

Nouvelles Internationales International News Section

Cette nouvelle section paraîtra dans chaque numéro et donnera aux lecteurs des informations sur les événements internationaux en psychologie appliquée.

This new section will appear in each subsequent issue of the *Review*, and will provide readers with information on international news in applied psychology.

A CONFERENCE ON CO-ORDINATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

25–30 July 1976 were the inclusive dates of a conference whose theme was: Coordination and Control of Group and Organizational Performance. The Conference was organized jointly by Dr. Bert King (U.S. Office of Naval Research) and Professor Siegfried Streufert (University of Bielefeld, West Germany), sponsored by the Human Factors Division of N.A.T.O., and held in Munich, West Germany. Some 26 papers were presented in seven topical clusters, all bearing to a greater or lesser degree on the questions posed by King in the beginning: How are control and power exerted in organizations, and how should they be exerted, toward the ends of productivity, effectiveness, and quality of working life? The clusters to which the contributed papers were fitted were titled 'Leadership Processes' (two sessions), 'Structural and Environmental Influences', 'Decision-Making Approaches', 'Participation and Control', 'Participation and Authority', and 'European Developments in Industrial Democracy'. Proceedings of the Conference are to be published in hard-cover by Plenum Press.

As keynote speaker, **Fred Fiedler** (University of Washington, U.S.A.) sounded some familiar notes. He expressed an optimistic view of the capability of 'current leadership theories' (i.e., contingency theory) to predict the performance of a group on the basis of the leader's personality attributes in interaction with situational factors, and identified 'the next problem' as development of a dynamic theory which can deal with the continual changes occurring in the leader as well as in the organizational structure. Among studies he mentioned was one showing that the LPC index (Least Preferred Co-Worker score) predicted the direction of change of behaviour under stress in a group of managers; with increasing stress (or organizational turbulence), relationship-oriented managers increased Rewarding behaviour, while task-oriented managers decreased behaviour of this kind. This is the kind of result that makes Fiedler optimistic that his own leadership theory will be able to deal with changes in organizations. A major theme underlying his talk was that providing organizations with effective managers (leaders) will be best achieved not by selection (at least not if the environments with which they must cope are very changeable) nor by training aimed at equipping the manager with a 'good management style' (i.e., changing his personality or behaviour); training he argued, should be devoted to helping the person judge what situational characteristics provide the best match for his existing style so that he can either alter the situation or move to a different one, always seeking the match that optimizes the effectiveness of his behaviour.

Leadership

Ralph Katz (Sloan School, M.I.T., Cambridge, U.S.A.) accepted the notion that leader behaviour must be different in different situations but proposed that leaders must change their behaviour to suit situational needs. He focused on needs stemming from the amount and type of 'disequilibrium' in the leader's particular group of subordinates (e.g., affective conflict vs. task

conflict), hypothesizing that affective conflict should lead subordinates to desire more Consideration, in contrast to task conflict, which should lead them to desire more Initiation of Structure. Katz further proposed that, regarding performance, Initiation of Structure would be the preferred leader behaviour to deal with either type of disequilibrium. These hypotheses were tested in a field study (questionnaires to a number of academic groups) and in a laboratory experiment, and both methods produced support. It can be seen that Katz's conclusion that leaders need highly flexible and diverse leadership styles, finely tuned to events and relationships within his group, was quite directly in contradiction to Fiedler's, which held that the leader's style be taken as a given and his ability to diagnose and alter situations be developed.

R. J. Butler (Management Centre, University of Bradford, England) expanded the contingency framework to include not only the immediate work group but also the structure of the organization and the larger context within which the organization functions, and constructed a model showing how the effectiveness of either employee-centred or task-centred leadership behaviour is constrained and influenced by these larger frames. As he affirmed, to be useful a contingency model has to be transformed into a decision model, and his paper was an effort to come to grips with some of the important variables that emerge when 'the situation' is analysed in more detail, and to operationalize 'leadership behaviour' in terms of the resources available to a leader in his situation.

Philip Yetton (Australian Graduate School of Management, University of New South Wales, Kensington, Sydney, Australia 2033) sketched the Vroom-Yetton model relating leaders' decision-making style to situational variables, noting in passing that managers do seem to encounter a very wide variety of situations in their work and that they do seem to vary their response to these situations, with the implication that it is probably not possible to aggregate across these situations and identify a leader with a particular style (e.g., relationship- vs. task-oriented, in Fiedler's system).

Gerry Randell (Management Centre, University of Bradford, England) concerned himself not with the building or testing of theory but with theory-implementation, the finding of ways to apply the results of research to such topics as leadership, motivation, job satisfaction, communication, etc., in such a way as to help managers to add to subordinate's *capacity* and *inclination* to work. He described a method of staff appraisal called Active Staff Development, based on a skills approach to management behaviour and introduced into an organization by a two-day workshop in 'performance review skills'. Although two days doesn't seem like much for the teaching of any kind of skill, much less managerial skills, Randell asserted that this approach has been adopted in many British work organizations and that under appropriate conditions and with adequate follow-up it can lead on to significant behaviour change (he and Fiedler were thus at nearly opposite poles on the question of how much effort ought to go into changing behaviour).

B. E. Partridge (Management Centre, University of Aston, England) discussed a study of shop stewards as leaders, using a minimum of theory and no quantification, and staying as close as possible to the level of the stewards' own interpretations of the meaning and purpose in their daily behaviour. He dealt specifically with the stewards' role and behaviour in grievance processing and showed what a multifaceted process this is and what difficult demands it makes of the steward. For example, just one of the facets is defining and articulating the grievance, and here the steward has to: (1) decide which of several value systems among his group to access in order to legitimize the group and maintain a collective unity; (2) decide which part of the management system to utilize in furthering the grievance; (3) decide how to articulate the

grievance so as to minimize opposition from management and other work groups; and (4) decide how to feed back the results of any bargaining in such a way as to confirm or change the values and beliefs of group members accessed under (1). What struck Partridge was the *variability* of action or style of leadership required of a shop steward; although he apparently did not directly test the notion that a given steward might be characterized as showing predominantly one kind of style, it sounds as though to do so would be to court failure. Certainly these stewards were shown to be dealing daily with the major topics in social and organizational psychology (group identity, intra- and inter-group conflict, communication, persuasion, the management of power, etc.).

Maria Pavlidou (Polytechnic School, Thessaloniki, Greece) also made a presentation at a pragmatic level and in an a-theoretical mode, discussing management approaches in the construction industry in developing countries and bringing out the notion that worker attitudes and management policies are necessarily very much interrelated. Theories and practices common in Western mechanized industrial settings may be more or less inapplicable in the construction industry (different in important respects from other industrial settings) and in developing countries (because of differences in worker attitudes, values, and expectations). Along the way she identified a number of vicious circles that stand in the way of movement toward Western industrialization in the developing countries.

Peter Suedfeld (University of British Columbia, Canada) rambled in a sometimes fascinating way over and around the notion of 'environmental load' and its effect on decision-making and problem-solving processes, touching rapidly on such topics as sensory deprivation, solitary confinement, prisoners-of-war, submariners, Antarctic work stations, astronauts, prisoners in jail, workers at monotonous tasks, ordinary inhabitants of the urban environment, characteristics of communications among governments, and the implications of the recent dramatically increased popularity of 'time-out' activities such as meditation. The thrust of all this was to show that we need to de-emphasize striving after general prescriptions for universally acceptable informational input levels and analyse in more detail the optimal environment for *particular* activities and for *particular* individuals—or perhaps simply allow individuals more freedom to establish their own preferred levels of environmental load. **Siegfried Streufert** (University of Bielefeld, West Germany) talked about an extension of the theory proposed earlier by Schroder, Driver, and Streufert relating 'environmental complexity' and 'cognitive structure' to 'complexity of information processing'. The extended theoretical statement will probably appear in all its complexity in the Proceedings; it was here presented in outline form as a set of some twelve propositions, with a minimum of discussion of each. One of the major implications is that planning designed to optimize decision-making will have to pay attention to characteristics of personality, of the environment, and of the decision-making task (a formidable set of contingencies).

Structural and Environmental Influences

J. M. Pennings (Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, U.S.A.) described a data analysis designed to show whether or not co-ordination within an organization (six indices) is significantly related to organizational effectiveness (seven indices); the results were positive and said to be strong enough to have implications for organizational design. **Eric Gunderson** (Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California, U.S.A.) surveyed a large-scale investigation of environmental and organizational influences on health and performance aboard U.S. Navy ships; this was another purely descriptive study which was able to highlight specific aspects of the physical and social environments that influence individual and group effectiveness and that had fairly clear implications regarding naval management strategies. Finally, **Kerstin Kiessler** (University of Cologne, West Germany) discussed an experimental

study testing the hypothesis that an organizational structure encouraging equal participation of all members would be more effective than a structure characterized by unequal participation (with its potential for power differences). The presentation focused on the experimenters' surprise at finding diametrically opposed results at two different business schools, with no way to explain the difference (Cummings earlier reported a similar interaction between the variables of principal interest and subject populations). The possibility of such interactions should perhaps be much more frequently investigated than it is (I know of one psychophysical investigator who transported his American subjects bodily to a Canadian lab to try to find the source of differences between his and Canadian results!).

Participation; Industrial Democracy

The two sessions on participation gave us papers ranging from theoretical overviews to cross-cultural field comparisons. A particularly good example of the former was the paper by **Peter Dachler** and **Bernhard Wilpert** (International Institute of Management, Berlin, West Germany), which argued that the field needs an analytic effort in order to develop concepts that go beyond the 'vague intuitive wisdom we so often refer to as "common sense"'. Participation was given a perspective much broader than that of a limited treatment of organizations for the solution of certain organizational problems, and it was shown that there are (1) different types of participation treatments used, (2) different quality dimensions characterizing different treatment types, (3) different social-economic and organizational theories and implicit assumptions underlying decisions and expectations about participations, and (4) different organizational and societal contexts.

An example of the field studies was one by **S. P. Bate** and **I. L. Mangham** (Centre for the Study of Organizational Change and Development, University of Bath, England) describing an effort to bring about an increase in employee involvement in a British chemical plant. The paper to appear in the Proceedings will cover the consultants' value premises, their model of change, data-collection methods, preliminary findings on attitudes toward participation, the form and consequences of data feedback, and some of the theoretical and empirical issues raised by the experience—far too much for inclusion in the conference paper, which concentrated on attitudes toward participation.

The session on industrial democracy (a more formal, legal arrangement than direct participation, aiming at participation through representation) comprised four papers, all of which discussed cross-national comparisons. Particularly impressive was the picture that emerged of a very ambitious undertaking by **Pieter Drenth** (Netherlands), **Frank Heller** (England), and colleagues, seeking to get insight into the process character of decision-making, as well as to study the effects of participative leadership style on decision-making by studying organizations in three countries (Netherlands, England, and Yugoslavia) intensively and longitudinally. The general framework for the design is a contingency model, with influence and power-sharing style (the independent variables) related to effectiveness, utilization of skills, and satisfaction (dependent variables), under moderation by a number of personal, situational, and structural variables. If this co-operative venture can be sustained and the formidable method problems dealt with satisfactorily, the results should be fascinating. **Bernard Bass** (University of Rochester, N.Y., U.S.A.) tried to show how industrial democracy (more prevalent in Europe) and participation (more prevalent in the U.S.) might be seen as complementary rather than as exclusive alternatives, and speculated that each might have special advantages for certain kinds of functions. This position, while it might be valid as far as it goes, does make direct payoff the criterion; whereas European advocates of industrial democracy tend to base their arguments on broad political philosophy, a base not touched by arguments about industrial efficiency. Along the way, Bass presented some interesting cross-

cultural data, gained by having subjects in various countries play a specially designed simulation game which yields an index of the comparative efficiency of self-planning vs. planning by others in small work groups; by this measure the greatest advantage for self-planning would be realized in North America (Canada plus the U.S.) and Ireland, the least in Germany.

The Proceedings of this meeting will provide expanded versions of each author's presentation, and should be a useful addition to the literature.

ANNONCES DES SYMPOSIA · SYMPOSIA NOTICES

Human Consequences of Crowding

This Symposium will be held on 6-11 November 1977 in Antalya, Turkey, and is sponsored by NATO and Middle East Technical University.

Correspondence addresses are:

For the Americas and the Pacific Region: R. B. BECHTEL, ERDF 2030 Eastspeedway no 116, Tucson, Arizona 85719, U.S.A.

For Africa, Asia, and Europe: M. R. GURKAYNAK/W. A. LECOMPTE, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

The objective of the Symposium is to bring together varying viewpoints regarding population density, crowding, and overmanning in behaviour settings.

Consequences humaines de la foule

Symposium organisé sous les auspices de l'OTAN et de l'université Technique du Moyen-Orient.

Le symposium se tiendra du 6 au 11 Novembre 1977 à Antalya, Turquie. Son objectif est de rassembler différents points de vue concernant la densité de la population, la foule, et la surpopulation.

Pour obtenir des renseignements complémentaires, se référer au texte anglais qui indique les adresses où ces renseignements peuvent être obtenus.

International Symposium on Psychological Assessment in Sport

This International Symposium on Psychological Assessment in Sport, will be held on 10-14 October 1977 at the Wingate Institute, Wingate, Israel.

The main purpose of the Symposium is to enable an exchange of ideas and experience on the means of measurement in sport psychology, including the fields of competitive sports, physical education and recreation.

At the Symposium there will be six workshops. Each workshop will include as keynoter an international expert in the field.

1. Psycho-motor abilities and their assessment. Professor Edwin Fleishman, U.S.A.
2. Psychological assessment during physical effort. Professor Gunnar Borg, Sweden.
3. Assessment of the personality of athletes. Professor John Kane, England.
4. Assessment of the motivation in sport and physical education. Professor Dorothy Harris, U.S.A.
5. Psychological assessment of athletes during pre-competition selection. Professor Ferruccio Antonelli, Italy.
6. Psychological assessment of the sport-gifted. Professor Ema Geron, Israel.

Official sponsors of the Symposium include the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP), the International Society of Sports Psychology (ISSP), The International

Council of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (ICHPER), and the Sports and Physical Education Authority of the Ministry of Education and Culture, Israel.

Symposium International sur l'évaluation psychologique dans le sport

Un Symposium International sur l'évaluation psychologique dans le sport se tiendra du 10 au 14 Octobre 1977 au Wingate Institute, Wingate, Israel.

Ce symposium se propose de faciliter un échange d'idées et d'expériences sur les moyens de mesure en psychologie du sport, y compris dans les domaines des sports de compétition, de l'éducation physique et des loisirs.

Il y aura six ateliers comprenant chacun un expert international dans ce domaine:

1. Aptitudes psycho-motrices et leur évaluation. Professeur Edwin Fleishman, U.S.A.
2. Evaluation psychologique pendant l'effort physique. Professeur Gunnar Borg, Suède.
3. Evaluation de la personnalité des athlètes. Professeur John Kane, Angleterre.
4. Evaluation de la motivation dans le sport et l'éducation physique. Professeur Dorothy Harris, U.S.A.
5. Evaluation psychologique des athlètes au cours de la selection avant compétition. Professeur Ferruccio Antonelli, Italie.
6. Evaluation psychologique des personnes douées pour le sport. Professeur Ema Geron, Israel.

Le symposium est placé officiellement sous les auspices de l'Association Internationale de Psychologie Appliquée (AIPA), de la Société Internationale pour la Psychologie du Sport, du Conseil International pour la Santé, l'Education Physique et les Loisirs et du Departement Sport Education Physique du Ministère de l'Education et de la culture d'Israel.

Pour plus de détails, écrire à: Symposium Secretariat, Wingate Institute,

For further details, contact: Wingate Post Office, Israel 42902