of Education

The groups that you will be watching and scoring have been videotaped. They are four-member all male or all female groups that have been instructed to come to a consensus (not by voting). The setting is a downed air craft with four survivors and 15 objects. Through discussion the four subjects in each group are to decide what ranking of items best insures survival. (See attached description of task).

In the discussion you will hear many kinds of comments. Some are irrelevant to the task in that they are expressions of emotion or have nothing to do with the task at hand. Other comments share information and argue the merits of a particular item. Still others suggest an agenda to be followed and tend to organize the efforts of the group. You will be focusing on these latter types of acts in your coding of the tapes.

In order to reach a final decision on the ranking of the objects, the group must make a number of additional and prior decisions about how to proceed in discussion. They must, implicitly or explicitly, decide what topic is under consideration at any given time, and how and when to proceed from one topic to another; they must develop ways to handle agreements and disagreements; they must recognize what constitutes consensus in order to move to a conclusion. Often they must handle the timing of decisions relating to their overall strategies as well as the timing of

decisions on subtasks. Since the groups were not directed to debate these issues of procedure formally or explicitly, they often deal with these procedural issues indirectly and informally. It is, therefore, necessary to study the following pages carefully to see what kinds of statements we have defined as procedural.

In general, procedural statements consist of all verbal acts which have the function of organizing and allocating the group's time and energy, either explicitly or implicitly. Included are remarks which deal with agenda sequencing and timing; remarks which call for group decision on specific issues; remarks which explicitly or implicitly suggest directions which the discussion of the group should take; and procedural remarks which are made in response to other procedural statements.

Any given act can be relevant or irrelevant to the procedural issue. Therefore, there will be statements which you do NOT score. In addition, any given statement may serve several group functions: we are asking you to focus on the procedural aspect only. For example, a call for consensus (a procedural act) may also be a declarative statement about the way the speaker thinks a particular object should be ranked. In this case you would score the procedural act and ignore the other aspects of the statement. All scoring will be coding interaction concerning procedure.

Cautionary notes to coders:

(1) The first bit of interaction is crucial. You may need to run and rerun the tape, especially the beginning sections, in order to capture the statements.

(2) Toward the end of the tapes, statements frequently serve a dual purpose, dealing with both procedure and ranking. Coding becomes difficult. When coding gets too confusing toward the end of the tape, STOP. Note what was said in the last discussion you coded, or where you gave up, and/or the time elapsed on the tape.

(3) Statements which are procedural are sometimes flagged by references to time and timing. Listen for the words: "should," "ought," and "must"; they may indicate procedural statements.

(4) Sometimes conversation is difficult to hear. Statements you do not hear until you have played the tape three or four times should NOT be scored. If you did not hear a statement the first listening, it is likely the members of the group did not hear it either. To decide whether or not to rerun the tape to catch a statement, take the point of view of a member of the group; if it was important to them it should be important to you.

(5) When subjects discuss the usefulness of an item you may hear what sound like procedural statements such as, "I think A should go before B", but are, in fact, not. You are to code how the subjects arrive at the ranking, not the actual decisions they make.

For example, the task requires that items be ranked according to utility in the desert. A statement complying with the instructions of the task, "I think A should go before B", would not be coded. A statement about how to complete the task, "First we need to decide...and then ..." would be coded.

Coding categories:

There are three major categories of procedural statements which are made in these groups and which you will code. They are (1) request for consensus, (2) statements that have implicit functions with respect to procedure, and (3) explicit statements about procedure. These will be scored by the actor who makes the statement.

Consensus statements: These statements call for a final decision on strategy and ranking. They may involve issues such as (coded C) 1) staying or walking away from the plane, 2) the rank of any given item, and 3) the final set of ranks. A call for consensus functions as if it is the last consideration of that specific issue.

Some groups proceed from general to specific classifications for ranking. During the course of the discussions they assign items to broad categories such as, most important and least important, must have and could live without, and then rank items within those groupings. Since this type of organization is one method of ranking, these decisions are procedural and would be covered by classification 2) above.

Implicit statements: These statements serve the function of organizing the behavior of the discussion group although the reference is not explicit. Stated differently, these statements serve the function of proposing an agenda item. Although not as blatant as other statements, they indicate an abrupt shift of topic.

(coded I)

For example, obtaining food is being discussed and the gun is under consideration with respect to obtaining food. One person says that the knife would be more useful for that purpose. That is a substantive comment that does not direct procedure; we do not consider that a topic change and would not code it. Another group member shifts the focus of conversation to using the flashlight for an emergency signal and does not relate it to obtaining food. That directs the discussion to a different topic, changing the procedure in terms of order of consideration. We would code that statement I.

Explicit statements: These statements refer directly or overtly to an issue of procedure. There are three categories of explicit statements: directives, questions, and residuals.

Explicit directives: These are statements containing instructions about procedure for the group. They may or may not refer specifically to the rank of an item. Directives cannot be questions.

(coded eD)

Explicit questions: These are specific questions, requiring answers,
(coded eQ) about the group's procedure. If you were transcribing
the tapes, these would be written with question marks.

Explicit residuals: These are all other explicit statements concerning
(coded eR) procedure, that are not directives or questions.
They often take the form of evaluation or reflection
on procedure.

PLEASE STUDY THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLES

They are probably your best guide.

Examples for Social Control Behavior Scoring
of Procedural Acts of 1/25/76

IMPLICIT (I)

Group is discussing article x. Suddenly one actor says, "Does anybody think the X should be next?"

"I'd be interested to know what were some of your reasons for your individual ratings."

CALLS FOR CONSENSUS (C)

Actor turns to group as a whole after a discussion, "So what do you think?"

"Do we agree that this is important?"

"So you think that water goes first?"

"So the raincoat goes next?"

"Do we all agree on that?"

"Do we agree that this is important?"

EXPLICIT--QUESTION (EQ)

"Have we decided to go or stay?"

"You want to start rating these things?"

"Where are we?"

"Have we given up on trying to find _____?"

"What do you think is more important--X or Y?"

"Shall we start at the top or bottom?"

EXPLICIT--DIRECTIVE (eD)

"Before we start and get into it too much, the question I had was-----."

"We should do the survival bit first."

"I want to think about that some." (Actor allocates role to self)

"I think we can almost put these things last."

"Put those things together."

"Let's see what's useless first."

"So, according to that, this goes next."

"Let me finish the point."

"I think we should defer to the person who offered a compromise solution."

"Why don't you read them off and I'll list them."

"Wait, let's see what we got."

"I was thinking that the best way to go about it is for each of us to say which we think is the most important."

"I'll volunteer to write them down as we go along."

"I think perhaps we need to decide-----."

"Maybe we could put them in clumps."

"Let's collect all the things that have to do with water."

"I think we've got this in groups and we should start writing them down."

"I think wherever we place any one of those, the other two ought to go."

EXPLICIT--RESIDUAL (eR)

"This is the tough part."

"We're assuming a whole scenario."

"Part of being a group is having different people share their experience."

"Everyone in the group has had their say and now the problem is coming to consensus."

"We'll just never come to any conclusion if we keep on going like this."

"We're arranging them according to how important it is."

"There's three of us that agree on that."

"That's a good question."

"We still don't know about most of them."

"I think that is one of the most important issues."

DO NOT CODE

"Salt tablets are not as important in the desert as water."

"We could use the parachute for shelter."

"I don't know how to read an aerial map, do you?"

"Has anyone really been in a desert?"

"I read an article about X."

"Do they say in the instructions whether we're supposed to go or stay?"

Coding statements that fit more than one category:

If a statement can be coded in more than one category, code it only once, in its highest applicable position in the following hierarchy:

- (1) Consensus
- (2) eD
- (3) eQ
- (4) eR
- (5) I

For example, if a statement is both eQ and C (Do we all agree that this item should go in the most important pile?), code it in the highest applicable category (here: C).

Coding notation:

List the numbers representing speakers sequentially as the interactions occur. For example:

Male & Female Work Groups Score Sheet				
Group # and sex: _____	<u>Subjects</u>		Coder's name: _____	
	2	3		
Total Time of tape: _____	1	4	sex: _____	
C	I	Explicit		
		eD	eQ	eR
		2		
		4		
		1		
	3			
	2			
			4	

This will graphically display the movement of the discussion.

Learning to code these statements requires patience. After you have become familiar with selecting out voices in typical conversations and typical ways in which groups handle this task, as well as the distinctions we are making, the task becomes much easier.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION IN THE DESERT AND THE TASK

THE SITUATION

It is approximately 10:00 A.M. in mid-August and you have just crash-landed in the Sonora Desert in Southwestern United States. The light twin-engine plane, containing the bodies of the pilot and the co-pilot, has completely burned. Only the air frame remains. None of the rest of you has been injured.

The pilot was unable to notify anyone of your position before the crash. However, he had indicated before impact that you were 70 miles south-southwest from a mining camp which is the nearest known habitation, and that you were approximately 65 miles off the course that was filed in your VFR Flight Plan.

The immediate area is quite flat and except for occasional barrel and saguaro cacti appears to be rather barren. The last weather report indicated the temperature would reach 110 that day, which means that the temperature at ground level will be 130 degrees. You are dressed in light weight clothing--short sleeved tops, slacks, socks and street shoes. Everyone has a handkerchief. Collectively your pockets contain \$2.83 in change, \$85.00 in bills, a pack of cigarettes, and a ballpoint pen.

TASK

Before the plane caught fire your group was able to salvage the 15 items printed on the cards that will be handed out to you. Your task is to rank these items according to their importance to your survival, starting with "1" the most important, to "15" the least important. When you have decided on your ordering of the items, please fill in the list on the page accompanying the cards.

You may assume:

- (1) There will be a four-person group of which you will be a member.
- (2) The members of the group will have similar educational backgrounds to yourself.
- (3) These four people will be the survivors of the crash landing.
- (4) The group has agreed to stick together.
- (5) All items are in good condition and no one is severely injured.

Each person is to individually rank each item. Delay discussion of the situation or problem until you have been grouped as a team.

APPENDIX I-a

SCORING SHEET FOR GAIN SCORES FOR DESERT SURVIVAL TASK

ITEMS	Step 1 Your Individual Ranking	Step 2 The Team's Ranking	Step 3 Survival Expert's Ranking	Step 4 Difference Between Step 1 & Step 3	Step 5 Differenc Between Step 2 & Step 3
flashlight(4 battery size)					
Jack knife					
sectional air map of the area					
plastic raincoat(large size)					
magnetic compass					
compress kit with gauze					
.45 caliber pistol(loaded)					
parachute(red and white)					
bottle of salt tablets (1000 tablets)					
1 quart of water per person					
a book entitled, Edible Animals of the Desert					
a pair of sunglasses per person					
2 quarts of 180 proof Vodka					
1 top coat per person					
a cosmetic mirror					
			TOTALS (the lower the score the better)	Your Score Step 4	Team Scor Step 5

Please complete the following steps and insert the scores under your team's number.

	TEAM NUMBER					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Step <u>6</u> AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL SCORE Add up all the individual scores (Step <u>4</u>) on the team and divide by the number on the team.						
Step <u>7</u> TEAM SCORE						
Step <u>8</u> GAIN SCORE The difference between the team score and the Average Individual Score. If the team score is lower than Avg. Ind. Score then gain is "-".						
Step <u>9</u> LOWEST INDIVIDUAL SCORE on the team						
Step <u>10</u> NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SCORES lower than the team score.						

APPENDIX I-b

TASK AND PROCESS STATEMENTS

GROUP # _____

SCORER _____

<u>PERSON ONE</u>		<u>PERSON TWO</u>		<u>PERSON THREE</u>		<u>PERSON FOUR</u>	
task	process	task	process	task	process	task	process
TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____	TotS _____
TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____	TotA _____
TotP _____	TotP _____	TotT _____	TotP _____	TotT _____	TotP _____	TotT _____	TotP _____

APPENDIX I-c

PROCEDURAL SCORING SHEET

Male & Female Work Groups Score Sheet

Group # and sex: _____ Subjects- Coder's name: _____
Total Time of tape: _____ 1 2 3 4 sex: _____

C	I	Explicit		
		eD	eQ	eR
		2		
		4		
		1		
	3			
	2		4	

This will graphically display the movement of the discussion.

APPENDIX I--d

CLAIMS OF EXPERTISE

GROUP # _____

SCORE _____

# one	# two	# three	# four

FREQUENCY EACH PERSON HANDLED CARD

# one	# two	# three	# four

STRATEGY

- 1) never discussed strategy
- 2) discussed strategy but did not refer to it in ranking objects
- 3) discussed strategy and referred back to it when ranking objects

CONTENT OF STRATEGY

APPENDIX I--e

FREQUENCY USES FOR EACH ITEM

GROUP # _____

ITEM	PERSON ONE	PERSON TWO	PERSON THREE	PERSON FOUR	TOTAL
PARACHUTE					
JACKET					
RAINCOAT					
MAP					
COMPASS					
KNIFE					
GUN					
FLASHLIGHT					
MIRROR					
SUNGLASSES					
FIRST AID KIT					
SALT TABLETS					
BOOK					
WATER					
VODKA					
TOTAL					

TIME DISCUSSION STARTED _____

TIME DISCUSSION ENDED _____

APPENDIX II-a

POST-SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____

Identification Number _____

Date _____

1. Do you know anyone who participated in this study, either today or previously?

Yes No

If yes, did you talk with him/her about the study at all?

Yes No

If yes, what kinds of things did you talk about? _____

2. Please indicate what you understood to be the nature of your task:

A. What details can you remember about the situation in the desert?

B. Which of the items to be ranked do you remember? _____

C. List anything that you can recall in the instructions about how your group was to proceed _____

3. Check the statement that best expresses your feelings about the group discussion:

- _____ A) The most important feature of the task was to get the best possible answer.
- _____ B) The most important feature of the task was the way we went about making the decision.

4. We would like you to think back to the final period in your group discussion - say the last few minutes. Please rate the following factors as to their order of importance at that time:

to the group as a whole

to yourself

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | presenting own ideas |
| _____ | _____ | listening to other's ideas |
| _____ | _____ | getting agreement |
| _____ | _____ | bringing the discussion to close |
| _____ | _____ | winding up with the best possible ordering of the items |

("1" = most important, "5" = least important)

5. Please rate the following factors as to their importance in determining the final ranking your group reached.

- _____ the way in which the discussion proceeded
- _____ the amount of relevant knowledge of group members
- _____ the decision to walk out or stay with the plane
- _____ the personal characteristics or manner of group members

("1" = most important, "4" = least important)

6. Please compare how your group behaved with how you think other groups might behave in terms of: 1) interpersonal interaction; 2) the ranking achieved.

A. comparing your group with other same-sex groups _____

B. comparing your group with opposite-sex groups _____


C. comparing your group with mixed-sex groups _____

7. Please compare the way you behaved in the discussion today with the way you usually act in a small group - in terms of how much you talked, the kinds of things you said, and how much you listened.

A. comparing your behavior in this group with your behavior in other same-sex groups _____

B. comparing your behavior in this group with your behavior in mixed-sex groups _____

Here is a picture of where each of you sat during the discussion:



8. Who contributed the best ideas in the discussion (i.e. who showed the best understanding and grasp of the problem, the keenest insight, the most reasoning ability.) Please rate all the members of the group excluding yourself.

("1" = highest)

1. Seating Position _____
2. Seating Position _____
3. Seating Position _____

9. Who did the most to guide the discussion and keep it moving effectively? (i.e. who kept the group on the task, tied together contributions of other members, suggested procedures for the group to follow, acted as moderator, provided compromise solutions.) Please rate all the members of the group excluding yourself.

1. Seating Position _____
2. Seating Position _____
3. Seating Position _____

10. Who had the most knowledge relevant to desert survival? Please rate all members of the group excluding yourself.

1. Seating Position _____
2. Seating Position _____
3. Seating Position _____

11. What in your personal experience would make you knowledgeable about desert survival? _____

12. Please indicate your group's final ranking of the items, as you remember it. _____

13. You are probably more confident in the ranking of some of the items than in others.

A. Which ones are you most sure of, and which least? _____

B. Do you think the other members of your group were more or less confident of the final ranking than you? _____

C. Are there any changes you would make now? _____

14. If you would want to change anything about the study today, what would it be? _____

15. Do you think anything about your experience here today would be of any use to you if you were really faced with the problem of surviving in the desert? _____

16. What do you think we might learn from this study? _____

APPENDIX II-b

POST-SESSION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Subject Name _____ Date _____
Identification Number _____
Interviewer Name _____

We've arranged these interviews so that we would have a chance to discuss some of your reactions to the study so far. We will be running several sessions and we plan to talk to all of the people who participate in our discussion groups. Since this is an exploratory study, we would like to know what you think and how you feel about the time that you spend here. This interview is not for the purpose of collecting data and we don't have any hypotheses about people's reactions. We hope that talking to all of the participants will help us to refine our procedures and better understand our results.

After some questions, I'll explain the study some more, and try to answer any questions you may have.

1. What did you understand to be the purpose of the study?

(If answer is incorrect - Do you remember when we explained to you that we were interested in the differences between all-male groups and all-female groups in dealing with problem-solving tasks?)

(If answer is vague - Can you tell me more about the kinds of things you think we're studying?)

Did you ever think we were studying anything else?

2. Have you ever participated in a study that reminds you of this one?

(Probe: Have you ever been in any other studies?)

(If Yes) What about it reminds you of this one?

3. Now think back to the time when all the participants were together in the first room, before you met with your group. What was your initial reaction at that time?

Was there anything you were confused about or didn't understand?

(If Yes) Are you still confused?

4. Think back to the first time you ranked the items, when you had your personal deck of cards. What did you understand to be the purpose of that activity?

Do you still think that? (If No) What do you think now and when did you change?

Do you remember what kinds of things you were thinking about when you first ranked the items?

How do you think other people were feeling?

5. Did anything anyone else contributed really start you thinking in a different way?

6. Naturally, any group working on a task like this will have some disagreements. How would you say your group handled any disagreements which arose?

7. Was there any time during the study that you felt uncomfortable?

(If Yes) When was that? Could you pinpoint your feelings a little more?

8. Did you feel angry or irritated with either one of us or someone in the group at any time?

(If Yes) When was that? What was it about _____ that made you feel that way?

9. If you could change anything about your group, what would you change?

(probe for overall strategy adopted, method of reaching group decision)

10. Do you have any other reactions or impressions about the study that we haven't covered yet? Has there been anything unpleasant about it for you?

APPENDIX III

THE EXPERT RANKING AND RATIONALE

The expert: Alonzo W. Pond, M.A., is the desert survival expert who has contributed the basis for the item ranking. He is the former Chief of the Desert Branch of the Arctic, Desert, Tropic Information Center of the Air Force University at Maxwell Air Force Base.

Two of the several books Mr. Pond has written are "Survival", an excellent reference if you would like to do more reading on this subject and "Peoples of the Desert", written after Mr. Pond had spent years living with people of every desert in the world except the Australian.

During World War II Mr. Pond spent much of his time working with the Allied Forces in the Sahara on desert survival problems. While there and as Chief of the Desert Branch, he encountered the countless survival cases which serve as a basis of the rationale for these rankings.

1. Cosmetic Mirror

Of all the items the mirror is absolutely critical. It is the most powerful tool you have for communicating your presence. In sunlight a simple mirror can generate 5 to 7 million candle power of light. The reflected sunbeam can even be seen beyond the horizon. If you had no other items you would still have better than an 80% chance of being spotted and picked up within the first 24 hours.

2. 1 Top Coat Per Person

Once you have a communication system to tell people where you are your next problem is to slow down dehydration. Forty percent of the body moisture that is lost through dehydration is lost through respiration and perspiration. Moisture lost through respiration can be cut significantly by remaining calm. Moisture lost through perspiration can be cut by preventing the hot, dry air from circulating next to the skin. The top coats, ironic as it may seem, are the best available means for doing this. Without them survival time would be cut by at least a day.

3. 1 Quart of Water Per Person

You could probably survive 3 days with just the first 2 items. Although the quart of water would not significantly extend the survival time, it would help

to hold off the effects of dehydration. It would be best to drink the water as you become thirsty, so that you can remain as clear-headed as possible during the first day when important decisions have to be made and a shelter erected. Once dehydration begins it would be impossible to reverse it with the amount of water available in this situation. Therefore, rationing it would do no good at all.

4. Flashlight (4 Battery Size)

The only quick, reliable night signalling device is the flashlight. With it and the mirror you have a 24 hour signalling capability. It is also a multiple use item during the day. The reflector and lens could be used as an auxiliary signalling device or for starting a fire. The battery container could be used for digging or as a water container in the distillation process (see plastic raincoat).

5. Parachute (Red and White)

The parachute can serve as both shelter and signalling device. The saguaro cactus could serve as a tent pole and the parachute shrouds as tent ropes. Double or triple folding the parachute would give shade dark enough to reduce the temperature underneath it by as much as 20%.

6. Jackknife

Although not as crucial as the first 5 items, the jackknife would be useful for rigging the shelter and for cutting up the very tough barrel cactus for moisture. Its innumerable other uses gives it the high ranking.

7. Plastic Raincoat (Large Size)

In recent years the development of plastic, nonporous materials have made it possible to build a solar still. By digging a hole and placing the raincoat over it the temperature differential will extract some moisture from urine-soaked sand and pieces of barrel cactus and produce condensation on the underside of the plastic. By placing a small stone in the center of the plastic a cone shape can be formed and cause moisture to drip into the flashlight container buried in the center of the hole. Up to a quart a day could be obtained in this way. This would be helpful, but not enough to make any significant difference. The physical activity required to extract the water is likely to use up about twice as much body water as could be gained.

8. .45 Caliber Pistol (Loaded)

By the end of the second day speech would be seriously impaired and you might be unable to walk (6 to 10% dehydration). The pistol would then be useful as a sound signalling device and the bullets as a quick fire starter. The international distress signal is three shots in rapid succession. There have been numerous cases of survivors going undetected because they couldn't make any loud sounds. The butt of the pistol might also be used as a hammer.

The pistol's advantages are counterbalanced by its very dangerous disadvantages. Impatience, irritability and irrationality would all occur as dehydration increases. This is why critical decisions should be made before dehydration sets in. Under the circumstances the availability of so lethal a tool constitutes a real danger to the team. Assuming it were not used against humans, it might be used for

hunting, which would be a complete waste of effort. Even if someone were able to shoot an animal with it, which is very unlikely, eating the meat would increase dehydration enormously as the body uses its water to process the food.

9. A Pair of Sunglasses Per Person

In the intense sunlight of the desert photophobia and solar retinitis (both similar to the effects of snow blindness) could be serious problems especially by the second day. However, the dark shade of the parachute shelter would reduce the problem, as would darkening the area around the eyes with soot from the wreckage. Using a handkerchief or compress material as a veil with eye slits cut in it would eliminate the vision problem, but sunglasses would make things more comfortable.

10. Compress Kit with Gauze

Because of the desert's low humidity, it is considered one of the healthiest (least infectious) places in the world. Due to the fact that the blood thickens with dehydration, there is little danger from bleeding unless a vein is severed. In one well-documented case, a man, lost and without water, who had torn off all his clothes and fallen among sharp cactus and rocks until his body was covered with cuts, didn't bleed until he was rescued and given water.

11. Magnetic Compass

Aside from the possibility of using its reflective surfaces as an auxiliary signalling device, the compass is of little use. It could even be dangerous to have around once the effects of dehydration take hold. It might give someone the notion of walking out.

12. Sectional Air Map of the Area

Might be helpful for starting a fire, or for toilet paper. One man might use it for a head cover or eye shade. It might have entertainment value. But it is especially useless and perhaps dangerous because it too might encourage walking out

13. A Book Entitled: "Edible Animals of the Desert"

The problem confronting the group is dehydration, not starvation. Any energy expended in hunting would be costly in terms of potential water loss. Desert animals, while plentiful, are seldom seen. They survive by laying low as should the survivors. If the hunt was successful, the intake of protein would cause an increase in the amount of water used to process the protein in the body. General rule of thumb--if you have lots of water, eat, otherwise, don't consume anything. Although the book might contain useful information, it would be difficult to adjust your eyes to reading and remain attentive as dehydration increases.

14. 2 Quarts of 180 Proof Vodka

When severe alcoholism kills someone, they usually die of dehydration. Alcohol absorbs water. The body loses an enormous amount of water trying to throw off the alcohol. We estimate a loss of 2 to 3 oz.

of water per oz. of alcohol. The Vodka consumed could be lethal in this situation. Its presence could cause someone in a dehydrated state to increase his problem. The Vodka would be helpful for a fire or as a temporary coolant for the body. The bottle might also be helpful. All in all the Vodka represents more dangers than help.

15. Bottle of Salt Tablets (1000 Tablets)

Wide spread myths about salt tablets exist. The first problem is that with dehydration and loss of water blood salinity increases. Sweat contains less salt than extracellular fluids. Without lots of extra water the salt tablets would require body water to get rid of the increased salinity. The effect would be like drinking sea water. Even the man who developed salt tablets now maintains they are of questionable value except in geographic areas where there are salt deficiencies.