1

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

DEVELOPING A MEASURE OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

by

Jane Bhar, B.COMM.

**A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirement for the degree of**

Masters of Management Studies

School of Business

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

Sept 21, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-08991-6

Canada

Name Jane Bhar

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Business Administration Management

SUBJECT TERM

0454

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0488
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0291
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
Accounting 0770
Banking 0454
Management 0338
Marketing 0385
Canadian Studies 0501
Economics 0503
General 0505
Agricultural 0508
Commerce-Business 0509
Finance 0510
History 0511
Labor 0358
Theory 0366
Folklore 0351
Geography 0578
Gerontology 0578
History 0578
General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0337
United States 0585
History of Science 0398
Law 0615
Political Science 0616
General 0617
International Law and Relations 0814
Public Administration 0452
Recreation 0626
Social Work 0627
Sociology 0938
General 0631
Criminology and Penology 0628
Demography 0629
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0630
Individual and Family 0700
Studies 0344
Industrial and Labor 0709
Relations 0999
Public and Social Welfare 0453
Social Structure and Development 0537
Theory and Methods 0539
Transportation 0541
Urban and Regional Planning 0542
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
General 0308
Anatomy 0309
Biostatistics 0379
Botany 0329
Cell 0353
Ecology 0369
Entomology 0793
Genetics 0410
Limnology 0307
Microbiology 0317
Molecular 0416
Neuroscience 0433
Oceanography 0821
Physiology 0778
Radiation 0472
Veterinary Science 0786
Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0425
General 0996
Medical

Geodasy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Polynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0382
Physical Therapy 0573
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Agricultural 0487
Analytical 0488
Biochemistry 0738
Inorganic 0490
Nuclear 0491
Organic 0494
Pharmaceutical 0495
Physical 0754
Polymer 0405
Radiation 0605
Mathematics 0986
Physics 0606
General 0608
Acoustics 0748
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0607
Atmospheric Science 0798
Atomic 0759
Electronics and Electricity 0609
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0610
Fluid and Plasma 0712
Molecular 0756
Nuclear 0611
Optics 0463
Radiation 0346
Solid State 0984
Statistics 0984
Applied Sciences 0984
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0765
Petroleum 0554
Sanitary and Municipal 0790
System Science 0428
Geotechnical 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

Thesis Acceptance Form

M.A.CANDIDATE

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis**

**"Developing a Measure of Supervisor Support"
submitted by Jane Bhar, BCOMM.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies**

Thesis Supervisor)

Director, Department of Business

**Carleton University
September 21, 1995**

ABSTRACT

This research involves the development of a behaviour-based measure of supervisor support. The main objectives of this research were twofold: (1) to identify the behaviours which public sector employees perceive typify supportive and non-supportive managers, and (2) to determine if gender, job type or parental status affects this perception.

According to the results, a supportive supervisor is one who: facilitates the completion of job tasks, engages in two-way communication with subordinates, mentors his/her employees, allows employees autonomy, recognizes that employees have a life outside work, provides positive feedback, and treats employees with respect. On the other hand, a non-supportive manager is one who: behaves inconsistently, is a poor interpersonal communicator, does not show respect for employees, focuses on hours of work, rather than output, and expects work to be given priority over non-work.

According to the measure developed in this study, employees who rated their managers as supportive are experiencing significantly higher levels of job satisfaction, lower levels of job stress, higher levels of organizational commitment, and lower levels of role overload and work to family interference than are employees who rated their manager as non-supportive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.0 THE WORK AND FAMILY LITERATURE	4
1.1 DEFINITIONS	5
1.2 MEASUREMENT	5
1.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORS	6
1.3.1 <u>Work Outcomes</u>	6
Absenteeism	7
Policy vs Managerial Discretion	8
Job Satisfaction	9
1.3.2 <u>Individual Outcomes</u>	9
Physical and Mental Well-Being	9
1.3.3 <u>Gender Differences</u>	11
2.0 THE SOCIAL SUPPORT LITERATURE	12
2.1 DEFINITIONS	12
2.2 MEASUREMENT	13
2.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORS	15
2.3.1 <u>Work Outcomes</u>	15
2.3.2 <u>Individual Outcomes</u>	16
Task vs Relationship-Oriented Individuals	16
Stress and Strain	17
Role Conflict	18
2.3.3 <u>Supervisor-Subordinate Communications</u>	18
2.3.4 <u>Gender Differences</u>	19
3.0 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	20
3.1 CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP	21
3.2 INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION	22
3.3 INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION	24
3.4 MEASUREMENT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT	24
3.5 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	26
3.6 SUPERVISOR SUPPORT AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	27

4.0 THEORY Z	28
4.1 APPLICABILITY OF THEORY Z TO THIS RESEARCH	30
5.0 SHORTCOMINGS OF THE AVAILABLE RESEARCH	31
CHAPTER TWO: METHODS	34
1.0 THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH	35
1.1 ASSUMPTIONS	37
1.2 CRITICISMS OF THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH	39
1.3 A COMPARISON OF THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH TO MORE TRADITIONAL METHODS OF MEASURE DEVELOPMENT	42
2.0 PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS	44
2.1 PHASE I: THE INTERVIEW	44
2.1.1 <u>Procedures</u>	44
2.1.2 <u>Analysis of Phase I Data</u>	46
2.2 PHASE II: CONSENSUS	47
2.2.1 <u>Procedures</u>	47
2.2.2 <u>Analysis of Phase II Data</u>	49
2.2.2.1 <u>Calculation of Group Differences</u>	49
2.2.2.2 <u>Determination of Consensus</u>	50
2.2.2.3 <u>Classification of Behaviours into Themes</u>	51
2.3 PHASE III - ASSESSMENT	51
2.3.1 Procedures	52
Job Satisfaction	52
Job Stress	53
Organizational Commitment	53
Role Overload	54
Work to Family Interference	54
Perceived Stress	55
2.3.2 ANALYSIS OF PHASE III DATA	55
2.3.2.1 <u>Assessment of Support</u>	56
2.3.2.2 <u>Reliability</u>	57
2.3.2.3 <u>Validity</u>	57
Content Validity	58
Construct Validity	58
A. Convergent Validity	58
B. Criterion-Related Validity	59

3.0 THE SAMPLES	59
3.1 PHASE I SAMPLES	59
3.2 PHASE II SAMPLES	60
3.2.1 <u>Department A Sample</u>	60
3.2.2 <u>The Department B Sample</u>	61
3.2.3 <u>Comparison of Phase II Samples</u>	63
3.3 PHASE III SAMPLE - The Pilot Study	63
 CHAPTER THREE: SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS	 66
1.0 BEHAVIOURS OF SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS	66
1.1 SUPPORTIVE THEMES	70
1.2 GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF A SUPPORTIVE MANAGER	76
1.2.1 <u>Relative Levels of Agreement with Behaviours</u>	76
1.2.2 <u>Significant Gender Differences</u>	76
1.2.3 <u>Comparison of Top Five Supportive Behaviours by Gender</u> ..	79
1.3 JOB-TYPE DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF SUPPORT ..	79
1.4 PARENTAL STATUS DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF SUPPORT	81
1.5 IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS ...	82
 CHAPTER FOUR: BEHAVIOURS OF NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS	 84
1.0 BEHAVIOURS OF NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS	84
1.1 NON-SUPPORTIVE THEMES	88
1.2 SIGNIFICANT GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF A NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGER	93
1.2.1 <u>Relative Level of Agreement with Behaviours</u>	94
1.2.2 <u>Significant Gender Differences</u>	94
1.3 JOB TYPE DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF NON- SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS	96
1.4 PARENTAL STATUS DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF NON-SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS	96
1.5 IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL NON-SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS	97

CHAPTER FIVE: RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE MEASURE . .	99
1.0 VALIDITY OF THE MEASURE	99
1.1 <u>Impact of Having a Supportive Supervisor on the Work</u> <u>Environment</u>	102
1.2 <u>Impact of Having a Supportive Manager on the Non-Work</u> <u>Environment</u>	103
2.0 RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURE	105
CONCLUSIONS	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Phase II Respondents (Department A)	61
Table 2: Phase II Respondents (Department B)	62
Table 3: Phase III Respondents (Department B)	64
Table 4: Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department A) . .	68
Table 5: Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department B) . .	69
Table 6: Supportive Behaviours By Theme and Gender (Department A)	71
Table 7: Supportive Behaviours By Theme and Gender (Department B)	72
Table 8: Behaviours with Significant Gender Differences	77
Table 9: Behaviours with Significant Job-Type Differences	81
Table 10: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department A)	86
Table 11: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department B)	87
Table 12: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked by Theme and Gender (Department A)	91
Table 13: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked by Theme (Department B)	92
Table 14: Behaviours with Significant Gender Differences	95
Table 15: Behaviours with Significant Parental Status Differences	97
Table 16: Individual Outcomes by Supportiveness Rating	102
Table 17: Cronbach Alphas	105

TABLE OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Summary Chart of Empirical Research	114
APPENDIX B: Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support	117
APPENDIX C: Jones-Johnson and Johnson's Supervisor Support Scale	118
APPENDIX D: Contents of Communication Measure	119
APPENDIX E: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire	121
APPENDIX F: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	122
APPENDIX G: Standard Management Assessment Instrument	123
APPENDIX H: Phase II Cover Letter	124
APPENDIX I: Department A Phase II Questionnaire	125
APPENDIX J: Department B Phase II Questionnaire	135
APPENDIX K: Department B Phase III Questionnaire	144
APPENDIX L: Measures of Individual and Organizational Outcomes	159
APPENDIX M: Phase II Demographics (Department A)	161
APPENDIX N: Phase II Demographics (Department B)	164
APPENDIX O: Phase III Demographics (Department B)	166
APPENDIX P: Reliabilities and Intercorrelations	170

INTRODUCTION

According to the literature, the supervisor is in a truly significant position in the organization with respect to influence on his/her subordinates. Galinsky, Ruopp and Blum (1983), for example, identified problems with supervisors as having a more negative effect on work life than any other work condition. Hughes and Galinsky (1988) claim that employees want improved supervisory relations to help them balance work and family responsibilities while other researchers suggest that 'supervisor support' is negatively related to stress (Jones-Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Himle, Jayaratne & Thyness, 1989; Jayaratne, Tripodi & Chess, 1983; Ford & Bagot, 1978).

The main objectives of this research were to:

- (1) identify the behaviours which public sector employees perceive typify supportive and non-supportive managers;
- (2) determine if gender affects this perception;
- (3) determine if job type affects this perception;
- (4) determine if parental status affects this perception; and
- (5) develop a behaviourally based measure of supervisor support.

There are two theories which together propose that supportive supervisor-subordinate relationships may be associated with reduced stress levels for employees and increased productivity for organizations. A theory by Karasek (1979) postulates that by providing employees with increased control, stress may be minimized. Having a supportive supervisor could, therefore, reduce employee stress levels by increasing their perceptions of control. According to Theory Z, reducing stress levels, may, in

turn result in increased productivity. In other words, the theory would suggest that supportive supervisors may have significant benefits for both the organization and the individual employees.

An extensive review of the work in this area indicates, however, that there are problems with the way 'support' is currently measured and defined. The purpose of the current study was to develop a measure of supervisor support that would allow us to better understand this construct. This measure should also enable us to quantify the benefits of supervisor support and the drawbacks of non-support.

The act frequency approach was used in this study to develop a measure of supervisor support. This methodology allows us to identify supportive and non-supportive behaviours in supervisors as perceived by their subordinates. The act frequency approach involves three phases. In phase one, a sample of employees was asked which behaviours of their supervisors they considered to be supportive or not supportive of their personal situation. A preliminary list of supportive and non-supportive behaviours was constructed based on these interviews. During phase two, a questionnaire was developed to ask respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the behaviours in the preliminary list were, in fact, supportive or not supportive. Critical supportive and non-supportive behaviours were then identified to form the final Supportive Supervisor Measure. Finally, in phase three a questionnaire was developed to assess the predictive ability of the final Supportive Supervisor Measure and evaluate the utility of the measure with respect to its ability to discriminate between supportive and non-supportive managers.

The sample consisted of two Federal Government Departments (herein referred to as Department A and Department B). A total of fifty-four phase I interviews were conducted: twenty-five with Department A and twenty-nine with Department B. The phase II consensus questionnaire was administered to a random selection of 500 employees at Department A and 100 employees at Department B. Response rates of 59.4% and 79.0% were achieved in Department A and B respectively. Only Department B participated in the phase III assessment questionnaire. A total of 242 useable questionnaires were returned, constituting a response rate of 38.7%.

This thesis begins with a review of published research on supervisor support. Shortcomings of the research will also be identified in the first chapter. The second chapter will outline the methodology used in the study. The analysis and procedures will be described and a detailed description of the participating samples will be provided. The third chapter of the thesis outlines the results of each phase of the study while chapter four provides a discussion of the findings. The fifth chapter will address the reliability and validity of the proposed measure. The thesis concludes with a discussion of the limitations of this research and relevant conclusions.

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to gain a better understanding of the research that has been done on supervisor support a thorough review of four relevant bodies of literature (the work and family literature, the social support literature, the transformational leadership literature and the literature on Theory Z management) was conducted. Empirical research which has relevance to this research is summarized below. This chapter also identifies how previous researchers have measured supervisor support, summarizes important findings, and identifies methodological shortcomings of the other studies.

1.0 THE WORK AND FAMILY LITERATURE

With the changing demographics of the workplace comes new challenges and struggles. Balancing the responsibilities of work and family is a heavy burden for dual income families. A number of researchers (Goff, Mount & Jamison, 1990; Hughes & Galinsky, 1988; and, Galinsky, 1986) have recently identified supervisor support as being important in facilitating the balancing of these conflicting demands. When Hughes and Galinsky (1988) asked individuals to shed light on what would improve the quality of family life while maintaining or improving productivity, improving supervisory relations was the second most common response given. The study concluded that:

"there have been few, if any, work place initiatives or training programs designed to make managers more aware of the work and family problems of employees. Clearly this is a very pressing need" (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988,

p46).

1.1 DEFINITIONS

There appear to be many definitions of supervisor support in the work and family literature. According to Hughes and Galinsky (1988) supervisor sensitivity (a related if not identical construct) is:

"the extent to which the respondent perceived his/her supervisor to be supportive of the employee in the work role as well as flexible and understanding about the employee's family role" (p.18).

Galinsky and Stein (1990) contend that supervisory work/family support occurs when supervisors exhibit the following four characteristics: they feel that handling family issues, especially as they affect job performance, is a legitimate part of the role; they are knowledgeable about company policies that apply to family issues; they exhibit flexibility when work/family problems arise; and, they are fair and do not display favouritism when handling employees' work/family problems (Galinsky & Stein, 1990). Finally, Goff et al. (1990) define supervisor support as the degree to which supervisors are willing to discuss family-related problems and be flexible when emergencies arise.

1.2 MEASUREMENT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

There are few scales in the work and family literature that measure supervisor support. A summary of the empirical research in this area including information on sampling, reliability and instruments is given in Appendix A.

Goff et al.(1990) used a six item scale to measure supervisor support. The

questions asked parents to indicate the degree to which supervisors are willing to discuss family-related problems and be flexible when emergencies arise (Goff et al., 1990).

Hughes and Galinsky (1988) developed a three item measure of supervisor sensitivity. These three items use a four point scale to assess a supervisor's flexibility with regards to the demands of the work role and the family role of the subordinate (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988).

1.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORS

Relatively little empirical research has been done in this area. The concept of supervisor support being a crucial ingredient in the successful balancing of work and family responsibilities is relatively recent. The majority of the research in this area was conducted by Ellen Galinsky and her colleagues in the late 1980's. Key findings from these studies are summarized below. The findings are discussed in the following order: those relating to work outcomes, those relating to individual outcomes such as mental health and well-being, and those which deal with gender differences.

1.3.1 Work Outcomes

The empirical findings relating to the effects of supervisor support on work outcomes have focused on employee absenteeism and the debate about whether employees with problems in dealing with work/family conflict should be assisted at the discretion of the supervisor or whether supportive programs should be made

company-wide policy.

Absenteeism: The relationship between supervisor support and absenteeism appears to be complex. Goff et al. (1990) found that, contrary to what they hypothesized, supervisor support was associated with higher rather than lower, levels of absenteeism. They explained that if employees perceive no threat of sanction from their supervisor, they may choose to miss work more often. Therefore, while increased empathy and flexibility on the part of the supervisor, aimed at accommodating a subordinate's dual role pressures may serve to reduce work/family conflict, it may also result in increased absenteeism (Goff et al., 1990).

Goff et al. (1990) also found supervisor support to be indirectly related to decreased absenteeism. The lower levels of work/family conflict experienced by employees was directly related to decreased absenteeism. Increased supervisor support was found to be associated with less work/family conflict which in turn was related to reduced absenteeism. Therefore, indirectly, increased supervisor support may lead to reduced absenteeism. They suggested that increased employee effort, commitment, loyalty, and motivation may follow as a result of supervisor support. This increased dedication on the part of the employee may result in improved attendance (Goff et al., 1990). These suppositions were not, however, empirically validated.

A study by Wiley and Eskilson (1988) found that many working parents hesitate in citing family responsibilities as the cause for a work absence or poor performance fearing that their bosses would not accept family responsibilities as an

adequate explanation. According to Hall and Richter (1988), this fear may not be unfounded since ten to fifteen years ago many senior executives felt that any conflict between an individual's private and professional lives was solely that person's responsibility. The work by Wiley and Eskilson (1988) suggests that attitudes may be changing, however, since many of the supervisors in the study indicated that they might find this a reasonable explanation for work absence. Wiley and Eskilson did not, however, indicate to what extent supervisor's behavior was influenced by their stated attitude.

Policy vs Managerial Discretion: Many companies choose not to institute formal programs or policies to facilitate employees' ability to cope with work/family problems, but rather prefer to allow supervisors discretion in handling them (Hughes, Galinsky & David, 1990). Work by Hughes and Galinsky (1988) suggests that this approach may be ineffective since research has demonstrated that work/family policies are ineffectual if supervisors do not support them. The possibility exists that these policies may serve to discourage support for the employee's dual role unless an effort is made to educate supervisors and to maintain a "family-friendly" environment (Hughes et al, 1990).

These results have implications for human resource activities such as selection and training of supervisory personnel (Goff et al., 1990). Research conducted by Galinsky, Hughes and David (1990) revealed that supervisors may or may not be aware of the work/family programs or practices that exist in the company or may use

them inequitably. Allowing the supervisor the discretion to resolve employees' work/family problems as he/she sees fit, permits supervisors to show favouritism by acting as gate keepers allowing or prohibiting usage of benefits from day to day (Galinsky et al., 1983).

Galinsky (1988) found that some supervisors are more flexible with a "favourite" employee or an employee with a higher position or status. This can create an advantage for some employees within an organization.

"Just as there is a gap between the have and have not companies, there can also be a gap between the have and have not employees within the company" (Galinsky et al., 1990, p.89).

Job Satisfaction: While the relationship between supervisor support and job satisfaction has not been directly investigated in great detail, Galinsky et al. (1983) found that those employees who reported having non-supportive supervisors were more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs.

1.3.2 Individual Outcomes

The empirical findings relating to individual outcomes have focused on issues of physical and mental well-being.

Physical and Mental Well-Being: Research indicates that having a supervisor who is supportive of work/family issues is linked to better mental and physical health outcomes (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988; Galinsky, 1988).

A number of studies suggest that the presence of a supportive supervisor is

negatively associated with the stress levels experienced by employees caught in the struggle of balancing work and family responsibilities (Goff et al., 1990; Love, Galinsky & Hughes, 1987; House, 1981; Galinsky et al., 1983; Fernandez, 1985). Goff et al., (1990), for example, found that supervisor support was an important work environment variable related to work/family conflict. Hughes and Galinsky (1988) found that supervisor sensitivity was one of only two job related variables that was individually significant in predicting stress. A sensitive supervisor was predictive of lower stress levels in subordinates.

Although little research has been done comparing the effects of supervisor support at different organizational levels, Galinsky et al. (1983) recognized the significance of it. Their findings show that supervisor relations can be one of the most powerful sources of workplace stress for white collar workers.

While a supportive supervisor can help alleviate stress related to work and family conflict, a study by House (1981) found, more generally, that a non-supportive supervisor is related to poor outcomes in individual physical health and well-being (Galinsky et al., 1983). Similarly, Repetti (1985) found that a non-supportive supervisor was strongly predictive of levels of anxiety and depression. Finally, a survey of 5000 employees by Fernandez (1985) found a significant relationship between stress at home and at work when the boss was not supportive of the employee's child care needs (Hughes & Galinsky, 1988).

Supervisory work/family support is also linked to employees' perceptions that they can balance work/family problems. The National Council of Jewish Women's

Study (1988) surveyed almost 2,000 employed women before and after childbirth in 80 communities and found that in relation to its effect on stress, having a supportive supervisor was roughly equivalent to having a supportive spouse (Galinsky & Stein, 1990).

1.3.3 Gender Differences

The literature indicates that supervisor support has implications for stress levels and coping ability for both males and females.

"For both men and women, having a supervisor who was insensitive to work and family roles was most predictive of stress and, for men only, was associated with more frequent psychosomatic symptoms and greater work-family interference." (Hughes and Galinsky, 1988, p 30)

In this same study, supervisor sensitivity was found to be one of the most powerful predictors of work-family interference for working fathers (Hughes and Galinsky, 1988).

The Decision-Maker study conducted by Galinsky et al. (1983) found that men discuss work and family problems with their managers more frequently than women. Whether this difference is due to different reactions from managers depending on whether the issue was raised by a male or female has yet to be researched. While the men who took part in this study denied any differences in their reactions to work and family problems coming from women rather than men, the women in the study admitted that they were more sympathetic to male than to female employees. One woman also commented that while she expected women to face these problems, she took it more seriously when a man faced them (Galinsky et al., 1983).

In a study by Wiley and Eskilson (1988), problems between work and family were viewed by both male and female participants as a more stable cause of absenteeism for women than for men. Wiley and Eskilson (1988) argue that this is due to the fact that it is typically the woman who is more responsible and responsive to family concerns. Women may be seen as less dependable in the work place as a result of their family responsibilities and may be overlooked by supervisors when promotion possibilities arise (Wiley & Eskilson, 1988). Wiley and Eskilson (1988) conclude that women may need different types of support from their supervisors than men.

2.0 THE SOCIAL SUPPORT LITERATURE

Cobb (1974) defines social support as:

"information leading the subject to believe that he[/she] is cared for and loved ... esteemed and valued ... and belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation." (Cobb, 1974, p.300)

While social support can come from various sources such as supervisors, co-workers, family and friends, the support originating from people in the workplace has been found to be the most important with regards to relieving work-related stress (House, 1981). The focus in this section of the review will be on the empirical examinations into the effects social support from one's supervisor has on employee and organizational outcomes.

2.1 DEFINITIONS OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

Through anecdotal reports, Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) suggested that

employees differentiate support from the organization as a whole from support from their immediate supervisor. So what characteristics of a supervisor are considered supportive? There is little consensus in this literature. Kirmeyer and Dougherty (1988) defined high-support supervisors as those who enhanced subordinate self-esteem by backing them up, giving them credit for difficult decisions and trade-offs they made, and avoided becoming overly critical of them. Himle et al. (1989) examined supervisor support based on the four different types of support developed by House (1981). Supports examined include: (1) emotional (i.e. "How true is it that your supervisor is warm and friendly when you have problems?"); (2) appraisal (i.e. "How true is it that your supervisor shows approval when you have done well?"); (3) instrumental (i.e. "How true is it that your supervisor helps you complete a difficult task?"), and; (4) informational (i.e. "How true is it that your supervisor gives information when you need it?") (Himle et al., 1989, p.23).

2.2 MEASUREMENT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

Three scales which attempt to identify the characteristics of a supportive supervisor have been developed by researchers in this field. Methodological information on these studies has been summarized in Appendix A. Other details which are relevant to this research are given below.

Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) developed a Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support that included sixteen items measuring different facets of what employees perceive supervisor support to be (please see Appendix B for list of items).

Jones-Johnson and Johnson developed a nine item scale measuring supervisor support (please see Appendix C for list of items).

The measure of supervisor support utilized by Kirmeyer and Dougherty (1988) was taken from the Work Environment Scale of Moos (1981) and consists of eight true/false items assessing the extent to which supervisors "really stand up for their people" and "tend to talk down to employees" (reverse scored).

Beehr, King and King (1990) developed two measures which defined social support from supervisors in terms of the contents of communication between the supervisor and their employees: the Affective Contents of Communications with Supervisors measure which assesses the affective contents of communication contains 12 statements describing possible conversation topics. Employees are asked to use a five point Likert scale to judge how often they talk about these subjects with their supervisors (see Appendix D for a listing of these statements).

The measure of Functional Supervisor Support was adapted from Caplan, Cobb and French (1975). It consists of four items, two representing emotional or esteem social support (defined by Beehr et al. (1990, p.66) as "support of a sociopsychological or purely interpersonal nature") and two items representing instrumental social support (defined by Beehr et al., (1990, p.66) as the "provision of tangible assistance or services or restructuring of the work environment"). As was the case with the affective measure, employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each statement using a five point Likert scale (see Appendix D for a listing of these statements).

The Affective Contents of Communications with Supervisors measure is a useful tool as it recognizes the importance of both the work and the non-work role of employees and because it is fairly detailed in scope (i.e. it has 12 items). However, it deals only with one aspect of support, namely communication. While the Functional Supervisor Support Measure recognizes the importance of two-way communication and flexibility to facilitate balancing work and family, it is limited in scope (i.e. it has only 4 items).

2.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORS

There has been more empirical research on supervisor support done in the social support literature than in the work and family literature. Relevant findings with respect to work outcomes, individual outcomes, supervisor/subordinate communication and gender differences are summarized below.

2.3.1 Work Outcomes

Virtually all of the empirical research on how social support from one's supervisor impacts work outcomes focuses on levels of subordinate's commitment to the organization.

A 1986 study by Eisenberger et al. (1986) suggested that employees' commitment to an organization is affected by their perception of the organization's (i.e. supervisors) commitment to them. Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) proposed that this type of commitment can be divided into two categories: a perception of a global,

organizational commitment to employees and a perception of support from supervisors. Their research found that while both aspects of organizational commitment are important, employees value supervisory feedback more than that received from the organization. (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988).

Levinson (1965) noted that employees tend to view actions by agents of the organization as actions of the organization itself. An employee, therefore, may see the supervisor as the personification of the organization. The implication of this finding is that greater supervisor support may be associated with greater organizational commitment.

2.3.2 Individual Outcomes

The empirical research relating social support from ones supervisor to individual outcomes have dealt with a variety of issues. The following section reviews literature which: (1) compares the benefits of supervisor support for task and relationship-oriented individuals, and (2) explores the relationship between supervisor support and psychological strain, role conflict and the employees' ability to cope.

Task vs Relationship-Oriented Individuals: Cummins (1990) examined the moderating effects of supervisory support on the relationship between job stress and job dissatisfaction. He found that the implications regarding the effects of supervisory support were different for individuals according to where they ranked on Fiedler's least preferred co-worker scale (LPC). The LPC asks subjects to evaluate the one person in

their experience "with whom they had the hardest time getting the job done" on an 18-item bipolar adjective scale. According to Rice (1978), people with low LPC scores highly value task success and evaluate themselves and others in terms of this criterion, while high LPC persons value interpersonal success and their attitudes are influenced by success in this domain. Cummins (1990) found that lack of support is stressful for relationship-oriented individuals (i.e. high LPC scores), whereas it is not associated with job stress or physical health symptoms for task-oriented individuals (i.e. low LPC scores).

Since supervisory support appears to be more important for those who value personal relationships, the value of establishing mentoring relationships may depend on a subordinate's values-orientation (i.e. task or relationship) (Cummins, 1990). According to Cummins (1990), mentoring relationships may only be an appropriate intervention for relationship-oriented individuals. This implies that task-oriented individuals may require different strategies for stress-reduction (Cummins, 1990).

Stress and Strain: Low levels of social support from supervisors have been found to be associated with depression and somatic complaints (Caplan et al., 1975; Himle et al., 1989), stress (Jones-Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Himle et al., 1989; Jayaratne et al., 1983; Ford & Bagot, 1978), and emotional distress manifested as feelings of frustration, irritation, and tension (Kirmeyer & Dougherty, 1988). House et al. (1980) found that supervisor support tended to reduce all forms of perceived work stress.

A study by Himle et al. (1989) suggests that the effect of instrumental and

informational support offered by supervisors may be reduced psychological strains which in turn lessens burnout and job dissatisfaction.

Role Conflict: Role conflict occurs when there is a simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one makes compliance with the other difficult. Bedeian, Armenakis, and Curran (1981) found that role ambiguity and role conflict have significant negative associations with supervisory support. Himle et al. (1989) identified emotional support and informational support as moderating anxiety related to role conflict and intent to turnover. Informational supervisory support was also found to moderate depression and irritation related to role conflict (Himle et al., 1989).

2.3.3 Supervisor-Subordinate Communications

While the importance of supervisor-subordinate communications in coping with levels of stress has been widely reported in the research literature (eg. Beehr, 1976; Kaufman & Beehr, 1986; LaRocco, House & French, 1980), until recently, no empirical research had been done which examined which types of communication between supervisor and employee are perceived by employees to be supportive. In 1990, Beehr and his colleagues conducted an exploratory study into the extent to which the contents of communications between supervisors and subordinates were linked to the perception of social support. Beehr et al (1990) observed three types of communication between supervisors and subordinates: positive job-related, negative

job-related and non-job-related communication. The results indicated that when subordinates perceive support from their supervisors, their communications are more likely to concern non-job-related or positive aspects of the job rather than negative ones (Beehr et al., 1990). While negative communications were not significantly related to perceptions of support from supervisors, they were not associated with perceptions of lack of support either. The functional supervisor support variable (outlined in Appendix D), on the other hand, had direct effects on employee strain as did the contents of communications between subordinates and supervisors (Beehr et al., 1990). These findings are consistent with other research studies in this area (e.g. Chisholm, Kasl & Mueller, 1986; Kaufman & Beehr, 1986; Osipow & Davis, 1988).

Beehr et al. (1990) also found that non-job-related communications between supervisor and employee moderated the relationship between the stressor and the strain, but lacked main effects. They hypothesized that this moderating effect could possibly be explained by a distraction strategy; that is a supervisor who talks about non-job-related topics with their subordinate may distract them from the stresses of work with a concomitant decrease in strain. Alternatively, they propose that these non-job-related communications enhance the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship.

2.3.4 Gender Differences

Jayaraine et al. (1983) found few differences between male and female social workers with respect to the relationship between emotional support by supervisors and

co-workers and work-related stress and strain. They maintain, however, that "sex should remain an important critical variable" (Jayaratne et al., 1983, p.26) because their data suggested that the effectiveness of different types of support depends on gender.

3.0 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Historically, managers relied on their legitimate power to persuade people to do as they were told. In other words, they operated under the principle of transactional leadership which is based on exchanges between manager and employees: the promise and reward for good performance, or threat and discipline for poor performance (Bass, 1978). Research would suggest, however, that an expanded view of motivation and leadership is needed in today's work environment:

"Subordinate motivation to work cannot be fully accounted for by any notion of a simple swap of desired material and psychic payments from a superior in exchange for satisfactory services rendered by the subordinate" (Bass, 1985, p.9).

The Ohio State Leadership Studies of the mid 1960's began to uncover dimensions of leadership that would lead to employees who were more satisfied with their jobs and more productive. They recognized that consideration (the extent to which the leader-subordinate relationship relies on mutual trust, respect, and sensitivity to subordinates' feelings) and initiating structure (the extent to which a leader defines and structures work with successful task accomplishment as the main goal) were fundamental components of leadership (Vecchio and Appelbaum, 1995).

Two decades later, Bass (1985) argued that an even broader view of leadership was needed. This type of leadership, which has been named transformational leadership, occurs when:

"leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group" (Bass, 1985, p.9).

In other words, transformational leadership is a combination of charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985). Literature on each of these constructs is reviewed below.

3.1 CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

Charismatic leaders have been described as having profound and extraordinary effects on their followers. They inspire unquestioned loyalty and devotion without regard to the followers' own self-interest. According to House (1977), charismatic leaders are highly motivated to influence their followers as a result of their confidence in their own abilities, their conviction in their own beliefs and their need for power. It is this confidence and conviction which inspires trust and loyalty in followers. The charismatic leader creates a vision which is related to strongly held values, beliefs and ideals shared by the organizational culture. By providing subordinates with more meaning for their work, charismatic leaders arouse enthusiasm, excitement, emotional involvement and commitment to group objectives (House, 1977).

Bass (1985) and his colleagues see charisma as the most general and important component of transformational leadership. Many followers of charismatic leaders

described their superior as someone who made everyone enthusiastic about work assignments, who inspired loyalty to the organization, who commanded respect from everyone, who had a special gift of seeing what was really important, and who had a sense of mission (Bass, 1985).

According to Zaleznik (1983), charisma is one of the elements that distinguishes leaders in organizational settings from managers. True leaders attract intense feelings of love (or hate) from subordinates and subordinates, in turn, want to identify with the leaders (Zaleznik, 1983). Yukl (1981) explains the scarcity of charismatic leaders in organizations as due to a lack of managers with the necessary skills. Berlew (1974), on the other hand, argues that being a conforming member in an organization is more important for most managers than risking standing out. How charisma combines with the other transformational characteristics of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation is what is important (Bass, 1985).

3.2 INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION

According to a survey of executives conducted by Bass (1985), transformational leaders tended to be friendly, informal, and treat employees as equals although they (the leaders) had more expertise. They gave advice, help and support and encouraged their subordinates' self-development. Similar to the non-job related communication concept noted by Beehr (1990), this consideration for others has emerged as a consistently important aspect of leader-subordinate relations.

Individualized consideration takes the form of mentoring and individuation by

the leader. A mentor is a trusted counsellor who accepts a guiding role in the development of a junior or less experienced member of the organization (Bass, 1985). The mentors use their greater knowledge, experience and status to help develop their junior executives. It is believed that mentoring increases the follower's self-esteem and fulfils some of his/her 'need to know' (Bass, 1985). Mentoring has become more popular in business, government and industry as employees and organizations become more interested in the career development of their individual employees. Johnson (1980) conducted a follow-up of 122 recently promoted employees and found that two-thirds had mentors.

Individuation implies one-to-one contact and two-way communication (Bass, 1985). This contact is:

"expected to enhance the follower's self-image, desire for information, fulfilment of needs that are very special or unique to that follower, and the follower's sense of some 'ownership' of decisions of consequence to him [or her]" (Bass, 1985, p.97).

Transformational leaders need, however, to balance out their attention to their various subordinates so as not to provide too much attention to one group and not enough to another, effectively creating an in-group and an out-group within the larger group of subordinates (Bass, 1985).

Finally, the transformational leader shows individualized consideration by acting as a role model. Margerison (1980) found that many executives attribute their own successful development as managers to past managers from whom much could be learnt.

3.3 INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION

Faced with ill-defined problems, it is a leader's level of competence and orientation which determine his/her ability to solve problems and to help subordinates solve problems (Bass, 1985). The transformational leader creates new symbols and images to establish new values, beliefs and associations key to his/her vision. These new symbols are an important component in intellectual stimulation for the followers. They help to vocalize, propagate and invoke new ideas and beliefs as well as to attach emotional value to them (Bass, 1985).

The importance of intellectual stimulation for the follower is that it is expected to lead to easier comprehension (via the creation of symbols and images), and enhance role clarity and acceptance. These in turn, are expected to lead to extra effort and enhanced performance on the part of the employee (Bass, 1985).

3.4 MEASUREMENT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

The Ohio State Leadership studies used the 'Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire' (LBDQ) developed by Stogdill (1974). The aim of the LBDQ is to obtain descriptions of leadership behaviour from followers. It covers 12 aspects of leadership behaviour, three are related to supervisor support: initiating structure (clearly defines his or her own role, and lets followers know what is expected of them), tolerance of freedom (allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action) and consideration (has regard for the comfort, well-being and contribution of his or her

followers). The relevant items in this measure are given in Appendix E.

Empirical research has uncovered three factors which are characteristic of transformational leadership by using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass (1985). They are charismatic leadership, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. The charismatic leadership factor is comprised of 18 items, the individualized consideration factor of 7 items and the intellectual stimulation factor of 3 items. Measures of these factors are shown in Appendix F. All items in these measures are descriptive statements about supervisors. Respondents are asked to judge how frequently the supervisor displays the described behaviour. The five possible responses are: frequently, if not always; fairly often; sometimes; once in a while; and, not at all.

The supervisory behaviour description questionnaire developed by Fleishman (1953) is a standard manager-assessment instrument (see Appendix G). As with the above-mentioned scales, this instrument is designed to measure individuals' leadership behaviour through descriptions from those whom they supervise.

While the LBDQ and the MLQ are comprehensive measures, certain items tend to involve attitude statements or be imprecise. Moreover, as the focus of these measures is not on supervisor support, they tend not to address all aspects of this construct. The standard management assessment instrument is also limited as it narrowly defines support as being work-related and ignores other dimensions of support.

3.5 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Ohio State Leadership studies found that managerial consideration was associated with lower rates of employees filing grievances and turnover and higher levels of employee satisfaction with supervisors (Vecchio and Appelbaum, 1995).

More recent research results suggest that there are many factors relating to characteristics of the supervisor, subordinate and the task which can affect the relationship between leadership style of managers and reactions of subordinates. A subordinate's expertise, experience, competence, knowledge of the job, job level and expectations concerning the manager can all moderate the relationship between leadership behaviour and employee satisfaction and performance (Vecchio and Appelbaum, 1995).

A supervisor's influence and similarity of attitude and behaviour with higher management can also affect this relationship. Similarly, characteristics of the task can also impact on the relationship between leader style and employee satisfaction and performance. Time urgency, physical danger, external stress, autonomy, job scope, ambiguity, importance of task, meaningfulness of task and tolerable error rate were all found to impact this relationship (Vecchio and Appelbaum, 1995).

Bernard Bass and his associates have developed a theoretical model which explains how organizations can benefit from transformational leadership. They postulate that the transformational leader enhances the follower's confidence through individualized attention and intellectual stimulation which, in turn, increases the value of the output to the follower. This increase in value to the follower is, in turn,

believed to lead to improved performance by the individual which then contributes to better results for the organization (Bass, 1985).

While the theoretical links between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes are well developed, the amount of empirical research in the area of transformational leadership is limited. Bass and his colleagues (Avolio & Bass, 1987; Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, Goodheim, 1987; Waldman, Bass & Stein, 1987) have gathered research results using the MLQ which have supported the basic propositions of their model. Bass (1985) found transformational leadership to be positively correlated with how effective the leader is perceived by subordinates, how much effort subordinates say they will expend for the leader, how satisfied the subordinates are with the leaders, and how well subordinates performed as rated by the leader (Bass, 1985).

Hater and Bass (1988) used the MLQ to compare differences in top performing and ordinary managers. They reported that top performing managers were significantly higher than the ordinary managers on charismatic leadership and individualized consideration (Hater & Bass, 1988).

3.6 SUPERVISOR SUPPORT AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The transformational leadership literature provides still more evidence that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is essential within an organization. It is expected that with the transformational process comes employees who are more motivated, more competent and more productive. The transformational leader's encouragement supports

and empowers his/her subordinates by delegating a great deal to them. Of crucial importance at this stage is paying attention to the needs and concerns of these employees and treating them as individuals (Bass, 1985). While the transformational leader has a vision for the organization, so do most employees. For a leader to be supportive, he/she must incorporate the divergent visions of organizational members into a shared organizational vision. With this accomplished, employees and organizations can flourish.

According to Burns (1978), the transformational process usually leads to upgraded needs of subordinates. As a result, they take on increased responsibility and become more self-directing and self-regulating. By allowing employees to self-regulate, the supervisor is handing control over to the employee which will result in higher self esteem and satisfaction for the employee. These conceptualizations are in line with what we know about supervisor support from the other two bodies of literature. At the heart of the issue are supervisors that are genuinely concerned for the development and well-being of their subordinates. What is needed is further research into defining what makes supervisors supportive and what is the most effective way of training them to adopt these characteristics so its occurrence can be more widespread.

4.0 THEORY Z

To explain the successes of American companies such as Hewlett-Packard, Dayton-Hudson and Rockwell International, William G. Ouchi (1981) developed a theory prescribing how companies should motivate employees to increase their

productivity. Ouchi (1981) theorized that these companies were thriving because they had developed company cultures similar to the ones found in Japanese firms. He labelled this culture as "Theory Z."

The basic premise of Theory Z is that involved workers are the key to increased productivity (Ouchi, 1981). The central characteristics of the Theory Z culture are: long-term employment, decision making by consensus, individual responsibility, slow promotion based on loyalty, an informal but explicit control system, career paths that are not highly specialized, and supervisory concern that extends to all aspects of a worker's life including the family. This last characteristic is very relevant to the concept of supervisor support.

While North America is lacking the highly homogeneous culture found in Japan which facilitates the development of close-knit organizational cultures, certain companies have studied the Japanese approach and adopted the North American equivalent. Management can instill corporate philosophy within the organization that creates the same effect as the industrial clan (defined as "a planned corporate group that functions to regulate its employees' social relations within and beyond economic considerations") (Sullivan, 1983, p.134). These environments, along with the appropriate incentives, foster worker involvement in close, cooperative relationships with other workers, managers and within groups. These close relationships act to enhance trust within the organization. Trust leads to employee satisfaction and a sense of autonomy. Theory Z predicts that

"happy, communal workers will be self-disciplined workers. The result will be increased productivity in comparison with non-Theory Z firms" (Sullivan, 1983,

p.134)

4.1 APPLICABILITY OF THEORY Z TO THIS RESEARCH

While the results of Theory Z have yet to be empirically supported, the literature suggests that an employee-supportive company philosophy may have positive effects on employees. A corporate culture that shows concern for the employee and places responsibility in their hands may increase feelings of autonomy and satisfaction (Ouchi, 1981). Research by Karasek (1979) suggests that employees who perceived more control over their jobs may experience less stress.

A Theory Z culture sees a worker's life as composed of work and non-work related activities, suggesting that support should be given to both these areas (Ouchi, 1981). For an organization to be supportive, the lines of communication between supervisors and subordinates should be open in order for each party to be aware of the concerns of the other. When a supervisor is interested in the concerns of his/her subordinates, the subordinate feels cared for and his/her self esteem is enhanced. Theory Z suggests that a supportive corporate philosophy not only increases productivity and profitability, but also self-esteem. Self esteem, is, in turn believed to be related to one's ability to cope effectively which, in turn, may result in decreased stress levels.

Aside from the data Ouchi collected to develop Theory Z, no specific empirical research program has provided evidence that the adoption of Theory Z will increase productivity. There is, however, strong theoretical support for the theory (Durkheim, 1933; Gouldner, 1959).

5.0 SHORTCOMINGS OF THE AVAILABLE RESEARCH

The few empirical studies on supervisor support are limited with respect to scope, definition of constructs, and detail. In the majority of studies, the term supervisor support is not defined. Those researchers who do define "support" do so in a restricted sense (i.e. usually define support as being work-related and ignore other dimensions of support).

Most of the available measures of supervisor support come from the social support and work and family literature. Measures from the social support literature are of limited use as they are based on attitudes not behaviours. Measures from the work and family literature, on the other hand, do not completely measure the construct.

Research on transformational leadership is still in the early stages. Of the little research that has been done in this area, most of it involves the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and/or has been descriptive and qualitative and as such tends to be too imprecise to make firm conclusions about the nature of transformational leadership behaviour. According to Yukl and Van Fleet (1990),

"the limitations of the questionnaire and the likelihood of attributional errors even in studies with an independent criterion make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions" (p 176)

Furthermore, while the theory of transformational leadership has provided many valuable insights into what an effective leader should do, it fails to address how the leader should do it. For example, central to the concept of transformational leadership is the creation of a vision that will appeal to followers. How would a leader do this?

Similarly, how do leaders obtain the commitment of followers to a new vision, especially in a large organization where there are competing visions? Research needs to be directed at the implementation of these transformational ideas.

A similar criticism can be rendered on the research into the applicability of Theory Z. Aside from the data Ouchi collected to develop his theory, no specific empirical research program has provided evidence that the adoption of Theory Z will increase productivity. In an excellent critique of Theory Z, Sullivan (1983) indicates that while Theory Z is an excellent prescriptive theory (i.e. it suggests how employees ought to be motivated to increase their productivity) with strong intuitive appeal, there are flaws with many of the theory's basic assumptions. Other critiques of the basic premises behind Theory Z can be found in Sullivan and Kameda (1982), Pucik (1981), Clark (1979) and Hatvany & Pucik (1981).

Another shortcoming in the entire body of literature in this area relates to the relationship between support from supervisors and differences in gender, job type and parental status. Are perceptions of what makes a supervisor supportive different for men and women? Do employees with different job characteristics and levels want different kinds of support from their supervisors? Does a worker's lifecycle stage affect their conception of supervisor support? These questions have not been addressed in the literature and cannot be examined with the instruments currently available.

Finally, the relationship between supervisor support and various outcomes that affect the organization and the subordinate have not received much attention. For

instance, the relationship between supervisor support and absenteeism is still unclear. Job dissatisfaction has been associated with having a non-supportive supervisor, but the reasons why have yet to be addressed. A new, more comprehensive measure such as the one developed in this thesis should facilitate this type of research.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

This study used the "act frequency" approach to develop a behaviourally based measure of supervisor support which can be used for selection and promotion of supervisors, sensitivity training, and performance evaluation.

The act frequency approach was developed in the early 1980's by Buss and Craik (1980, 1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c). The methodology was touted as being a new, widely applicable way of studying personality. The act frequency procedure involves two main steps: 'act nominations' and 'prototypicality ratings'. 'Act nominations' involve subjects nominating behaviours they believe are representative of a given disposition. The goal is to create a preliminary list of behaviours that is as exhaustive as possible. Once the preliminary list is complete, all redundancies, non-act statements, frequency statements, and vague statements are eliminated (Buss & Craik, 1983). The second step involves a panel of judges rating each of the behaviours on the revised list for prototypicality (the degree to which they believe a given behaviour is typical of the disposition in question) on a 7-point scale. These ratings are analyzed for each behaviour for consensus or near-consensus.

This chapter will include a description of the act frequency approach including an analysis of the key criticisms brought forth against it and a comparison with more traditional methods. A description of the application of act frequency procedures and the analysis performed in the current study will also be outlined.

1.0 THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH

Dispositional concepts are central to virtually all approaches to the analysis of personality. A dispositional attribution functions to summarize the trends of someone's behaviours, thoughts and feelings. While there are three basic perspectives from which dispositional concepts have been viewed, the act frequency approach views dispositions as

"summary statements about behaviour up to the present; they are not predictions, although they carry normal implications that the individual's character is so far continuing the same" (Buss & Craik, 1983a, p244).

The focus is on specifying the frequency of acts within determined categories over a given period of time.

Block (1989) provides an example that nicely illustrates what the act frequency approach is proposing. He proposes that a statement such as "Mary is dominant" implies that over a specified period of time, Mary has displayed many dominant acts and is expected to exhibit more in the future.

Multiple act criteria are replacing single-act validation criteria as fundamental measures of an individual's dispositions (Buss & Craik, 1980, 1981, 1983a; Jaccard, 1974). The act frequency approach asserts that, for a given disposition (for example, 'dominance'), a composite multiple-act index (for example, a list of behaviours nominated as being 'dominant') constitutes an appropriate basis for estimating future multiple-act indices (Buss & Craik, 1983a).

Act frequency dispositions are summaries of behaviour that help to predict future behaviour. They are viewed as being neither causal nor explanatory (Buss &

Craik, 1983a). To say that someone is dominant because he/she displayed a number of dominant acts is different from saying that someone performed a specific dominant act *because* that person is dominant.

"Trends in dispositional manifestations must instead be explained on independent grounds, and not with recourse to the disposition itself" (Buss & Craik, 1983a, p.245).

Two significant properties of dispositional categories are: (i) dispositions are treated as 'fuzzy sets' in that category boundaries are not sharply defined and each category blends into related categories, and (ii) not all members within a given category possess equal status within it for as Buss and Craik (1985) observe,

"dispositional categories are composed of acts that differ in their within-category status from highly central or prototypical to progressively more peripheral."

As opposed to other personality scales, the act frequency approach provides an absolute metric because it entails a true zero when no acts within the dispositional category are manifested for the period of observations. An implication of ratio scales is that the magnitude of manifestation of a disposition can be established independent of relative comparisons. The only means available for gauging scales that lack an absolute zero is by comparing the position of one person to the relative position of another. A true zero also allows individuals to compare their scores on different dispositions as well as allowing analysis within samples or populations (Buss & Craik, 1980, 1981, 1983a).

1.1 ASSUMPTIONS

An analysis of the basic assumptions on which the act frequency approach rests will facilitate an understanding of a discussion of the criticisms of the method. In a comprehensive analysis of the act frequency approach, Dyke (1990) outlined the following as the five key assumptions of the method:

- 1) The domain sampling perspective: a subject's score on a sample of items from a domain of content is a good estimator of that individual's score on the universe of content.
- 2) Aggregating across items drawn from a domain provides a more stable target for prediction.
- 3) Dispositions can be measured by their behavioural manifestations.
- 4) Behavioural domains are natural cognitive categories with membership gradients.
- 5) Specific acts provide a better measure of a behavioural construct than do global evaluations (Dyke, 1990,p.82).

For each disposition (i.e. a single concept such as gregariousness) there is an unlimited number of traits that categorize the behaviour, thoughts and feelings that are characteristic manifestations of that disposition. Statistically speaking, the larger the sample, the greater its representation of the population. Similarly, the greater the number of sources providing the items, the less biased and the more representative the sample. The act frequency approach produces a list of acts provided from multiple sources that characterize a given disposition. Therefore, the domain sampling perspective assumption appears to be a reasonable one.

The second assumption has to do with multiple act indices versus single-act indices. This switch away from single acts to act trends is not unique to the act

frequency approach. It is commonly used in scale construction (Wiggins, 1973) and observer ratings (Block, 1981; Horowitz, Inouye & Siegelman, 1979). Other recent approaches that use multiple indices are in the domain of attitudes (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974), social behaviour (Jaccard, 1974), and affective behaviour (Epstein, 1979). Buss and Craik (1983a) compared single act by scale correlations with multiple act by scale correlations. They found that for the prototypical act composites, the correlations were greater for the composite in each case (Buss & Craik, 1983a). Therefore, it appears as though the second assumption is also a reasonable assumption.

The third assumption is that dispositions are simply the sum of their behavioural manifestations. According to Dyke (1990), although this assumption leads to a contentious debate amongst personality psychologists, it is not necessary to resolve when the method is used to measure behaviour as in the present study.

Another assumption of the act frequency approach is that behavioural domains are natural cognitive categories with internal structures (Dyke, 1990). As discussed above, two important characteristics of dispositional categories are that they are fuzzy sets and that elements vary in their degree of prototypicality. These are key properties of the internal structure of categories. This assumption deals with the idea of family resemblance brought forth by Wittgenstein (1953) and elaborated by Rosch and Mervis (1975). As cited in Dyke (1990), Rosch (1975) uses the category of bird to illustrate the idea of family resemblance. The use of the word 'bird' is understood by people within a culture to include robins, sparrows, herons and eagles and exclude cats and radishes. Similarly, there is consensus that penguins are more peripheral to the 'bird'

category whilst robins are fairly central (Rosch, 1975). Dyke (1990) argues that we learn to use categories such as dominance in a similar fashion by organizing it around the most prototypical examples.

The final central assumption of the act frequency approach is that specific acts provide a better measure of a behavioural construct than do global evaluations.

Specific acts are believed to encourage raters to think concretely and as such, are preferred to global evaluations. It is also preferable when dealing with measures of behaviour. According to Dyke (1990), "when the construct of interest is behaviour, a measure at the behavioural level of analysis is to be preferred" (p.84).

1.2 CRITICISMS OF THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH

The act frequency approach has been subject to extensive criticism by Block (1989) and Moser (1989). A great deal of their criticism is applicable only to the use of the method in measuring personality. Since the current study is an application of the act frequency approach to the measurement of behaviour, only the relevant criticisms in this area will be discussed. Many of the following criticisms are drawn from Dyke's 1990) in-depth analysis.

Block (1989) started his criticisms with the title of the approach. He claims, "the label, the act frequency approach, is a misnomer: The AFA does not study the 'acts' of people" (p.237). Instead of direct behavioural observation, the 'act' data is generated when "subjects retrospectively about the applicability to them of each of 100 positively phrased statements contained in a booklet" (Block, 1989, p.237). According

to Dyke (1990), while Block's observation is correct, it does not invalidate the use of the act frequency approach. Rather it only suggests that the act frequency approach is more similar to traditional approaches than Buss and Craik (1980) proposed.

Block (1989) detected a serious flaw with one of Buss and Craik's (1980) claims. Buss and Craik (1980) concluded that

"considerable agreement exists among members of each panel [of judges] regarding which acts are prototypically dominant" (p.383).

According to Block (1989),

"their conclusion was wrong because they did not recognize that the reproducibility of a set of average scores is always higher, and generally much higher than the coefficient found when the prototypicality ratings of each judge are correlated with the prototypicality ratings of every other judge, with the average of these correlations then being taken" (p.235).

When Block (1989) corrected this error, he found that there was little agreement among judges as to which 'act' statements were prototypically dominant.

As cited in Dyke (1990), Rosch (1975), in demonstrating the reliability of internal structures, did not require high reliability in the ratings of individual judges as necessary for category coherence. Reliability, however, is commonly enhanced through the use of mean ratings. According to Dyke (1990), the issue is the reliability of mean prototypicality ratings which she suggests is supported by enough evidence to act as reliable indicators of category structures.

Block (1989) questions the usefulness of indices composed of protoypical acts that are unusual or have multiple conditions. He argues that acts that are so specific and require multiple conditions to be met are technically useless. This problem is

more of a contentious issue when respondent's are being asked to rate the number of times they exhibited the given behaviour in a given period of time. In the present study, judges will be asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree that a given supervisory act is supportive or not supportive of their specific situations. Also, in the current study, acts will be constructed as simply as possible, limiting the number of conditions in each act as much as possible.

Another criticism Block (1989) has of the act frequency approach, as cited in Dyke (1990), relates to the lack of face validity of many of the act statements. More specifically, he objects to including in the measure acts that have low prototypicality (i.e. by definition these acts are a poor fit or are not members of the category at all). While Buss and Craik (1980) included all 100 acts nominated in their scales, conceptually the measure should include only those acts that demonstrate high prototypicality. In the current study, only the acts that receive a high level of consensus from judges will be included in the final measure. The inclusion of only the highly prototypical acts should contribute to face validity.

The final criticism of the act frequency approach which both Block (1989) and Dyke (1990) hold to be true relates to the ambitious nature of some of Buss and Craik's (1980) claims. For instance, they claim that the method provides ratio measurement by measuring a sample of content when clearly the entire universe of content would have to be measured to substantiate such claims. Buss and Craik (1980) also claim that their measure is not subject to normal validation. According to Dyke (1990),

"to claim that a measure stands alone, without validation in relation to other measures and constructs, is hubris" (p.97).

While Buss and Craik (1980) claim that the act frequency approach provides a new distinctive perspective, Block (1989) argues that their approach is not unlike traditional approaches to measurement. In order to highlight the contributions of the act frequency approach, the next section will compare it to traditional methods.

1.3 A COMPARISON OF THE ACT FREQUENCY APPROACH TO MORE TRADITIONAL METHODS OF MEASURE DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally, there are five steps in scale construction (Dyke, 1990):

- Step 1: Generating items.**
- Step 2: Editing of the pool of items.**
- Step 3: Judgement of adequacy of the items as measures of the construct.**
- Step 4: Summing of items to improve reliability and validity.**
- Step 5: Sequential revision process.**

While Block (1989) claims that the act frequency approach to item generation is equivalent to traditional methods, Dyke (1990) argues that they are not. She argues that while traditional methods offer little guidance in creating items, the act frequency approach adopts an empirical process for the creation of items resulting in an important contribution to item development.

The second step involves editing the pool of items created. While both

methods edit out redundancies, traditional methods edit out during selection while the act frequency approach edits by generating a large number of items and editing out redundancies. According to Dyke (1990), the act frequency approach is more likely to result in a more thorough sampling of the domain.

The third step involves judging the adequacy of the items as measures of the construct. While Block (1989) views the act frequency evaluation and traditional evaluation to be equivalent, Dyke (1990) does not. Traditional methods ask respondents to reply in terms of their own values, preferences or behaviours while the act frequency approach ask respondents to indicate the degree to which the acts reflect the behaviour of prototypical others. Dyke (1990) argues that in traditional methods, respondents are only reflecting on their behaviour thus introducing random variance. Therefore, the act frequency approach is less likely to be influenced by chance characteristics of the sample.

The fourth step and fifth steps are the summing of items and sequential revision respectively. The summing of items procedure is common to both traditional methods and the act frequency approach while sequential revision is unique to traditional approaches. This process involves an assessment of convergent and discriminant validity. As Dyke (1990) points out, although this process has not previously been part of the act frequency approach it is necessary to validate act indices in relation to other measures and constructs removing any advantage of traditional methods.

This comparison shows that while the act frequency approach and traditional

methods both go through the same steps in construction, when validation is performed, the act frequency approach has more to offer in terms of item generation, editing and judging adequacy of items.

2.0 PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS

This section outlines the procedures and analysis performed in each phase of the current study. Two Federal Government Departments participated.

Before outlining the procedures followed in this study, it is necessary to note that both Departments did not participate to the same degree. Both Departments completed the 'act nominations'(phase I) and 'prototypicality ratings'(phase II) stages prescribed under the act frequency methodology. Department B agreed to a third phase, a pilot test of the measure, which involved the verification of the measure resulting from phase II. This section will outline the procedures followed in both Departments.

2.1 PHASE I: THE INTERVIEW

The goal of phase I was to generate a comprehensive list of supportive and non-supportive behaviours. This section outlines the procedures followed and the analysis performed in the phase I interviews in both Departments.

2.1.1 Procedures

A few days prior to the commencement of the phase I interviews, each

Department transmitted e-mail messages to all of the potential respondents. The purpose of this message was to inform employees that the study was being done, provide them with a rationale for doing the study and outline their potential involvement. A result of this message was increased legitimacy for the study. The importance of this announcement became evident after Department A experienced technical difficulties in transmitting its message. The result was that most of the respondents had not read the message and, therefore, had no prior warning that they might be contacted. A consequence of this lack of information was interviews with respondents who were suspicious of the motives of the study, who had not given any prior thought to the topic and, therefore, had little to contribute. Ultimately, a shorter list of behaviours was generated in Department A (147 behaviours in Department A versus 280 in Department B).

The initial step in the study was to interview employees in each of the two Departments participating in the research. The purpose of the interviews was to identify management behaviours that employees perceived as being supportive or non-supportive of their individual situation. After explaining the purpose of the study and assuring the respondents of confidentiality, two questions were asked:

(1) What specific behaviours of your manager are not supportive of your personal situation? and

(2) What specific behaviours of your manager are supportive of your personal situation?

Respondents were asked in the interview to focus on specific behaviours and

not attitudes or general traits. Consequently, if someone responded with a phrase such as "My manager is thoughtful" I prompted for a specific example of thoughtful behaviour. Responses concerning other people were also discounted. For example, some individuals talked about incidents that happened to friends in other departments. We did not record these, preferring instead to stay with personally-experienced behaviours. The use of the word "personal" was used to encourage the person to talk about behaviours which supported them both at work and outside work.

The interviews were conducted over the telephone and lasted anywhere from five to twenty-five minutes with the average length around ten minutes.

2.1.2 Analysis of Phase I Data

Phase I of the study involves the compilation of supportive and non-supportive behaviours from the individual interviews. A complete set of behaviours was compiled and the list was then analyzed for redundancies. All redundancies, attitude statements and vague behaviours were discarded and some behaviours were re-phrased so that the behaviour was stated clearly and simply in a manner that captured the supportive or non-supportive behaviour described in the interviews.

The interviews with Department A generated 94 supportive and 53 non-supportive behaviours which were then reduced to 32 unique supportive and 13 unique non-supportive behaviours. Due to the relatively small number of behaviours generated in Department A, the list of supportive and non-supportive behaviours used in this Department was augmented with behaviours that were found to be important in

a similar unpublished study of private sector firms. A total of 13 behaviours were added to the Department A list of which 7 were non-supportive and 6 were supportive resulting in a total of 38 supportive and 20 non-supportive behaviours (see Appendix I). The interviews with Department B generated 190 supportive and 90 non-supportive behaviours which were reduced to 51 unique supportive and 35 unique non-supportive behaviours (see Appendix J). These lists of behaviours will be referred to throughout the rest of the text as the "Initial Supportive Supervisor Scale."

2.2 PHASE II: CONSENSUS

The next step involved the development of the phase II survey instrument that incorporated the supportive/non-supportive behaviours identified in the interviews in phase I. The next section outlines the procedures followed and the analysis performed in phase II.

2.2.1 Procedures

Each item in the Initial Supportive Supervisor Scale was examined to determine if it should stay in the analysis. The behaviours were analyzed for redundancies according to the procedures outlined in the act frequency approach. The resulting lists were included in the Phase II Consensus Questionnaire design (see Appendices I and J). In this questionnaire, the respondent was asked to rate the extent to which he/she agreed or disagreed with the list of supportive and non-supportive behaviours. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 – strongly disagree to 7 – strongly

agree was used for responses. The form of the questions was as follows:

A supportive manager is one who:

	strongly					strongly	
	disagree					agree	
Listens to my concerns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A non-supportive manager is one who:

	strongly				strongly		
	disagree				agree		
Takes credit for my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Someone who disagreed with this statement would choose either 1, 2 or 3 depending on the strength of their disagreement. A 4 would indicate neither agreement nor disagreement whereas 5, 6, and 7 indicate various degrees of agreement.

For Department A (the department that did not participate in phase III of the study), the consensus phase questionnaire also included 12 questions taken from a standard management assessment questionnaire (see Appendix G) and, at the request of the Department, 13 questions measuring work-family conflict (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981), 5 questions measuring stress (Cohen, Kamarack & Mermelstein, 1983), 5 questions measuring job satisfaction (Quinn and Shepard, 1974), and 8 questions measuring work-role conflict (Cohen et al., 1983). Demographic questions such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, and job type were included in the survey administered to both Departments.

The final questionnaire package contained a cover letter (see Appendix H), the survey (see Appendices I and J), and a return envelope with a confidential mailbox location somewhere within the Department printed on it. The package was provided in both English and French (translation done by the Canadian Centre for Management Development), took no longer than thirty minutes to complete and was distributed by both Departments via their internal mail systems.

The questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of employees at each Department. The respondents completed the questionnaires and returned them in the sealed envelope provided to a central location within the Department. These unopened questionnaires were then picked up from there for analysis.

2.2.2 Analysis of Phase II Data

Three types of analysis were performed on the data collected during phase II of the study: (1) the calculation of group differences, (2) the identification of critical behaviours through the determination of consensus, and (3) the classification of similar behaviours into themes.

2.2.2.1 Calculation of Group Differences

Analysis of the phase II data began with the computation of means for each supportive and non-supportive behaviour in the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale. The following means were calculated:

- total sample mean,

- male/female means,
- manager/non-manager means, and
- parent/non-parent means.

T-tests were then calculated for each item in the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale to determine if there were significant differences in what is perceived to be supportive or non-supportive behaviours across gender, job type, and parental status. The Bonferroni adjustment was also used to minimize type I errors.

2.2.2.2 Determination of Consensus

Each behaviour was examined to decide whether it should remain in the analysis. A high degree of consensus as to whether a given behaviour was considered to be supportive or non-supportive was sought.

Critical supportive and non-supportive behaviours were identified as those behaviours with overall mean scores greater than 6.00. While this cut-off point was arbitrary, it was established to identify those behaviours that the majority of respondents felt typified supportive and non-supportive managers (i.e. a cut-off of 6 ensures that a majority of respondents are scoring 6 and 7 on a behaviour, indicating a strong level of agreement that it typifies supportive or non-supportive behaviours). These critical behaviours are referred to in the act frequency literature as the acts which demonstrate high prototypicality. Those behaviours with overall mean scores of 6.0 or above formed what is referred to in the text as the "final Supportive Supervisor Scales."

2.2.2.3 Classification of Behaviours into Themes

To facilitate the discussion of the perceptions of what behaviours typify supportive and non-supportive supervisors, the behaviours in the final Supportive Supervisor Scales were grouped together based on common theme. The classification was done based on common sense and the reliability of the themes was evaluated using alpha.

While factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis are often used to determine how data groups, their use is not appropriate in this study. In the context of the current study, factor analysis would group behaviours based on the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed that the behaviours were supportive (or non-supportive). What is sought in the current study, however, is groupings of items that relate to the same types of behaviours (i.e. several adjectives of dominant). For this reason, alpha was selected, to evaluate how well the different behaviours "hung together" (i.e. measured the same construct).

2.3 PHASE III - ASSESSMENT

Department B agreed to pilot test the final Supportive Supervisor Scale in one of their divisions. The pilot study had two major objectives: (1) to assess the predictive ability of the measure by linking supportive management with relevant outcomes such as stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment etc., and, (2) to evaluate the utility of the measure with respect to response burden and its ability to discriminate between supportive and non-supportive managers. This section outlines

the procedures followed and the analysis performed in phase III.

2.3.1 Procedures

Once questions that did not receive strong consensus in phase II were dropped, the remaining questions were formulated into the Phase III Assessment Questionnaire (see Appendix K). This questionnaire contained the list of supportive and non-supportive behaviours from phase II that were identified as being critical.

The questionnaire asked respondents to what extent they agreed or disagreed that their managers displayed each of the critical supportive/non-supportive managerial behaviours in the final Supportive Supervisor Scale. As with the phase II questionnaire, respondents were asked to rank their agreement with each item using a scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

A number of other items were included in the phase III questionnaire.

Demographic questions were included in the phase III survey to enable a discussion of the results based on gender, job type and parental status. Measures of individual and organizational outcomes were included in the questionnaire to establish a link between a supportive/non-supportive supervisor and the given outcome. The following measures will be discussed in this thesis (see Appendix L):

Job Satisfaction : Job satisfaction is the degree to which employees have a positive, affective orientation towards employment by the organization (Higgins et al., 1992). While not much is known about the relationship between supervisor support and job

satisfaction, research by Galinsky et al. (1983) found that employees who reported having non-supportive supervisors were more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs. The measure of job satisfaction developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974) was used in this study. Employees were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with their job in general, their pay, their work hours, their work schedule and their work tasks using a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) through 5 (very satisfied). High job satisfaction is defined as mean scores greater than 3.5. Previous studies indicate that this is a reliable measure (coefficient alphas of 0.75 to 0.85).

Job Stress: Research by House et al. (1980) found that supervisor support tended to reduce all forms of perceived job stress. The job stress scale used in the current study was devised by Kahn et al. (1964) and views job stress in terms of the incompatibility of work demands. This 9-item scale asks respondents to indicate how frequently they are bothered by certain features of their work, and responses are summed with high scores indicating high tension. High stress is defined as scores of 2.5 or greater. Previous studies indicate that this is a reliable measure (coefficient alphas of 0.70 and 0.77).

Organizational Commitment: Levinson (1965) implies that greater supervisor support may be associated with greater organizational commitment as employees tend to view actions by agents of the organization as actions of the organization itself. The organizational commitment scale used in the current study was devised by Mowday,

Steers and Porter (1979). This 7-item scale asks respondents to indicate the extent of their identification and involvement in their organization. High organizational commitment occurs when employees achieve a score of 3.75 or greater. Previous studies consistently indicate high internal consistency for this measure (coefficient alphas ranging from 0.82 to 0.93 with a median of 0.90).

Role Overload: Research by Goff et al. (1990) found that supervisor support was an important work environment variable related to work/family conflict. One component of work/family conflict is role overload which exists when the total demands on time and energy associated with the prescribed activities of multiple roles are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably (Higgins et al. 1992). The measure of role overload used in the current study was developed by Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981). High role overload is defined by Duxbury and Higgins (1992) as scores of 3.5 or greater. The internal reliability of the scale has been confirmed as reliable (reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients range from 0.75 to 0.89).

Work to Family Interference: Another aspect of work/family conflict is work to family interference which occurs when the family role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the work role (Higgins et al., 1992). The work to family interference measure used in the current study was developed by Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981). The scale enables employees to indicate how often they feel strains of various kinds related to time for work and time for family on a 5-point likert scale.

High work to family interference is defined as scores of 3.5 or greater. Previous studies consistently indicate high internal consistency for this measure (coefficient alphas ranging from 0.78 to 0.83).

Perceived Stress: The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) was developed by Cohen, Kamarck & Mermelstein (1983). The PSS is a 14-item instrument on which respondents rate on a 5 point Likert-type scale the frequency within the last month that they have experienced different feelings. Essentially, the PSS is designed to measure perceived levels of global stress. Cohen et al., (1983) report Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.84 to 0.86, indicating that the PSS has high internal consistency. Test-retest reliabilities were high for brief intervals and moderate for six-week intervals. Because the PSS was used to rate stress levels over the previous month, such a pattern of test-retest reliability is considered appropriate. Population norms were established by Higgins et al. (1992) to account for the negative bias that is often associated with stress scales. High stress is defined as scores of 2.6 or greater.

2.3.2 ANALYSIS OF PHASE III DATA

Analysis of the phase III data involves the assessment of support and the determination of reliability of the themes and of the measure as a whole.

2.3.2.1 Assessment of Support

A manager is considered supportive if his/her subordinate agrees that he/she displays a number of supportive behaviours or if he/she does not display a number of the non-supportive behaviours. Therefore, supportiveness ratings can be determined by examining the responses to the supportive behaviours or the non-supportive behaviours.

Mean scores for each individual supportive (non-supportive) behaviour were calculated to assess employees' perceptions of how frequently their current managers are displaying the given behaviour. Supportive managers are defined, for the purpose of this analysis as managers whose employees give them mean scores of 5.5 or greater with respect to a particular supportive behaviour or 2.5 or lower with respect to a particular non-supportive behaviour. Non-supportive managers are defined as those with mean scores of 2.5 or lower on a supportive behaviour or greater than 5.5 on a non-supportive behaviour. Managers whose employees rate them as greater than 2.5 but lower than 5.5 are considered to display "mixed" levels of support for both the supportive and non-supportive behaviours.

Mean scores were also calculated for the aggregate of all supportive behaviours and all non-supportive behaviours to enable a rating of supportive, non-supportive or mixed to be assigned to a particular manager. The number of managers that fit into each of these groups was then calculated.

2.3.2.2 Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency and stability of a score from a measurement scale (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). The terms consistency and stability are needed to describe form-associated and time-associated reliability respectively. Reliability can be measured using one of two tests:

- (1) **internal consistency** which looks at the amount of error in measurement that there is in the measuring instrument, or,
- (2) **test-retest** which examines whether the results will be similar when the same set of objects are measured repeatedly.

The present study will use internal consistency as the measure of reliability. Alpha, a measure of reliability that is an estimate of the average of all possible split-halves reliability coefficients, will be used as the measure of internal consistency. Alpha's will be calculated for each theme and the measure as a whole. Correlation matrices will also be provided to reveal the strength of the association between all pairs of variables.

2.3.2.3 Validity

A measure is valid if it does what it is supposed to do and measures what it is supposed to measure (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). To develop a valid measure, three forms of validity must be satisfied: content, construct and criterion-related validity. This section assesses the final Supportive Supervisor Scale in terms of these three different types of validity.

Content Validity. Content validity is the degree to which the scale items represent the domain of the concept under study (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). In this study, content validity refers to the extent to which the supportive and non-supportive managerial behaviours represent a supportive and non-supportive supervisor. The considerable amount of overlap in the supportive and non-supportive behaviours generated in the two government Departments suggests that the final Supportive Supervisor Scale is, in fact, measuring supportive and non-supportive behaviours.

Furthermore, the item generation procedure prescribed under the act frequency approach enhances the validity of the measure. The advantage of the act frequency approach with respect to validity is in the nomination process where items are generated by the actors in context. Therefore, it can be stated with a reasonable degree of confidence that the final Supportive Supervisor Measure has content validity.

Construct Validity: Construct validity is the degree to which the measurement scale represents and acts like the concept being measured (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). It encompasses convergent validity, discriminant validity and criterion-related validity.

A. Convergent Validity: As the final Supportive Supervisor Scale is a unique behaviour-based instrument within the literature that recognizes that supervisor support encompasses support for both the work role and the non-work role of employees, no other scale exists to allow the determination of convergent validity.

B. Criterion-Related Validity: Criterion-related validity is the degree to which the scale under study is able to predict a variable which is designated a criterion (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). According to the literature, having a supportive supervisor may be associated with lower levels of stress (Goff et al., 1990; Love et al., 1987; House, 1981; Galinsky et al., 1983; and, Fernandez, 1985), a better ability to balance the demands of work and family (Goff et al., 1990; Hughes & Galinsky, 1988; and, Galinsky, 1986), higher levels of job satisfaction (Galinsky et al., 1983), and greater commitment to the organization (Levinson, 1965). X^2 will be used to determine if there is a link between high support from supervisors and each of the above mentioned outcomes (e.g. to determine if high job satisfaction is linked to high support).

3.0 THE SAMPLES

This section provides a detailed description of the phase I, phase II and phase III samples of both Departments.

3.1 PHASE I SAMPLES

A total of fifty-four interviews were conducted: twenty-five with Department A and twenty-nine with Department B. The candidates were randomly chosen by the personnel division of each Department to include 50% male and 50% female participants. The sample was not stratified by job type as it was expected that a random sample would include a few members from each job type proportional to what

existed within each Department.

3.2 PHASE II SAMPLES

The Phase II questionnaire was administered to a random selection of 500 employees at Department A and 100 employees at Department B. A total of 297 and 79 useable questionnaires were returned from Department A and Department B respectively representing respective response rates of 59.4% and 79.0% (see Tables 1 and 2 for a breakdown of respondents by gender and job type).

3.2.1 Department A Sample

A complete description of the demographic characteristics of the Department A sample can be found in Appendix M. The sample is made up predominately of highly educated married mothers and fathers (half of the respondents possess a university degree or degrees). Respondents earn above average income with the majority (83%) making more than \$40,000 a year and slightly more than 40% making more than \$60,000.

The data indicates that the demographic characteristics of the sample are associated with both gender and job type. Women have less formal education than men (35% of women have a university degree versus 61% of men) and have lower incomes (32% of women earn more than \$60,000 per year versus 56% of men). There are no gender differences with respect to marital status and parental status.

Table 1: Phase II Respondents (Department A)

Job Type	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Manager	43 (58.9%)	30 (41.1%)	73 (24.6%)
Non-Managers:	74 (33.0%)	150 (67.0%)	224 (75.4%)
Officers	53 (44.8%)	84 (46.6%)	137 (45.9%)
Support Staff	21 (18.1%)	66 (36.9%)	87 (29.5%)
TOTAL	117 (39.4%)	180 (60.4%)	

Demographic differences based on job type are also observed in this sample. While non-managers are on the whole less likely to be married or have children, non-managers with children are more likely to have young families (i.e. more children under 5 than managers). Not surprisingly, managers have more education and earn more money than non-managers.

3.2.2 The Department B Sample

A complete description of the demographic characteristics of the Department B sample can be found in Appendix N. The phase II sample is made up predominately of married men and women slightly more than half of whom (54.4%) are parents. Of

all respondents, only 30.2% have children under the age of five and 18.2% have elder care responsibilities. The average age of the respondents was 38 years.

The data indicates that the demographic characteristics of the sample are associated with both gender and job type. Women have less formal education than men (25.9% of women have a university degree versus 56.0% of men) and have lower incomes (11.3% of women earn more than \$60,000 per year versus 32.0% of men). There are no gender differences with respect to marital status and parental status.

Table 2. Phase II Respondents (Department B)

Job Type	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Managers	8 (61.5%)	5 (38.5%)	13 (16.5%)
Non-managers:	17 (24.6%)	49 (75.4%)	65 (82.3%)
Officers	15 (19.0%)	29 (36.7%)	44 (55.7%)
Support Staff	2 (2.5%)	20 (25.3%)	22 (27.8%)
Total	25 (31.6%)	54 (68.4%)	

Demographic differences based on job type are also observed in this sample. Non-managers are more likely to be married, but less likely to have children under age five. The majority of managers (76.9%) have university degrees while only 27.7% of

non-managers indicated having university degrees. These differences are similar to those found in Department A.

3.2.3 Comparison of Phase II Samples

The proportion of men and women in the two samples is approximately the same (32% of the Department B sample are men versus 39% in Department A). In both samples, approximately 70% of the respondents are married. While a higher proportion of the Department A sample have children, the percent of respondents with children less than 5 years of age is the same in both samples.

Job type data, on the other hand, are dependent on department type. Managers make up a higher proportion of the Department A sample (24% versus 17%) while the Department B sample has a higher proportion of officers (56% versus 46%). In both Departments, however, men are significantly more likely than women to be in managerial positions while women are more likely to hold support jobs. The proportion of employees in support positions is virtually identical in both departments.

Education and income data are consistent with the job type data. The Department A sample has a higher proportion of their respondents with university education and a higher percent of people making more than \$60,000 per year.

3.3 PHASE III SAMPLE - The Pilot Study

The total sample consists of 242 respondents from Department B of which 89 (36.8%) are men and 153 (63.2%) are female (see Tables 3 for a breakdown of

respondents by gender and job type). A complete description of the demographic characteristics of the sample can be found in Appendix O.

The sample is made up predominately of highly educated men and women (almost half of them possess a university degree or degrees). Respondents earn above average income with the majority (67%) making more than \$40,000 a year and 29% making more than \$60,000.

The data would also suggest that Department B has been undergoing a tremendous amount of change in the past year. The typical employee has had 2.4 managers in the past year and worked for their present manager for about a year.

Table 3. Phase III Respondents (Department B)

Job Type	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Managers	28 (31.4%)	33 (21.6%)	61 (25.2%)
Non-managers	61 (68.5%)	120 (78.4%)	181 (74.8%)
Total	89 (36.8%)	153 (63.2%)	

The data indicates that the demographic characteristics of the sample are associated with both gender and job type. Male respondents are more likely than female respondents to be married (79% versus 68% of women) and have children (57% versus 48% of women). While both men and women possess equivalent formal

education (45% of both men and women have university degrees), women have lower incomes (21% of women earn more than \$60,000 per year versus 43% of men). The income data is consistent with the fact that men are more likely than women to be managers (31% of men versus 22% of women) while women are more likely to work in administrative support (30% of women versus 9% of men).

The demographic data for Department B samples in phase II and in phase III were remarkably consistent. This would suggest that these data are a fairly true reflection of the demographic profile of the people in this Department.

CHAPTER THREE

SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS

This chapter will include a discussion of what respondents from Departments A and B perceive as supportive supervisory behaviours highlighting similarities and differences between the Departments. Differences in desired supervisor support will also be examined by gender, job type and parental status. Finally, the importance of supervisor support will be addressed through a discussion of implications for the individual employee and the organizational bottomline.

1.0 BEHAVIOURS OF SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS

Analysis of the consensus phase questionnaire indicates that:

- in Department A, 26 unique supportive behaviours exceed the cut-off of 6.0 (representing 81% of the supportive behaviours from the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale),
- in Department B 22 unique supportive behaviours exceed the cut-off of 6.0 (representing 43% of the supportive behaviours from the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale).

These items can be considered to represent the behaviours of supportive managers as perceived by employee of these two Departments. The behaviours are ordered according to their ranking in Table's 4 and 5 and classified according to predominant theme in Tables 6

and 7. Department A's data are given by gender in Table 4 to allow a discussion of gender differences in these results. There were no significant gender differences in the Department B data so only total score data are provided.

Four supportive behaviours are particularly worthy of note as they all have means of 6.4 or higher in both Departments. They are:

- makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job,
- encourages any training that is needed to do my job,
- shares information with me, and
- utilizes my abilities.

In other words, there is a high degree of consensus within both Departments that these are very important supportive supervisor behaviours.

**Table 4: Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance
(Department A)**

BEHAVIOUR	ALL	MEN	WOMEN
Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	6.48	6.42	6.51
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	6.47	6.38	6.53
Shares information with me *	6.44	6.30	6.53
Utilizes my abilities	6.44	6.30	6.53
Is available to answer questions	6.37	6.29	6.43
Gives recognition when I do my job well	6.35	6.25	6.42
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job *	6.33	6.14	6.45
Makes me feel comfortable in approaching him/her *	6.33	6.09	6.48
Supports me to those higher up in the organization *	6.31	6.04	6.49
Is aware of what's going on	6.29	6.14	6.39
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	6.29	6.24	6.32
Listens to my concerns	6.29	6.17	6.36
Lets me work independently	6.27	6.25	6.29
Is supportive of the decisions I make	6.23	6.18	6.27
Lets me do the work from start to finish	6.12	5.99	6.20
Asks my opinion about things	6.10	6.07	6.12
Makes it easy for me to rearrange my job schedule	6.10	6.05	6.12
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	6.06	6.02	6.09
Makes decisions interactively with me *	6.06	5.85	6.21
Is flexible with time off for family reasons *	6.06	5.91	6.16
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	6.05	5.95	6.12
Uses a pleasant tone of voice with me *	6.05	5.74	6.26
Gives me challenging jobs	6.05	5.86	6.18
Helps me learn from my mistakes	6.04	5.97	6.09
Allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements *	6.04	5.79	6.20
Provides informal information on what is going on in the Dept*	6.00	5.79	6.13

Note: Significant gender differences are marked with an asterisk (*)

**Table 5: Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance
(Department B)**

BEHAVIOUR	MEAN
Shares information with me	6.68
Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	6.59
Provides clear instructions by making objectives known	6.56
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	6.56
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	6.54
Listens to my concerns	6.52
Gives recognition when I do my job well	6.52
Utilizes my abilities	6.52
Supports me to those higher up in the organization	6.49
Gives me challenging jobs	6.46
Encourages my ideas	6.42
Helps me learn from my mistakes	6.42
Is pleasant and polite	6.35
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	6.34
Maintains his/her cool under pressure	6.32
Is available to answer questions	6.30
Thanks me for the work I do	6.29
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	6.28
Focuses on the positive instead of the negative	6.27
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	6.22
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	6.20
Lets me work independently	6.19

1.1 SUPPORTIVE THEMES

On reorganizing the lists of supportive behaviours, several themes appear (see Table's 6 & 7). A supportive supervisor is one who:

- (1) facilitates the completion of job tasks,
- (2) engages in two-way communication with subordinates,
- (3) mentors his/her employees,
- (4) allows employees autonomy,
- (5) recognizes that employees have a life outside work,
- (6) provides positive feedback, and
- (7) treats employees with respect.

It is interesting to note that while all of these themes could be observed in both of the government Departments that participated in this research, the number of behaviours in each theme and in some cases the behaviours themselves varied by Department. Details on each of these themes is provided below.

Facilitates the completion of job tasks: Behaviours in the first theme all relate to making resources available to facilitate the completion of job tasks. Supportive managers are perceived as ones who make sure their subordinates have access to needed resources to do their jobs and encourage training to upgrade their skills. Employees need access not only to tools but also to advice. Managers who are aware of what is going on in the Department and who are available to answer questions are also central to this theme of availability. It is interesting to note

**Table 6: Supportive Behaviours By Theme and Gender
(Department A)**

BEHAVIOUR	ALL	MEN	WOMEN
Facilitates the Completion of Job Tasks (0%)			
Makes sure I have the tool/equipment I need to do my job	6.48	6.42	6.51
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	6.47	6.38	6.53
Is available to answer questions	6.37	6.29	6.43
Is aware of what's going on	6.29	6.14	6.39
Engages in Two-way Communication (40%)			
Shares information with me	6.44	6.30	6.53
Listens to my concerns	6.29	6.17	6.36
Asks my opinion about things	6.10	6.07	6.12
Makes decisions interactively with me *	6.06	5.85	6.21
Provides informal information on what is going on in the Dept *	6.00	5.79	6.13
Mentors Employees (17%)			
Utilizes my abilities	6.44	6.30	6.53
Supports me to those higher up in the organization *	6.31	6.04	6.49
Lets me work independently	6.27	6.25	6.29
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	6.06	6.02	6.09
Gives me challenging jobs	6.05	5.86	6.18
Helps me learn from my mistakes	6.04	5.97	6.09
Gives Employees Autonomy (0%)			
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	6.20	6.24	6.32
Lets me do the work from start to finish	6.12	5.99	6.20
Recognizes Employees have life Outside of Work (33%)			
Makes it easy for me to rearrange my job schedule	6.10	6.05	6.12
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	6.06	5.91	6.16
Allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements *	6.04	5.79	6.20
Provides Positive Feedback (25%)			
Gives recognition when I do my job well	6.35	6.25	6.42
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job *	6.33	6.14	6.45
Is supportive of the decisions I make	6.23	6.18	6.27
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	6.05	5.95	6.12
Respect (100%)			
Makes me feel comfortable in approaching him/her *	6.33	6.09	6.48
Uses a pleasant tone of voice *	6.05	5.74	6.26

Note: * indicates a significant gender difference

% indicates % of items in theme with significant differences by job type.

Table 7: Supportive Behaviours By Theme (Department B)

BEHAVIOUR	MEAN
Facilitates the Completion of Job Tasks	
Makes sure I have the tool/equipment I need to do my job	6.59
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	6.56
Is available to answer questions	6.30
Engages in Two-way Communication	
Shares information with me	6.68
Provides clear instructions by making objectives known	6.56
Listens to my concerns	6.52
Mentors Employees	
Utilizes my abilities	6.52
Supports me to those higher up in the organization	6.49
Gives me challenging jobs	6.46
Encourages my ideas	6.42
Helps me learn from my mistakes	6.42
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	6.28
Lets me work independently	6.19
Gives Employees Autonomy	
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	6.34
Recognizes Employees have life Outside of Work	
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	6.20
Provides Positive Feedback	
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	6.54
Gives recognition when I do my job well	6.52
Focuses on the positive instead of the negative	6.27
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	6.22
Respect	
Is pleasant and polite	6.35
Maintains his/her cool under pressure	6.32
Thanks me for the work I do	6.29

that this theme contains the first and second ranked supportive behaviours at Department A and the second and fourth ranked supportive behaviours at Department B. These results suggest that these types of behaviours are very important to government employees.

Engages in two-way communication with their subordinates: Behaviours in the second theme all relate to communication. From the employee's perspective, two-way communication involves listening to employees' concerns, keeping employees informed (i.e., shares information), and involving employees in decision-making (i.e. asks my opinion about things and makes decisions interactively with me). Supportive managers also provide clear instructions by making their objectives known to employees and they provide informal information on what is going on in the Department. This theme contains the first and third highest ranked supportive behaviours at Department B and the third highest ranked behaviour at Department A. While two-way communication is important to employees in both Departments, it may be more important to employees in Department A since these employees were more likely to offer examples of how supportive managers engaged in two-way communication and strongly agree that such behaviours are important.

Mentors Employees: A third set of behaviours all relate to mentoring. A mentor is a trusted counsellor who accepts a guiding role in the development of a junior or less experienced member of the organization (Bass, 1985). The behaviours given by the

employees in these samples suggest that within the public sector context, a supportive supervisor who mentors his/her employees utilizes their abilities, lets them work independently, gives them challenging and interesting jobs, provides them with guidance in doing their work, and helps them learn from their mistakes. Managers who mentor employees also help the subordinate get exposure within the organization and back up their ideas to senior management (i.e., makes sure your opinion is heard at meetings and supports you to those higher up in the organization). It is believed that mentoring increases the subordinate's self-esteem and fulfils some of his/her 'need to know' (Bass, 1985).

Allows employees autonomy: The fourth set of behaviours deal with autonomy and trust. Employees view as supportive, managers who give them enough trust and control to make decisions on their own and do the work from start to finish.

Recognizes that employees have a life outside work: Employees also view as supportive managers who make it easier for them to balance work and family demands (i.e., are flexible with time off for family reasons; make it easy for their employees to rearrange job schedules; allow employees to take advantage of flexible work arrangements). These types of behaviours are more likely to be required by employees with family commitments (i.e. mothers, fathers and those with elder care responsibilities). While these behaviours are important in both Departments, the data suggests that they are more appreciated by Department A employees as more

behaviours relating to this theme exceeded the cutoff of 6.00 in Department A than in Department B.

Provides positive feedback: The next set of behaviours all deal with the general issue of positive feedback. Supportive behaviours that fall into this theme include gives recognition for a job well done, gives feedback on a regular basis, and expresses confidence in their employees' abilities). The importance of these behaviours to all government employees cannot be emphasized enough. According to both motivation and learning theory, positive reinforcement is necessary to the learning process (i.e. more likely to repeat reinforced behaviour) and a precondition for motivation (Vecchio and Appelbaum, 1995). It makes intuitive sense that employees who receive positive feedback on a regular basis will be more motivated and more productive than employees who do not get positive feedback.

Treats employees with respect: The final set of behaviours all deal with the notion of respect. Employees view as supportive managers who treat them with respect (i.e. managers who are pleasant and polite; who maintain their cool under pressure; who thank them for the work they do, and who provide an environment that makes employees feel comfortable in approaching him/her). It is interesting to note that although this theme was found in both Departments, the behaviours provided by the employees in the 2 Departments were quite different.

1.2 GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF A SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

While there were no significant gender differences in the perception of supervisor support in Department B, over one quarter (26.9%) of the supportive behaviours in Department A with mean scores of 6.0 or greater showed significant gender differences. Supportive supervisor by gender data for Department A are shown in Table 6 (significant gender differences are marked with an asterisk (*)) and discussed below.

1.2.1 Relative Levels of Agreement with Behaviours

As can be seen in Table 6, women in Department A were more likely than men to agree that all of the behaviours identified in this analysis were supportive. The interview data suggests two possible explanations for these differences. First, it may be that women have a greater need for supportive behaviours from their managers (i.e. male dominated environment, greater work and family demand). Alternatively, it may be that women are more appreciative of supportive behaviours than are men (i.e. more likely to be in low autonomy jobs at the lower levels of the organization).

1.2.2 Significant Gender Differences

Of the 26 supportive behaviours in the central agency sample with scores above 6.0, significant gender differences were observed on 7 supportive behaviours (see Table 8) and relate to four themes (marked with an asterisk (*) in Table 6):

- (1) Treats employees with respect: significant gender difference for 100% of behaviours,
- (2) Engages in two-way communication: significant gender difference in 40% of behaviours,
- (3) Recognizes employees have life outside of work: significant gender difference in 33% of behaviours, and
- (4) Mentors employees: significant gender difference in 17% of behaviours.

Table 8: Behaviours with Significant Gender Differences

Supportive Behaviour	Felt signif. more strongly by:	Signif.
Department A		
-Makes me feel comfortable approaching him/her	women	001
-Supports me to those higher up	women	001
-Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	women	007
-Makes decisions interactively with me	women	008
-Provides informal information on what is going on in the Department	women	005
-Uses a pleasant tone of voice with me	women	000
-Allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements	women	003

Note Significance determined using a t-test, $\alpha=0.05$

Women in the Department A sample are significantly more likely than the men at Department A to agree that a manager who shows them respect is supportive. It is likely, especially given the high score given by women to "uses a pleasant tone of

voice") that this gender difference may be partially attributed to job level differences.

Women at Department A are more likely than men to hold support type roles.

Research has shown that employees in support roles are often treated with less respect than managerial and professional employees (Higgins, Duxbury & Lee, 1992).

Women in Department A are more likely than men to strongly agree that behaviours relating to two-way communication characterize a supportive manager.

Women are more likely than men to strongly agree that a supportive manager is one who makes decisions interactively with them and provides informal information about what is going on in the Department.

The idea that women are more likely than men to agree that two-way communication is supportive, supports previous research on gender differences in communication which shows that men talk more at meetings than women, interrupt women when they speak, often fail to ask their opinions, and claim women's ideas as their own (Tannen, 1994). These results may also be due to the fact that almost forty percent of the women in the Department A sample (versus 18% of men) are in support positions where two way communication is often, unfortunately, more the exception than the rule.

The results indicate that women are more likely than men to agree that managerial support of work and family issues is supportive. Since women in our society are still considered by many to be the primary care givers, they are more likely than men to need flexible work arrangements to help them balance the dual demands of work and family (Higgins et al., 1992). It is not surprising, therefore, that women

are more likely than men to agree that allowing access to flexible work arrangements is a supportive behaviour.

The final theme that contains gender differences is mentoring. Women in Department A were more likely than men to agree that managers who encourage them to advance in the organization by supporting them to those higher up in the organization were supportive.

1.2.3 Comparison of Top Five Supportive Behaviours by Gender

There was a high degree of agreement among the women in the two Government Departments with respect to what constituted support. Women in both Departments ranked the same four behaviours among the top five with respect to importance. Regardless of Department, women strongly agree that managers who share information with them, make needed tools/equipment available, encourage training and support them to those higher up in the organization are supportive. There was less of a consensus among male respondents. Of the top five ranked supportive behaviours in each Department, only one behaviour is common for male respondents. Men within both Departments agree that sharing information is a highly supportive managerial behaviour.

1.3 JOB-TYPE DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF SUPPORT

There were very few significant differences with respect to the level of agreement among managers and non-managers regarding which supportive behaviours

are associated with supervisor support. In Department A, significant job-type differences are observed on three behaviours and on only one behaviour in Department B (see Table 9).

On looking at the percentage of behaviours in each theme with job-level differences it becomes evident that the majority of the differences occur in only two of the seven themes.

- (1) **Recognizing that employees have life outside of work.** While both managers and non-managers strongly agreed that a supportive manager is one who recognizes that employees have life outside of work, non-managers had significantly stronger agreement than did managers (significant job-type difference for 66% of behaviours).
- (2) **Respect.** While both managers and non-managers strongly agreed that a supportive manager is one who shows respect for his/her employees, non-managers agree significantly more strongly than do managers (significant job-type difference for 50% of behaviours in Department A).

It should be noted that the following supportive behaviours are in the top five for both managers and non-managers at Department A: makes sure employees have the tools/equipment they need to do the job, utilizes their abilities and shares information with them. Interestingly, these three behaviours are also in the top five supportive behaviours for both men and women. This emphasizes the importance of these three behaviours in Department A.

Table 9: Behaviours with Significant Job-Type Differences

Supportive Behaviour	Felt signif. more strongly by:	Signif.
Department A		
-uses a pleasant tone of voice with me	non-mgrs	007
-allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements	non-mgrs	000
-Is flexible with time off for family reasons	non-mgrs	010
Department B		
-Is aware of what's going on	non-mgrs	004

Note: Significance determined using a t-test, $\alpha=0.05$

1.4 PARENTAL STATUS DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF SUPPORT

The data would suggest that the perceived importance of the supportive behaviours is not associated with parental status. Significant differences by parental status were not observed in either Department.

While these results would seem to suggest that the perception of what makes a supportive supervisor does not differ notably by parental status, care must be taken in interpreting this data. Only a small proportion of the parents in either sample (approximately one-quarter of the respondents) are parents of children under 5. Research would suggest that it is parents in this group who will be the most different from non-parents (family demands are particularly high in families with pre-schoolers) (Higgins et al., 1992). Since such a small proportion of our parents fall into this group, it may be that key parental status differences may not have shown up in this

study.

1.5 IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS

It should be noted that there are 15 unique supportive behaviours that appear in the final Supportive Supervisor Scales of both Departments. These 15 critical behaviours represent almost three quarters (72.7%) of the behaviours from the Supportive Supervisor Scale in Department B and two-thirds (61.5%) of the behaviours from the Supportive Supervisor Scale in Department A. The overlap appears in all themes except the one related to showing respect for employees. All those surveyed agree that a supportive manager is one who:

- makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job
- encourages any training that is needed to do my job
- shares information with me
- utilizes my abilities
- is available to answer questions
- gives recognition when I do my job well
- expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job
- supports me to those higher up in the organization
- encourages me to make decisions on my own
- listens to my concerns
- lets me work independently
- makes sure my opinions are heard at meetings

- is flexible with time off for family reasons
- gives me feedback on a regular basis
- gives me challenging jobs
- helps me learn from my mistakes

It may be that these behaviours are universally accepted in the Federal Government as being supportive. Further research would be necessary to determine this. In any case, these are behaviours that should be emphasized in future use of the scale.

While the gender differences in the support data of Department A provide useful information on how to effectively manage female employees in that Department, the lack of gender differences in three of the Department A and all of the Department B themes is also worthy of note. Managers must recognize that both men and women employees in both Departments strongly agree that a supervisor who facilitates the completion of job tasks, gives them high levels of autonomy, and provides positive feedback is supportive.

The lack of job-level differences in the perceived importance of the different behaviours is consistent with that observed for gender and again emphasizes the importance of behaviours which typify two-way communication, mentoring, empowerment and positive feedback. Within Department A, supervisors of non-managers should show respect for their employees, recognize that they have a life outside of work and facilitate their work.

CHAPTER FOUR

BEHAVIOURS OF NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS

This chapter will include a discussion of what respondents from Departments A and B perceive as non-supportive supervisory behaviours highlighting similarities and differences between the Departments. Differences in perceived importance of the non-supportive behaviours will also be examined by gender, job type and parental status.

1.0 BEHAVIOURS OF NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGERS

Analysis of the consensus phase questionnaire indicates that:

- in Department A, 16 unique non-supportive behaviours exceed the cut-off of 6.0 (representing 80% of the non-supportive behaviours from the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale),
- in Department B, 14 unique non-supportive behaviours exceed the cut-off of 6.0 (representing 40% of the non-supportive behaviours from the initial Supportive Supervisor Scale).

These items can be considered to represent the behaviours of non-supportive managers as perceived by employees of these two Departments. The behaviours are ordered according to ranking in Table's 10 & 11 and classified according to predominant theme in Table's 12 & 13. Department A data are given by gender in Table's 10 and 12 to allow a discussion of gender differences in these results. There were no gender differences in the Department B data.

Four non-supportive behaviours are particularly worthy of note as they all have means of 6.25 or higher in both Departments. They are:

- offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum,
- tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently,
- displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion,
and
- takes credit for my work.

In other words, there is a high degree of consensus within both Departments that these are very important non-supportive supervisor behaviours.

2

OF/DE

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Table 10: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department A)

BEHAVIOUR	ALL	MEN	WOMEN
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	6.38	6.19	6.49
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	6.35	6.26	6.42
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	6.34	6.18	6.44
Takes credit for my work *	6.32	6.09	6.47
Talks about what I didn't do not what I did	6.24	6.10	6.32
Only talks to me when I make a mistake	6.17	6.03	6.27
Avoids talking to me	6.16	6.08	6.22
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons *	6.16	5.92	6.31
Doesn't clearly communicate what is expected of me	6.14	6.00	6.23
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	6.08	5.97	6.15
Treats me as if my job was lower in status than it actually is	6.06	5.91	6.16
Expects me to work long hours regardless of my personal situation	6.05	5.85	6.18
Treats managers differently from non-managers *	6.05	5.72	6.26
Gives directions quickly, not making clear his/her objectives *	6.04	5.81	6.19
Vents frustration on me in times of crisis	6.03	5.87	6.13
Has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done	6.01	5.83	6.13

NOTE: * indicates significant gender difference on this item

Table 11: Non-Supportive Behaviours Ranked in Order of Importance (Department B)

BEHAVIOUR	MEAN
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	6.49
Criticizes other employees behind their back	6.39
"Puts me down" in front of colleagues	6.38
Takes credit for my work	6.34
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	6.33
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	6.25
Uses fear as a motivator	6.24
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	6.22
Avoids talking to me	6.18
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	6.16
Talks about what I didn't do not what I did	6.16
Manages strictly by the book - does not take circumstances into consideration	6.13
Does not respect my hours of work - calls meetings late in the day or makes requests on Friday for Monday	6.11
Has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done	6.00

NOTE: There were no significant gender differences observed on the non-supportive behaviours in Department B.

1.1 NON-SUPPORTIVE THEMES

On reorganizing the lists of non-supportive behaviours (see Tables 12 & 13), five themes appear. A non-supportive supervisor is one who:

- (1) behaves inconsistently;
- (2) is a poor interpersonal communicator;
- (3) does not show respect for employees;
- (4) focuses on hours of work, rather than output; and
- (5) expects work to be given priority over non-work.

It is interesting to note that while all of these themes could be observed in both of the government departments who participated in this research, the number of behaviours in each theme and in some cases the behaviours themselves varied by Department.

Behaves inconsistently: Employees strongly agree that managers who have two stories, one that is used in private meetings and one in public forums are not supportive. They also agree that managers who distribute work tasks and recommend for promotions on the basis of personality rather than performance are not supportive. As mentioned in the interviews, "certain employees have been promoted into management who lack all the necessary skills except the ability to be the boss' pet."

A number of factors suggest that this theme contains those managerial

behaviours ranked as the most non-supportive by public sector employees. First, there is a high degree of consensus between the government Departments with respect to the behaviours which typify inconsistent supervision. Second, the behaviours included in this theme were the top three ranked non-supportive behaviours in Department A and the first and fifth ranked non-supportive behaviours in Department B.

Is a poor interpersonal communicator: Individuals within both Departments strongly agreed that managers who are poor interpersonal communicators are not supportive. Behaviours associated with this theme include: avoidance of employees, the tendency to talk about what employees did not do, not what they did, only talking to the employee when they make mistake, an inability to clearly communicate expectations, and an inability to give directions. While employees of both Departments agree that managers with poor interpersonal communication skills are non-supportive, overall mean scores indicate that employees in Department A strongly identified a greater number of behaviours in this theme than did employees of Department B (i.e. five behaviours related to this theme received overall mean scores greater than 6.00 in Department A compared to only two behaviours in Department B).

Does not show respect for employees: Employees strongly agree that a manager who does not behave respectfully towards them is not supportive. Several factors suggest that for government employees, taking credit for someone else's work is a very non-supportive supervisory behaviour. The fact that this is the only "respect"

behaviour identified by employees in both Departments emphasizes its importance. As noted previously, although behaviours typifying the theme of respect were observed in both Departments, the actual behaviours associated with lack of respect were quite different. This finding is consistent with the findings reported in conjunction with support

Employees who worked in Department A strongly agreed that managers who take out their frustrations on the employee, treat managers differently than non-managers and treat employees as if their job is lower in status than it actually is are showing lack of respect. Employees in Department B, on the other hand, strongly agreed that managers who criticize employees behind their backs and in front of others and use fear as a motivator are non-supportive. Interview data suggests that disrespect of this nature may lead to a reduction in confidence and morale for the employee.

Focuses on hours of work, rather than output: Employees in both Departments strongly agreed that managers who focus on hours of work rather than output and who have unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done in a given time period are non-supportive. It was mentioned several times in the interviews that managers who "insist that I fill out a leave request before leaving work a half hour early to pick up my sick child from school" are perceived by employees to be non-supportive.

Table 12: Non-Supportive Behaviours by Theme and Gender (Department A)

BEHAVIOUR	ALL	MEN	WOMEN
Behaves Inconsistently (0%)			
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	6.38	6.19	6.49
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	6.34	6.18	6.44
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	6.35	6.26	6.42
Poor Interpersonal Communicator (20%)			
Talks about what I didn't do not what I did	6.24	6.10	6.32
Only talks to me when I make a mistake	6.17	6.03	6.27
Avoids talking to me	6.16	6.08	6.22
Doesn't clearly communicate what is expected of me	6.14	6.00	6.23
Gives directions quickly, not making clear his/her objectives *	6.04	5.81	6.19
Does Not Show Respect For Employees (50%)			
Treats managers differently from non-managers *	6.05	5.72	6.26
Takes credit for my work *	6.32	6.09	6.47
Treats me as if my job was lower in status than it actually is	6.06	5.91	6.16
Vents frustration on me in times of crisis	6.03	5.87	6.13
Focuses on Hours of Work, Rather than Output (0%)			
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	6.08	5.97	6.15
Has unrealistic expectations about how much can be done	6.01	5.83	6.13
Expects Work to be Given Priority over Non-Work (50%)			
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons *	6.16	5.92	6.31
Expects me to work long hours regardless of my personal situation	6.05	5.85	6.18

NOTE: * indicates significant gender difference on this item

% indicates percentage of items in theme that display significant gender differences

Table 13: Non-Supportive Behaviours by Theme (Department B)

BEHAVIOUR	MEAN
Behaves Inconsistently	
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	6.49
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	6.33
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	6.22
Poor Interpersonal Communicator	
Avoids talking to me	6.18
Talks about what I didn't do not what I did	6.16
Does Not Show Respect For Employees	
Criticizes other employees behind their backs	6.39
"Puts me down" in front of colleagues	6.38
Takes credit for my work	6.34
Uses fear as a motivator	6.24
Focuses on Hours of Work, Rather than Output	
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	6.16
Has unrealistic expectations about how much can be done	6.00
Expects Work to be Given Priority over Non-Work	
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	6.25
Manages strictly by the book - does not take circumstances into consideration	6.13
Does not respect my hours of work - calls meetings late in the day or makes requests on Friday for Monday	6.11

Expects work to be given priority over non-work: Managers who expect work to ALWAYS take priority over non-work and treat their employees as if they have no other legitimate demands outside their work are rated as non-supportive. Symptomatic of this type of behaviour are negative verbal comments about taking time off for family reasons, not respecting hours of work (calling meetings late in the day or making requests on Friday for Monday) and the expectation that employees will work late regardless of their personal situations. During the interviews, employees indicated being frustrated when the boss frowns at them when they cannot work late because they have to pick children up at daycare. These employees feel they are being penalized unnecessarily. This theme is closely linked to the idea of focusing on hours at work rather than output.

1.2 SIGNIFICANT GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF A NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

Gender differences in the perception of non-supportive behaviours were associated with Department type. There were no significant gender differences in the Department B sample with respect to the perception of what behaviours were associated with non-support. In Department A, on the other hand, several of the non-supportive behaviours with scores of 6.0 or greater showed significant gender differences. Supportive supervisor by gender data for Department A are shown in Table 12 (significant gender differences are marked with an asterisk (*)) and discussed below.

1.2.1 Relative Level of Agreement with Behaviours

It should be noted that while both men and women agreed that the non-supportive behaviours identified in this study were highly non-supportive, women in Department A showed higher levels of agreement than men on all 16 items. These results, which were identical to those observed with the supportive behaviours, support the idea that women are more sensitive to managerial behaviours (both supportive and non-supportive) than men. The interviews suggest two reasons why women may be more likely to agree that these behaviours are non-supportive: (1) women in Department A are more likely than men to have experienced the non-supportive behaviours, or (2) women in Department A feel that the consequences of these non-supportive behaviours are more serious for them.

The lack of significant gender differences in the Department B sample, on the other hand, indicates a considerable level of agreement among men and women in this Department regarding what supervisory behaviours are non-supportive.

1.2.2 Significant Gender Differences

Of the 16 non-supportive behaviours from the Department A data with scores above 6.00, significant gender differences were found on 4 (shown with an asterisk in Table 12 and with level of significance in Table 14). They relate to two themes

- (1) Expects work to be given priority over non-work (significant gender differences in 50% of behaviours),
- (2) Does not show respect for employees (significant gender differences in 25% of behaviours).

Table 14: Behaviours with Significant Gender Differences

Non-Supportive Behaviour	Felt signif. more strongly by:	Signif.
Department A		
-Treats managers differently from non-managers	women	001
-Gives directions quickly, not making clear his/her objectives	women	017
-Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	women	017
-Takes credit for my work	women	015

Note. 1) No significant gender differences were observed in Department B.
 2) Significance determined using a t-test, $\alpha=0.05$.

Women were more likely than men to agree that managers who expect work to be given priority over non-work and focus on hours at work rather than output are non-supportive. These findings are consistent with the respective supportive behaviours which express the idea that women need more work flexibility than men to balance competing work and family demands. The interview data suggest that women would rather be judged on what they do rather than where they do it.

The results indicate that while not being treated with respect is ranked as highly non-supportive by both men and women, it is a bigger issue for women in Department A than it is for men. Women were significantly more likely to agree with three of the six behaviours in this theme (treats managers differently than non-managers, takes credit for my work, uses sexist language).

Also of interest is the lack of gender differences with respect to the importance of being a good communicator. There is a high level of consensus among both men

and women that managers who have poor interpersonal communications skills are non-supportive. These findings are consistent with the fact that both men and women perceived a manager with effective interpersonal communication skills to be highly supportive.

1.3 JOB TYPE DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF NON-SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS

The results indicate that job-type has no significant impact on the types of managerial behaviours that employees at either Department A or B agreed to be non-supportive. There were no significant differences observed in either Department. This lack of significant differences emphasizes the importance of the non-supportive behaviours to all employees in each Department regardless of job-type.

1.4 PARENTAL STATUS DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF NON-SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS

The data would suggest that the perception of what makes a non-supportive supervisor is not associated with parental status. No behaviours in the Department A sample showed significant parental status differences regarding the employee's level of agreement with the non-supportive behaviours. There was only one significant parental status difference in the Department B sample (see Table 15). These findings are consistent with those reported with respect to the supportive behaviours. Again, one must be careful drawing conclusions from these findings as the proportion of parents with young children in both samples is small.

Table 15: Behaviours with Significant Parental Status Differences

Non-Supportive Behaviour	Felt signif. more strongly by:	Signif.
Department B -"Puts me down" in front of others	non-parents	.018

Note: 1) There were no significant parental status differences observed in the Department A sample.
 2) Significance determined using a t-test, $\alpha=0.05$.

1.5 IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL NON-SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURS

It should be noted that there are nine unique non-supportive behaviours that appear in the final Supportive Supervisor Scales of both Departments. These nine behaviours represent almost two-thirds (64.3%) of the behaviours in the Department B final Supportive Supervisor Scale and just over half (56.3%) of the behaviours in the Department A final Supportive Supervisor Scale. The overlap is 100% in two themes (behaves inconsistently; and focuses on hours of work rather than output) and 50% in the other three themes. All those surveyed would appear to agree that a non-supportive manager is one who:

- offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum
- displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion
- tells people what they want to hear then behaves differently
- talks about what I didn't do not what I did

- **takes credit for my work**
- **focuses on hours of work rather than output**
- **has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done**
- **makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons.**

It may be that these behaviours are universally accepted in the Federal Government as being non-supportive. Further research would be necessary to determine this. In any case, these are behaviours that should be emphasized in future use of the scale.

While the gender differences in the non-support data of the Department A sample provide useful information on how to effectively manage employees in this Department, the relatively small number of significant differences with respect to gender and the lack of differences with respect to job-type are also worthy of note. Managers must recognize that both men and women employees in both Departments strongly agree that a supervisor who is a poor communicator and does not show respect for employees is not supportive.

CHAPTER FIVE

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE MEASURE

An assessment of measurement properties involves an evaluation of reliability and validity. The reliability of the final Supportive Supervisor Scale is assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The validity of the final Supportive Supervisor Measure is established based on its ability to predict variables which are designated as criterion. The criterion variables were determined based on the review of the literature which suggests the relationships between having a supportive supervisor and several outcomes. The predictive ability of the final Supportive Supervisor Scale is established based on its relationship to the following criterion variables: stress level, ability to balance work and family, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

1.0 VALIDITY OF THE MEASURE

This research examined content and construct validity. The considerable amount of overlap in the supportive and non-supportive behaviours generated in the two Departments suggests that the final Supportive Supervisor Scale is, in fact, measuring supportive and non-supportive behaviours. These results suggest that the final Supportive Supervisor Scale has good content validity. The remainder of this section will focus on criterion-related validity, a component of construct validity.

Managers were assessed as supportive or non-supportive based on both the supportive and the non-supportive behaviours using the same procedure. The supportive-non-supportive breakdown was calculated as follows: supportive managers

have mean scores greater than 5.5 on the supportive behaviours (or 2.5 or lower on the non-supportive behaviours) and non-supportive or mixed support managers have mean scores of less than 5.5 on the supportive behaviours (or greater than 2.5 on the non-supportive behaviours). Managers who displayed mixed support were grouped with those who displayed non-support due to the low number of respondents with managers in the non-supportive category.

Based on the supportive behaviours, of the 202 respondents in Department B who chose to evaluate their current managers, 151 (74.8%) rated their managers as supportive and 13 (6.4%) rated their managers as non-supportive. The remaining 38 (18.8%) rated their managers as mixed. The results for the non-supportive behaviours were virtually identical. Based on the non-supportive behaviours, 78.1% rated their managers as supportive and 2.5% rated their managers as non-supportive. The remaining 19.4% rated their managers as mixed. These results suggest that the majority of those who responded to the assessment questionnaire work in a supportive work environment, however, caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions about the Department. Due to the high level of uncertainty regarding job security that exists within the Public Service at this time and the relatively low response rate achieved in phase III (38.7%), it is conceivable that only those employees with supportive supervisors completed the survey. Therefore, it is possible that the results are so favourable due to response bias rather than organizational culture.

Managers were evaluated separately based on the supportive and the non-supportive behaviours (see Table 16). Table 16 shows the percentage of employees who scored high on the outcomes of interest (i.e. job satisfaction, stress, organizational

commitment, role overload, and work to family interference). Data is presented in two ways: (1) employees whose managers obtained high scores with respect to supportive behaviours, and (2) employees whose managers scored high with respect to non-supportive behaviours.

As can be seen in Table 16, the trends observed with respect to the outcomes of interest are virtually identical for both the supportive and non-supportive behaviours. This is an important finding as it suggests that support and non-support are opposite ends of the same continuum. Due to the high degree of similarity between the findings obtained when the supportive scores were used to split the sample and the results obtained when the non-supportive scores were used, the remainder of the discussion focuses on only one set of data: the supportive behaviours.

The cut-offs used to divide outcomes into high and low were established by Higgins and Duxbury (1992) and defined in Chapter Two of this thesis. Only those scoring high on the various outcomes are examined in this analysis.

The results of the current study are consistent with the relationships proposed in the literature indicating that the final Supportive Supervisor Scale has good predictive validity. A detailed discussion of the link between each outcome and supervisor support is given in the following section.

Table 16: Individual Outcomes by Supportiveness Rating

Outcome	Supportive Behaviours			Non-Supportive Behaviours		
	Supportive Supervisor	Non-Supportive or Mixed Supervisor	Prob (df=2)	Supportive Supervisor	Non-Supportive or Mixed Supervisor	Prob. (df=2)
High Job Satisfaction	88.7%	66.7%	.00010	89.9%	59.1%	.00000
High Job Stress	37.5%	80.4%	.00000	42.1%	70.5%	.00147
High Organizational Commitment	78.1%	47.1%	.00011	77.8%	43.2%	.00000
High Role Overload	62.0%	84.3%	.01313	63.1%	84.1%	.02235
High Work to Family Interference	36.7%	58.8%	.02119	37.6%	59.1%	.00556
High Perceived Stress	41.9%	66.7%	.00862	41.9%	70.5%	.00340

NOTE: N=242, Test performed= Chi-Square

1.1 Impact of Having a Supportive Supervisor on the Work Environment

This section empirically examines how "supportive" managerial behaviours, as defined by the "final Supportive Supervisor Scale" affect employee perceptions of their work environment. Job satisfaction, job stress and commitment to the organization are examined.

Job Satisfaction: The data indicates that having a supportive manager is significantly (prob.= .00010) related to high job satisfaction (defined as mean scores of 3.75 or greater on the job satisfaction scale). Of the 151 respondents who rated their current managers at Department B as supportive, 89% have high job satisfaction. Of the people with low or mixed support, on the other hand, 67% have high job satisfaction.

Job Stress: Having a non-supportive or mixed manager is significantly (prob.=.00000) related to high levels of job stress (defined as employees with mean scores of 3.75 or more on the job stress scale). Of all the Department B respondents with non-supportive managers, 60.4% rate their job stress as high. Only 37.5% of respondents who rated their current manager as supportive, on the other hand, are experiencing high job stress.

Commitment to the Organization: Having a supportive manager is significantly (prob.=.00011) related to high levels of commitment (defined as a commitment score of 3.75 or more) to the Department. Seventy-eight percent of respondents with supportive managers rate their commitment to the Department as high. Of employees with non-supportive or mixed support managers, only 47% describe their commitment to the Department as high.

1.2 Impact of Having a Supportive Manager on the Non-Work Environment

A manager not only influences his/her subordinates while they are in the work environment, he/she may also have an impact on the subordinate's home front by either facilitating the balancing of the competing roles or hindering it. This section empirically examines how "supportive" managerial behaviours, as defined by the "final Supportive Supervisor Scale" affect employee perceptions of their non-work environment. Role overload, work to family interference and perceived stress are discussed.

Role Overload: The data indicates that the relationship between a supportive manager and role overload is significant (prob.=.01313). Eighty-four percent of respondents with non-supportive or mixed support managers are experiencing high levels of role overload (defined as a role overload score of 3.75 or higher). This compares to 62% of respondents with supportive managers.

Work to Family Interference: The data indicate that the supportiveness rating of managers is significantly related to the perception of interference from work to family (prob.=.02119). Fifty-eight percent of respondents at Department B with non-supportive or mixed managers have high work to family interference (defined as a role interference score of 3.75 or higher) versus 37% of employees with supportive managers.

Perceived Stress: The data indicate that the supportiveness rating of managers is significantly related to the employee's perception of stress (prob.=.00812). Sixty-seven percent of respondents at Department B with non-supportive or mixed managers have high stress (defined as a stress score of 2.5 or higher) versus 42% of employee with supportive managers.

2.0 RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURE

Reliability refers to the consistency and stability of a score from a measurement scale (Davis and Cosenza, 1985). The results indicate that the final Supportive Supervisor Scale has high internal consistency. The Cronbach alphas for the themes ranged from 0.66 to 0.88 while the measure as a whole had an alpha of 0.93 (see Table 18).

Correlation matrices for the Supportive Supervisor Measure and the individual themes can be seen in Appendix P. The following themes, as listed in Table 18, are a combination of both supportive and non-supportive behaviours: engages in two-way communication, treats employees with respect, and expects work to be given priority over non-work/focuses on hours of work rather than output. Non-supportive behaviours were reverse scored in the first two themes and supportive behaviours were reverse scored in the third theme.

Table 18: Cronbach Alphas

THEME	# OF ITEMS	CRONBACH ALPHA
Supportive Supervisor Measure	43	0.9304
1. Facilitates the completion of job tasks	3	0.8140
2. Encourages two-way communication	4	0.7593
3. Mentors employees	6	0.8827
4. Provides positive feedback	4	0.7672
5. Treats employees with respect	5	0.6855
6. Expects work to be given priority over non-work/Focuses on hours of work rather than output	4	0.6603
7. Behaves inconsistently	3	0.7112

To attain higher alpha scores, the following behaviours were omitted from themes 5 and 6 (as listed in Table 18): thanks me for the work I do; maintains his/her cool under pressure; focuses on hours of work rather than output; allows time off for family reasons; and, does not respect my hours of work; calls meetings late in the day or makes requests for Monday on Friday.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has filled a void within the literature through the development of a comprehensive, behaviour-based measure of supervisor support. In doing so, the concept of supervisor support has been defined in terms of quantifiable and readily observable behaviours. This construct is worthy of inspection as it further links support to outcomes of interest such as stress, ability to balance work and family, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The measure of supervisor support developed in this research has high internal reliability, construct validity and criterion-related validity. This research also identified themes which are consistent with the literature. These conclusions will be discussed in detail below.

The results suggest that a supportive supervisor is one who: facilitates the completion of job tasks, engages in two-way communication with subordinates, mentors his/her employee, allows employees autonomy, recognizes that employees have a life outside work, provides positive feedback, and treats employees with respect. A non-supportive supervisor, on the other hand, is one who: behaves inconsistently, is a poor interpersonal communicator, does not show respect for employees, focuses on hours of work, rather than output and, expects work to be given priority over non-work. These themes are consistent with the literature.

It is worthy of note that while all of these themes were observed in both of the Government Departments that participated in this research, the number of behaviours in each theme, and in some instances the behaviours themselves, varied by Department.

There was a substantial amount of overlap observed between the two Departments regarding the importance of several supportive and non-supportive behaviours. A total of 24 behaviours were ranked as critical by both Departments; 15 of which are supportive behaviours and 9 of which are non-supportive behaviours.

All those surveyed agree that a supportive manager is one who: makes sure employees have the tools/equipment they need to do the job, encourages any training that is needed to do the job, shares information with employees, utilizes their abilities, is available to answer questions, gives recognition when they do their jobs well, expresses confidence in employees' ability to do a difficult job, supports them to those higher up in the organization, encourages employees to make decisions on their own, listens to their concerns, lets them work independently, makes sure their opinions are heard at meetings, is flexible with time off for family reasons, gives them feedback on a regular basis, gives them challenging jobs, and helps them learn from their mistakes. Similarly, all those surveyed would appear to agree that a non-supportive manager is one who: offers employees support in private but then disowns their ideas in a public forum, displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion, tells people what they want to hear then behaves differently, talks about what employees didn't do not what they did, takes credit for their work, focuses on hours of work rather than output, has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done, and, makes employees feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons.

While these results may be specific to the Departments surveyed, they may also indicate behaviours which are universally important within the federal government or

perhaps all organizations. Further research would be necessary to verify how widely these supportive and non-supportive behaviours are considered critical.

There were a few significant differences by gender and job-type observed with regards to how strongly employees agree that certain behaviours are, in fact, supportive or non-supportive. In all instances, it is the women and non-managers who agree more strongly about the supportive nature of the behaviour. Women are more likely than men to agree that a supportive manager is one who: makes them feel comfortable approaching him/her, supports them to those higher up, expresses confidence in their ability to do a difficult job, makes decisions interactively with them, provides informal information on what is going on in the Department, uses a pleasant tone of voice with them, and allows them to take advantage of flexible work arrangements. Similarly, non-managers are more likely than managers to agree that a supportive supervisor is one who: uses a pleasant tone of voice with them, allows them to take advantage of flexible work arrangements, and is flexible with time off for family reasons. It is not surprising that there is overlap between the behaviours that women and non-managers agree most strongly about as women are more likely than men to hold non-managerial positions within the Departments.

More important than the differences in agreement based on gender and job-type is the lack of differences by gender and job-type. The large proportion of behaviours without significant gender or job-type differences emphasizes the high level of consensus within these Departments on how a supportive manager should and should not behave. Meanwhile, the observance of significant differences in agreement were predominantly within Department A which suggests that they may be due more to

organizational culture than gender or job-type.

The themes identified in this research are consistent with literature on work and family, social support, transformational leadership and Theory Z. Supervisors who recognize that employees have a life outside of work are considered supportive while those who focus on hours of work rather than output and expect work to be given priority over non-work are considered non-supportive. These results are consistent with the literature on work and family which suggests that supervisor support is an important variable in determining an employee's ability to balance the demands of work and family.

A second theme relates to two-way communication. A supportive supervisor listens to his/her employees' concerns, provides clear instructions by making objectives known, shares information with employees, expresses confidence in an employee's ability to do a difficult job, gives recognition on a regular basis, focuses on the positive instead of the negative, and gives employees feedback on a regular basis. A non-supportive supervisor avoids talking to employees and talks about what they did not do instead of what they did. Behaviours relating to two-way communication have been identified as highly supportive managerial behaviours in this study. Again, the link between communication and support has been drawn in the research literature. The Theory Z literature, for example, identifies the importance of open lines of communication between supervisors and subordinates in order for each party to be aware of the concerns of the other. The current study goes beyond this literature in that it provides a specific list of behaviours of supervisors relating to supportive and non-supportive communication.

A third theme relates to mentoring. A mentor utilizes his/her employee's abilities, supports them to those higher up in the organization, lets them work independently, makes sure their opinions are heard at meetings, gives them challenging jobs, helps them learn from their mistakes, and encourages their ideas. These findings are also consistent with other work in the area. According to the transformational leadership literature (Bass, 1985), mentoring will increase the employees' self-esteem and fulfil some of his/her 'need to know'. Again a significant contribution of this research is that it provides guidance to those who wish to mentor others in that it identifies several specific mentoring behaviours that employees strongly agree are supportive.

While this research concluded with a pilot study aimed at assessing the supportiveness of current managers, additional benefits can be achieved by following up on the results of the study. The final Supportive Supervisor Scale can be used as an upward feedback tool or as a starting point in the development of training programs for managers aimed at creating awareness around the elements of a supportive work environment. The measure can also be used in promotion decisions. The data collected during this study suggests that the supportiveness of a manager has such an important impact on the employee that organizations may want to ensure that managers who are not supportive are not promoted to positions of greater influence. Academics can build on these results to further research in the area of supervisor support and business practitioners can incorporate these supportive behaviours into their organizational culture to benefit both employees and the organization as a whole.

Future research should examine the relative impact of each of the individual

themes. The individual themes could be related to the outcomes of interest to determine if any one component of supervisor support has a greater impact on the individual or the organization than any of the others. Further research should also be directed at determining how widespread the critical supportive and non-supportive behaviours are.

The results of this study suggest that support and non-support are opposite ends of the same continuum as opposed to forming two separate ones. This can be seen in the actual behaviours as several of the non-supportive behaviours are just the opposite of supportive ones. It is suggested, therefore, that a supervisor who does not display supportive behaviours is non-supportive as opposed to just not being supportive.

While the results of this research are significant and contribute to a growing body of literature on the subject, as with all research, the current study has limitations. The main limitations involve generalizability and lack of response.

Generalizability refers to the extent to which general statements may be extrapolated to larger populations. The results were obtained by surveying a sample of each Department and, as such, may not be generalizable to the entire Department, other Departments or other private sector organizations.

The relatively small number of parents within the samples limited the establishment of significant differences based on parental status. It may be within these two groups where the largest differences in agreement occur.

The results of the pilot study may not accurately reflect the managerial environment within Department B. It may be that respondents with supportive managers were more likely to respond than were employees with non-supportive

managers. Due to the cost-cutting environment within the Federal Government, participants may not have felt comfortable assessing their managers in fear of reprisal and ultimately of losing their jobs. Several questionnaires were returned with comments of this nature.

Finally, the limitations inherent in the act frequency approach also apply in this study. With respondents asked to retrospect about the applicability of each item in the measure, it is possible that external influences or limitations related to recall may result in inaccurate responses. While behaviours are stated in as simple a manner as possible, respondents may misinterpret them and provide responses that do not accurately reflect their position.

THE WORK AND FAMILY LITERATURE

AUTHOR	FOCUS and INSTRUMENT	SAMPLE	DEFINITION OF SUPPORT	ALPHA'S & RELIABILITY MEASURES	FINDINGS
S.Goff, M. Mount and R.Jamison (1990)	Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism. (Questionnaire: 6 items)	62 users of a daycare centre in large mid-western electronics and communications firm 191 non-users (161 male, 92 female)	The degree to which supervisors are willing to discuss family-related problems and be flexible when emergencies arise.	No alpha Internal consistency reliability of .90	Supervisor support related to increased absenteeism at a marginally significant level ($B=.22$, $p=.067$) The more supportive the supervisor, the less work/family conflict experienced by the employee.
D.Hughes and E.Galinsky (1988)	Examines the extent to which changes in the work place that are worker-designed affect the mental and physical well-being of employees. (Questionnaire: 3 items)	733 employees at a large pharmaceutical company in New Jersey (326 women, 406 men) (26% managers/supervisors, 42.3% scientists, 31.1% clerical/technical workers)	Supervisor sensitivity was defined as the extent to which the respondent perceived his/her supervisor to be supportive of the employee in the work role as well as flexible and understanding about the employee's family responsibilities.	No Alpha No reliability measure.	Supervisor sensitivity: - is a powerful predictor of work/family interference for fathers [$B=-.16$, $sr^2=.02$, $F(1,194)=4.68$, $p>.05$] - is individually significant in predicting stress for employed mothers [$B=-.25$, $sr^2=.07$, $F(1,75)=5.44$, $p>.05$]
E.Galinsky et al. (1986)	To explore the area of supervisor support. (Interviews)	20 senior managers from a research division at Merck	No definition of support provided.	No Alpha No reliability measure	Usage of programs from day to day was determined by the managers. Managers more aware of extreme work/family problems. Managers more likely to hear about work/family problems from men rather than women.
D. Hughes et al. (1986)	Supervisor support. (Questionnaire: 3 items)	733 employees from Merck (55.5% male, 44.5% female)	Supervisor task support: the extent to which the respondent felt supported by his/her supervisor for accomplishing work tasks. Supervisor work/family support: respondent's perception of the supervisor as supportive when work/family problems arose.	Supervisor task support: Cronbach's Alpha = .91 Supervisor work/family support: Cronbach's Alpha = .85 No reliability measures	Combined 2 measures into measure of supervisor support. If perceive supervisor to be non-supportive, more likely for employee to be dissatisfied with his/her job, report increased levels of work/family conflict, more stress and more stress-related health problems.

THE SOCIAL SUPPORT LITERATURE

AUTHOR	FOCUS and INSTRUMENT	SAMPLE	DEFINITION OF SUPPORT	ALPHA'S & RELIABILITY MEASURES	FINDINGS
J.Kortke and C.Sharafinski (1988)	Employee commitment. (Questionnaire)	216 employees at a municipal government site in South Western U.S. (Average age: 37.8 years)	No definition of support provided.	Coefficient Alpha: .98	Employees commitment is affected by their perception of the organizations commitment to them which consists of: - perception of a global organizational commitment to employees - perception of support from supervisors Employees reported more support from supervisors than from the organization as a whole. Employees prefer feedback and support from those close to them.
G.Jones-Johnson and W.Johnson (1991)	Examined the effects of subjective unemployment on psychosocial stress. Moderator effects of perceived supervisor and social support were investigated. (Questionnaire: 9 items)	212 employees at American public utility government agency. 24-70 years old (72% men, 28% women)	No definition of support provided.	Coefficient Alpha= .92	Supervisor support was positive and significantly related to all of the psychosocial stress variables (depression, frustration, hostility, insecurity).
S.Kirmeyer and T.Dougherty (1988)	Investigated the buffering role of social support from supervisors in the relationship of work-load to both tension-anxiety and coping. (Observation and questionnaire: 8-items)	(4) police officers radio dispatchers at 12 police stations (51 men, 9 women)	Social support is information that leads a person to believe that he/she is cared for, esteemed and valued and belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation.	Cronbach's Alpha: .77 Test-retest reliability: .82	Supervisor support may benefit subordinates working in a potentially overloading environment in 2 ways: 1) ameliorate the effects of overload on emotional distress 2) encourage problem-focused coping.

SOCIAL SUPPORT LITERATURE (CONT'D)

AUTHOR	FOCUS and INSTRUMENT	SAMPLE	DEFINITION OF SUPPORT	ALPHA'S & RELIABILITY MEASURES	FINDINGS
T.Beehr, L.King, D.King (1990)	Examined contents of communication between supervisor and subordinate in context of occupational stress as potential forms of social support. (3 measures: 1) affective contents of communications with supervisors (12 items), 2) functional supervisor support (3 items), 3) satisfaction with supervisor (3 items)).	225 registered nurses from 7 hospitals Response rate = 66.8% 92% of respondents were female Average age = 35.5 74.1% married Average of 1.3 children	No definition of support provided	Measure 1: coefficient alpha's as follows: factor 1 - non-job related .92 factor 2 - negative .75 factor 3 - positive .80 Measure 2: coefficient alpha .85 Measure 3: coefficient alpha .93	Subordinate's perceptions of available support from their supervisors are primarily associated with positive job-related communication or with non-job-related communication. Functional supervisor support variable had main effects on employee strains.
J.House and J.Wells (1978)	Studied the effects of social support on work stress, health, and the relationship between stress and health. (Questionnaire: emotional support (4 items) and instrumental support (2 items)).	1809 white male employees at a large tire, rubber, chemicals, and plastics manufacturing plant in a small northeastern U.S. city. 70% response rate (there were too few blacks or females for analysis)	Emotional support-involves providing empathy, caring, love, and trust. Instrumental support - involves providing a person with information that the person can use in coping with personal and environmental problems.	Not available.	Social support (from supervisors and spouses) can directly reduce work stress and hence indirectly improve selected health outcomes (ulcers and neuritis), while also buffering workers against the effects of stress on health.

APPENDIX B**Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988)**

- 1 My supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of our dept.**
- 2. If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would do so.**
- 3. My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me.**
- 4. My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.**
- 5. My supervisor wants to know if I have any complaints**
- 6. My supervisor takes my best interests into account when he/she makes decisions that affect me.**
- 7. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.**
- 8. My supervisor really cares about my well-being.**
- 9. If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would be sure to notice.**
- 10. My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favour.**
- 11. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.**
- 12. If given the opportunity my supervisor would take advantage of me.**
- 13. My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me.**
- 14. My supervisor cares about my opinions.**
- 15. My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments.**
- 16. My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible.**

APPENDIX C

Used 9 item scale: My supervisor:

- 1 gives emotional support;**
- 2 is indifferent**
- 3 makes work life easier**
- 4 can be relied on when things get tough at work**
- 5 helps solve work-related problems**
- 6 is good to work with**
- 7 won't stand by when I need help**
- 8 will do anything to help**
- 9 helps solve personal problems**

5pt scale 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree (Jones-Johnson and Johnson, 1991)

APPENDIX D

The wording of some of the items reflects the nature of the subjects being studied.

Beehr et al. (1990) studied communication between nurses in hospitals and their supervisors, the head nurses.

Affective Contents of Communications with Supervisors

Subjects were asked to judge how often they talked about these subjects with his/her supervisor using a 5-point Likert scale:

1=never, 2=seldom, 3=occasionally, 4=often, 5=always

- 1 We discuss things that are happening in our personal lives.**
- 2 We talk about off-the-job interests that we have in common.**
- 3 We share personal information about our background and families.**
- 4 We talk about off-the-job social events.**
- 5 We talk about how we dislike some parts of our work.**
- 6 We talk about the bad things about our work.**
- 7 We talk about problems in working with doctors.**
- 8 We talk about how this hospital is a lousy place to work.**
- 9 We talk about the good things about our work.**
- 10 We share interesting ideas about nursing care.**
- 11 We talk about how this hospital is a good place to work.**
- 12 We talk about the rewarding things about being a nurse.**

Functional Supervisor Support

Subjects were asked to judge the extent to which they agreed with each item using a 5-point Likert scale.

1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, no opinion, or undecided, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree

The first 2 items measure emotional or esteem social support and the remaining 2 measure instrumental social support.

"The head nurse is willing to listen to my personal problems."

"The head nurse is easy to talk to."

"I can depend on the head nurse for help when things get tough at work."

"The head nurse is willing to change my work schedule when I need it."

APPENDIX E

This appendix lists three aspects of leadership behaviour from the 'Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire' by Stogdill (1963). Respondents are supposed to rate how often their supervisor displays the given behaviour on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=never, 2=seldom, 3=occasionally, 4=often, 5=always).

Initiating Structure

- 4. Lets group members know what is expected of them
- 14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures
- 24. Tries out his or her ideas in the group
- 34. Makes his or her attitudes clear to the group
- 44. Decides what shall be done and how it will be done
- 54. Assigns group members to particular tasks
- 64. Makes sure that his or her part in the group is understood by the group members
- 74. Schedules the work to be done
- 84. Maintains definite standards of performance
- 94. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations

Tolerance of Freedom

- 5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work
- 15. Permits the members to use their own judgement in solving problems
- 25. Encourages initiative in the group members
- 35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best
- 45. Assigns a task and then lets the members handle it
- 55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it
- 65. Is reluctant to all the members any freedom of action (R)
- 75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative
- 85. Trusts members to exercise good judgement
- 95. Permits the group to set its own pace

Consideration

- 7. Is friendly and approachable
- 17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group
- 27. Puts suggestions made by members of the group into operation
- 37. Treats all group members as his or her equals
- 47. Give advance notice of changes
- 57. Keeps to himself or herself (R)
- 67. Looks out for personal welfare of the group members
- 77. Is willing to make changes
- 87. Refuses to explain his or her action (R)
- 97. Acts without consulting the group

APPENDIX F

Charismatic leadership

- 1 Makes everyone around him/her enthusiastic about assignments
- 2 I have complete faith in him/her.
- 3 Is a model for me to follow
- 4 Inspires loyalty to the organization
- 5 Is an inspiration to us
- 6 Inspires loyalty to him/her
- 7 Makes me feel good to be around him/her
- 8 Commands respect from everyone
- 9 Makes me proud to be associated with him/her
- 10 I am ready to trust his/her capacity to overcome any obstacles.
- 11 Encourages me to express my ideas and opinions
- 12 Has a special gift of seeing what it is that is really important for me to consider
- 13 In my mind, he/she is a symbol of success and accomplishment
- 14 Has a sense of mission which he/she transmits to me
- 15 Excites us with his/her visions of what we may accomplish if we work together
- 16 encourages understanding of points of view of other members
- 17 Increases my optimism for the future
- 18 Gives me a sense of overall purpose

Individualized Consideration

- 1 Gives personal attention to members who seem neglected
- 2 finds out what I want and tries to help me get it
- 3 You can count on him/her to express his/her appreciation when you do a good job
- 4 Is satisfied when I meet agreed-upon standards for good work
- 5 I earn credit with him/her by doing my job well
- 6 Treats each subordinate individually
- 7 Makes me feel we can reach our goals without him/her if we have to

Intellectual Stimulation

- 1 His/her ideas have forced me to rethink some of my own ideas which I had never questioned before
- 2 Enables me to think about old problems in new ways
- 3 Has provided me with new ways of looking at things which used to be a puzzle for me

(Bass, 1985, p.210)

APPENDIX G**STANDARD MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT:**

The Supervisory Behaviour Description Questionnaire. (Fleishman, 1953)

Respondents were asked to rate, on a 7 point scale where 1 = never, 4 = sometimes and 7 = always, the extent to which their manager demonstrates the following behaviours:

1. Refuses to give in when people disagree with him/her.
2. Demands more of us than we can do.
3. Treats people under him/her without considering their feelings.
4. Refuses to explain his/her actions.
5. Acts without consulting us.
6. Expresses appreciation when one of us does a good job.
7. Helps out with personal problems.
8. Stresses the importance of high morale among us.
9. Is understanding of our family demands.
10. Treats men and women equally.
11. Is willing to make changes.
12. Can be easily approached.

APPENDIX H: Phase II Cover Letter**To: Department X Employees**

Over the last seven years we have been conducting research on the inter-relationships between work and personal lives and the problems which occur when individuals can't balance the conflicting demands from these domains.

One major finding of our research is the importance of a supportive manager in helping individuals balance the dual demands of their work and personal life. In 1993, we conducted over 60 interviews and surveyed nearly 500 private sector employees to help us understand the dimensions of a "supportive" manager. The results indicated that a supportive manager can significantly lower incidences of work-family conflict and stress.

These important results are worth pursuing. Consequently, we are expanding the scope of the study and are now conducting the research in the public sector. We value your opinion and encourage you to participate in this important study. The survey should take from 30 to 45 minutes to complete.

Your individual responses are strictly confidential and only summary results will be presented to Department B. You will be able to get a copy of these results, once available.

Please complete the survey and return it to us in the enclosed envelope via internal mail. Should you have any questions, please Jane Bhar at (613) 567-0683.

Sincerely,

Chris Higgins
Associate Professor

Linda Duxbury
Associate Professor

Jane Bhar
M.M.S. Student

APPENDIX I: DEPARTMENT A PHASE II QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR OPINIONS ON WHAT MAKES A SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

The following questions are designed to elicit your opinions about the behaviours associated with a "supportive" manager. This is a person who is sensitive to, and supportive of your particular personal situation, whether it be your family responsibilities, your gender, your ethnic background or any other personal characteristic.

From your perspective, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with whether the behaviours listed below represent a "supportive" manager. Some of the questions may not seem relevant to your personal situation. However, all of these questions were based on comments made in personal interviews with Department A employees. Please CIRCLE the appropriate response.

A supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Lets me work independently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives recognition when I do my job well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is supportive of the decisions I make	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes it easy for me to rearrange my job schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Talks to me about non-work activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is available to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helps me learn from my mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listens to my concerns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lets me do the work from start to finish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shares information with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asks me how I am	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asks my opinions about things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Provides me with guidance in doing my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides informal information on what is going on in the Dept.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helps me to solve problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides me with a variety of tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me a lot of responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Acts as a role model	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses a pleasant tone of voice with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides me with interesting work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lets me take calculated risks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Stresses that health and family come first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes me feel comfortable in approaching him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Works closely with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is aware of what's going on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Utilizes my abilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supports me to those higher up in the organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me challenging jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Has frequent face to face discussions with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes decisions interactively with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION B: YOUR OPINIONS ON WHAT MAKES A NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

The following questions are designed to elicit your opinions about the behaviours associated with a "non-supportive" manager. This is a person who is not supportive of your particular personal situation, whether it be your family responsibilities, your gender, your ethnic background or any other personal characteristic.

From your perspective, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with whether the behaviours listed below represent a "non-supportive" manager. Some of the questions may not seem relevant to your personal situation. However, all of these questions were based on comments made in personal interviews with Department A employees. Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate response.

A non-supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vents frustration on me in times of crisis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expects me to work long hours regardless of my personal situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives direction quickly, not making clear his/her objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Avoids talking to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Takes credit for my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Doesn't clearly communicate what is expected of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Checks up on me constantly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Treats managers differently from non-managers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A non-supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Only talks to me when I make a mistake	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Talks about what I didn't do, not what I did	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Treats me as if my job was lower in status than it really is	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Interrupts me when I'm speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses sexist language	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes negative comments regarding "priorities" when I have to leave early	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION C: YOUR CURRENT MANAGER

Think about your immediate manager. Please indicate the extent to which he/she demonstrates the following behaviours by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response.

	Never			Some- times		Always	
My manager refuses to give in when people disagree with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager expresses appreciation when one of us does a good job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager demands more of us than we can do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager helps us with our personal problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager treats people under him/her without considering their feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager refuses to explain his/her actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager acts without consulting us.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager stresses the importance of high morale among us.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager is understanding of our family demands.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager treats men and women equally.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager is willing to make changes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My manager can be easily approached.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Is your present manager a male or female?

A. Male

B. Female

SECTION D: WORK AND FAMILY

The following are ways in which work and family life can interact. Family can include spouse, significant other and/or children. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY AGREE	
I feel I have more to do than I can comfortably handle.	1	2	3	4	5	
I feel physically drained when I get home from work.	1	2	3	4	5	
I feel emotionally drained when I get home from work.	1	2	3	4	5	
I feel I have to rush to get everything done each day.	1	2	3	4	5	
I feel I don't have enough time for myself.	1	2	3	4	5	
My job keeps me away from my family too much.	1	2	3	4	5	
I have a good balance between my job and my family time.	1	2	3	4	5	
I wish I had more time to do things for the family.	1	2	3	4	5	
My time off work does not match other families members' schedules well.	1	2	3	4	5	
Family life interferes with work.	1	2	3	4	5	
I worry about whether I should work less and spend more time with my family.	1	2	3	4	5	
I always find enough time for the children.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
I worry about my children when I'm working.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

SECTION E: WORK STRESS

The questions in this section focus on work stress. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 		NEUTRAL 		STRONGLY AGREE
I work under a great deal of tension.	1	2	3	4	5
I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.	1	2	3	4	5
If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.	1	2	3	4	5
Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.	1	2	3	4	5
I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION F: STRESS AND COPING

The following set of questions ask about stress and coping. Please **CIRCLE** the most appropriate answer for each question.

How often in the LAST MONTH have you:

	NEVER 		SOME- TIMES 		ALWAYS
Been upset because something happened unexpectedly?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt that you were unable to control important things in your life?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt nervous or "stressed"?	1	2	3	4	5
Dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt that you were coping effectively with important changes that were occurring in your life?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt that things were going your way?	1	2	3	4	5
Found that you could not cope?	1	2	3	4	5
Been able to control irritations in your life?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt you were on top of things?	1	2	3	4	5
Been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?	1	2	3	4	5
Found yourself thinking about things that you had to accomplish?	1	2	3	4	5
Been able to control the way you spent your time?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION G: DEMOGRAPHICS

We need some demographic information about you to help us interpret this questionnaire. To answer the following questions, please **CIRCLE** the letter of the answer which best describes you and/or fill in the information requested.

1. What is your gender?

A. MALE

B. FEMALE

2. What is your age? _____ YEARS

3. What is your present marital status? (**CIRCLE** all that apply)

A. NEVER MARRIED

B. MARRIED OR LIVING WITH A SIGNIFICANT OTHER

C. DIVORCED

D. SEPARATED

E. WIDOWED

4. What is your spouse's age? _____ YEARS or N/A

5. How many children do you have? _____ CHILDREN (If 0 please go to Q.7)

6. If you have children, please answer the following questions concerning your children..

AGE	SEX (Please CIRCLE)	PERCENT OF TIME LIVING WITH YOU
CHILD #1 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #2 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #3 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #4 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT

7. Are you responsible for the care of an elderly person(s)?

A. No --> Go to question 8

B. Yes

7a. How many hours per week do you spend caring for this person(s)? _____ HOURS

7b. Does the elderly person(s) you are responsible for live with you?

A. No

B. Yes --> What is their relationship to you? (e.g. father) _____

8. How long have you worked for your present employer? ____ YEARS
- 8a. How long have you had your present job? ____ YEARS
- 8b. How long have you worked for your present manager? ____ YEARS
9. Where do you work?

- A. [REDACTED] Headquarters
B. Regional Office

- 9a. What is your type of position?

- A. EX minus one and above
B. All other managers and supervisors
C. Officer
D. Support

10. How many individuals report to you directly? ____ PEOPLE

11. Please CIRCLE the letter which BEST describes your educational background:

- A. PUBLIC SCHOOL OR LESS
B. SOME HIGH SCHOOL
C. HIGH SCHOOL
D. COMMUNITY COLLEGE
E. SOME UNIVERSITY
F. A UNIVERSITY DEGREE
G. POST GRADUATE DEGREE(S)

12. Please CIRCLE the category which BEST describes your income before taxes:

- A. LESS THAN \$ 19,999
B. \$20,000 TO \$ 39,999
C. \$40,000 TO \$ 59,999
D. \$60,000 TO \$ 79,999
E. \$80,000 TO \$ 99,999
F. MORE THAN \$100,000

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by anyone within the [REDACTED]. Only aggregate responses will be returned to your employer and copies will be available through them or from us directly.

Please place your completed survey in the sealed envelope provided and return it via the internal mail system.

Should you have any questions or concerns about this survey please call Jane Bhar collect at:

Tel: (513) 567-0683

APPENDIX J: DEPARTMENT B PHASE II QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: YOUR OPINIONS ON WHAT MAKES A SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

The following questions are designed to elicit your opinions about the behaviours associated with a "supportive" manager. This is a person who is sensitive to, and supportive of your particular personal situation, whether it be your family responsibilities, your gender, your ethnic background or any other personal characteristic.

From your perspective, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with whether the behaviours listed below represent a "supportive" manager. Some of the questions may not seem relevant to your personal situation. However, all of these questions were based on comments made in personal interviews with employees of the Department B. Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate response.

A supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Lets me work independently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives recognition when I do my job well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is supportive of the decisions I make	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rewards team work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Focuses on the positive instead of the negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is available to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helps me learn from my mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listens to my concerns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides clear instructions by making objectives known	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shares information with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Asks me how I am	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asks my opinions about things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides me with guidance in doing my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides informal information on what is going on in the Dept.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helps me to solve problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maintains his/her cool under pressure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me a lot of responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Acts as a role model	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asks about my family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Allows me to take advantage of flexible work arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is pleasant and polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lets me take calculated risks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Stresses that health and family come first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listens to me when I need to discuss personal matters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Works closely with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is aware of what's going on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Utilizes my abilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supports me to those higher up in the organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me challenging jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Has frequent face to face discussions with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Makes decisions interactively with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is quick to respond to requests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Coaches me in my career development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is consistent: states what he/she wants and sticks to it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
States clearly whose interest a decision is serving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Will "roll up his/her sleeves" and help out when I'm overworked	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Compensates for overtime with time off	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Thanks me for the work I do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages my ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me the authority to set priorities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Doesn't keep me waiting - has an appreciation for my time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Introduces me to people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Has a good sense of humour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Respects my work hours - doesn't expect me to work over lunch or stay late after work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION B: YOUR OPINIONS ON WHAT MAKES A NON-SUPPORTIVE MANAGER

The following questions are designed to elicit your opinions about the behaviours associated with a "non-supportive" manager. This is a person who is not supportive of your particular personal situation, whether it be your family responsibilities, your gender, your ethnic background or any other personal characteristic.

From your perspective, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with whether the behaviours listed below represent a "non-supportive" manager. Some of the questions may not seem relevant to your personal situation. However, all of these questions were based on comments made in personal interviews with employees of the Department B. Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate response.

A non-supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Manages strictly by the book - does not take circumstances into consideration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expects me to work long hours regardless of my personal situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives direction quickly, not making clear his/her objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Avoids talking to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offers me support in private but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Takes credit for my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Doesn't clearly communicate what is expected of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Checks up on me constantly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A non-supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done in a given time period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Treats managers differently from non-managers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Calls me to a meeting without giving me time to prepare	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Talks about what I didn't do, not what I did	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Treats me as if my job was lower in status than it really is	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Interrupts me when I'm speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses sexist language	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes negative comments regarding "priorities" when I have to leave early	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses fear as a motivator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
"Puts me down" in front of colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Criticizes other employees behind their backs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Overrules my decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expects me to be at work as long as he/she is	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Only hears what he/she wants to hear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does not tolerate any mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Frequently changes his/her mind and priorities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A non-supportive manager is one who:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Does not understand what has to be done	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Contradicts me in meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is inflexible to change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Leaves requests unanswered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes changes to my work without offering explanations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does not respect my hours of work - calls meetings late in the day or makes requests on friday for monday	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION C: DEMOGRAPHICS

We need some demographic information about you to help us interpret this questionnaire. To answer the following questions, please **CIRCLE** the letter of the answer which best describes you and/or fill in the information requested.

1. What is your gender?
 - A. MALE
 - B. FEMALE
2. What is your age? _____ YEARS
3. What is your present marital status? (**CIRCLE** all that apply)
 - A. NEVER MARRIED
 - B. MARRIED OR LIVING WITH A SIGNIFICANT OTHER
 - C. DIVORCED
 - D. SEPARATED
 - E. WIDOWED
4. What is your spouse's age? _____ YEARS or N/A
5. How many children do you have? _____ CHILDREN (If 0 please go to Q.7)
6. If you have children, please answer the following questions concerning your children.

AGE	SEX (Please CIRCLE)	PERCENT OF TIME LIVING WITH YOU
CHILD #1 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #2 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #3 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT
CHILD #4 _____ YEARS	M F	_____ PERCENT

7. Are you responsible for the care of an elderly person(s)?

A. No --> Go to question 8

B. Yes

7a. How many hours per week do you spend caring for this person(s)? _____ HOURS

7b. Does the elderly person(s) you are responsible for live with you?

A. No

B. Yes --> What is their relationship to you? (e.g. father) _____

8. How long have you worked for the Department B? _____ YEARS

8a. How long have you had your present job? _____ YEARS

8b. How long have you worked for your present manager? _____ YEARS

9. What is your type of position?

A. EX

B. EX minus one

C. Officer

D. Support

10. How many individuals report to you directly? _____ PEOPLE

11. Please **CIRCLE** the letter which **BEST** describes your educational background:

A. PUBLIC SCHOOL OR LESS

B. SOME HIGH SCHOOL

C. HIGH SCHOOL

D. COMMUNITY COLLEGE

E. SOME UNIVERSITY

F. A UNIVERSITY DEGREE

G. POST GRADUATE DEGREE(S)

12. Please **CIRCLE** the category which **BEST** describes your income before taxes:

- A. LESS THAN \$ 19,999
- B. \$20,000 TO \$ 39,999
- C. \$40,000 TO \$ 59,999
- D. \$60,000 TO \$ 79,999
- E. \$80,000 TO \$ 99,999
- F. MORE THAN \$100,000

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by anyone within Canadian Heritage. Only aggregate responses will be returned to your employer and copies will be available through them or from us directly.

Please put your completed survey in the sealed envelope provided and return it via the internal mail system.

Should you have any questions or concerns about this survey please call Jane Bhar collect at:

Tel: (613) 557-0683

APPENDIX K: DEPARTMENT B PHASE III QUESTIONNAIRE**SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS**

We need some demographic information about you to help us interpret this questionnaire. Any questions concerning your partner should be answered with respect to your partner or significant other. To answer the following questions, please **CIRCLE** the letter of the answer which best describes you and/or **FILL IN** the information requested.

1. To which branch do you belong to? (**CIRCLE** appropriate response)

1. Finance	6. Information Management
2. Communications	7. Administrative Services
3. Corporate and Intergovernmental Affairs	8. Human Resources
4. Corporate Review	9. Other
5. Integrated Management	

2. To which job category do you belong? (**CIRCLE** appropriate response)

1. Executive Group
2. Scientific and Professional
3. Administrative and Foreign Service
4. Technical
5. Administrative Support
6. Operational

3. How many employees report directly to you? _____ EMPLOYEES

4. Do you consider yourself a visible minority? (**CIRCLE** appropriate response)

1. No
2. Yes

5. What is your gender? (**CIRCLE** appropriate response) .

1. Male
2. Female

6. What is the gender of your manager? (**CIRCLE** appropriate response)

1. Male
2. Female

7. How many different managers have you had over the past year? _____ managers
8. How long have you worked under the direction of your current manager? _____ months
9. What is your age? _____ YEARS
10. What is your present marital status? (CIRCLE appropriate response)
1. Married or living with significant other
 2. Separated (skip to Q.15)
 3. Divorced (skip to Q.15)
 4. Never Married (skip to Q.15)
 5. Widowed (skip to Q.15)
11. Please identify the type of job **YOUR PARTNER** currently occupies (CIRCLE appropriate response):
1. Managerial	6. Retail
2. Professional	7. Production
3. Technical	8. Homemaker
4. Administrative	9. Unemployed
5. Clerical	10. Other _____
	(specify)
12. Approximately how many hours per week does **YOUR PARTNER** work on his/her job?
- _____ HOURS/WEEK
13. Please indicate the number of children living at home in each of the following age groups (if no children, please skip to question 15).
- _____ 0-3 Years _____ 13-18 Years
- _____ 4-5 Years _____ Over 18 Years
- _____ 6-12 Years
14. In your family, who has the main responsibility for the day to day arrangements for the care of the children? (CIRCLE appropriate response)

I HAVE

|

1

SHARE EQUALLY

|

2

3

PARTNER HAS

|

4

5

15. Please indicate the number of elderly dependents in each of the following categories (if no elderly dependents, skip to question 16).

___ Living in your home --> Hours per week spent caring for this person(s): ___ Hours

___ Living elsewhere --> Hours per week spent caring for this person(s): ___ Hours

16. Please CIRCLE the number which best describes:

**YOUR
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

1. High school or less
2. Community College
3. Some University
4. A University Degree
5. Post Graduate Degree(s)

**YOUR PARTNER'S
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

1. No partner
2. High school or less
3. Community College
4. Some University
5. A University Degree
6. Post Graduate Degree(s)

17. Please CIRCLE the category which best describes:

YOUR INCOME

1. Less than \$12,000
2. \$12,000 to \$19,999
3. \$20,000 to \$39,999
4. \$40,000 to \$59,999
5. \$60,000 to \$79,999
6. \$80,000 to \$99,999
7. More than \$100,000

YOUR PARTNER'S INCOME

1. No Partner
2. Less than \$12,000
3. \$12,000 to \$19,999
4. \$20,000 to \$39,999
5. \$40,000 to \$59,999
6. \$60,000 to \$79,999
7. \$80,000 to \$99,999
8. More than \$100,000

18. Do you consider yourself familiar enough with your current manager to evaluate him/her?

1. Yes ---> proceed to question 19
2. No ---> skip to question 20

19. Please answer the following questions with respect to YOUR CURRENT MANAGER.

My current manager:	strongly disagree	mostly disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	mostly agree	strongly agree
Lets me work independently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives recognition when I do my job well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages me to make decisions on my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offers me support in private, but then disowns my ideas in a public forum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Avoids talking to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Focuses on hours of work rather than output	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me feedback on a regular basis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Focuses on the positive instead of the negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is available to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helps me learn from my mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listens to my concerns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tells people what they want to hear then behaves differently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provides clear instructions by making objectives known	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shares information with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses fear as a motivator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Utilizes my abilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Talks about what I didn't do, not what I did	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supports me to those higher up in the organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives me challenging jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Criticizes other employees behind their backs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Manages strictly by the book - does not take circumstances into consideration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is pleasant and polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Has unrealistic expectations about how much work can be done in a given time period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is flexible with time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Takes credit for my work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
"Puts me down" in front of colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Thanks me for the work I do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maintains his/her cool under pressure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Does not respect my hours of work - calls meetings late in the day or makes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION B: YOUR JOB

The following questions ask about your job and experiences with your employer. Please **CIRCLE** the most appropriate answer for each question.

20. Please indicate how satisfied you are with (**CIRCLE** the number appropriate for each statement):

	VERY DISSATISFIED		NEUTRAL		VERY SATISFIED
Your job in general	1	2	3	4	5
The number of hours you work	1	2	3	4	5
The schedule of your working hours	1	2	3	4	5
The sorts of things you do on the job	1	2	3	4	5

21. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements (**CIRCLE** the number appropriate for each statement):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY AGREE
I work under a great deal of tension	1	2	3	4	5
I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job	1	2	3	4	5
If I had a different job, my health would probably improve	1	2	3	4	5
Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night	1	2	3	4	5
I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that my job is more interesting than others I could get	1	2	3	4	5
I would leave Department B if offered the same job with another Department (or company)	1	2	3	4	5
I don't mind spending a half-hour past quitting time if I can finish a task.	1	2	3	4	5

22. Listed below are four common decisions about your work. How much authority do you have in making each of the following decisions about your work? (**CIRCLE** the number appropriate for each statement).

	NONE 		SOME 		A LOT
Determining what tasks I will perform from day to day	1	2	3	4	5
Setting quotas on how much work I have to complete	1	2	3	4	5
Establishing rules and procedures about how my work is to be done	1	2	3	4	5
Determining how work exceptions are to be handled	1	2	3	4	5

23. In some jobs, things are unpredictable. During the last month, how often was your productivity negatively impacted because you were:

	NEVER 		SOMETIMES 		ALWAYS
Unsure on whether things would work as expected?	1	2	3	4	5
At a loss about whom to go to for reliable help when you could not solve a problem?	1	2	3	4	5

24. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements (**CIRCLE** the number appropriate for each statement):

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 		NEUTRAL 		STRONGLY AGREE
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort in order to help the Dept be successful	1	2	3	4	5
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for the Dept	1	2	3	4	5
I am aware of the Dept's vision and values	1	2	3	4	5
I find that my values and the Dept's values are very similar	1	2	3	4	5
I am proud to tell others that I am part of the Dept	1	2	3	4	5
The Dept really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	1	2	3	4	5
I really care about the fate of the Dept	1	2	3	4	5

25. The following questions ask about your future with Department B. **CIRCLE** the number that best describes how you feel about:

	VERY WORRIED		MIXED FEELINGS		I FEEL VERY GOOD
Your future with Department B?	1	2	3	4	5
Your career progression at Department B?	1	2	3	4	5
The security of your present job?	1	2	3	4	5

26. We are interested in the number of times during the last three months that you experienced the following situations. We are also interested in the impact you feel each of these situations has had on your ability to do your job (**CIRCLE** the number appropriate for each statement):

	Extent Experienced in Last 3 Mos.					Impact on Ability to do Job				
	Never	Mthly	Wkly	Daily	Daily**	Negative				None
Positive										
Your manager showed that he/she had trust and confidence in you	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You had trust and confidence in your manager	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You bring job problems to the attention of your manager	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You feel comfortable volunteering info to your manager on personnel problems, group conflict, or other types of human relations problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You have a sense of being a part of your manager's team	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You find that the members of your group know when you need assistance and offer their help	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
You identify with your work group (such as feeling part of the group and wishing to remain in the group)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION C: TIME MANAGEMENT

The following questions relate to how you spend your time and divide responsibilities. Family can include partner, significant other/or children and elders. Please **FILL IF** the information requested.

27. On your last regular work day approximately how many hours did you spend in the following activities:

Working at the office _____ HOURS

Working at home _____ HOURS

Home chores and errands _____ HOURS

Activities with children _____ HOURS

Self-related activities
(includes activities alone
or with partner) _____ HOURS

Caring for elders _____ HOURS

28. On your last regular non-working day approximately how many hours did you spend in the following activities:

Working at the office _____ HOURS

Working at home _____ HOURS

Home chores and errands _____ HOURS

Activities with children _____ HOURS

Self-related activities
(includes activities alone
or with partner) _____ HOURS

Caring for elders _____ HOURS

29. At present, approximately how many hours per week do you spend working at home:

During regular work hours? _____ HOURS/WEEK

Outside regular work hours? _____ HOURS/WEEK

SECTION D: ATTITUDES TOWARDS CURRENT WORK ARRANGEMENTS

The following types of work arrangements are common in North America.

- A. Regular work arrangements are designed so that employees work a set number of hours each week, arriving and departing at the same time each day.
- B. Flextime is designed to allow employees to vary their arrival and departure times for a fixed period. All employees must, however, be available at the office during a "core" time period which is set by the department.
- C. Compressed Work Weeks are designed to allow employees to take one working day off every week (or every other week) if they put in longer hours every working day.
- D. Rotating Shifts are designed so that employees work a set number of hours each week but time of day worked and days of week worked vary.
- E. Job Sharing arrangements are where two individuals share the same job on a part-time basis.
- F. Regular Part-Time arrangements in which employees work fewer hours per day or fewer days per week than regular full time employees.

30. Please **CIRCLE** the letter that best describes how your employment is **currently** arranged:

- A. Regular
- B. Flextime
- C. Compressed Work Week
- D. Rotating Shift
- E. Job Sharing
- F. Regular part-time

31. Approximately how many hours a week in total do you work on your job?

_____ HOURS/WEEK

32. How easy or difficult is it:

	Very Difficult 	Neither Difficult Nor Easy 		Very Easy 		
For you to vary your working hours (i.e. arrival and departure times)?	1	2	3	4	5	
For you to spend some of your regular work day working at home?	1	2	3	4	5	
For your partner to vary his or her working hours (i.e. arrival and departure times)?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
For your partner to spend some of his or her regular work day working at home?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

SECTION E: ACTIVITY

This Section asks a number of questions about your ability to work. Please **CIRCLE** the appropriate answer or **FILL IN** the information requested.

33. During the last three months to what extent:

	Never 	Mthly 	Wkly 	Daily 	Daily**
Did the stress and strains from commuting to work reduce your productivity?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you try to improve work methods to solve work problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you spend time trying to develop your skills and abilities to do a better job?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you feel contented, (rather than frustrated) in trying to do your job?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you automatically increase your work pace and shorten your work breaks when work pressures increased?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you stay late to finish work?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you have a sense of achievement in performing your job (such as getting a kick out of doing good work)?	1	2	3	4	5

34. Please think about the past three months of work. About how often:

	How many times in past 3 months?	Average # of minutes per time
Were you late for work because of family reasons?	_____	_____
Were you late for work because of personal reasons?	_____	_____
Were you late for work because of weather/traffic conditions?	_____	_____
Did you have to leave work early or interrupt your work because of family reasons/concerns?	_____	_____
Did you have to put long hours into the job?	_____	_____

SECTION F: WORK AND FAMILY

The following are ways in which work and family life can interact. Family can include partner, elders and/or children. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response.

35. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	STRONGLY DISAGREE		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY AGREE
	1	2	3	4	5
I feel I have more to do than I can comfortably handle.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel physically drained when I get home from work.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel emotionally drained when I get home from work.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel I have to rush to get everything done each day.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel I don't have enough time for myself.	1	2	3	4	5
After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to do.	1	2	3	4	5
On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.	1	2	3	4	5
My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.	1	2	3	4	5
My work takes up time that I'd like to spend with family/friends.	1	2	3	4	5
I'm often too tired at work because of things I have to do at home.	1	2	3	4	5
My personal demands are so great that it takes away from my work.	1	2	3	4	5
My superiors and peers dislike how often I am preoccupied with my personal life while at work	1	2	3	4	5
My personal life takes up time that I'd like to spend at work	1	2	3	4	5

36. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY AGREE
If I were unable to work long hours, it would limit my career opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5
If I were to take a leave of absence for family reasons, it would limit my career advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
Family responsibilities make it difficult for people to advance in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5
My organization's policies are supportive of my family needs.	1	2	3	4	5
I have seriously thought about leaving the workforce and not looking for other work.	1	2	3	4	5
I have seriously thought about leaving this organization to work for one with greater job flexibility.	1	2	3	4	5
I have seriously thought about leaving this organization to work for one that allows me to spend more time with my family.	1	2	3	4	5
My manager is sensitive to and supportive of my personal/family responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with the balance between the demands of my work and my personal life.	1	2	3	4	5

37. Please consider each of the following work situations and indicate the extent to which they have been affected by your family situation.

	NEGATIVE IMPACT		NO IMPACT		POSITIVE IMPACT
Productivity.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall career ambitions.	1	2	3	4	5
Job mobility.	1	2	3	4	5
Job-related travel.	1	2	3	4	5
Employer's view of you as an employee.	1	2	3	4	5
Colleagues' view of you as an employee.	1	2	3	4	5

38. Please consider each of the following family situations and indicate the extent to which they have been affected by your work situation.

	NEGATIVE IMPACT 		NO IMPACT 		POSITIVE IMPACT 	
Amount of time spent with partner.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Amount of time spent with children.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Relationship with partner.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Relationship with children.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Sharing of family responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

39. The following set of questions ask about stress methods of coping. Please **CIRCLE** the most appropriate answer for each question.

How often in the last month have you:

	NEVER 		SOMETIMES 		ALWAYS
Been upset because something happened unexpectedly?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt that you were unable to control important things in your life?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt nervous or "stressed"?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt that things were going your way?	1	2	3	4	5
Found that you could not cope?	1	2	3	4	5
Been able to control irritations in your life?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt you were on top of things?	1	2	3	4	5
Been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?	1	2	3	4	5
Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	1	2	3	4	5

40. Not counting regular and maternity-related check-ups, how many times during the last 12 months have you seen a physician for your problem? _____ TIMES
41. How many times during the last 12 months have you seen a physician for a child's problem? _____ TIMES
42. How many times during the last 12 months have you seen a physician for an elder's problem? _____ TIMES
43. During the last 12 months have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of health problems?
- A. NO
- B. YES -> How many days? _____ DAYS
44. During the last 12 months have you been unable to work or carry out your usual activities because of personal/family responsibilities (i.e., sick child, elder care, home responsibilities)?
- A. NO
- B. YES -> How many days? _____ DAYS
45. Approximately how many times during the last 12 months have personal/family responsibilities caused you to:
- Miss a full day of work. _____ TIMES
- Miss time during a work day
(e.g., arrived late, left early,
left and returned). _____ TIMES

Have you any comments you would like to make?

OPTIONAL: If you are willing to participate in any follow-up studies that may occur, please write your first name and a telephone number where you can be contacted (home or work):

FIRST NAME: _____

TELEPHONE NO: (_____) _____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If you have any questions please call Jane Bhar at (613) 567-0683.

APPENDIX L: Measures of Individual and Organizational Outcomes

Quinn and Shepard (1974) Job Satisfaction Measure:

Your job in general
 The number of hours you work
 The schedule of your working hours
 The sorts of things you do on the job

Kahn et al. (1983) Job Stress Measure:

I work under a great deal of tension
 I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job
 If I had a different job, my health would probably improve
 Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night
 I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things
 I feel that my job is more interesting than others I could get
 I would leave DEPARTMENT X if offered the same job with another Department (or company)
 I don't mind spending a half-hour past quitting time if I can finish a task.

Mowday et al. (1979) Organizational Commitment Measure:

I am willing to put in a great deal of effort in order to help the Dept be successful
 I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for the Dept
 I am aware of the Dept's vision and values
 I find that my values and the Dept's values are very similar
 I am proud to tell others that I am part of the Dept
 The Dept really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance
 I really care about the fate of the Dept

Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981) Role Overload Measure:

I feel I have more to do than I can comfortably handle.
 I feel physically drained when I get home from work.
 I feel emotionally drained when I get home from work.
 I feel I have to rush to get everything done each day.
 I feel I don't have enough time for myself.

After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to do.
On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.
My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.
My work takes up time that I'd like to spend with family/friends.
I'm often too tired at work because of things I have to do at home.
My personal demands are so great that it takes away from my work.
My superiors and peers dislike how often I am preoccupied with my personal life while at work
My personal life takes up time that I'd like to spend at work

Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981) Work to Family Interference Measure:

Amount of time spent with partner.
Amount of time spent with children.
Relationship with partner.
Relationship with children.
Sharing of family responsibilities.

APPENDIX M: PHASE II DEMOGRAPHICS (DEPARTMENT A)

VARIABLE	TOTAL	GENDER		JOB TYPE		
		MEN	WOMEN	MGR	OFFICER	SUPPORT
Marital Status						
• Never Married	12.8%	15.4%	11.1%	4.2%	11.2%	21.2%
• Married/Significant Other	74.1%	70.9%	76.1%	79.2%	76.1%	67.1%
• Divorced	9.8%	9.4%	10.0%	12.5%	9.7%	8.2%
• Separated	2.4%	4.3%	1.1%	4.2%	1.5%	2.4%
• Widow	1.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.5%	1.2%
Parental Status						
• Non-Parents	34.6%	37.6%	32.6%	22.2%	34.3%	44.2%
• Parents	65.4%	62.4%	67.4%	77.8%	65.7%	55.8%
Parents With Kids						
• No Kids Under 5	73.8%	76.7%	72.1%	80.4%	75.0%	62.5%
• Kids Under 5	26.2%	23.3%	27.9%	19.6%	25.0%	37.5%
Education						
• Some High School	1.7%	2.6%	1.1%	1.4%	1.5%	2.3%
• High School	24.7%	10.5%	33.9%	17.1%	14.6%	47.7%
• Community College	14.4%	11.4%	16.4%	7.1%	10.0%	26.7%
• Some University	13.4%	14.0%	13.0%	14.3%	13.8%	12.8%
• University Degree	45.7%	61.4%	35.6%	60.0%	60.0%	10.5%
Income						
• > 19,000	0.3%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	5.2%	1.2%
• 20,000 - 39,000	16.4%	3.5%	24.4%	5.9%	47.8%	41.9%
• 40,000 - 59,000	42.3%	40.7%	43.3%	20.6%	41.0%	50.0%
• 60,000 - 79,000	29.7%	37.2%	25.0%	38.2%	6.0%	5.8%
• 80,000 - 99,000	9.6%	14.2%	6.7%	27.9%	0.0%	1.2%
• > 100,000	1.7%	4.4%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%

APPENDIX M: PHASE II DEPARTMENT A DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

VARIABLE	TOTAL	GENDER		JOB TYPE		
		MEN	WOMEN	MGR	OFFICER	SUPPORT
Elder Care						
• No	89.5%	89.4%	89.6%	89.9%	89.2%	88.9%
• Yes	10.5%	10.6%	10.4%	10.1%	10.8%	11.1%
Work Location						
• Dept A HQ	69.0%	79.3%	62.4%	77.5%	72.7%	57.0%
• Regional Office	31.0%	20.7%	37.6%	22.5%	27.3%	43.0%
Job Type						
• Ex Minus I	6.5%	13.8%	1.7%	26.4%	-	-
• Other Managers	18.2%	23.3%	14.8%	73.6%	-	-
• Officer	45.9%	44.8%	46.6%	-	100.0%	-
• Support	29.5%	18.1%	36.9%	-	-	100.0%
Direct Report Status						
• No Direct Reports	15.4%	11.4%	20.6%	9.7%	-	-
• Direct Reports	84.6%	88.6%	79.4%	90.3%	-	-
Gender of Manager						
• Male	57.6%	68.2%	50.9%	74.2%	53.7%	49.4%
• Female	42.4%	31.8%	49.1%	25.8%	46.3%	50.6%

APPENDIX M: PHASE II DEPARTMENT A DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

VARIABLE	TOTAL	GENDER		JOB TYPE		
		MEN	WOMEN	MGR	OFFICER	SUPPORT
Age	41.8	43.8	40.6	43.6	43.1	38.5
Spouse's Age	42.0	40.8	42.7	43.8	42.6	39.2
Hours in Elder Home Care	4.9	3.9	5.5	3.3	5.1	5.7
Years in Central Agency	13.1	14.7	12.1	15.4	13.9	10.2
Years in Present Job	6.0	6.9	5.3	5.8	6.3	5.4
Years with Present Manager	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.2	2.8	3.1
# of Employees Supervised	6.4	7.2	5.5	6.7	-	-

APPENDIX N: PHASE II DEMOGRAPHICS (DEPARTMENT B)

VARIABLE	TOTAL	GENDER		JOB TYPE	
		MEN	WOMEN	MGR	NON-MGR
Marital Status					
• Never Married	19.5%	28.0%	15.1%	30.8%	17.2%
• Married/Significant Other	68.8%	60.0%	73.6%	46.2%	73.4%
• Divorced	6.5%	4.0%	7.5%	15.4%	4.7%
• Separated	5.2%	8.0%	3.8%	7.7%	4.7%
Parental Status					
• Non-Parents	46.2%	48.0%	44.4%	53.8%	44.6%
• Parents	53.8%	52.0%	55.6%	46.2%	55.4%
Parents With Kids					
• No Kids Under 5	71.4%	53.8%	76.7%	50.0%	75.0%
• Kids Under 5	28.6%	46.2%	23.3%	50.0%	25.0%
Education					
• Some High School	3.8%	4.0%	3.7%	7.7%	3.1%
• High School	26.9%	16.0%	31.5%	7.7%	30.8%
• Community College	16.7%	12.0%	18.5%	0.0%	20.0%
• Some University	16.7%	12.0%	20.4%	7.7%	18.5%
• University Degree	35.9%	56.0%	25.9%	76.9%	27.7%
Income					
• <19,000	2.6%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	3.1%
• 20,000 - 39,000	39.0%	12.0%	50.9%	0.0%	46.9%
• 40,000 - 59,000	40.3%	56.0%	34.0%	30.8%	42.2%
• 60,000 - 79,000	16.9%	28.0%	11.3%	61.5%	7.8%
• 80,000 - 99,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
• > 100,000	1.3%	4.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
Elder Care					
• No	81.8%	87.0%	79.6%	66.7%	84.4%
• Yes	18.2%	13.0%	20.4%	33.3%	15.6%
Job Type					
• EX	3.8%	12.5%	0.0%	23.1%	-
• EX minus one	12.8%	20.8%	9.3%	76.9%	-
• Officer	55.1%	58.3%	53.7%	-	66.2%
• Support	28.2%	8.3%	37.0%	-	33.8%
Direct Report Status					
• No Direct Reports	65.8%	52.0%	72.2%	15.4%	75.4%
• Direct Reports	34.2%	48.0%	27.8%	84.6%	24.6%

APPENDIX N: PHASE II DEPARTMENT B DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

VARIABLE	TOTAL	GENDER		JOB TYPE	
		MEN	WOMEN	MGR	NON-MGR
Age	38.0	39.4	37.4	40.0	37.6
Spouse's Age	37.8	33.6	29.8	39.1	29.2
Hours in Elder Home Care	1.7	0.8	2.2	1.5	1.8
Years in Department	2.5	2.1	2.7	1.6	2.7
Years in Present Job	3.5	5.0	2.9	2.2	3.9
Years with Present Manager	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.8	1.3
# of Employees Supervised	1.6	2.8	1.0	5.8	0.8

APPENDIX O: PHASE III DEMOGRAPHICS (DEPARTMENT B)

	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
BUSINESS UNIT			
• Finance	20.0%	10.4%	13.7%
• Communications	8.6%	10.4%	9.8%
• Corp. & Intergovt Affairs	2.9%	14.9%	10.8%
• Corporate Review	5.7%	-	2.0%
• Integrated Management	2.9%	4.5%	3.9%
• Information Management	20.0%	25.4%	23.5%
• Admin. Services	22.9%	11.9%	15.7%
• Human Resources	11.4%	19.4%	16.7%
• Other	5.7%	3.0%	3.9%
JOB CATEGORY			
• Executive Group	14.3%	3.3%	7.4%
• Scientific & Professional	17.1%	18.3%	17.9%
• Admin. & Foreign Services	48.6%	41.7%	44.2%
• Technical	5.7%	6.7%	6.3%
• Administrative Support	8.6%	30.0%	22.1%
• Operational	5.7%	-	2.1%
SUPERVISOR STATUS			
• No Direct Reports	60.0%	64.2%	62.7%
• Direct Reports	40.0%	35.8%	37.3%
VISIBLE MINORITY			
• No	94.1%	86.6%	89.1%
• Yes	5.9%	13.4%	10.9%
GENDER OF MANAGER			
• Male	57.1%	51.5%	53.5%
• Female	42.9%	48.5%	46.5%
EVALUATE MANAGER			
• Yes	82.9%	89.4%	87.1%
• No	17.1%	10.6%	12.9%

APPENDIX O: PHASE III DEPARTMENT B DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

	GENDER		TABLE TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
	MEAN	MEAN	
# of different mgrs in past year	2.7	2.3	2.4
Months with current manager	16.9	9.9	12.3
# of Employees (span of control)	7.8	4.4	5.8
Age	37.9	39.7	39.1
Spouse Hours Work per Week	35.2	41.1	39.2
Elder care home hours	20.0	25.0	22.5
Elder care elsewhere hours	4.7	5.9	5.6

APPENDIX O: PHASE III DEPARTMENT B DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
MARITAL STATUS			
• Married	79.4%	68.2%	72.0%
• Separated	5.9%	3.0%	4.0%
• Divorced	-	10.6%	7.0%
• Single	14.7%	18.2%	17.0%
SPOUSE JOB TYPE			
• Manager	10.7%	13.6%	12.5%
• Professional	32.1%	47.7%	41.7%
• Technical	7.1%	9.1%	8.3%
• Admin.	14.3%	4.5%	8.3%
• Clerical	3.6%	-	1.4%
• Retail	3.6%	2.3%	2.8%
• Production	-	2.3%	1.4%
• Homemaker	7.1%	4.5%	5.6%
• Unemployed	7.1%	2.3%	4.2%
• Other	14.3%	13.6%	13.9%
PARENTAL STATUS			
• Non-Parents	42.9%	52.2%	49.0%
• Parents (all)	57.1%	47.8%	51.0%
• Parents with Children under 6	30.0%	28.1%	28.8%
ELDER CARE			
• Home	2.9%	3.0%	2.9%
• Outside	8.6%	13.4%	11.8%

APPENDIX O: PHASE III DEPARTMENT B DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
EDUCATION			
• High School	14.3%	15.2%	14.9%
• College	14.3%	18.2%	16.8%
• Some University	11.4%	24.2%	19.8%
• University Degree	31.4%	25.8%	27.7%
• Graduate Degree	28.6%	16.7%	20.8%
SPOUSE'S EDUCATION			
• No Partner	3.3%	14.3%	10.1%
• High School	26.7%	18.4%	21.5%
• College	13.3%	18.4%	16.5%
• Some University	10.0%	4.1%	6.3%
• University Degree	26.7%	20.4%	22.8%
• Graduate Degree	20.0%	24.5%	22.8%
INCOME			
• 20,000 - 39,000	25.7%	37.3%	33.3%
• 40,000 - 59,000	31.4%	41.8%	38.2%
• 60,000 - 79,000	40.0%	19.4%	26.5%
• 80,000 - 99,000	2.9%	1.5%	2.0%
SPOUSE'S INCOME			
• No Spouse	3.3%	10.4%	7.7%
• < 12,000	20.0%	6.3%	11.5%
• 12,000 - 19,000	13.3%	6.3%	9.0%
• 20,000 - 39,000	26.7%	16.7%	20.5%
• 40,000 - 59,000	26.7%	35.4%	32.1%
• 60,000 - 79,000	6.7%	14.6%	11.5%
• 80,000 - 99,000	3.3%	6.3%	5.1%
• > 100,000	-	4.2%	2.6%

APPENDIX P: Reliabilities and Intercorrelations

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Facilitates the completion of job tasks (alpha=0.8140):						
1. Makes sure I have the tools/equipment I need to do my job	1.0000					
2. Encourages any training that is needed to do my job	0.5991	1.0000				
3. Is available to answer questions	0.5002	0.7036	1.0000			
Engages in Two-way Communication (alpha=0.7593):						
1. Listens to my concerns	1.0000					
2. Provides clear instructions by making objectives known	0.3806	1.0000				
3. Shares information with me	0.4500	0.6326	1.0000			
3. Avoids talking to me (reverse scored)	0.3570	0.2219	0.3473	1.0000		
4. Talks about what I didn't do not what I did (reverse scored)	0.4210	0.4285	0.4712	0.4016	1.0000	
Mentors Employees (alpha=0.8827):						
1. Utilizes my abilities	1.0000					
2. Supports me to those higher up	0.5329	1.0000				
3. Gives me challenging jobs	0.7224	0.6466	1.0000			
4. Helps me learn from my mistakes	0.4535	0.6318	0.5699	1.0000		
5. Makes sure my opinion is heard at meetings	0.5623	0.5332	0.5454	0.6006	1.0000	
6. Encourages me to make decisions on my own	0.4415	0.5622	0.5053	0.5413	0.5163	1.0000
Provides Positive Feedback (alpha=0.7672):						
1. Expresses confidence in my ability to do a difficult job	1.0000					
2. Gives recognition when I do my job well	0.46302	1.0000				
3. Focuses on the positive instead of the negative	0.4638	0.5363	1.0000			
4. Gives me feedback on a regular basis	0.3171	0.5527	0.3976	1.0000		

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Treats Employees with Respect (alpha=0.6855):						
1. Is pleasant and polite	1.0000					
2. "Puts me down" in front of others (rs)	0.1600	1.0000				
3. Criticizes others behind their backs (rs)	0.2609	0.2807	1.0000			
4. Uses fear as a motivator (rs)	0.2472	0.4672	0.4247	1.0000		
5. Takes credit for my work (rs)	0.3598	0.2604	0.3289	0.4852	1.0000	
Expects Work to be Given Priority over Non-work/Focuses on Hours of Work rather than Output (alpha=0.6603):						
1. Is flexible with time off for family reasons (rs)	1.0000					
2. Has unrealistic expectations about how work can be done	0.3536	1.0000				
3. Manages strictly by the book	0.7127	0.4725	1.0000			
4. Makes me feel guilty about sick days and time off for family reasons	0.0000	0.5949	0.0868	1.0000		
Behaves Inconsistently (alpha=0.7112):						
1. Offers support in private then disowns my ideas in a public forum	1.0000					
2. Tells people what they want to hear, then behaves differently	0.5685	1.0000				
3. Displays favouritism in assigning work tasks and recommending for promotion output	0.3311	0.4712	1.0000			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avolio, B. and Bass, B. (1987). "Charisma and Beyond." In J.G. Hunt (Eds.), Emerging Leadership Vistas (29-49). Boston: Lexington.
- Bass, B., Avolio, B. and Goodheim, L. (1987). "Quantitative Description of World-Class Industrial, Political, and Military Leaders." Journal of Management, 13, 7-20.
- Bass, B. (1978). "From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision." Organizational Dynamics, 6, 19-31.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. London: Collier Macmillan.
- Bass, B., Valenzi, E., Farrow, D., Soloman, R. (1975). "Management Styles Associated with Organizational, Task, Personal and Interpersonal Contingencies." Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(6), 720-729.
- Bedeian, A., Armenakis, A., and Curran, S. (1981). "The Relationship Between Role Stress and Job-Related, Interpersonal, and Organizational Climate Factors." The Journal of Social Psychology, 113, 247-260.
- Beehr, T. (1985). "The Role of Social Support in Coping With Organizational Stress." In T.A. Beehr and R.S. Bhagat (Eds.), Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations: An Integrated Perspective (57-82). New York: Wiley.
- Beehr, T., King, L., and King, D. (1990). "Social Support and Occupational Stress: Talking to Supervisors." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36, 61-81.
- Berlew, D. (1974). "Leadership and Organizational Excitement." In D.A. Kalb, I.M. Rubin, and J.M. McIntyre (Eds.), Organizational Psychology: A Book of Readings (16-34). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Block, J. (1989). "Critique of the Act Frequency Approach to Personality." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 234-245.
- Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Buss, D. (1984). "Toward a Psychology of Person-Environment (PE) Correlation: The Role of Spouse Selection." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 361-377.
- Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1980). "The Frequency Concept of Disposition: Dominance and Prototypically Dominant Acts." Journal of Personality, 43, 379-392.

Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1981). "The Act Frequency Analysis of Inter-Personal Dispositions: Aloofness, Gregariousness, Dominance, and Submissiveness." Journal of Personality, 49, 175-192.

Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1983a). "Acts, Dispositions, and Personality." Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 13, 241-301.

Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1983b). "The Dispositional Analysis of Everyday Conduct." Journal of Personality, 51, 393-412.

Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1983c). "The Act Frequency Approach to Personality." Psychological Review, 90, 105-126.

Buss, D. and Craik, K. (1985). "Why Not Measure That Trait? Alternative Criteria for Identifying Important Dispositions." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 934-946.

Caplan, R., Cobb, S., and French, J. (1975). Job Demands and Worker Health. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Castaneda, M. and Nahavandi, A. (1991). "Link of Manager Behavior to Supervisor Performance Rating and Subordinate Satisfaction." Group and Organization Studies, 16(4), 357-366.

Chisholm, R., Kasl, S., and Mueller, L. (1986). "The Effects of Social Support on Nuclear Worker Responses to the Three Mile Island Incident." Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7, 179-194.

Clark, R. (1979). The Japanese Economy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cobb, S. (1974). "Physiological Changes in Men Whose Jobs Were Abolished." Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 18, 245-258.

Conger, J. and Kanungo, R. (1987). "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings." Academy of Management Review, 12(4), 637-647.

Cummins, R. (1990). "Job Stress and the Buffering Effect of Supervisory Support." Group and Organization Studies, 15(1), 92-104.

Davis, D. and Cosenza, R. (1995). Business Research for Decision Making. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.

- Durkheim, E. (1933). The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Macmillan.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., Lee, C., and Mills, S. (1992). "An Examination of Organizational and Individual Outcomes." Optimum, 23(2), 78-95.
- Dyke, L. (1990). PHD Dissertation on Self Promotion. Queens University.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., and Sowa, D. (1986) "Perceived Organizational Support." Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 500-507.
- Elman, M. and Gilbert, L. (1984). "Coping Strategies for Role Conflict in Married and Professional Women with Children." Family Relations, 24, 549-563.
- Epstein, S. (1979). "The Stability of Behavior: I. On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1097-1126.
- Evans, M. (1970). "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 277-298.
- Fernandez, J. (1985) Child Care and Corporate Productivity: Resolving Family/Work Conflict. New York: Lexington Book, D.C. Heath Co.
- Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1974). "Attitudes Toward Objects as Predictions of Single and Multiple Behavioral Criteria." Psychological Review, 81, 59-74.
- Fleishman, E. (1953). "The Description of Supervisory Behavior." Journal of Applied Psychology, 37, 1-6.
- Ford, D. and Bagot, D. (1978). "Correlates of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction for Minority Professionals in Organizations: An Examination of Personal and Organizational Factors." Group and Organization Studies, 3, 30-41.
- Galinsky, E. (1986). "Family Life and Corporate Policies." In Michael W. Yogman and T. Berry Brazelton (Eds.), In Support of Families (109-145), Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Galinsky, E. (1988). The Impact of Supervisors' Attitudes and Company Culture on Work/Family Adjustment. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Galinsky, E., Hughes, D., and David, J. (1990). "Trends in Corporate Family-Supportive Policies." In Corporations, Businesses and Families, 75-94.

Galinsky, E., Ruopp, R., and Blum, K. (1983). The Corporate Work and Family Life Study. Unpublished paper, Bank Street College of Education, New York, N.Y. as cited in Galinsky, E. (1988).

Galinsky, E. and Stein, P. (1990). "The Impact of Human Resource Policies on Employees: Balancing Work/Family Life." Journal of Family Issues, 11(2), 368-383.

Goff, S., Mount, M., and Jamison, R. (1990). "Employer Supported Child Care, Work/Family Conflict, and Absenteeism: A Field Study." Personnel Psychology, 43, 793-809.

Gouldner, A. (1959). Introduction. In E. Durkheim (Ed.), Socialism and Saint Simon. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, v-xxix.

Greller, M. and Harold, D. (1975). "Sources of Feedback: A Preliminary Investigation." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 244-256.

Hall, D. (1972). "A Model of Coping with Role Conflict: The Role Behavior of College-Educated Women." Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 17, 471-486.

Hall, D. (1989). "Promoting Work/Family Balance: An Organization-Change Approach." Organizational Dynamics, 17, 5-18.

Hall, D. and Richter, J. (1988). "Balancing Work Life and Home Life: What can Organizations Do to Help?" The Academy of Management Executive, 2(3), 213-223.

Harrison, A., and Minor, J. (1978). "Interrole Conflict, Coping Strategies, and Satisfaction Among Black Working Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 799-805.

Hater, J. and Bass, B. (1988). "Superiors' Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership." Journal of Applied Psychology, 73(4), 695-702.

Hatvany, N. and Pucik, V. (1981). "Japanese Management Practices and Productivity." Organizational Dynamics, 9(4), 5-21.

Higgins, C., Duxbury, D., and Lee, C. (1992). Balancing Work and Family: A Study of Canadian Sector Employees. Ottawa: National Centre for Management Research and Development.

Himle, D., Jayaratne, S., and Thyness, P. (1989). "The Buffering Effect of Four Types of Supervisory Support on Work Stress." Administration in Social Work, 13(1), 19-34.

Holahan, C. and Gilbert, L. (1979). "Conflict Between Major Life Roles: Women and Men in Dual-Career Couples." Human Relations, 32, 451-467.

Horowitz, L., Inouye, D., and Siegelman, E. (1979). "On Averaging Judges Ratings to Increase Their Correlation with an External Criterion." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 453-458.

House, J., McMichael, A., Wells, J., Kaplan, B., and Landerman, L. (1980). "Occupational Stress and Health Among Factory Workers." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 20, 139-160.

House, R. (1971). "A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly, 321-338.

House, R. (1977). "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." In J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The Cutting Edge (189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R., Spangler, W., and Woycke, J. (1991). "Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 364-396.

Howell, J. and Frost, P. (1989). "A Laboratory Study of Charismatic Leadership." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43, 243-269.

Hughes, D. and Galinsky, E. (1988). "Balancing Work and Family Life: Research and Corporate Application". In A.E. Gottfried & A.W. Gottfried (Eds.), Maternal employment and children's development: Longitudinal Research (54-71). New York: Plenum Press.

Jaccard, J. (1974). "Predicting Social Behavior From Personality Tests." Journal of Research in Personality, 7, 358-367.

Jayarathne, S., Tripodi, T. and Chess, W. (1983). "Perceptions of Emotional Support, Stress, and Strain by Male and Female Social Workers." Social Work Research Abstracts, 19(2), 19-27.

Johnson, M. (1980). "Speaking from Experience: Mentors - The Key to Development and Growth." Training and Development Journal, 34(7), 55-57.

Jones-Johnson, G. and Johnson, W. (1991). "Subjective Underemployment and Psychosocial Stress: The Role of Perceived Social and Supervisor Support." The Journal of Social Psychology, 132(1), 11-21.

- Karasek, R. (1979). "Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign." Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 285-311.
- Kaufmann, G. and Beehr, T. (1986). "Interactions Between Job Stressors and Social Support: Some Counter Intuitive Results." Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 522-526.
- Kirmeyer, S. and Dougherty, T. (1988). "Work Load, Tension, and Coping: Moderating effects of Supervisor Support." Personnel Psychology, 41, 125-139.
- Kottke, J. and Sharafinski, C. (1988). "Measuring Perceived Supervisory and Organizational Support." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48, 1075-1079.
- Kuhnert, K. and Lewis, P. (1987). "Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis." Academy of Management Review, 12(4), 648-657.
- LaRocco, J. and Jones, A. (1978). "Co-Worker and Leader Support as Moderators of Stress-Strain Relationships in Work Situations." Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(5), 629-634.
- LaRocco, J., House, J., and French, J. (1980). "Social Support, Occupational Stress, and Health." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 21, 202-218.
- Lazarus, R. and Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal and Coping. New York: Springer.
- Levinson, H. (1965). "Reciprocity: The Relationship Between Man and Organization." Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 9, 370-390.
- Liden, R., Wayne, S., and Stilwell, D. (1993). "A Longitudinal Study on the Early Development of Leader-Member Exchanges." Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(4), 662-674.
- Love, M., Galinsky, E., and Hughes, D. (1987). "Work and Family: Research Findings and Models for Change." ILR Report, 25, 13-20.
- Margerison, C. (1980). How Chief Executives Succeed. Bradford, England: MCB Publications.
- McClelland, D. and Boyatzis, R. (1982). "Leadership Motive Pattern and Long-Term Success in Management." Journal of Applied Psychology, 67(6), 737-743.
- Moos, R. (1981). Work Environment Scale Manual: A Social Climate Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moser, K. (1989). "The Act-Frequency Approach: A Conceptual Critique." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 73-83.

National Council for Jewish Women. (1988). Employer Support for Child Care. New York: Author.

Osipow, S., and Davis, A. (1988). "The Relationship of Coping Resources to Occupational Stress and Strain." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32, 1-15.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ouchi, W. and Jaeger, A. (1978). "Type Z Organization: Stability in the Midst of Mobility." Academy of Management Review, 3, 306.

Pearlin, L. and Schooler, C. (1978). "The Structure of Coping." The Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-22.

Podsakoff, P., Todor, W., and Skov, R. (1982). "Effects of Leader Contingent and Noncontingent Reward and Punishment Behaviors on Subordinate Performance and Satisfaction." Academy of Management Journal, 25(4), 810-821.

Pucik, V. (1981). "Promotions and Intraorganizational Status Differentiation Among Japanese Managers." Academy of Management Proceedings, August, 33-40.

Repetti, R. (1985). "Social Factors in the Workplace and Mental Health." Paper presented at the 1985 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Rice, R. (1978). "Construct Validity of the Esteem for Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale." Psychological Bulletin, 85, 1199-1237.

Rosch, E. (1975). "Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories." Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 104, 192-223.

Rosch, E. and Mervis, C.B. (1975). "Family Resemblances: Studies in the Internal Structure of Categories." Cognitive Psychology, 7, 573-605.

South, S., Markham, W., Bonjean, C., and Corder, J. (1987). "Sex Differences in Support for Organizational Advancement." Work and Occupations, 14(2), 261-285.

South, S., Bonjean, C., Corder, J., and Markham, W. (1982). "Sex and Power in the Federal Bureaucracy." Work and Occupations, 9(2), 233-254.

- Speizer, J. (1981). "Role Models, Mentors, and Sponsors: The Elusive Concepts." Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 6(4), 692-712.
- Smith, G. and DeWine, S. (1991). "Perceptions of Subordinates and Requests for Support: Are Males and Females Perceived Differently when Seeking Help?" Group and Organization Studies, 16(4), 408-427.
- Stogdill, R. (1974). Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. New York: Free Press.
- Sullivan, J. (1983). "A Critique of Theory Z." Academy of Management Review, 8(1), 132-142.
- Sullivan, J. and Kameda, N. (1982). "The Concept of Profit and Japanese-American Managerial Communications." The Journal of Business Communications, 19(1), 33-40.
- Vecchio, R. and Appelbaum, S. (1995). Managing Organizational Behaviour: A Canadian Perspective, Toronto: Dryden.
- Waldman, D., Bass, B., and Einstein, W. (1987). "Effort, Performance, and Transformational Leadership in Industrial and Military Settings." Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60, 177-186.
- Wiggins, J. (1973) Personality and Prediction: Principles of Personality Assessment, Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley.
- Wiley, M. and Eskilson, A. (1988). "Gender and Family/Career Conflict: Reaction of Bosses." Sex Roles, 19(7/8), 445-466.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophical Investigations. New York: Macmillan.
- Yukl, G. (1981). Leadership in Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. and Van Fleet, D. (1990). "Theory and Research on Leadership in Organizations." Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3, 147-197.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and Leaders: Are they different?" Harvard Business Review, May-June, 67-78.
- Zaleznik, A. "The Leadership Gap." (1983) Washington Quarterly, 6, 32-39.

END

1 0-0 6-9|6

FIN