1985

Work Groups as an Aid to Management

John W. Porter

WORK GROUPS AS AN AID TO MANAGEMENT

John W. Porter, BS

A Digest Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of the Lindenwood Colleges in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science

1985

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY

Dr. Jack Kirk, Chairman and Faculty Advisor

Dr. Arlene Taich, Dean of Evening College, LCIE

Adjunct Professor Don Fuller

DIGEST

The work group is an important part of every

organization. These groups are important in that they

have a definite impact on both the organization and the

employees. Every employee is a member of a work group.

The employee that is a part of a supervisory unit or an

employee in a department is a member of the formal work

group. Those employees that share their time on the job

with those individuals that they care to be with for

reasons other than the organization's design, are

members of the informal work group, or clique as it is

sometimes called. The subject of work groups is an

important one because managers do manage groups of

people - divisions, departments, or work units. Groups

are composed of individuals, but the group influences

these individuals just as the leader does. The pressure

exerted by the group can affect the productivity and

performance of the manager's department positively or

negatively. The successful manager must understand the

dynamics of group behavior.

On the work site, the informal group can benefit

both the organization and the organization's employees.

Because the informal group welds such a force, manage-

ment should give these groups attention. Management should also learn to use these groups as an aid to attaining the goals and objectives of the organization. The informal group is that group that will provide fulfillment of several types of needs for the employee. If these needs are not fulfilled, the employee may experience a difficult time on the job. This difficulty could lead to poor performance.

Before management can attempt to use the work group, there should be a thorough understanding of the processes that occur within these groups. Researchers have studied groups for years. The results can be seen in such studies as the Hawthorne Studies, and others. These studies serve to give insight into the workings of the group. At least three functions of groups are important to an organization's success; namely, the socialization of the new employee, getting the job done, and helping in the decision-making process.

This paper will explore the classification of the different types of work groups, some explanations of methods utilized to study work groups, some knowledge about the reasons for the development and formation of the work group, an understanding of some of the

characteristics of groups, and some insights into the results of group membership. How managers use work groups will be shown through research and a brief period of observation.

WORK GROUPS AS AN AID TO MANAGEMENT

John W. Porter, BS

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the Lindenwood Colleges in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science

1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Few managers today question the existence of work
groups. This paper is concerned with work groups in all
types of organizations. More specifically, this paper
deals with the informal work group, also known as
cliques. These groups are found in all organizations
and at all levels in the organization. As far back as
the 1920's, behavioral scientists have paid special
attention to the processes that affect both individuals
and organizations.

The primary purpose is to explain how work groups,
especially the informal group, can be used by management
as an aid to helping the organization achieve its goals
and objectives. Some management theorists believe that
work groups are a detriment to any organization, and
should be discouraged. Those theorists belong to the
traditional school of thought, and view the work of the
organization as being completed not by groups of people,
but by individuals. The behavioral school of thought
takes the opposite view and considers the work of the
organization as being completed by groups of individ-
uals. These groups have characteristics that are
uniquely their own. They have a very powerful influence

1

on individuals in the organization who in turn can have an effect on the organization. These groups can alter the behavior of the employees while they are on the job, and often alter the organization.

Work groups fall into two main classifications, formal and informal. The formal group is that set of employees that are put together by the organization's design. The informal group, or cliques, is that set of employees that are together in response to a social need. These groups do not arise as a result of deliberate design by the organization, but they evolve naturally. These groups, in contrast to the formal groups, are not controlled by the organization, yet they have a definite impact on the organization. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 254)

This paper will explore work groups in regard to five main areas: the classification of the different types of work groups, a brief explanation of methods utilized to study these groups, the reasons for the formation and development of work groups, and an understanding of some of the characteristics of groups and insight into the results of group membership. These areas are broad and will be dealt with in more detail in the body of this paper.

Methods of research have not changed much since the early studies were conducted. The most famous research involved the Hawthorne studies. These experiments were conducted in a bank wiring room, which resembled, somewhat, a factory setting. Other methods involve controlled observations. Here again most of these were conducted in factories. Not much research, if any, has been conducted in an office setting. However, the results of these studies can be applied to both settings. The behavior of groups tend to be the same, regardless of the type of organization and the number of employees. Lab studies have been conducted to study the behavior of groups as well. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 252)

In addition to what the literature has to offer, there are a few personal observations included. These observations were done over a fourteen-week period. Controlled observations were conducted in a local office of American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) and an office of the Missouri Division of Family Services, a state social service agency. The AT&T office is an experimental office. Here the employees are allowed freedoms that the other offices across the country are not allowed to enjoy. In setting up the study, only one manager in the office was aware of my purpose there, and

the employees did not know what I was doing or who I was doing it for. The methods employed at this office were the personal interview and close observations. The Missouri Division of Family Services office is a regular state agency. It was chosen because it is a government office and usually in government offices, the behavior is controlled closely. The methods of study used in this office involved observation only, and I was not allowed to interview any of the employees. Both of these offices deal in a service to the public. The results of these two studies is interesting in that the behavior of the groups in these two offices, one from the private sector and the other from the public sector, was essentially the same.

The hypothesis to examine deals with the assumption that the informal work group can be used as an aid to management. The traditional school of management thought believes the informal work group is undesirable in a business setting. My hypothesis is the opposite of the traditional school of thought. The informal groups are not a detriment, and these groups can be utilized to aid the organization in achieving its goals and objectives. This is what I shall attempt to support.

Before management can attempt to utilize the informal work group, managers need to be well informed of the nature and characteristics of the informal work group. An understanding here is essential if management is to make maximum use of these groups. Included in this paper will be discussions of what needs are fulfilled by the informal group, what these groups provide to management, the development and formation of these groups, the development of the group's objectives, the structure of the group, the development of group leaders, and the types of groups. These are all aspects of work groups that are more specially related to individuals. Also there are discussions on how these groups are related to the organization and the organization's objectives. Special groups, such as committees and task forces, will be briefly discussed. Conflict will be discussed with all of its implications. Included here is a discussion of how conflict can be created and used as a benefit to the organization. There are things that work groups do for the organization, also there are things the work groups can do for its members. The discussion of what the group can do for its members is the last topic to be

discussed. It may not seem that this topic has much meaning for how the informal group can be an aid to management, but in actuality, it is the basis for achieving the goals and objectives of the organization.

CHAPTER II

The effective operation of any organization is contingent upon how well the organization's leaders can effectively manipulate its employees. These employees are viewed as both individuals and as part of a group. The very nature of management implies that more than one individual is involved. These individuals then, are a part of a group, regardless of the size. Management must be concerned with the group as well as the individual. It is the group that has a definite impact on the behavior of the individual and ultimately on the organization. Each member of the group has a personality that is unique, but the group will dictate their basic behavior while they are a member of the group. Management has to recognize that subtle change in personality in order to effect a successful and productive organization. Management then, must realize the importance of the groups and the influence they exert on the total organization. When taken into consideration, work groups are throughout the organization and almost every employee is a part of a group. (A member of several groups within the organization.)

Work groups are social organizations as they

provide social and psychological needs for the organization and the individual. We must remember that the work in the organization is not completed by the individual, but by groups of individuals. When used effectively, the work group can be used as an aid to management. Conversely, when they are not utilized effectively, they work to the detriment of the organization.

It is important that management understand the psychological aspects of the work group as well. The work group does not have a defined personality of its own, but displays the combined personalities of those individuals that comprise the group. These combined personalities must be treated as one personality. Management must then endeavor to understand the psychological make-up of each group under their span of control.

Each individual in the group comes from a different cultural background, and will provide a different cultural opinion to the group. These cultural attitudes will have a definite impact on the activities and the decision-making processes that the group engages in.

The intent of this paper is to examine work groups

and support the theory that when these groups are used effectively, they can be an aid to management. To accomplish this goal, it will be necessary to examine work groups from the very basics to the more complex interworkings of the group. It is advantageous from the outset to understand the needs provided by the group to the individual as well as management. Group formation and development is important because management would then be better able to recognize the group and become familiar with the leader or leaders of the groups. A major discussion will be conducted in the area of group conflict. This factor alone accounts for a large percentage of group effectiveness. It is important to have an understanding of why groups form and how they solve problems.

In recent years the two main schools of management theory, traditional and behavioral, have split because of their views regarding individuals and groups. The traditional management theory has been strongly individualistic. It has cultivated ideas and assumptions with the individual as the basis. Groups were recognized, but only as official committees whose use should be kept to a minimum. The behavioral management theorists have suggested that the natural

organizational unit, rather than the individual should
be the primary concern. The primary belief of the
behavioral school of thought is that an organization
will work best when its personnel function not as
individuals, but as members of highly effective work
groups. This implies that this school of thought takes
the view that the structure of the organization is a
series of interlocking groups. The manager is a link
between two or more of these groups, and at the same
time he is the leader of his own group and a partici-
pating member of his superior's group. (Flippo, 1970,
pg. 366). The main focus will be from the behavorist
view of management, since that school of thought has
concerned itself with the group rather than the individ-
ual. It is important for management to study and under-
stand work groups because this is essential to formation
of laws that will influence and govern the operation of
groups.

> "Just as one must define the dimensions of an
> individual personality in order to understand
> a person and predict his behavior, so must one
> define the dimensions of group syntality in
> order to understand it and predict its behavior."
> (Flippo, 1970, pg. 368)

In terms of an organizational setting, there are
many definitions of a work group. One such definition

is:

> "A collection of employees (managerial or non-managerial) sharing certain norms who are striving toward member need satisfaction through the attainment of a group goal." (Donnelly, 1981, p. 252)

Glueck, another management theorist has a slightly different definition for work groups. He defines them as:

> "A group whose members function as a team and participate fully in group discussions; whose objectives are clearly developed, and whose resources are adequate to accomplish its objectives." (Glueck, 1980, p. 534)

Although these definitions are the same, the former has one factor more than the latter. Donnelly, in his definition, has considered the social aspect and the feeling of belonging. This feeling allows for, and causes the necessary cohesiveness that is so very important and necessary if the group is to be effective. To illustrate the complexity of work groups, it must be pointed out that the aforementioned definitions are both very basic. Within these definitions is also a sub-division or sub-classification of work groups. These groups can be subdivided into formal and informal groups. Each of these have definitions and each of them can exert a definite impact and influence on both the organization and the individual.

Every organization has technical requirements which stem from its objectives. The accomplishment of these objectives requires certain tasks to be performed and employees are assigned to perform these tasks. These employees become members of these groups because of their position in the organization. These groups are formal in nature, and form the departments, units, and so forth, that management creates by design to do the work of the organization. A formal work group is one that is,

> "a set of two or more people who see themselves as a group, are interdependent with one another for a purpose, and communicate and interact with one another on a more or less continuing basis." (Glueck, 1980, p. 534)

In many cases, but not always, the members of these formal groups work closely together physically. Formal groups are created to fulfill specific tasks clearly related to the organization's purposes. They can be permanent, like departments or temporary like committees. The demands and processes of the organization leads to the formation of these groups.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, whenever employees associate on a fairly continuous basis, there is a tendency for groups to form whose activities may be different from those required by the organization.

These groups are informal in nature, and are natural groupings of people in the work situation in response to social needs. The informal group then is,

> "a set of two or more people formed by mutual attraction of its members." (Glueck, 1980, p. 534)

These groups do not arise as a result of deliberate design, but rather evolve naturally, and are not created by the organization. The informal group, also known as a clique usually supplements the formal group in achieving the organization's objectives. Basically, these groups are just as important as the formal groups, but they play the important part of or role of satisfying the needs of the individual members of the group.

There are three types of informal groups, they are:

1. horizontal; 2. vertical; and, 3. mixed

The horizontal groups are those whose composition are mainly those individuals who work in the same area and are of the same rank and status. The vertical clique are those members of the group that have different rank and status within the same department; and the mixed group is one that is a group of people of different rank and status from different departments in different locations. The latter of these three types of groups

may form because their members have known each other in the past or know each other off the job. (Glueck, 1980, p. 534) Even though the formal work group is important, it is the informal work group that has the more defined impact. These groups usually shape and form the behavior of the individual while they are on the job. From the standpoint of management it is this behavior that the manager has to consider when he/she is trying to influence employees, and this is the rationale for studying work groups in the field of management.

The formation of work groups is inevitable and ubiquitous. Consequently, no matter how rewarding or satisfying it is to work in a particular organization, it is also certain that work groups are going to form. Thus it is in management's best interest to understand what happens within work groups because they are found throughout the organization. Work groups, have a strong influence on the overall behavior and performance of members of the organization. To understand the focus of influence exerted by the group requires a systematic analysis. Group membership can have both a positive and negative impact as far as the organization is concerned. If managers are to avoid the negative consequences generated by groups it is vitally important and

necessary that they learn about work groups. The

aforementioned statements can be used to best explain

why there is a need by management to study work groups.

The common, or basic assumption that can be found in

these three statements can be found in all answers to

the question, why should management concern itself with

work groups. That common assumption is that work groups

definitely exist and are forces which affect the

attitudes and behaviors of employees. This is the most

obvious and pragmatic reason for management's concern

and study of work groups.

Kurt Lewin, a recognized scholar, best captured the

reason groups needed to be studied and understood in a

speech he made in 1942. He stated:

> "Although the scientific investigation of group
> work are but a few years old, I don't hesitate
> to predict that group work, that is, the hand-
> ling of human beings not as isolated individuals,
> but in the social setting of groups, will soon
> be one of the most important theoretical prac-
> tical fields. It is easier to affect the per-
> sonality of ten people if they can be melted
> into a group than to affect the personality of
> any one individual separately." (Zander, 1979,
> p. 418)

An explanation of the reason for group formation

can be found in a number of factors, which include

physical, economic, sociopsychological, and need

fulfillment. All of these can be considered as

categories of determinants of group formation.

When the work site is designed in such a manner that causes people to be placed in close proximity to each other, there is a tendency for them to interact and communicate with each other. If there is any obstacle to this interaction on a fairly regular basis, there is less of a tendency to form the group. This does not mean that workers must constantly communicate before a work group forms. It should be obvious that some degree of interaction and communication is necessary. (Cartwright, 1976, p. 171)

In most organizations, it is a typical practice to locate workers in similar occupations together. This placement of workers, by the organization, lends itself to the possibility that communication and social interaction will take place. Usually, in any setting, this communication and social interaction will help shape and form each employee's attitude and behavior that is included in the physical setting. Thus it should be expected that those more experienced workers will help those with less experience to learn the job. This will occur only if there is acceptance by the group. This will have the ultimate effect of making the supervisor's job a little easier. Management should

recognize this and aid the employees in their accept-
ance by the group.

In some cases work groups form because individuals
believe that they can derive more economic benefits on
their jobs if they form into groups. For example,
individuals (strangers) working at different stations on
an assembly line may be paid on a group incentive basis.
Whatever the group produces determines the wages for
each member. Because of the interest of the workers, in
their wages, these employees will interact and
communicate with each other. These employees will soon
realize that by working as a group they may perceive and
actually obtain higher economic benefits. The case of a
nonunion work site can be used as another example of
economics as a motive for group formation. Here the
workers might join together to bring pressure against
management for more economic benefits. The members of
the group would have a common interest, increased wages,
which would lead to group affiliation. (Donnelly, 1981,
pp. 258-259)

Employees in an organization are also motivated to
form work groups so that certain needs can be more
adequately satisfied. Safety, social-affiliation,
esteem, and self-actualization needs can be satisfied to

some degree by work groups.

Work groups provide members with safety in the form of protection from the outside pressures such as the demands placed on them by management for better quality and increased production. By becoming members of a group, employees can discuss their concerns with other members of the group who may often share the same attitude towards management. If the group is not there for the employee to lean on when management imposes demands, the employee may feel that they are standing alone and thereby causing a feeling of insecurity.

The communication and interaction existing between members of a work group serve as a buffer to the demands of management. Another form of safety need satisfaction occurs in instances when an employee is new and required to perform a task that is difficult over an extended period of time. The employe may not want to continually contact the supervisor for instruction, and therefore this employee will depend largely upon the group for needed instruction. This reliance upon the group can be interpreted as providing this employee with a form of security need satisfaction. New employees are often concerned about performing their tasks well so that they can be retained by the organization. Thus, continually

requesting help from the supervisor is thought by some
as indicating that the new employee is not performing
the job well. Consequently, these employees turn to the
group for help so there will be little chance of their
position being threatened. Whether or not the
supervisor believes that continual requests for help are
a sign of an inability to perform the job is not the
main issue. The main point of importance is how the new
worker perceives his/her situation and job security.
(Donnelly, 1981, p. 289)

Of the reasons for the individual's need to join
groups, is that each of them have need as a base. Maslow
has identified one of these reasons as social need.
These needs have been identified as learned needs which
include the need for friendship, affection, and inter-
action and acceptance by peers. From management's
view, this need by the subordinate, when recognized as
such, can be an aid. Likewise, if the employee has
aligned themselves with the wrong group of employees,
their association can cause management particular
concern. Through the friendship and support that they
offer, groups serve as the primary mechanism for
satisfying these needs. The work group is the most
likely place to find companionship, understanding, and

comradeship on the work site. Both problems that are
personal in nature, and most certainly those related to
the job, can be discussed with the members of the group.
It is the members of the work group that we spend more
time with than anyone else.

Acceptance by others at the work place is just as
important as acceptance anywhere else. Employees will
go to any length to obtain acceptance and avoid
rejection. It is the work group that usually provides
the source of acceptance at work. If for any reason it
becomes a source of rejection, an alternative source of
acceptance is sought, and often it is a task that is
extremely difficult. The main cause behind why
employees join work groups, then, is the need for
affiliation or the fulfillment of the social need of
belonging and acceptance. In regard to the need factor,
there are certainly those employees that prefer to be
alone, and appear to produce more at a better quality.
However, these individuals are more the exception than
the rule, and usually do not fit the norm when the
total work force is used as the medium of measurement.
We must realize also that there are some employees that
have a greater need for affiliation than others and that
some jobs provide this need better than others. (Glueck,

1980, p. 536)

Another reason people become involved in work
groups is that the group satisfies the recognition-ego/
esteem needs as identified and described by Maslow.
These needs can make a significant contribution to the
development of a person's identity. The work group is
the chief source of recognition and esteem for most, if
not all employees. Those employees that are not engaged
in the same profession, may not have a clear perception
of what the job or profession is all about but the
members of the profession or work group knows and
provides the necessary feedback. Groups, then, help us
train ourselves in psychological adjustment, maintain
our self-esteem and confirm our identity. (Glueck,
1980, p. 537)

The satisfaction of the needs for power and
security can also be provided by the group. If a group
supports a group member against demands by outsiders
(other groups, clients, managers, etc.) it provides for
that employee more control over their destiny, a sense
of power, and ultimate destiny. The evidence is fairly
strong that most employees join unions to provide
protection for themselves against what they perceive to
be capricious or arbitrary acts by supervisors. Groups
provide the employee with similar feelings of security.

By joining groups, employes hope to protect themselves against outside pressures. (Glueck, 1980, p. 538)

Groups serve a number of other purposes in addition to those previously discussed. Among these other purposes are: they help to establish and stabilize employee perceptions of the work place, they serve as a source of information, they provide help when members of the group are sick or absent, and they also provide relief from boredom through mutual interaction. (Glueck, 1980, p. 538)

There are certain benefits that work groups provide to the organization. The previous discussion has provided insight into what work groups provide the employees of the organization. Likewise, work groups provide definite benefits to the organization. If management is to derive any benefit from work groups, there must be a concrete understanding of all aspects of these groups. With the understanding will come the ability of management to utilize these groups to their benefit. In a broad sense, there are three main functions or benefits that work groups provide to the organization. Glueck has identified these benefits as: (1) socialization of new employees; (2) an aid to getting the job done; and (3) help in the decision-

making process.   (Glueck, 1980, p. 538)

Sociologists term the process of orienting new

employees socialization.   The meaning here is that the

new employee is taught the work norms, that is, how to

behave at work.   In some cases work groups tend to slow

down those employees that are "ratebusters" and showing

up the members of the group.   These groups can also have

the opposite effect.   They can control employees that

are too slow by pressuring them to increase their out-

put.   Likewise the work group can pressure the members

that are deficient in other areas, such as attitude,

attendance, personal appearance.   In this manner,

the group orients and integrates the new employee into

the organization's work rules and norms and keeps the

employee under control.   The supervisor cannot be

expected to watch the employees all the time, but the

group can. (Glueck, 1980, p. 538)   The process of

socialization of new employees is one that is definitely

can be an aid to management.   But we must keep in mind

also, that this same process can be just as detrimental

to the organization as beneficial.   Management then,

must have an understanding and knowledge of the

socialization process.   Not only can this process

make the manager's job easier, it can also help the

manager increase his production and ultimately the efficiency of the organization.

An aid to getting the job done is also a benefit to the organization provided by the work group. Every organization has a program whereby new employees are given training on how to perform their task. As in all organizations this training is usually not completely adequate. The first line supervisor adds to the training the new employee receives initially. However, this too can fall short of everyone's expectations. There are certain aspects of every job where management and training staff cannot provide adequate instruction. Usually it is the work group that provides the new employee with the ability to cope with the job, and how to deal with and handle the many variations on the techniques taught in the training programs that are needed to get the job done. Those employes that have experience on the job have devised ways to perform their duties in a more expedient manner and with more ease. These same employees can teach these same methods to other members of the group. For example, many jobs require that more than one person work on the same task, but in different locations at different times. One employee may need to receive what another has completed

before his task can be completed. If for any reason one is not providing what the other needs, help can be offered with the deficiency to be more productive. Both of these employees could work separately, but cooperation helps them both. Thus work groups facilitate both training and operations and therefore are beneficial to the organization.

The decision-making process is another area where the work group can be beneficial to the organization. This area will be discussed later in greater detail, but the point to be stressed here is that some decisions turn out better when several people with different backgrounds and training make them jointly, than if one person makes them alone. Well established groups that are operating effectively can make better decisions. In view of this and previous discussions it becomes clear that it makes sense for a manager to learn to work with and through groups instead of trying to prevent their formation. To do this effectively, the manager should have some knowledge of how groups form and develop. (Glueck, 1980, p. 539)

It is just as important for management to understand how work groups form as it is to know why they form. A knowledge of how groups form is a key to

the effective use of these groups as a management tool.
These groups don't just spring up from nothingness.
Their formation and development appears to take place in
stages. Glueck has identified these stages:

1. initial formation
2. development of structure
3. elaboration of structure and
4. development of leaders.

Stage one involves assemblying a number of people
with the abilities needed to achieve an organizational
objective. The important thing to remember here is that
each of the individuals recognizes the social need to
belong to the group and that they are willing to give
and receive friendship and other affiliation needs.
(Glueck, 1980, p. 539)

The second stage of the group formation process is
characterized by the need to establish common task
objectives. During the third stage the formal leaders
are appointed by management. The fourth and final stage
of development is actually there to supplement and
strengthen the third stage. It is during this stage
that informal leaders are developed. This is the
emergence of the informal work group. These leaders are
the people whom group members turn to when they

encounter problems. The informal leaders, in a sense, provide social maintenance to the other members of the group. (Glueck, 1980, p. 540)

Formation of the informal group has attracted the attention of noted management writers such as Kadushin, Burns, and Tichy. Tichy has alluded to the fact that literature does not give certain aspects of informal group formation the attention it deserves. Tichy contends that there is a need for an examination of specific organizational variables and their effects on informal clique structure. Most studies have acknowledged that contextual variables, formal structure and organizational structure, affect the informal structure.

The effects have not been studied thereby giving the impression that they are random assumptions that are highly improbable. This concept is the focal point of an article by Tichy. He examines the variables of compliance, mobility, and size in the light of their probable effects on informal clique structure of organizations. These key variables were selected because each of them plays a role in an important phase of either sociological or social-psychological research. The compliance variable has its roots in the Weberian

approach which is based primarily from a structuralist view. The mobility factor was taken from the formation and assumptions of Thibault and Kelley, who based their assumptions on group and social relations and from reference group theory in social psychology. The variable is related to the work by Simmuel, a management theorist. Tichy's view and examination of these three variables is with the intent of relating them to the informal clique structure. The analysis focuses on the effect they have on the motivational base for clique formation and the structure constraints related to clique formation. Each of the variables affects the individual and group motivation for clique formation and each creates constraints within which the cliques of various structural characteristics emerge. Tichy took the research and assumptions of management writers such as Blauner, Woodward, Litterer, Ingham, Blau, Etzioni, Hornstein, and others, and developed empirical propositions using the three variables of compliance, mobility, and size, and relating them to the motivation for clique formation and the constraints within which cliques can form. (Tichy, 1973, p. 194)

Despite the fact that management studies have included work groups for years, the literature has dealt

with the affects of organizational variables on the
formal structure at varying levels, only a few
systematic relationships have been formulated and
presented. Tichy's review of the literature found that
propositions relating organizational variables to the
informal structure were also lacking in the literature.
It was found also that there was little written con-
cerning the emergence of informal structures and that
their subsequent structural characteristics have been
empirically tested and found stable. (Tichy, 1973, p.
15) This is an illustration of the varying nature of
work groups, and subtly tells management that each
informal work group has to be dealt with differently
and governed also by forces other than just the people
involved.

It was found also that

"discussions of the effects of formal structure
on informal structure has been a part of the
literature since Barnard's The Functions of the
Executive (1938). More recently, Etzioni has
posited that different compliance types create
different motivations for the emergence of in-
formal structure, as well as provide different
constraints for emergent characteristics of the
informal structure. Etzioni's formulations
lead to the following propositions: normative
systems tend to develop informal structures
that are integrated and that overlap with the
formal structure; coercive systems tend to
develop segregated informal structures that are
integrated and that overlap with the formal

structures that control a large sphere of
activities, and utilitarian organizations
tend to fall between the normative and co-
ercive, with informal structures emerging
to fulfill expressive needs. Dalton (1959)
discussed informal cliques in terms of their
motivational base and relationships to the
informal structure. His typology included
vertical ambiotic, vertical parasitic, hor-
izontal aggressive, and random cliques.
Hornstein discussed the relationship of or-
ganizational culture to variables at other
levels in the organization by applying a
framework (Katz and Kahn, 166) which viewed
the effects of culture on the organization's
work process, physical layout, modes of
communication, and exercise of authority."
(Tichy, 1973, 195)

In analyzing the structure of informal work groups,
Tichy developed empirically testable propositions using
the key variables mentioned earlier. In doing so, it is
necessary to relate these variables to the motivation
for clique formation and the constraints within which
cliques can form.

Each of the aforementioned variables are
significant to the study of the informal work group.
Mobility is one such variable that is unique because it
could be the basic motivating factor behind the
formation of an informal work group. Mobility is the
upward vertical movement within an organization.
Gumpert and Smith defined three kinds of mobility
systems: (1) the high-mobility system in which vertical

movement is based primarily upon merit and where
movement is fairly rapid, (2) the seniority system where
promotion is due to length of time on the job; and (3)
the no-mobility system where there is no chance or desire
for vertical movement. These systems are important
because each of them tends to develop different clique
structures that serve as reference groups. A key factor
in the formation of cliques or informal work groups is
the social comparison need. This social need has lead
to three assumptions that offer somewhat of an
understanding of how the mobility variable fits into
clique formation. The assumptions that follow are the
result of a joint study conducted by Thibult and Kelly
in 1959. These assumptions take into consideration (1)
the type of mobility system that exists; (2) the members
relative status in the system; and (3) the proper
identification of the components of the task. The
need to use different comparison people is dictated by
the type of system that is in existence. For example,
it has been found that a no-mobility system, outcome
comparisons with people who are at higher levels, tend
to cause dissatisfaction because of the fact their
better rewards are never attainable. It would appear
then that the better strategy is to compare oneself with

those at the same level or below. (Tichy, 1973, p. 195)

In a mobility system, one of the primary moti-
vations for good performance is the anticipation of
better rewards. It is necessary then, to have
comparisons with others with higher status for
satisfactory adaptation. Management commonly views
individuals as members of groups or classes of
individuals and often refers to them as reference
groups. These reference groups serve as standards to
evaluate attitudes, abilities, or current situations.
Kelley discusses these in some of his writings, and
classified them into two distinct types, normative,
and comparative. According to Kelley, the normative
reference group sets and maintains standards for the
individual, while the comparative group provides a
standard of comparison by which the indivudal evaluates
himself and others. It is likely that reference groups
most often and frequently become membership groups.
Both the normative and comparative needs of an indi-
vidual are most easily fulfilled by the group to which
they belong. If what Kelley has found is true, it
is safe to assume that these reference groups are then
effects on the membership groups. Some of these groups
are classed as informal cliques. (Tichy, 1973, p. 196)

Compliance is another of the key variables selected by Tichy. Tichy bases his assumptions regarding this variable on the views of Etzioni. Compliance was categorized by Etizioni into three types: coercive, utilitarian, and normative. Each of these are further subdivided into two components, power and degree of involvement. Etzioni classifies power into three types which differe according to the means employed to make those involved comply. Coercive is the first type and is characterized by the use of physical threat. The second type is remunerative, which makes use of material resources. The third type of power is normative and uses allocation and manipulation of rewards that are symbolic in nature. What Etzioni has hypothesized does not deal directly with clique (informal work group) formation, it does offer however, both a motivational basis for their formation and influences on their structures. (Tichy, 1973, p. 196)

The size variable refers to the number of members in the organization. Here Tichy bases his theory on size to the writings of Simmel. According to Simmel, size affects both the characteristics of the organization and the informal structure. In this respect, size becomes one of the main organizational

34

influences on the informal structure (Tichy, 1973, p.
196)

Blau based his assumptions regarding size in
respect to the classification of organizations. They
are classed as large, those with more than 1,000
employees, and small, those with fewer than 500 em-
ployees. Blau found that large organizations tend to
be more structurally differentiated than those that are
classified as small. Those organizations considered as
large have a number of official positions, employees in
each of these positions, levels of authority, sections
per division, and a large administration. Because of
this, the effects of size on clique formation and
structure are more complex than the other variables
previously discussed. Size includes the characteristics
listed above. These characteristics are actually a set
of intervening variables. Many of the effects of size
are indirect. Differences in size are not proposed to
lead to special clique types, but rather to modify types
determined by compliance and mobility variations.
(Tichy, 1973, p. 197)

Tichy limited his analysis of clique formation to
those within an organization. He defines clique as:

"A subset of members who are more closely
identified with one another than with the
remaining members of the group and who ex-
change something among themselves this ex-
change can be referred to as the content
of the relationships and may be informa-
tion, affection, friendship." (Tichy, 1973,
p. 197)

The definition of clique used here is further restricted
to face to face groups.

There are seven characteristics of cliques that are
important because they aid in gaining an understanding
of clique formation. If management is going to use the
informal clique, or work group, the following charac-
teristics hold a particular importance. Organiza-
tional clique density is the first characteristic, and
has been defined as the proportion of people who belong
to cliques over the total number of people within the
organization. The second is openness, the number of
reciprocal relationships people within a given clique
have with people outside of the clique. Two slightly
different indicators of openness are: (1) the pro-
portion of isolates in a clique, these are individuals
with no relations outside of the clique, and (2) the
total number of relationships they have outside of the
work group. The third characteristic has been
identified as interclique membership, the degree of

inclusion of members from different status levels of the formal status levels present in the intraclique hierachy. This is the number of status levels existing within a given clique; the status structure of the clique, regardless of the formal status of the clique structure involves interhorizontal status memberships, the number of occupational categories found with a given clique; operationally, the number of informal occupational categories present in any given clique over the formal occupations present in any given clique over the number of formal occupations and categories in the organization. Size is the sixth characteristic, and simply deals with the number of members in the clique. Goals and motivational base is the seventh and final characteristic. This is basically the reason for the clique's formation, to provide social support to aid in more effectively getting work done. (Tichy, 1973, p. 197)

There are essentially five types of cliques: (1) coercive, (2) normative, (3) high-mobility utilitarian, (4) seniority utilitarian, and (5) no-mobility utilitarian. Each of the clique types will be explained in terms of the motivational base for formation and the emergent structure, including organizational clique

density, clique size, interrank hierarchy, openness, and interhorizontal membership. An understanding in this area can be an aid in the development of a framework for understanding the relationship among a broad range of organizational variables.

The coercive clique is listed as one of the five types of cliques, however, it is normally not found in business organizations. Cliques of this nature are usually confined to such institutions as prisons, unless we consider situations where unions have called a strike against management and the employees are following the union. Despite the fact that the coercive clique is not business oriented, the motivational basis for formation and the other key variables can be used to emphasize and illustrate the power cliques have in regard to the operational activities of an organization. In a coercive system, the members are usually alienated and often in open conflict with the formal organization. A clique of this type will exist when a union calls an organization's employees out on strike. In such situations, the same basis for formation applies here as well as in prison. The formal organization must threaten harm (physical or financial) in order to control its members. Coercion cannot be effectively

used to control a large number of employees because of the close supervision and observation that is required. To support the counter-organizational norms, attitudes, and activities not directly controlled by the coercive formal organization, an informal system of control tends to develop. Cliques make up one of the units within this informal subcollectivity. Members of coercive organizations usually form cliques for power gains or counter-power, and to aid in coping with their alienation and with the hostile environment. (Tichy, 1973, p. 199)

The structure of the coercive clique is characterized by having a high organizational clique density. This is due to the importance of clique membership as an almost necessary means for coping with the social environment. These systems are usually total institutions in which the scope of control of the formal system is limited by the resources of the organization. The indivduals in the coercive system are strongly pressured to belong to a clique and the result is a high organizational clique density. Only the lowest participants in the coercive organizations who are part of the subcollectivity tend to be members of cliques; therefore, the interrank membership is low. The inter-

horizontal membership; however, is high. The tendency for cliques in coercive organizations to be formed with a motivational base, which is large in scope of control and which also tends to fulfill defensive needs, looks to the need for a fairly varied authority structure. The pressure to form large cliques, which tend to exist in coercive systems, comes primarily from the large scope of activities under the control of the informal subcollectivity and from the inherent conflict between the informal organization and those being coerced. Large cliques also help individuals achieve more counterpower to defend themselves against one another and/or the formal organization. (Tichy, 1973, p. 201)

TYPES OF CLIQUES AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

In organizations where the normative compliance system prevails, many of the participants needs tend to be met within the formal work setting, thus there is a very high degree of overlap for relationships and groups which satisfy both expressive and instrumental needs. The tendency here is for informal groups to be identical to the formal. Thus leading to the assumption that there is little pressure in a normative compliance system for clique formation outside of formally defined relationships. As a result, there is a high degree of friendship and work group overlap. These organizations where the normative system prevails, tend to be highly integrated; i.e. interrank, and instrumental and expressive. The clique density is moderate and the overlap between the friendship group and the work group is evident. The size of the clique is usually small. The reason for this is the general lack of motivation for clique formation. The overlap of the work groups and cliques in normative organizations is visible in the clique's high interrank membership and low interhorizontal membership. The interhorizontal status membership

40

is low because normative work groups are generally found around single occupational categories. Even though the interhorizontal membership is low, the cliques that form tend to be open, so that more relationships exist outside of the cliques than in other types of organizations. In normative organizations, most of the employees are integrated into the organization and usually they are categorized by possessing high levels of commitment. Thus it becomes easier for functional relationships to become friendship relationships. The relative size of the organization has little effect on the motivational base of the structure of the normative clique. (Tichy, 1973, pp. 201-202)

The high mobility utilitarian clique is characterized by a strong internal pressure. The entire organization is oriented towards getting ahead, thus relationships become the means to an end. In organizations of this type, the individual becomes extremely sensitive to the opinions of his immediate superiors. In most cases these superiors will control the employee's life choices. Cliques play a key role in helping organizations and their members facilitate upward mobility. Cliques also provide a means for reference groups needs

to be fulfilled. In order to become properly social-
ized and to move upward in the system, lower status mem-
bers must be visible and able to view the norms and out-
comes of higher status members. Due to the system's
dependence upon having lower status members strive for
and achieve mobility, the higher status members are
pressured to facilitate this process by associating
with the lower status members, both to socialize them
properly and to evaluate them in an informal manner.
Therefore, relationships, including informal clique
relationships, become instrumental for both high and
low status members and the interrank membership is
high. Because these relationships are related to
success in the system, members of such systems
are urged to maintain continual informal relations,
and organizational clique density therefore tends
to be high. In the high mobility organization, size
affects the clique density. As a result of this, small
organizations tend to have a higher density than the
larger organizations. In those organizations that are
classified as large, the employees tend to refrain from
joining cliques. In larger organizations, it is easier
for isolated individuals to go unnoticed and

uninfluenced by cliques. In smaller organizations isolated people become more visible, employees become less alienated and more involved, and therefore pressured to join a clique. (Tichy, 1973, p. 202)

The size of the organization also has an affect on interrank membership. The increased occupational position's and authority level's differentiation in large organizations makes it possible to view clique formation as forming a square configuration, created by a criss-cross pattern of vertical and horizontal dimensions of differentiation. Within these organizations are many hierarchial levels with each of these levels containing many occupational positions. Each of these positions is composed of many individuals. Cliques tend to form among people of the same occupation and on the same level. A good deal of interaction among members is needed in order for the clique to fulfill the socialization and evaluation needs of both higher and lower status employees. The low status member must be in a clique with members of a higher clique if he wants to learn or acquire the patterns of higher status social relations, expected behavior and attitudes. This is necessary if the lower status member is going to become upwardly

mobile. (Tichy, 1983, p. 203)

High mobility utilitarian organizations tend to exert a pressure on the degree of clique openness. High mobility members are urged to develop relationships outside of their immediate clique. These employees tend to be on the lookout for useful friendships, especially among those higher status employees. These cliques tend to be more open. The degree of clique openness tends to be influenced by the size of the organization. Those that are in small organizations are more open than those in large ones. In small organizations, interaction outside of the clique has a greater tendency to develop into more personal and friendly relationships, thus leading to more open cliques. (Tichy, 1973, p. 203)

The fourth type of clique is the seniority util-itarian clique. Cliques of this type are character-ized by the individuals sharing the same interest. There is little competition in these systems since promotion tends to be dependent upon the members length of service with the organization, and these systems tend to have low mobility. However, there does exist the possibility of upper mobility. Since this possibility does exist,

some instrumental reference group needs exist, along
with the need for their fulfillment. In these systems,
interrank clique membership and intraclique hierarchy
are moderate. The main cause contributing to this
condition is the slight mobility factor. There are two
opposing forces that affect clique size in seniority
organizations. One of these is the pressure that is
exerted by the members' anticipatory socialization
needs, which causes, and allows for, the inclusion of
clique members from more than one status level. The
other pressure is the need for socio-emotional rewards
from coworkers. Even though there are different formal
statuses present in a seniority organization clique,
they tend to be less important than in a system such as
the high mobility system. There are two main causes
behind this condition: (1) the criteria for higher
status has more to do with how long an employee has been
with the organization, rather than how competent the
employee is, and (2) the members are not pressured to
participate in instrumental grooming activities and
those activities designed to impress them. These two
factors make the intrastatus hierarchy moderate.
Likewise, in these systems, the interhorizontal status

membership is moderate. This is attributed to the unique condition that exists in seniority organizations. It appears that on one hand, position categories are irrelevant to fulfillment of socio-emotional friendship needs, thereby leading to some interhorizontal memberships. On the other hand, they are relevant to fulfillment of the anticipatory socialization needs which leads to less interhorizontal memberships. It is assumed that both of these needs are found in at least some of the members, the result of this coexistence is a structure that reflects both sets of needs. Size also has an influence on the interhorizontal clique membership. Those organizations classified as large will naturally have more individuals in the same horizontal status thereby increasing the possibility that cliques will form within one horizontal status. In small organizations, due to their structure, cliques of this type may be impossible to form. The level of clique openness in those organizations is moderate. This is due mainly to the low mobility factor that dominates seniority organizations. In the seniority organizations, there is little pressure placed on

employees to develop instrumental relationships outside of the clique. (Tichy, 1973, p. 204)

Non-mobility Utilitarian Organizations

In no mobility utilitarian organizations, the motivational base is influenced by two factors: (1) reference group needs diminish as the members become satisfactorily adjusted to their positions, and (2) the remaining reference group needs tend to put pressure on inclusion of members of the same status level only. Usually when cliques form, that fulfills reference group needs, these groups run counter to the goals and needs of the organization. According to the literature, there has been a lot written about this condition which is counted as a phenomenon. Roethlisberger and Dickson conducted an experiment in 1939 regarding the work restruction phenomenon. "An examination is made here of the pressures which are normally present in a system to develop certain adoptive informal structures. Adoptive behavior is behavior on the part of system members that is generally congruent with organizational goals. Theoretical support for the affective motivational base of no-mobility cliques proposed earlier is found in

Homans (1950). His supposition that people who interact frequently tend to develop positive sentiments towards each other, supports the notion that, due to a lack of any instrumental mobility needs or defensive needs, no-mobility system members form cliques based on affective needs or, in Homan's terms, positive sentiments." (Tichy, 1973, p. 205)

In the no-mobility system, there is little pressure applied to members to have overlapping informal clique and reference group memberships. The needs of the reference group tends to play a minor role in clique formation. Because of the differing motivational base, the no-mobility cliques are usually under pressure to be widely inclusive. The size of the clique is influenced greatly by the need of the members to increase the results of an interpersonal or social nature, and the fact that low-status members without any chance for promotion tend to form fairly large friendship groups. The no-mobility utilitarian cliques tend to be less hierarchially structured internally than the mobility system and seniority system. (Tichy, 1973, p. 205) "Members of no-mobility organizations tend not to be interested in instrumental relationships, since they offer very little possibility of changing the

individual's status in any way; once a member is satisfactorily adopted to a clique he is under no pressure to look for other relationships. This tends to create cliques which are closed, thus having proportionately a large number of isolated individuals." (Tichy, 1973, p. 205)

Coalitions

The discussion on work group formation is vital if management is to understand them and begin to use them to their advantage. Not only is work group formation influenced by the work situation, they are equally influenced by the size and structure of the organization. There is a time when more than one work group (or clique) will join together as one social unit. When this happens, the resulting group is termed a coalition. A social unit is defined as any individual or group, which for the duration of a particular situation, follows the same coalition strategy. A coalition is defined as the joint use of resources by two or more social units. Once formed a coalition will often meet the definition of a social unit from the point that it is formed to the point that the allegiance is no longer necessary. Coalitions are characterized as being

temporary in nature, means oriented, and composed of members or groups that differ in goals. There is usually little value consensus in a coalition and the stability of a coalition requires "tacit neutrality" of the coalition on matters which go beyond the immediate prerogatives. (Gamson, 1961, p. 374)

According to Gamson, there are certain conditions that must exist if any coalition is going to be counted as full-fledged. (1) There must be a decision to be made or a problem to be solved, and there must be more than two social units attempting to maximize their share of the results. (2) No one alternative will maximize the payoff to all participants. (3) No one has initial resources sufficient to control the decisions by himself, and (4) No participant must have veto power. (Gamson, 1961, p. 374)

To predict who will join a coalition there are certain variables that must be known. It must be known what the relevant resources are for any given decision, and at what starting point, how much of these resources each participant controls. Also we must know the pay-off for each coalition. There must also be a known rank ordering of each participant's inclination to

join with every other player excluding that player's control of the resources. Finally, we must know the effective decision point. (Gamson, 1961, p. 375)

The basis for coalition formation is essentially the same as that for the informal work group/clique, and will not be recounted here. The most significant thing about coalition formation is the fact that a coalition will form if, and only if, there are "reciprocal strategy choices between two participants" (Gamson, 1961, p. 376) Coalition formation is important to management only if management has an understanding of work groups and recognizes when an informal group or groups have formed. Just the recognition of group formation is not enough, there must also be an identification of the leader of the group.

Group Leaders

The leaders of the work group may not be easily identified. Usually a period of observation is required by an informed and knowledgeable manager before the leader of the informal group can be identified. The leader of the work group is classified as two types: (1) the task leader, usually the supervisor of the formal group, appointed by the organization, and (2) the social leader, or the informal group leader. The former

type of leader is task oriented and has the responsibility of making sure the organizational objectives are achieved. The social leader, on the other hand, provides social maintenance and can be just as effective as the formal leader. The informal leaders are usually those that have the most status both on and off the job. They usually possess the "right" education, skill, the right sex, the right age, ethnic background, and more seniority than the other members of the group. (Glueck, 1980, p. 540)

The informal leader emerges from within and serves a number of facilitating functions. One such function is that of initiating action and providing direction. If the members of the group are not directed towards the accomplishment of objectives, there will be a breakdown in the group's effectiveness. If there develops a difference of opinion, on a group related matter, the leader has the responsibility of attempting to settle the matter and moving the group towards accomplishing its objectives. The informal leader has also the responsibility of communicating the values to the group, and to nonmembers of the group, supervisory personnel and to the union. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 266)

Scott and Mitchell summarizes the characteristics
of group leaders as:

1.   The leadership role is filled by an indi-
     vidual who possesses the attributes which
     the members perceive as being critical for
     satisfying their needs.

2.   The leader embodies the values of the
     group and is able to perceive these
     values, organize them into an intelli-
     gible philosophy, and verbalize them to
     nonmembers.

3.   The leader is able to receive and de-
     cipher communications relevant to the
     group and effectively communicate im-
     portant information to group members.
     (Scott, 1976, pp. 179-182)

Group Characteristics

The definition of work groups, mentioned earlier,

gives two basic types of groups, the formal and the

informal.   There is still a further classification in

that they can be ineffective or effective.   The ineffec-

tive work group needs no explanation, the name is self-

explanatory.   The effective work group is one that

carries the greatest impact and will be the focal point

of the discussion to follow.   An effective work group is

one in which the individuals in the group behave or

function as a team and fully participates in group

discussions and whose objectives are clearly developed;

and whose resources adequate to accomplish its

objectives. (Glueck, 180, p. 540) There are certain factors that influence group effectiveness. The size of the group, number of members, the location and whether or not the members can make eye contact or not, cohesiveness, group norms, and the nature of the task, have all been identified as factors that affect the effectiveness of any group. (Glueck, 1980, p. 540)

Size

The effective group is relatively small in size. Some researchers have gone so far as to affix numbers to the various effective groups. Seven has been found to be the ideal maximum for a decision-making group, and fourteen members for the fact-finding group. It is assumed by some that the larger the group gets, the more effective it becomes. The larger group offers a greater potential for higher talents. The larger group offers the members a better choice of finding someone they would like to work with. However, the larger group also offers some disadvantages.

Research has also shown that the disadvantages more than offset the advantages. The larger the group gets, the more effort it takes to get the group to function. The larger group takes longer to function and may never

become functionable. The larger group gives the members
a greater opportunity to form smaller groups. When the
group gets larger, the members then have less of a
chance to participate. Being able to fully participate
is one of the factors in the definition of an effective
group. (Glueck, 1980, pp. 540-541) Size, then, is an
important variable in group effectiveness.

Research has shown, also that the number of members
in a group and their location, (physical placement) have
an effect on the group. It has been found that an even
number of members make more accurate decisions than an
odd number, but a group with an odd number works faster.
Groups whose members are located closer together
physically have a greater advantage to interact, thus
facilitating frequent interaction, than those members
that are separated. This may be due to the ability of
the members to maintain eye contact. Eye movement,
direction of gaze, and mutual eye contact have been
found to be important nonverbal interactions that have
an influence on group effectiveness. The easier it is
to communicate in person, the more likely the group is
to be cohesive, which is another factor that aids in a
work group being effective. (Glueck, 1980, p. 540)

Cohesiveness

A simplistic definition of cohesiveness is the stick togetherness of a group. A more refined definition of the cohesiveness concept is the attraction of members to the group in terms of the strength of forces on each member to remain active in the group, and to resist the urge to leave it. All of the characteristics of the effective group are influenced in some degree by the cohesiveness of the group. The greater the attraction within the group, the more likely it is that the membership will adhere closely to a group norm. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 272) Cohesiveness, then results from homogeneity of membership, stability of membership over time, and the satisfaction of group members' needs. (Glueck, 1980, p. 541)

Group Norm

Group norm is another factor that contributes to the effectiveness of a group. A norm has been defined as an agreement among the members of the group as to behavior the members will exhibit. The more a group member complies with the group's norms, the more that person accepts the groups standard of behavior. (Litterer, 1973, p. 96) Work groups also utilize norms to bring about job performance that is acceptable to the

group.   Three specific social processes bring about
compliance with group norms, these are: group
pressures, group review and enforcement, and the
personalization of norms.   (Litterer, 1973, pp. 245-47)

The process of group pressure was clearly illu-
strated by Asch in a series of experiments.   These
experiments were concerned with how social forces
constrain opinions and attitudes.   The experiment
illustrated also, how group pressure and support for
one's viewpoint are related.   If an individual stands
alone, they are inclined to succumb to group pressure.
But when they find their attitude supported by even one
group menmber, they resist pressure to change.   (Asch,
1955, pp. 31-35)   Group members who value their group
membership highly and who derive some satisfaction of
personal needs from the group, allow group pressures to
influence their behavior and performance.   This
assumption leads to another group process that has been
termed group review and enforcement.   (Donnelly, 1981,
p. 269)

When an individual becomes a member of a group,
they are quickly made aware of group norms.   The other

group members will then observe the actions and language
of the new member to determine whether or not the new
member is adhering to the group's norms. If the members
of the group are not complying with the generally
accepted norms, a number of different approaches may be
applied to get the member to comply. One such approach
is the soft approach. This approach entails a dis-
cussion between respected leaders and those persons
deviating from the norm. If this does not provide
effective, more rigid corrective action, such as the
members of the group scolding the individual both
privately and publicly. The ultimate type of enforce-
ment would be to ostracize the nonconforming member and
not communicate with him at all. These are just a few
of the many strategies which may be used to bring non-
conforming members into compliance. Other more severe
methods may be employed also, such as sabotaging the
noncomformers performance. It should be pointed out
that review and enforcement occurs at the mangerial
levels in a form similar to that in the subordinate
ranks. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 269)

The last of the three social processes that bring
about compliance with group norms has been identified as

personalization of norms. Research has shown that behavioral patterns of individuals are significantly influenced by their value systems. These values are influenced by the events that occur around them, thus we can safely assume that values are learned, and can be personalized. For example, an individual may enter a work group where the norm dictates fair and equal treatment for all. This norm may be accepted as morally and ethically correct. Prior to becoming a member of this group, the individual may have displayed little interest in the fair treatment for all philosophy. Because of a latent feeling of fairness, the member personalizes this group-learned norm, it becomes a standard of conduct which is correct from the vantage point of both the group and society. (Litterer, 1973, p. 96)

Nature of the Task

The nature of the task is the final factor that influences the group's effectiveness. Homogeneous groups are better when the task or goal requires mutual cooperation and conflict free behavior, and when the task is simple. Heterogeneous groups are more effective

when the task is complex. The ideal group is one which
is effective from the group's point of view and one in
which the group's norms coincide with the norms or
objectives of the organization. A group of this kind
comes from a combination of group process, effective
leadership, and managerial processes. (Glueck, 1980, p.
542)

Type of Groups

Earlier, a general distinction was made between
formal and informal groups. Another more specific and
descriptive classification system used to describe
groups is the command, task, interest, and friendship
framework. The groups identified as task and command,
belong to the formal classifications of groups because
they are prescribed by the organizational structure.
The interest group and the friendship group are not
designed by the organization and belong to the informal
classification. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 260)

The Command Group

The command group is specified by the organiza-
tional chart and the subordinates report directly to
a specified supervisor. As the span of control of a
manager increases, so does the command group size

increase. A task group is composed of a number of employees working together to complete a project or job. Even though the activities of each member of the group is different, if they are working for the achievement of the same goal or objective, their combined activities will make the group a task group.

Interest/Friendship Group

An interest group is one in which the members have come together for a common cause that usually has little to do with achieving the organization's objectives, but to achieve an objective that is solely for their own benefit. These members may or may not be from the same command or task group. This group will usually disband after the desired objective has been achieved. This type of group does not last as long as the other aforementioned groups. The friendship group arises because of some common characteristic such as age, ethnic background, political affiliation or sentiment, interest in sports, or just a desire to spend their break times together. These groups often extend their interaction and communications to off the job activities. (Sayles, 1957, pp. 131-145)

Just as groups can form to achieve the organization's objectives, they can also resist or

sabbotage them, especially if the leaders fail to interpret these objectives effectively to the group. Groups that resist organizational objectives do not always develop randomly. Sometimes management can cause a resistance group to form. For example, management may attempt to raise the standards of output, and thereby cause the fear that jobs will be eliminated. A group may then try to protect less competent employees who cannot meet the new standards through a program of unified resistance. Some research indicates that group problems do not develop as often in some groups as in others. Glueck cites the work of Leonard Sayles as an aid to explaining the concept regarding problems within groups. According to Glueck, Sayles describes how groups differ from each other but stresses that there is regularity in group behavior.

Sayles classifies groups into four types:

apathetic

erratic

strategic

conservative.

Apathetic groups are those whose members are relatively low-paid and low-skilled workers who are

interdependent. He found that the leaders of these groups were very difficult to identify. Erratic groups are those that are made up of semiskilled workers who worked together in smaller groups doing jobs that required interaction. They all did the same job and were homogeneous. The leaders of these groups tend to be strong individuals who were autocratic. Strategic groups are those groups whose members are skilled employees, and whose jobs were the better or key jobs in the organization. The leaders of these groups were those employees that did their jobs well and repre-sented the employees quietly. The conservative groups consisted of the most highly skilled workers. They worked on their own. They chose leaders from among the most competent workers, who led quietly and stayed in the background. (Glueck, 1980, p. 543)

Sayles rated the groups on a series of dimensions that are important to managers ranging from how active they were in unions and the number of grievances they filed, to how contented or frustrated they were at work. He found that the group that caused management the most trouble were the erratic groups. His research disclosed

that these groups were unpredictable; an action by man-
agement may lead to nothing one time, but may provoke
a strike the next time. Sayles concluded from his
research with the apathetic group that the workers in
this group were continually frustrated, but they made no
outward signs. Sayles found also, that the strategic
group was quite unique in its dealings with management.
They make demands on management, but they also let
management know where they stand with the group. The
conservatives, he found, are the elder statesmen and
usually go about their business without any trouble.
Generally, management spends most of its time dealing
with strategic groups and trying to keep erratic groups
in line. (Glueck, 1980, pp. 543-544)

Committees

Committees are another kind of group that manage-
ment is likely to deal with. It can be said that
committees belong to two different classifications at
the same time. They are classed as spcial groups be-
cause they are called together for one specific pur-
pose, and they are classified as task groups because
management calls them together, and dictates the prob-
lem they are to solve. They work for management, and
solve problems that usually benefit the organization.

The use of committees is very common in organizations. These are actually task groups that are established for such purposes as:

1. Exchanging views and information

2. Recommending action

3. Generating ideas

4. Making decisions

Committees can achieve each of these purposes. However, a group of individuals may have difficulty in making decisions. Thus, the fourth purpose, making decisions, is hard to achieve in a committee. Behavioral scientists recommend that a committee be kept relatively small, since size affects the quality of a group's decision. Increasing a committee's size tends to limit the extent to which members want to communicate. As size increases, a growing number of members seem to feel threatened and less will participate actively. This perceived threat can lead to increased stress and conflict. In most committees a chairperson is expected to provide proper direction. Ordinarily successful committees have chairpersons who understand group processes. The group's objectives and purposes are clear, the members are encouraged to participate, he or she knows how to keep the committee

moving towards the objectives without becoming con-
strained by endless debates, conflict, and personality
clashes. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 262)

Just as there are different types of groups, there
are different types of committees. There are three
basic types of committees that are given recognition:

1. board or commission

2. standing committees

3. adhoc committees

A board or commission is a group of people
appointed or elected to help manage an organization.
Standing committees are those that are usually found at
the lower levels of organization, and is defined as a
group of individuals appointed for a rather lengthy time
to serve a specific purpose. Safety committees in a
business and promotions and tenure committees are
examples of standing committees. A committee appointed
for a specific or short-term purpose to make a par-
ticular decision or recommendation, is called an ad
hoc committee. A committee created to review whether a
merger offer for the corporation should be accepted,
rejected, or counter-offered is an adhoc committee. An
adhoc committee is also known as a task force. (Glueck,
1980, p. 548)

The definition of a committee is a group of two or more individuals created to serve a specific purpose, or make a recommendation. (Glueck, 1980, p. 548) There are specific reasons for using committees, among them are the following:

1. Since committees are composed of more people that actually participate, there is likely to be a greater acceptance by participants and their work units.

2. With committees composed of representatives of units that might be affected by the out-come of a committee's efforts, potential coordination problems can be worked out be-fore decisions are made.

3. Committees usually defuse power, thus not giving one person all the authority.

4. If the committee members are chosen properly more experience and different backgrounds can be brought to bear on the issue or problem it is supposed to resolve.

5. Committees can serve as fast and fully accu-rate communication and information processing mediums.

6. Committees can serve to provide new managers with additional experience and training.

7. Committees can be used to avoid putting the blame for hard or unpleasant decisions on one person. (Glueck, 1980, pp 549-550)

Even though committees are widely used, there is still a dislike for them. Committees are just like other groups, they can be effective or ineffective. It is the manager's responsibility to make them effective. Therefore, it is important that management understand, know how to make or call a committee together, and then know how to make them work. The following are a few things about committees that are considered as dislikes or disadvantages:

1. They are considered as very costly to the organization. This is not always true, unless a committee is used to do the work a single person can do.

2. Committees are said to be time consuming. Those committees that are poorly structured will be a waste of time.

3. At times, and when used improperly, committees can be poor decision makers.

4. Committees are said to be indecisive at times.

5. Committees can lead to serious differences and conflict among members. (Glueck, 1980, p. 550)

All of the aforementioned disadvantages can be overcome by the abilities of management, or the chairperson. Committees are called together by management, so if problems arise, then, at the base of the problem is management.

Just as there are some good reasons for using committees, there are some equally good procedures that can be followed before, during, and after committee meetings to aid in making them more effective, and increasing their productivity. From the very beginning care should be taken when the individuals are being selected to serve on a committee. The chairperson should be chosen carefully, with emphasis placed on that person's abilities and personality and how the chosen individuals will suit the leadership role and relate to the committee's duties and responsibilities. The date when the work of the committee should be completed should be set early and the chairperson should be re-minded shortly before the date arrives. (Glueck, 1980, pp 550-551)

Glueck has outlined a set of guidelines for making committees more effective. He arranges these into what the chairperson should do prior to the meeting, during the meeting, and after the meeting. The same is done for the members of the committee. The discussion to follow summarizes Glueck's guidelines:

What The Chairperson Should Do Prior To The Meeting:

1. limit the size of the committee

2. choose members who are informed and can act in a conscientious and reasonable manner

3. get a clear definition of the committee's responsibilities and authority

4. disseminate this definition along with the agenda and supporting documents to members so they can prepare for the meeting

5. contact the committee members to remind them of the time and place of the meeting, and provide answers to any questions the members might have before the meeting

6. choose a secretary to take notes and distribute them to members after each meeting

7. make sure each meeting starts on time (Glueck, 1980, p. 550)

During The Meeting The Chairperson Should:

1. encourage participation by all committee members and generally set the tone

2. avoid dominating the meeting

3. avoid getting into competition with other committee members for equal time

4. from time to time, summarize the discussion that has already taken place

5. keep the discussion on the right subject

6. be alert and interested

7. end the meeting on time

After The Meeting The Chairperson Should:

1. make sure the secretary distributed the notes promptly

2. make the same preparations for any follow-up just as for the first meeting

3. schedule meetings so that the committee's work conforms to the prescribed time table

4. after the final meeting, personally thank the members in writing (Glueck, 1980, p. 550)

Glueck has also set forth guidelines for those individuals selected to be a part of a committee. To be effective, both the chairperson and the members of the

committee should do certain things to prepare for par-
ticipation. According to Glueck, those persons selected
for a committee should do the following things before
the first meeting:

1. read the materials and develop preliminary
   ideas

2. consult with those you are representing on the
   committee and solicit their ideas

3. be on time for the meeting

During The Meeting, The Committee Members Should:

1. be active and participate and make sure all
   ideas are stated clearly

2. be encouraging to the other members, be
   rational and avoid being domineering

After The Meeting The Committee Members Should:

1. reconsider their initial position and review
   the notes from the meeting

2. consult with those you represented for re-
   sponses and suggestions (Glueck, 1980, p. 540)

According to Glueck, if the above guidelines are
followed, the committee will be more effective and each
of the committee members will be left with a feeling of
some sort of satisfaction. No matter what guidelines or

methods are employed, there is the possibility of
conflict.

Conflict and Conflict Management

Conflict among members of a group can arise in a
variety of ways. In the mutual acceptance and decision-
making stages of group development, there is likely to
be disagreement over member roles, schedules, stand-
ards, and plans. These disagreements can cause the
group to be ineffective and fragmented. There can also
be a development of coalitions and power centers within
the group that will cause the group to be ineffective,
and create anxiety for the members. Conflict is one
aspect of the group process that management must be on
the alert for, especially when dealing with certain
kinds of groups. When there are two or more individuals
working together, and there must be to have a group,
interpersonal conflict is always present. Differences
in opinion, attitudes, values, and beliefs create
tension. There is a tendency for individuals to align
themselves with other persons that share the same be-
liefs, values, and opinions. Individuals who are in a
state of conflict with other members are likely to
become dissatisfied with the interpersonal features of
the group. Those members that are experiencing conflict

are likely to withdraw from actively participating in the group activities. If the performance of the group is affected by conflict, it becomes management's responsibility to determine the cause of the problems and/or the underlying reasons. Before management can undertake any steps to solve conflict, its definition, causes, and the kinds of conflict.

Conflict is one of the major problems that can develop within or between groups. "Conflict is said to exist between two or more individuals when they disagree on a significant issue, or issues, and clash over the issues." (Glueck, 1980, p. 545) There are two key words: "significant" and "clash", that are important. If the disagreement is over something minor, there will be no conflict to develop. If there is a disagreement over a major issue and there is no clash, still the situation is not termed conflict. For a disagreement to be called conflict, there must be a significant or major issue involved and there must be a clash. There is no simple explanation for this assumption, other than minor issues will trigger the psychological and social re-sponses to cause conflict. In his study, (according to Glueck) Pondy discovered that conflict is not a series

of isolated incidents, but a set of incidents, thus it is considered as part of a process. When dealing with conflict, the present situation (conflict) is partly influenced by preceeding situations. The present situation comes about because of conditions in the environment and other forces leading to latent conflict, or conflict that is less obvious. These conditions are perceived differently by people, and then the actual incident occurs. After the conflict becomes manifest, the aftermath includes hurt feelings on the part of the loser, and good feelings on the part of the winner. Before management can begin to deal with conflict, there must be an investigation into the causes of conflict. (Glueck, 1980, p. 545)

The discussion so far has been in regard to conflict among the members of a group. The technical term for this is intra-group conflict. Another form of conflict is inter-group conflict. This is a major disagreement between two or more groups or departments. It is the management's desire that groups work together, and work towards the accomplishment of organizational and individual goals. However, conflicts can and do arise between groups. When organizations are structured in such a manner that what is done by department A flows

to department B and department B's output flows to
department C -- that is the departments are interde-
pendent -- it is crucial that there is cooperation
between the departments. Then cooperation should be one
of the main concerns of management. The relationship
between these departments can become disruptive and so
antagonistic that the entire flow of work is slowed off,
stopped completely. Even though management wants
cooperation, there are times when cooperation is not
desirable. Two groups or departments may cooperate
because they both oppose something that management is
trying to do. If the groups perceive that management's
actions are going to be detrimental, these groups may
cooperate to sabotage management's plans. Cooperation
is what would exist if there is no conflict. The brief
discussion of cooperation interjected here is used only
to stress the importance of management's concern and
knowledge of intergroup conflict. (Donnelly, 1981, p.
275)

There are many reasons why conflict develops be-
tween groups. Some of the more important reasons re-
lated to intergroup conflict are: differences in group
objectives, differences between individuals, limited
resources, differences in interests and goals, problems

with communication, lack of clarity.

Group Objectives

When two or more groups have different or opposing objectives, conflict is usually the result. For example, management may have one objective, while the union or a group of employees may have another objective that is not compatible with management's objective. Also, when there is a struggle for power between the leaders of two groups, there is usually conflict. Here, reference is to management and the union. (Glueck, 1980, p. 545)

Group Individuals

There are times when there is a difference between individuals. Personal dislikes act as a filter to information, causing conflicts that are really per-sonality conflicts, though on the surface they may appear to be the result of differences in perception. Conflict can also result when individuals have differ-ent perceptions and attitudes towards the same problem. (Glueck, 1980, p. 546)

Resources

Usually when groups have an abundance of money, materials, and time, they are effective. However, when groups are competing for limited resources, there is a

good chance that conflict will result. The competition for limited equipment money, or money for merit increases can become heated. Thus, when resources are limited, people become competitive, and the result can be conflict. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 276)

Interests and Goals

Differences in interest and goals can be a cause for conflict. This is best explained through an example. One group of workers may be dissatisfied with the way promotions are given and may request that management formulate plans to change and improve the system. At the same time, another group of workers may request that management do something about the pension plan.

Management recognizes the two different goals, but has the belief that the pension issue has the greatest importance and addresses it. The groups may want management to solve both problems, but this is not currently possible. Thus, one group becomes hostile because management appears to be ignoring their request. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 276)

Communication

Conflict can also arise out of communication problems. Groups often become involved with their own

areas of responsibility, with each developing their own vocabulary. Paying attention to one area of responsibility is an important and worthy endeavor, but it can cause problems in communication. The receiver of information must be considered when a group communicates an idea, proposal or decision. This is often not the case, and in consequence there are misinformed receivers who become irritated and then hostile. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 276)

Job Clarity

Job clarity involves knowing what others expect in terms of accomplishing a task. In some instances it is difficult to tell who has the responsibility for a particular task. Researchers have found that this difficulty exists in most organizations. For example, is an increased interest in a product line due to, or because of advertising, marketing, or research and development. Or who is responsible for losing a talented management trainer, the human resources department or the training department? This inability to pinpoint positive and negative contributions causes groups to compete for control over those activities that are recognized. The causes of conflict just cited are some of the more common ones. Each of them exists and

needs to be managed. The management of intergroup conflict involves determining strategies and minimize these problems. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 276)

Although a conflict is viewed in a negative light, it can be of some value to the enterprise. It provides the opportunity for new leaders to arise and for the organization to examine and possibly alter its objectives to respond to changing environments. President Franklin Roosevelt felt that conflict was necessary for effective policy making by appointing advisers who advisers who would clash and then assuming the role of arbitrator in their disagreements. Roosevelt believed by doing so he was able to weed the bias out of the opinions they offered. (Glueck, 1980, p. 547)

William Evan a contingency theorist, claims that conflict is to be avoided in crises organizations such as armies and in stable organizations, but desirable in volatile companies such as Research and Development organizations (Evan, 1965, p. 32) On the other hand, Claggett Smith found that conflict is not desirable in most businesses that are effective, but useful in effective unions and voluntary organizations. (Smith, 1966, p. 527) Unfortunately, there is not a lot of literature about this subject, but what is available

tends to support Evan's assumption. To summarize Evan's position, conflict is sometimes good and sometimes bad, and management should design a control and conflict resolution system to fit the amount of conflict that is desirable in their organization. (Glueck, 1980, p. 547)

What is done about conflict is often determined by the attitudes of management and employees regarding conflict. Managerial attitudes toward conflict are closely related to leadership styles. In the traditional school of thought, management believes that conflict refers to a failure of managerial planning and control and therefore it should be suppressed and severely dealt with. Those from the participative school of thought contend that conflict is normal, sometimes desirable, and can be managed so that an equilibrium state is attained. Still consultative leaders take the position that conflict arises, and that it is more likely in some departments than in others, and that it should be both minimized and managed. (Glueck, 1980, p. 548)

Glueck contends "there are three functional approaches to managing conflict:

1. Discuss the conflict fully with the parties in-
    volved and work it out.

2. Solve conflict by majority rule, compromise, or
    hierarchial appeal.

3. Suppress conflict by use of authority with sub-
    ordinates; by competitive with peers; by per-
    suasive with superiors." (Glueck, 1980,
    p. 548)

Traditional managers rely on dominance or power to
settle a conflict; the coalition or person with the most
power imposes the solution. Sometimes the solution is
just a matter of suppressing the conflict. The leaders
considered as participative, try to work it out through
bargaining, problem solving, persuasion and confronta-
tion. While the consultative leaders try in-between
mechanisms; discussion followed by a vote; compromise;
or political mechanisms, changing the structure, or if
necessary, submitting the dispute to an impartial arbi-
trator. (Glueck, 1980, p. 548)

To summarize, research evidence on conflict man-
agement shows that conflict has many causes, that it
does not always reduce productivity, and that there are
many ways of reducing conflict. It can be concluded
that the right method for dealing with conflict depends
on the nature of the enterprise and the manager.

CHAPTER THREE

Work groups are an important part of every organization. Both the formal group and the informal group share importance equally. However, the focal point of this section is devoted to the informal work group of the clique, so to speak. Some management theorists feel that these groups should be broken up and their formation discouraged. Other management theorist feel just the opposite. They view the informal clique or work group as somewhat beneficial, and their formaation should be encouraged. I am in agreement with the latter group. My hypothesis is that if these groups are effectively managed and controlled, they can be used to the benefit of management and ultimately the total organization. Research and experience has given concrete evidence that these groups wield a strong influence on both the employment and the organization. The point I'm making is simply that the informal work group or clique can be used as an aid to management, rather than being a cause for concern. The intent of this section is also to take what is provided through literature and apply it to an office setting and situations, since most of the literature refers to controlled studies of those

employees in a factory setting. The hypothesis stated above will be proven through the literature that is available, personal observation, and some long term personal experience.

The main emphasis will be on how the first-line manager will use the informal work group, rather than the higher levels of management. Even though the same principle can be applied to the higher levels of management, it is the first-line managers that work directly with those employees that actually do the organization's work. The higher one goes in management, the more the likelihood that the chances for interacting with subordinates decreases. Even though cliques are found at all levels, the higher levels of management tend to show a decrease in the number of employees in management at that level. The size of the informal group plays a part in the interworkings of the group, and the amount of control and power the leaders of the group hold.

The expected results of the research are that the reader will have a better understanding of how management can use the clique or cliques as an aid to

attaining the goals and objectives of the organization. Also it is expected that from this brief study that new insights will be gained of the functions of the informal group in a business setting, rather than a factory-assembly-line setting.

In accomplishing any goal of explaining how management can use the informal work group to its benefit, literature will have to be the basis. Due to the time involved in undertaking a study of this nature, it would be almost impossible to accomplish this otherwise. Along with what the literature has to offer will be the result of some personal observations. These observations were conducted in organizations in both the public and private sectors. Both organizations deal with the public. The point here is to illustrate that the type of organization has no effect on the workings of the informal group.

If this study is to be effective and the hypothesis examined, there must be a thorough understanding of what an informal group is. The informal group or clique, is that group of employees that come together for social needs. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 254) Even though their objectives are different from those of the formal work

group, when managed effectively these groups can be used to help the organization towards achieving its goals and objectives. The definition is misleading because it appears that this group and its activities have nothing to do with the workings of the organization. That is precisely the case. They have nothing to do with the work of the organization, but they can have a definite impact on the organization. They can be an asset, if management is able to identify the group and the group leaders.

The key to using cliques effectively lies in how well the manager can identify and get along with the members of the clique, especially the leader. The leaders of cliques are usually those employees that are looked up to by the other members of the group. While they are usually the ones with more seniority, that is not always the case. The leaders usually have out-going personalities and good-to-excellent job perform-ance. The first thing a manager should do is observe the employees enough to identify the leaders, then cultivate a professional working relationship with that person. There are some things that the group leaders can do for the supervisor/manager that can make

their job easier. One such thing is the training of a new employee. Most organizations have departments whose chief responsibility is to train new employees. After this initial training, the employee is sent to the department where their immediate supervisor has the responsibility of continued training. More than likely, the formal training a new employee receives is not enough. The little tricks all employees develop for getting the job done cannot usually be taught by the first line supervisor. This is one area where informal work groups can aid the first line supervisor. Before this can happen, the manager/supervisor must have knowledge of who the leaders of the work groups are. there must also be a working of relationship established between the leaders of the cliques and management. If this has been established, the manager can be reasonably assured that physically placing the new employee in that particular work group, will yield the desired result, namely continued training of the new employee. The job is not done at this point. What the manager has done is to place the employee in a formal work group. A formal work group is one that is a "set of two or more people who see themselves as a group, are interdependent with

one another for a purpose, and communicate and interact
with one another on a more or less continuing basis."
(Glueck, 1980, p. 534) Even though the manager has
placed the new employee in the formal clique, the
employee may not be a part of the informal clique. It
is the informal clique that will teach the new employee
the tricks of the trade. It is important that the
manager understand just how the new employee, or any
employee, becomes a member of the informal clique.
There are ways the manager can facilitate the employee's
integration into a work group.

<p align="center">The Group Integration Process</p>

Three Part Process. If a "new" employee, new to
the organization, or new to the work group, is to be
effectively integrated into a work group, a supervisor
must be concerned with all the forces which can prevent
the new employee from becoming a contributing group mem-
ber. Once a person has been hired by an organization, a
complex process is set in motion. This process, labeled
the Group Integration Process, has three parts: the
supervisor, the employee, and the group. The primary
dimension is the newly hired individual. A new job
requires the organization of new skills, a different way

of thinking, the meeting of, and the adjustment to new
people, and the understanding of a new work setting.
Likewise, the group, considered the second dimension,
is being asked to adapt to and integrate the new em-
ployee so that it can successfully accomplish the
tasks assigned to it. The unit supervisor, the third
dimension, is responsible for managing the employee's
entrance into the life of the work group and must be
assured that the group effectively integrates the new
employee. (Summers, 1977, p. 394)

To illustrate this point, a situation will be
related. The situation occurred in the Missouri
Division of Family Services, a state social service
agency. The physical arrangement in this office dic-
tates that all employees in the same supervisory unit
sit together. In this one occurrence, this did not
happen. The new employee was located away from the
formal work group physically, necessitating his/her
acceptance by a group of employees that were not
controlled by the same supervisor. This new employee
was not accepted by the members of the informal group
that she was forced to sit with. The supervisor
recognized there was a problem and did all she could to

rectify it. Still the employee was not accepted. The new employee encountered all kinds of difficulty and subsequently quit. From the onset, the new employee was less thoroughly indoctrinated into the group than the other employees that had entered the group, and she appeared to be isolated from the emotional support of the formal group, support that had been important to new employees in the past.

The three-dimensional approach as applied to the aforementioned situation suggests that the supervisor serves as a link to the resource that the new worker represents, and the unlocking of that employee's potential with the group, indicative that the group has ther power to encourage or stifle performance. The supervisor's role is to integrate both organizational and human variables into an effective and efficient system. The variables must be balanced and blended on a continuing basis as they change and conflict. In analyzing a problem of the nature that our supervisor faced, each of the three dimensions and their interrelationships must be taken into account and treated carefully. (Summers, 1977, p. 395)

The group integration process can offer specific help to understanding the process by which individuals become a part of a work group. The process that a person goes through, from the employment interview to the point at which they become a full-fledged member of a work group, has six distinguishable phases or stages that can be abstracted and applied. The six phases - invitation, induction, orientation, training, relationship, and integration require a functional acceptance by the employee of each stage before the next stage can be successfully undertaken. If the first stage, or any other stage for that matter, is not solidly constructed, then the subsequent phase or phases will be weakened. Keep in mind that the employee does not know he or she is going through a phase. The group integration process is an aid that the supervisor can use to facilitate the employee's acceptance into a work group. (Summers, 1977, p. 395)

Invitation. The group integration process starts with an invitation by a company to a job applicant to become one of their employees. The process begins here because this is the stage where the organization gets its first chance to talk to the

applicant. Here the interviewer can explain all of the necessary qualifications that the new hire must possess to be productive and effective. These individuals who are handled sensitively, provided a full and accurate description of the job , and suitably placed in positions that capitalize on their backgrounds and potential, are most likely to find a setting in which they can work effectively. A change from these standards opens the possibility that trouble will follow.

The case of a sales clerk hired at a local chain drug store serves as an example of what can happen when the invitation stage does not function properly. The store had advertised that it needed a new sales clerk. The employees already on board were well aware of the need as well as what duties were to be performed. When the person was hired, the manager hired him/her as a cashier only. Those duties were different from the duties of sales clerk. The existing employees were not aware of this change and when the new employee refused to do the duties of a clerk, there was animosity towards the new hire from the other employees. Because of the change in assignment, the new hire began his/her career

with this store with negative feelings, confusion, a defensive posture, mistrust and a high degree of anxiety. A faulty start of this kind, a weak first block so to speak, can seriously affect the individual's learning rate and her adjustment to the demands of the job. New employees enter into a relationship with an organization with a mixture of tension and optimism. Either of these factors can be heightened depending upon how the person is treated by the company. Whatever turns out to be the predominant perspective will have long term implications. Obviously, it is in the best interest of management and the company to have otpimism as the prevailing outlook because such feelings will lead to an increased learning rate and a higher level of commitment to the group's task. (Summers, 1977, p. 396)

Induction. The second stage has been labeled induction and involves telling the new employee about the desired and official relationship that an employee has with the organization. Although the exact format varies from company to company, the goals are similar, namely to complete forms, outlining company policy, benefits explained and a general orientation to the company provided. In many organizations that phase is

performed by the personnel department and is intended to leave a positive impression in the mind of the new hire. When this phase is conducted outside the work group, the supervisor often continues this phase once the new employee arrives on the job, particularly when there is an indication that the new employee does not fully understand the complexities of the information that has been presented. The fact that a new employee usually retains only a small part of what is told during the first few days is understandable, considering the tremendous anxiety an individual faces when entering a new company. This makes it especially important for the supervisor to thoroughly know the content of the induction program so that he or she can effectively determine whether the trainee has grasped the intricasies of this stage of the process, and then decide what steps to take if the trainee has not.

Implications arise when the trainee does not understand the induction stage. For example, the new employee may be confused about benefits, policies, and general expectations that the company has of each employee. Questions that were not answered prevent future phases from maturing. As in the previous phase,

if the employee is left with doubts, then the negative
feelings will adversely affect their personal attitude
towards the organization. On the other hand, if this
phase is a success, the trainee gradually begins to
understand and identify with the goals of the organi-
zation and is eager to contribute to the group's
purpose. (Summers, 1977, p. 396)

Orientation. The orientation stage builds
directly onto the induction stage. The supervisor who
is aware of the importance of the human element of the
integration process will dig to gain an understanding of
the new employee's perception of the organization and
what has been learned to date, correcting false impres-
sions and filling in gaps. The primary purpose of this
stage is to start building a relationship between the
new employee and the group. Whereas the induction stage
concentrated on more general issues, orientation is
intended to impress the new employee with the import-
ance of accomplishing the goals of the work unit, and
to help the new employee begin to feel a part of the
new surroundings. Socialization is an important func-
tion of this phase. Failure to properly and effec-
tively orient a new employee to job responsibilities

and new associates can cause alienation and serious damage to the trainee's view of the organization and the unit work. (Summers, 1977, p. 397)

Training. The fourth stage in the integration process is training. Training in a manner that is systematic, encourages efficiency and effectiveness in a work group. Thorough and uniform training helps to assure that a new employee will understand how to do a job and will more quickly become a contributing member of a work unit. Conversely, failure to adequately train a person fully may result in increased errors, lower productivity and strained relationships within and outside of the work group. If the new employee is placed in a situation where management has fallen short of his/her expectations in the integration process, the condition under which the employee is working will cause the training program to be ineffective. (Summers, 1977, p. 397)

Relationship. The relationship stage refers to the type of interaction that takes place between individuals in the work group. The optimal conditions exist when group members operate cohesively, that is are collectively motivated in directions that are in agreement

with organizational and group goals. Group cohesiveness occurs when members interact, share experiences and behave in a cooperative manner. The conclusion is that the supervisor should stress the building of inter-personal relationships. This relationship building process begins at the very outset of the employee's entrance into the company. It will pick up speed as the new employee has an opportunity to increase their interaction with fellow workers and represents the quality of the rapport that the group members have as they work together. If the relationship stage is weakened and the employee is unable to relate to others in a group, the indivdual will be prevented from being fully integrated into the work unit. (Summers, 1977, p. 397)

Integration. The full integration of a new em-ployee into a work group is the end point of this pro-cess. Few will argue the point that highly effective work groups are important for an organization. There are many properties and characteristics that have been ascribed to work groups. Likert, in his study of work groups, found that some of them are: members and leaders have roles that are interchangeable; the members

of the group will establish a relaxed working relation-
ship; there is a high degree of trust and confidence
between all the group members, including the leader; the
values and goals of the group are consistent with the
members values and needs because the group action is
influenced by the members. Although the list goes on,
the implication here is that the above conditions will
not be realized unless the members are fully integrated
when they feel and are helped to feel a part of the
whole, and when they are contributing substantially to
the purpose of the group. This view of integration
places responsibility on all three dimensions mentioned
at the beginning of this discussion, the newly hired
person, the work group members, and the supervisor.
Undeniably, the group members and the new employee have
essential responsibilities in the integration process,
but it is the supervisor that has the greatest oppor-
tunity to encourage the members to accept and support
the new person and to structure the entrance of the
employee so that they can quickly fit into the group's
activities. The supervisor is viewed as the prime in-
tegrator and linker of group dynamics. (Summers, 1977,
p. 416)

The Work Group As A Management Tool

The integration process is the basis for getting the new employee into a work group. This process does not mean that the new employee will be accepted. It is merely a process by which the supervisor can facilitate the new employee's acceptance by the work group. After the process has been successfully completed, the supervisor can make use of the group to then facilitate the work process. Training the new employee has been mentioned as one aspect in which the supervisor can use the work group as an aid. Watching and keeping tabs on employees is another area where the supervisor can use the work group as a management tool.

Watching. There times when management cannot always keep a watchful eye on employees, however the work group can perform this function for the supervisor. This is not to imply that the supervisor has spies. What is meant here is that so far as adhering to the rules and regulations of the organization, the supervisor cannot always be in a position to observe the conduct of all the employees in their span of control. The members of the group can, however, do this function for the supervisor. Along with this, the group can teach the

new employee the work rules and make sure that the employee conforms. If for any rason, the faulting employee does not conform, the members of the group will render their own method of discipline. Here again, it is important that the supervisor have the support of the group leader. How this process works can be seen in an incident that occurred at the Missouri Division of Family Services.

Production at this agency is determined by the number of case reviews and other case actions that come due during a particular calendar month. Production is a very important factor here because the Federal government requires that case reviews and Food Stamp applications and reapplications be completed within certain time frames. If these time frames are not met, the Federal government has the right to impose financial sanctions that will be detrimental to both the Agency and the recipients it serves. This particular incident involves a caseworker who consistently fell short of the case review requirement. This employee was well liked by the members of both the formal work group and the informal clique. This employee was active in all activities of the informal group, both on and off the

job. An important point here is the fact that this employee did not have a personal problem or any other problem or physical limitation that could have an adverse affect on her productivity. When the monthly reports were published, it was discovered that this employee's production was not what it should be. After the supervisor completed an investigation of this employee's production and training record, it was concluded that this employee was simply "goofing off". The supervisor devised methods to help this employee, all to no avail. The supervisor then let the members of the informal group feel the impact of the nonconforming group member by dividing this employee's delinquent case actions equally among the members of the work group. The members accepted the extra work, but in turn gave the nonconforming employee a very difficult time. The effect was to cause the nonconforming group member to become more responsible. Of course, this was not an immediate result. After approximately seven weeks, the employee was back on the right track. The supervisor in this case could have fired the employee, or taken another form of discipline. Because of the work rules of this agency, either method would have started a long

involved process that would have taken months to complete. The supervisor used the work group first. Had this method failed, one of the other prescribed methods for dealing with a problem of this nature would have been utilized. The main point is that the supervisor was able to use the work group to keep an employee on the job, thereby eliminating the need to initiate an adverse personnel action. There are times when the members of the group will initiate an action to bring an employee in line without the consent or knowledge of management.

Another incident that illustrates the point that the work group can be a "watch dog" for management can be seen in what occurred in the AT&T office. There was a male employee that came to work in attire that was objectionable. This employee was well aware of the dress code in this office. The members of the informal work group, of which this person was a member, talked to this employee before management had an opportunity to do so. The clique convinced this employee that he should not come to work dressed in such a manner. The dress code at this office is quite relaxed. However, what this young man wore was even more relaxed. The members of

the clique felt that the manner in which he was dressed was too relaxed. The result was this young man went home and changed into something more suitable. The members of the informal clique could have allowed management to talk to the employee. When the person that approached the employee was interviewed, the response indicated that the conversation was not based on concern for the employee, but that the concern was for the sake of not having management review the dress code.

This is an illustration of the informal work group aiding management with management being involved. In this instance, the members of the work group enforced one of the company's policies, thereby releasing management of this particular responsibility. If management had performed this duty, there could have possibly been hurt feelings on the part of the employee, or the employee could have felt so intimidated that he could have filed a grievance with the union. This incident brings us to another function of management that the informal group can perform, and that is teaching the new employee the rules and regulations.

Teaching. How often have we experienced starting a new job and somewhere during the orientation stage

we are handed a book of personnel rules and regulations? Many times the new hire is given such a book and told to read it. Usually what we read tends to be mostly forgotten. If the employee is accepted into the work group, the members of the group will usually tell the new employee that they are in violation of some rule before management finds out. In the eyes of management, this new employee will be viewed as a model employee because they (management) have not had to record negative things in the employee's performance record. The incident just discussed could have just as easily been perpetrated by the immediate supervisor. In other words the supervisor could have been the cause behind the group members talking with the nonconforming employee. For those managers who are aware of the work group, their job can be made easier because they will have the ability to manipulate their employees to their advantage. In its simplest form, management is just the manipulation of others.

Socialization. The socialization process is just another of the ways the work group can be used as an aid to management. Here again, it is important to stress that management cannot use work groups without a well-rounded relationship with those designated as lead-

ers of the clique. When a new employee enters a new employment setting, they are usually quite lonely because they don't know anyone. They would not have had an opportunity to find someone to confide in, or someone that can show them how to cope with situations encountered on the work site. Here again the informal clique can prove to be invaluable. The supervisor cannot be expected to be available to listen to the woes of any employee, especially when the concern is not one that is connected with the job. Yet, concerns can be so serious in nature that they can affect the employee's performance on the job. This applies to any employee not just the new employee. From the employee's point of view, it is not all that desirable for the employee to go to the supervisor with every problem or concern. This will cause the supervisor to feel that this employee is still in the child stages of development, or that this employee is not mature enough to be left alone. The work group can lend the ear these employees need. The leader or some group member can offer some advice that could possibly give the troubled employee some relief.

In cases where an employee has moved from another city for employment purposes, the group can aid this

employee in finding a place of residence. It is not
expected that this employee will know which part of town
to settle in, as in the case of a transfer employee in
Operator Services at the AT&T office. This situation
involves an employee being transferred from another
state to this area. The employee did not have any
relatives here and was totally alone. To further
complicate matters, this employee was only given one
week's notice that he was being transferred. Con-
sequently, he was not given the opportunity to come
here and look for a suitable residence. He arrived in
town on a Saturday night and out of necessity took up
residence in a hotel, one that was not too savory, but
expensive nevertheless. He was due to report to work
the very next day, and thus there was no opportunity to
find a place to live, nor was there adequate trans-
portation. After arriving on the job, and meeting
his supervisor, he discovered that the supervisor had no
concern with where he lived. A few days later, he met
one of the other employees, an older female, who engaged
him in conversation. The problem he was having soon
came to light. The other employees of the informal work
group were informed and shortly thereafter this employee

was advised of where to find a suitable apartment.

The situation above could have become such a problem that this employee could have missed days from work. Scheduling for operators changes weekly, they are not always given the same days off. Even though the supervisor had nothing to do with what transpired, the company experienced a benefit in that this employee was facilitated in his stressful adjustment to the new environment. Also, through the socialization process, this employee was told of benefits offered employees in this area that were not offered in his hometown. The supervisor, in this case, did not advise this employee of the benefits because they were unaware that they were not offered at all offices.

The discussion so far has been centered around those managers who have a leadership style of the "Y" type, but what of those "X" type managers? Managers of the "X" type of leadership style are characterized by being very authoritarian in nature. They view all employees as lazy, nonmotivated and not wanting to work. They also feel that employees have to be watched at all times, and never leave the child stages of development, and thereby prefer to be directed, and above all, are in

need of security. (Latham, 1964, p. 146) How does the "X" leadership style affect the informal group? Surprisingly, these leaders have very little effect on the informal group. However, the informal group can have an effect on the "X" type leader.

The "X" type manager, by nature has very little use for the informal group. Because of their views towards the nature of all employees, they would never consider using them for any reason, let alone as an aid. The members of the informal clique can cause a manager of this type a lot of concern. For example, there is a supervisor of the "X" type at the Missouri Division of Family Services office. Needless to say, she was not very well liked. It seems that this supervisor was constantly causing concern for the informal group that sat near her office. The group members became tired of her actions, and initiated some of their own. The group leader launched a series of complaints against this supervisor, and when there was no immediate action, enlisted the aid of other groups. The result was that this supervisor was called into conference with the Unit Manager and advised of the consequences of her actions if they continued. This supervisor did not change her leadership style but became less open with her actions.

The Theory "X" manager is an aspect of work groups that was neglected in the literature. My brief observation in this area only disclosed this one incident. The style of leadership that a supervisor displays is a prime factor in their relationship with the leaders of the informal clique. The Theory X manager does not fit the norm when using the work group as a tool, as discussed here. They would never allow this to happen at anytime.

Causing Changes. The discussion of the aforementioned incident brings up another very important point. There are times when work groups work against the policies or procedures of the organization. This should not be misconstrued as an act against the supervisor. At times, situations will arise where the manager cannot persuade the informal clique to carryout his/her wishes. Usually, these situations are those involving company policy or procedure. If the employees feel the policies or procedures are unfair there is very little the supervisor can say that will cause them to accept the directives.

When the work group is faced with what they perceive as an unfair or unreasonable policy, procedure

or practice, they can handle the situation in such a manner that the top levels of management may change their policy. It may not seem that management is using groups to their benefit but it is still, in a sense, using them. To explain, let's assume that a policy change has been handed down to a lower level manager. Let's assume also that this manager does not agree with the directive, and feels the same as those subordinates it affects directly. It would not be desirable to have the supervisor go against the wishes of top management. So the supervisor manipulates the work group in such a manner that the work group confronts management. Hence, the supervisor has again used the work group as a benefit. This is not exactly what the title of this paper means. Still, this is included to illustrate that in some cases, the outward appearance may reflect one thing, but management may be the underlying cause. An illustration of this can be seen in an incident that occurred at an AT&T office.

Those AT&T employees that are operators have the responsibility of "branding". "Branding" is the practice of thanking the customers for using AT&T when the operator handles a long-distance call. The opera-

tors had become lax in their branding responsibility, and top management became concerned. Operators view branding as a nuisance, and some of them refused to do it. Top management advised lower management that since branding had fallen to a very low percentage, the whole office would be judged as unsatisfactory. All performance appraisals would reflect an employee as coming from, or being employed in an office where the work has been deemed unsatisfactory. This would have an adverse affect on the lower level manager and their subordinates. The lower level managers passed the information on to their employees, even though they felt the practice was unfair. Naturally, a practice of this nature would cause concern among most of the operators, especially those who were branding faithfully. The supervisors, even though they did not agree with the new policy, did not disagree with the higher levels of management by voicing their concern. The supervisors left the situation to the individual employees. One of the supervisors had a private conversation with one of the male operators, one that had been previously identified as a group leader. After this meeting, the operator

went to the manager in charge of the entire office and discussed the directive. Later, management conducted another investigation, and discuvered that those employees that were branding less were those employed at midnight. Management then rescinded their first directive and issued essentially the same directive, but stated the shift that was staffed with those employees that were branding less, would be the ones that would be judged unsatisfactory. In this situation, management could have chosen to launch a protest, but didn't. The operators affected could have called in the union, but didn't. An interview with one of the supervisors disclosed that during this time AT&T had decided there were too many lower level managers and planned to reduce staff at that level. It was partly out of fear for their jobs that these supervisors did not confront higher levels of management, and partly because they would appear to be in opposition of top management.

Decision-Making. Decision-making is another function of the work group. Usually it is a committee that is employed as a decision-making group. Technically, committees are formal work groups, however, these can be ineffective and time consuming if not

picked with care and managed properly. Management has the responsibility of picking the members of a committee. It would stand to reason that management would choose those employees that were cooperative. This is not always possible, nor desirable. But if management selected those employees that had been identified as leaders of the informal groups, there would be a greater chance of forming a committee that would prove to be more productive. Of course, the managers in the various units would be charged with the responsibility of choosing committee members. On the surface, this does not appear to be using the informal group as an aid, but remember, those committee members are also members of the various informal cliques in the organization.

Conflict. Conflict is a condition that is not desirable in any situation. However, when mangement introduces conflict, the resulting behavior can be a benefit and tool for management. It is best that there is a thorough understanding of what conflict is. "Conflict is said to exist between two or more individuals or work groups when they disagree on a significant issue (or issues) and clash over the issue." (Glueck, 1980, p. 545)

Conflict can be managed and to the manager that utilizes the participative style, conflict is something desirable. It is possible to induce conflict into the work group. The expected result will be a benefit to the organization. If, for example, management wanted to increase production without offering wage incentives, conflict of a beneficial nature could be created and controlled by management to achieve the desired result. When conflict is induced, it does not mean that anger has to develop. However, if anger does result, management should be able to channel the energy produced by anger towards increased productivity. Just how this is accomplished depends largely on the leadership style of the manager and the relationship that exists between the manager and the members of the work group.

This discussion of work groups as an aid to management is not intended to be a "how-to" manual. Because this discussion is not trying to be exhaustive, there are not more examples of how these groups can be of a benefit to the organization and used as an aid by management. There are many factors that are called into play when management endeavors to manipulate

these groups to their benefit. It is very necessary that management possess a clear understanding of work groups and all its aspects and implications. Even with a solid knowledge of work groups, there must be a long period of observation to determine who the leaders of the groups are, how many cliques are in their unit, and how well these groups interact. Before an attempt can be made to utilize the work group as an aid, management should be thoroughly acquainted with those studies that involve the workings of work groups. Even though these studies do not advise how work groups can be used, they do provide insight into the impact they have on the behavior of group members. The studies are numerous. The only three which will be included in the discussion here are the Hawthorne Studies, Bales Interaction Analysis, and Moreno's Sociometric Analysis.

Hawthorne Studies

The influence of informal groups over employee behavior and performance was spelled out in the famous Hawthorne Studies. These studies were conducted in a factory type setting. The intent of this writer's study is to view work groups in a business or office setting. The results are basically the same, for the findings can

be applied to both settings. In the Hawthorne Studies, the setting was partially in a bank wiring room. In that portion of the study, a group of workers were observed for approximately three months. This group developed specific norms for the level of output and other aspects of job behavior. The group decided to produce two units of work a day and to finish the second unit exactly at quitting time. Any group member who tried to speed up the work to change the two unit norm was given a difficult time. These behaviors existed despite the fact that the group had the capability to produce more and despite the existence of what management believed was a good pay incentive plan.

The point of the Hawthorne example is not that informal groups are disruptive to mangers. Instead it illustrates the powerful influence that groups can exert over their members. Both formal and informal groups can exert powerful influence forces. This influence can be economic, social, psychological, or even physical. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 254)

Bales Interaction Analysis

Behavioral scientists believe that managers must continually acquire vital knowledge about factors such

as characteristics of group structure, the impact of
groups on the attitude of members, and how the mem-
bership influences such things as group culture and
attractiveness. The methods utilized by behavioral
scientists have proved successful in studying group
behavior in a lab setting. Management development
seminars, the college classroom, or a boy's day camp
have all been used as settings for investigating group
behavior. Naturally, these settings are different than
a company office, a production department work area or
an emergency room in a hospital, but many perceptive
insights are provided by laboratory group behavior
studies.

Bales developed what is called the interaction
analysis to obtain work group behavior data by observing
what is occurring within a group. He studied groups
attempting to reach a decision. After studying groups
in the laboratory setting, he concluded that group
behavior can be classified as task oriented and human
relations oriented. He proposed that through group
interaction a number of tasks and human relations
reactions occur in both positive and negative forms.

In his studies, Bales used a problem involving the solving of a business case. Bales observed the interaction and recorded the group discussion that occurred in leaderless groups attempting to analyze a clash in human relations. He identified twelve categories of interactions which occurred within the groups as they attempted to resolve the case. After the group case-solving sessions members completed a questionnaire concerning their reations, their satisfaction, their opinions about their discussion group. From the answers recorded on the questionnaire and from observation, Bales developed an interaction profile of satisfied and dissatisfied case-solving groups using his twelve category descriptive system.

Bales developed another procedure for understanding work group behavior and interaction. He named this procedure the who-to-whom matrix. The procedure involved tabulating the number of discussions between individuals and who initiated the discussion and who addressed the group as a whole.

It was found that the patterns of discussion varied under different circumstances. Bales concluded that groups with no designated leader usually tend to have

more equal participation than groups with designated leaders and that the size of the group is an important factor affecting within the group patterns of discussion. When groups have more than five members, the leader tends to speak to the group as a whole rather than to specific members, while the other members tend to speak more to specific individuals than to the group as a whole. As the number of members in the group increases, a larger and larger proportion of the activity tends to be addressed to the leader and a smaller and smaller proportion to the other members. It appears that the communication pattern tends to become centralized or centered around the leader.

Bales did not confine his studies to tracing communication patterns, he also studied the roles of group members. More specifically, he studied the roles of best idea person, best guidance person, best liked person, and the person considered the scapegoat. From his studies, Bales concluded that the persons with best ideas and those that gave the most guidance, could easily be classified as the task specialists in the group, while the person liked the best was viewed as the group's human relations specialist.

The results of using these two classifications made it possible for Bales to formulate an analysis of what can happen if the human relations specialist attempts to take over the group from the task specialist. This type of internal conflict can disrupt the activities and performance of the group. It has been concluded from this part of the Bales Analysis that groups work more effectively when two members fill the two separate leader roles.

Bales interaction analysis provides a valuable technique for analyzing small groups functioning in a lab setting. The research and findings provide managers with insights about patterns of communication, roles, and the status system found within groups. The vital question regarding what makes a group tick, what is the pattern of group communication, and who the task leader is, and who fills the capacity of human relations leader, can be dealt with more effectively if the results of research, similar to those of Bales, are made available to mangers. (Bales, 1951, pp. 485-495)

Moreno's Sociometric Analysis

J. L. Moreno, another management researcher, formulated what has been termed, a Sociometric analysis.

This is a method of studying work group behavior and structural characteristics involving the use of self reports from the members of the group. These reports show the preference and repulsion patterns of group members. Based on the written choices of members, this method provides insights about the leaders and status hierarchy of the group and about communication patterns of those interested in such matters. To grasp an understanding of the complex communication patterns and interactions of groups, Moreno asked group members whom they liked and disliked within the group, enabling him to gain knowledge about group relations. From the data collected, Moreno was able to construct a sociogram.

A sociogram is a diagram that illustrates the interpersonal relationships existing within a group. This diagram is used to determine the extent to which one person likes to work with another. The same type of procedure can be used to illustrate rejections. The sociometric procedure recommended by Moreno has value for managers. If managers can identify the leaders of a group, they may be able to work with the leaders in bringing about change. Of course, many factors such as the type of change being introduced, the group's past

relations with management, and the influence of the leader within the group would be critical to the success of dealing with work group leaders. (Moreno, 1947, pp. 287-292)

The membership patterns of interest and friendship groups are not tightly controlled by the organization. However, managerial actions such as laying out a work area, allowing members to take coffee breaks at a speci- fied time, and demanding a certain level of productivity influence the interaction and communication patterns of employees causing individuals to affiliate with each other so that interest and friendship groups emerge. (Donnelly, 1981, p. 262)

Satisfaction and Decision Making in Groups

Two potential end results or consequences of group membership are the satisfaction of members and the reaching of effective group decisions. In recent years, behaviorists and managers have increased their efforts to understand the causes of member satisfaction and decision-making within groups.

Hesling and Dunphy report that a member's per- ception of freedom to participate influences need satisfaction. Those persons, that viewed themselves as

active participators reported themselves more satisfied,
while those individuals who perceived their freedom to
participate to be insignificant typically were the least
satisfied members in a work group. (Heslin, 1964, p.
110)

"The freedom-to-participate factor is related to
the whole spectrum of economic and sociopsychological
needs. For example, the perceived ability to par-
ticipate may lead individuals to believe that they
are valued members of the group. This assumption can
lead to the satisfaction of social esteem, and self-
actualization needs." (Donnelly, 1981, p. 278)

A number of studies illustrate that a group mem-
ber's perception of progress toward the attainment of
desired goals is an important factor in member satis-
faction. Work groups that go toward the attainment
of goals, show higher levels of member satisfaction,
while those members of groups that are not adequately
progressing toward the attainment of the groups goals,
showed a lower satisfaction level.

Status consensus is a concept defined as an
agreement about the relative status of all group
members. Several studies reviewed by Heslin indicate

that when the degree of status consensus is high, member
satisfaction tends to be high; where status consensus
within the group is low, member satisfaction tends to be
low. Heslin also concluded that status consensus is
more readily achieved in groups where:

1. The group task specialist is perceived to
   be competent by the members of the group.

2. A leader is produced that plays a role that
   is considered an important group task.

3. A leadership role is produced and is filled
   by an individual who can concentrate on co-
   ordinating and maintaining the activities of
   the group.

The study completed by Heslin suggests that per-
ceptions of the membership concerning freedom to par-
ticipate, movement toward goal attainment, and status
consensus significantly influence the level of need
satisfaction attained by the members of the group.
Their review also clearly indicates that when a group
member's goals and needs are in conflict with the goals
and needs of the overall group, lower levels of
membership satisfaction are the result. (Heslin, 1964,
p. 100)

The degree of satisfaction among employees in
health and welfare agencies toward their place of work
was the focus of a study by Bagley, Hage, and Aiken.

These researchers measured the flow of communication among staff members in meetings that were formally scheduled as well as contacts that were informal. They found that total communication among colleagues was not associated with satisfaction, but the direction of the flow, was correlated with satisfaction. To explain, when most of the informal talk was from subordinates to supervisor, more unfavorable views of the work place were revealed. And when most of the informal conversation was directed to subordinates from superiors, favorable work place attitudes were the rule. Thus, who initiates informal communciation may be an area of interest for further research attempting to explain group membership satisfaction. (Bagley, 1975, p. 619)

A number of research studies have raised the question of whether group decision-making is superior, inferior, or equal to individual decision-making. There are studies which support almost every type of claim. Maier, instead of developing an exact answer to the question, discusses assets and liabilities of group decision-making.

In a group there is a greater total of knowledge

and information. Thus, decisions that require the use of knowledge should give groups an advantage over individuals. This additional information can be helpful in reaching the best decision possible. (Donnelly, 1980, p. 280)

"Many problems require making decisions that depend upon the support of other group members. Insofar as group decision-making permits participation and influence, it follows that more members accept a decision when a group solves the problem than when one person solves it. A person reaching a decision must persuade others in the group who may resist being told what the best solution is for the problem. Individuals, by working on the problem, believe that they are more responsible for the solution. This feeling of shared responsibility with others is satisfying to some people.

Decisions made by an individual, which are to be carried out by others, must be communicated to those who must execute. Thus, the individual decision-maker must communicate effectively before positive action is taken. The chances for communication breakdowns are reduced when the individuals who must execute the decision have participated in making it. They were involved in reaching the decision and were aware of how it was

reached. Knowing the details of how the decision was reached improves the decision executor's understanding." (Maier, 1967, p. 242)

Making a decision in a group puts pressure on each member. The desire to be an accepted and cooperative group member tends to silence individual disagreement and favors agreement. If a majority is forceful enough, its decision will usually be accepted regardless of whether the quality is adequate.

"In some groups, a dominating individual takes over. This person, because of a strong personality, organizational position, reputation, or status can dominate the group. None of these traits or characteristics is necessarily related to decision-making skill. However, they can inhibit group discussion, reduce creativity among other members, and stop members from making positive contributions. Taking stands may hinder a group in reaching a good solution. Most problems have more than one solution, and individual group members may have personal preferences. Sometimes a member may take a stand on his or her preference and will feel that a defeat means loss of face. Thus, the member becomes more concerned with

winning than with finding the best group decision."
(Maier, 1967, p. 245)

"Available research suggests that better ideas
emerge when a number of people work on a problem
separately than in a face-to-face group. These findings
have been supported using groups of research scientists,
managers, and students. However, another researcher,
after studying thirty-six three-person brainstorming
groups, concluded that persons in groups are not nec-
essarily poorer decision makers than those working on
their own. He suggests that an inhibiting force appear
to be present when people work face-to-face in a
group." (Delberca, 1971, p. 205)

"The assets of working in a group have been noted
above. These must be weighed against the liabilities of
working in a group. Present knowledge suggests some
important differences in decision making by individuals
and groups. Groups appear to make fewer errors, take
greater risks, and inhibit somewhat the generation of
ideas from less vocal members. The biggest cost of
decision-making seems to be the time needed to reach a
decision." (Street, 1974, p. 433)

CONCLUSION

The Behaviorial School approach to management is replete with discussions, theories and research findings concerning work groups. The interest in work groups is intense and based upon premises such as groups are ubiquitous, groups influence an employee's percetion and attitudes, groups influence the productivity of employees, groups aid individuals in satisfying un- fulfilled needs, and groups facilitate communications.

Groups may be formal or informal. They may be permanent or temporary. Formal groups are created to accomplish specific tasks. Informal groups are formed by their members and can either help or hinder the chievement of the needs of the organization. Informal groups are important in fulfilling the recognition, social and other needs of the group members.

At least three functions of work groups are instrumental in an organization's success: the socialization of the new employee, getting the work of the organization done and help in the decision-making process. Because work groups are so significant, it makes sense for a manager to learn to work with them and through them. A thorough knowledge of groups,

129

especially where the informal clique is concerned, is essential if management is going to manipulate them to their benefit.

The knowledge that the manager acquires about groups should include an understanding of how these groups form. Research has given valuable insight into the formation process. It was discovered that the formation process occurs in four stages: Stage One - the initial formation. Stage Two - the development of the group's objective. These objectives will be somewhat different from the objectives of the organization. Both the organization's objectives and those of the group will basically yield the same results, the attaining of the organization's goals and objectives. Stage Three - elaboration of the structure of the work group. Stage Four - the development of the group's leader or leaders.

An effective work group is one whose members function as a team and fully participate in group discussions, whose objectives are clearly developed, and whose resources are adequate to accomplish its objectives. Factors influencing group effectiveness include the size of the group, the number of members,

eye contact and location of members, cohesiveness, group norms, and the nature of the task. All of these factors are very seldom found naturally. That is, when management plans the layout of an office, some of these factors will not be easy to effect. Eye contact is one, all the members of the existing group will, or may not, be physically located where eye contact can be easily facilitated. If management is aware of these factors, they can facilitate the development of an effective group by making sure that all the factors that make an effective group are present and provided for the members of the group. The ideal group is one in whch the group's norms coincide with the norms or objectives of the firm.

Work groups can be dysfunctional in two ways. They may resist or sabotage organizational objectives, or conflict may develop within or between groups. Conflict is said to exist between two or more individuals or groups when they disagree on a significant issue and clash over it. Major causes of conflict appear to be: differences in group objectives, differences between individuals, and differences resulting from job or structure. Conflict does not always have to be

detrimental. There are some forms of conflict that can be beneficial. Whenever management introduces conflict, and controls it, the results can be a benefit if the resulting behavior is positive.

Conflict does not always cause a reduction in productivity. How conflict is handled is in part a function of what attitudes managers, and employees have about it. Leaders from the traditional school view conflict as a failure of managerial planning and control, and makes efforts to suppress it. Those leaders from the participative school feel that conflict is desirable, normal, and can be managed so that an equilibrium state can be attained. On the other hand, those managers that subscribe to the consultative school have come to conclude that conflict sometimes arises and feel that it should be kept to a minimum and managed. The preferred leadership style will influence the manager's approach to conflict. There are three basic approaches to conflict resolution: discuss the conflict fully with all parties involved and try to work it out, solve the conflict by use of the majority rule, the use of compromise or hierarchical appeal, and suppress conflict by use of authority with subordinates,

competition with peers, and persuasion with superiors.

The methods for studying work groups has not changed through the years. Observations and controlled experiments completed in a lab setting are the usual methods employed. Of those studies conducted, the Hawthorne Studies are the most famous. This study illustrated the powerful influence that groups can exert over their members. These influences can be economic, psychological, physical, or social.

R. F. Bales, in conjunction with F. L. Strodbeck, developed what has been termed the interaction analysis to obtain work group behavior. This was accomplished by observing directly what is occurring within a group. From his research, Bales was able to identify twelve categories of interactions which occurred within the group. Bales also developed a procedure for understanding work group behavior and interaction. This procedure is termed the who-to-whom matrix. Bales tabulated the number of discussions between individuals, who initiated the discussion, and who addressed discussion to the group as a whole. He found that the patterns of discussion varied under different circumstances. Bales also studied the roles of group

members. Bales interaction analysis furnishes a valuable technique for analyzing small-group functioning in laboratory settings. The findings and insights of his research provide mangers with insights about communication patterns, roles, and the status systems within work groups.

J. L. Moreno devised the sociometric analysis method of studying work group behaviro and structural characteristics. This process or procedure involves the use of self reports from group members. These reports indicate the preference and repulsion patterns of group members. This method provides insights about the leaders and status hierarchy of the group and about communication patterns to those interested in such matters.

The interest in groups and their dynamics has not abated and is not expected to do so. What has been and is currently being learned about group phenomena is being put to greater use in organizations. Awareness of the practical importance of groups to the continued effectiveness of an organization should generate more studies which should lead to an additional understanding of group behavior and the groups' influence in

organizational settings. Along with this understanding
of work groups, more especially the informal work group,
managemt will acquire the ability to use these groups in
an effective manner, and thereby increase the productiv-
ity of the organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Paul G. III, & Slocum, John W. Work groups and employee satisfaction. Personnel Administration, 1971, 32(2), 37-42.

Alderfer, C. P. Group and intergroup relations. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), Improving Life at Work; Behavioral Science Approaches to Organizational Change. Goodyear Publishing Co, 1977.

Argyris, Chris. The incompleteness of social psychological theory. American Psychologist, October 1969, pp. 893-908.

Asch, Solomon. Effect of group pressures upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In Dorwin Cartwright & Alvin Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics Research and Theory. Evanston, Ill: Row Peterson, 1953, pp. 151-162.

Asch, Solomon E. Opinions and social pressures. Scientific American, November 1955, pp. 31-35.

Bagley, C. B., Hage, J. M., & Aiken, M. Communication and satisfaction on organizations. Human Relations, 1975, pp. 611-626.

Bales, R. F. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1950.

Bales, R. F., & Stribeck, F. L. Phases in group problem solving. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, pp. 485-495.

Bales, R. F. The equilibrium problem in small groups. In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, & E. A. Shils (Eds.), Working Papers in the Theory of Action. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1953.

Bavelas. Communication patterns in task groups. Journal of the Accoustical Society of American, 1950.

Bennett, E. B. Discussion, decision, commitment, and consensus in group decisions. Human Relations, 1955.

136

Bennie, K. D., & Sheats, P. Functional roles of group members. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 2.

Bennis, Warren G. & Shepard, Herbert A. A theory of group development. Human Relations, Summer 1963.

Biddle, B. J. Role Theory: Expectations, Identifies, and Behaviors. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Blumberg, M. Job switching in autonomous work groups: an exploratory study in a Pennsylvania coal mine. Academy of Management Journal, 1980, 23.

Bouchard, T. J., Jr. Personality, problem-solving procedure and performance in small groups. Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 1953, 53.

Caplow, Theodore. Two Against One: Conditions in Triads. Englewood Cliffs: J. J. Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Carnell, C. A. Semi-autonomous work groups and the the social structure of the organization. Journal of Management Studies, 1982, 19(3).

Cartwright, Darwin, & Lippett, Ronald. Group dynamics and the individual. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1957.

Chertkoff, J. M. A revision of Caplow's coalition theory. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1967, 3.

Clements, L. Wage payment systems and work groups frames of reference: a plant level study. Industrial Relations Journal, 1976, 7(1).

Collins, Barry, & Raven, Bertram. Group structures: attractions, coalitions, communication and power. In Gardner Lindzry, & Elliot Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Corwin, Ronald. Patterns of organizational conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1969, 14.

138

Cummings, Larry, etal. The effects of size and spatial arrangements on group decision-making. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17.

Cummings, T. G. Worker reactions to autonomous work groups: conditions for functioning, differential effects and individual differences. Organizational and Administrative Sciences, 1976/1977, 7(4).

Cummings, Thomas G. Self-regulation work groups: a socio-technical synthesis. Academy of Management Review, 1978, 3(3).

Cummins, Robert C., & King, Donald C. The interaction of group size and task structure in an industrial organization. Personnel Psychology, 1973.

Darkenwald, Gordon. Organizational conflict in colleges and universities. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1971, 16.

Davis, James. Group Performance. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Delbercq, Andre. How informal organizations evolve. Business Perspective, Spring 1968, 4.

Denison, D. R. Sociotechnical design and self-managing work groups: the impact on control. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 1982, 3(4).

Deutsch, M. An experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition on group process. Human Relations, 1949, 2.

Donnely, James H., Gibson, James L., & Ivancevick, John M. Fundamentals of Management. Texas: Business Publications, Inc., 1981.

Dutton, John & Walton, Richard. Interdepartmental conflict and cooperation: two contrasting studies. Human Organization, 1966, 25.

Even, William. Conflict and performance in R and D. organizations. Industrial Management Review, Fall 1965.

Filley, Alan. Committee management: guidelines from social science research. California Management Review, 1970, 13.

Filley, Alan. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1975.

Filley, Alan, etal. Management Process and Organizational Behavior. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1976.

Fisher, B. A. Small Group Decision Making. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.

Fotilas, P. Semi-autonomous work groups: an alternative in organizing production work. Management Review, July 1981, 70(7).

Gamson, William A. A theory of coalition formation. American Sociological Review. June 1961, 26.

Gergin, Kenneth J. The Psychology of Behavior Exchange. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Glueck, William F. Management. Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1980.

Golde, Ray. Are your meetings like this one? Harvard Business Review, January-February 1972.

Goldman, M., Bolen, M., & Martin, R. Some conditions under which groups operate and how this affects their performance. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 4(54).

Grace, H. A. Conference and performance. Journal of Social Psychology, 1954, 40.

Graham, Gerald. Interpersonal attraction as a basis of informal organization. Academy of Management Journal, December 1971.

Guetzkow, H., & Gyr, J. An analysis of conflict in decision-making groups. Human Relations, 1954, 4.

Hackman, J. R. The design of self-managing work groups. In B. King, S. Streufert, & F. E. Fiedler (Eds.), Managerial Control and Organizational Democracy. Washington D.C.: Winston and Sons, 1978.

Hall, E. J., Mouton, J. S., & R. R. Blake. Group problem-solving effectiveness under conditions of pooling vs. interaction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 59.

Hall, Jay. Decisions, decisions, decisions. Psychology Today, November 1971, 4.

Hassenfeld, Yheskel, & English, Richard A. Human Service Organizations. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1964.

Herold, David. Improving the performance effectiveness of groups through a task-contingent selection of intervention strategies. Academy of Management Review, April 1978, 3.

Heslin, Richard, & Dunphy, Dexter. Three dimensions of member satisfaction in small groups. Human Relations, May 1964.

Hollman, Charles R. Adequacy of group decisions as a function of the decision-making process. Academy of Management Journal, June 1972, 15(2).

Holmans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1961.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1950.

Jackson, J. Norms and Roles: Studies in Systematic Social Behavior of Industrial Work Groups. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Jacobs, J. H. The application of sociometry to industry. May, 1954.

Janis, Irving L. Group-Think. Psychology Today, November 1971.

Janis, Irving. *Victims of Group Thing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Kast, Fremount, & Rosenzweig, James E. *Organization and Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.

Katz, Fred. Explaining informal work groups in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. September 1965, 10.

Kelly, Harold H. Communication in experimentally created heirarchies. *Human Relations*. February 1951.

Kemp, Nigel J., Wall, Toby, D., Clegg, Chris W., & Cordery, John L. Autonomous work groups in a grenfield site: a comparative study. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, December 1983, 56(4).

Kiesler, Sara. *Interpersonal Processes in Groups and Organizations*. Arlington Heights, Ill.: AHM Publishing Co., 1978.

Kilman, Ralph H., & Thomas, Kenneth W. Four perspectives on conflict management: an attributional framework for organizing descriptive and normative theory. *Academy of Management Review*, January 1978.

Klein, S. M. *Workers Under Stress: The Impact of Work Pressure on Group Cohesion*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1971.

Koch, James L. Effects of goal specificity and performance feedback to work groups on peer leadership, performance, and attitudes. *Human Relations*, October 1979.

Komorita, S. S. & Chertkoff, Jerome M. A Bargaining Theory of Coalition Formation. *Psychological Review*, May, 1973.

Likert, Renisis. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Likert, Renisis, & Likert, Jane G. *New Ways of Managing Conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.

Lindzey, Gardner, & Bogagta, Edgar F. Sociometric
    measurement. In Gardner Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook
    of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-
    Wesley, 1954.

Literer, Joseph A. The Analysis of Organizations.
    New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Lourenco, Susan, & Glidewell, John. A dialectical analy-
    sis of organization conflict. Administrative
    Science Quarterly, December 1975.

Lynch, James. The Broken Heart: Medical Consequences
    of Loneliness. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Maier, Norman, R. F. Assets and liabilities in group
    problem solving," Psychological Review, July
    1967.

Maier, N. R. F. Prior commitment as a deterent to group
    problem solving. Personnel Psychology, Spring
    1973, 26.

Manners, George. Another look at group size, group
    problem solving, and member consensus. Academy of
    Management Journal, December 1975.

Mans, C. C., & Sims, J. P., Jr. The potential for group-
    think in autonomous work groups. Human Relations,
    September 1982.

Martins, L., & Jacobs, M. Structured feedback delivered
    in small groups. Small Group Behavior, February
    1980.

Meadows, Ian, G. Organic structure and innovation in
    small work groups. Human Relations, June 1980.

Mills, T. M. Coalition patterns in three person groups.
    American Sociological Review, December 1954.

Moreno, J. L. Contributions of sociometry to research
    methodology in sociology. American Sociological
    Review, June 1947.

Nanak, Guru. Autonomous work groups within Yugoslav
    system of self-management. Journal of Sociology.
    April 1982.

Nye, Robert. Conflict Among Humans. New York: Springer Publishing, 1973.

Pfinner, John M. & Sherwood, Frank P. Non-formal aspects of the organization. Administrative Organization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969, pp. 18-27.

Pondy, Louis. A systems theory of organizational conflict. Academy of Management Journal, September 1966.

Pondy, Louis. Organizational conflict: concepts and models. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1972.

Pridham, Karen F. Acts of turning as stress-resolving mechanisms in work groups, with special reference to the work of W. R. Bion. Human Relations, April 1975.

Pridham, Karen F. Toward an adequate theory of stress resolution in work groups. Human Relations, September 1977.

Prince, George M. How to be a better meeting chairman. Harvard Business Review, January-February 1969.

Reif, William, etal. Perceptions of the formal and the informal organization. Academy of Management Journal, September 1973.

Rhodes, Rodney F., & Landy, Frank J. Management of of industrial work groups toward psychology and testing. Journal of Applied Psychology, October 1973.

Roark, A. E. & Wilkinson, L. Approaches to conflict management. Group and Organization Studies, December 1979.

Robinson, Richard B. Conflict management: individual preference and effectiveness. Proceedings of the Academy of Management, 1978.

Roy, Donald. Efficiency and the fix, informal intergroup relations in piecework machine shop. American Journal of Sociology, November 1954.

Sashkin, M. Perspective (quality of work life and autonomous work groups in the Peoples Republic of China). Group and Organizational Studies, September 1980.

Sayles, Leonard R. Research in industrial human relations. Industrial Relations Research Association. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Sayles, Leonard R. The Behavior of Industrial Work Groups. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Sayles, Leonard R., & Strauss, George. Human Behavior in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Schein, Edgar. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Schrank, Robert. Ten Thousand Working Days. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1978.

Scott, William G., & Mitchell, Terence R. Organization Theory. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1976.

Seashore, Stanley E. Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1954.

Simmel, George. Significance of numbers for social life. In A. Paul Hare, Edgar F. Borgatta, & Robert F. Bales (eds.), Small Groups. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Sims, Henry P. Jr. & Manz, Charles, C. Conversations within self-managed work groups. National Productivity Review, Summer, 1982.

Shaw, Marvin. Why people join groups. In Marvin Shaw (Ed.), Group Dynamics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Shaw, M. E. Group Dynamics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Shea, G. P. Work design committees: the wave of the future. Journal of Applied Management. March-April 1979.

Shepard, Clovis R. Small Groups, Some Sociological Perspectives. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co. 1964.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper and Row, 1953.

Smith, Claggett. A comparative analysis of some conditions and consequences of intraorganizational conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1966.

Sorensen, James & Sorensen, Thomas. The conflict of professionals in bureaucratic organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1974.

Stagner, Ross. Corporate decision-making. Journal of Applied Psychology, February 1969.

Stagner, Ross. Conflict in the executive suite. In Warren Bennis (Ed.), American Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1970.

Stroghill, R. M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford Press, 1959.

Stoghill, Ralph. Group productivity, drive and cohesiveness. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, August 1972.

Street, W. R. Brainstorming by individuals, coacting, and interacting groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, August 1974.

Stumpf, S. A., Zand, D. E., & Freedman, R. D. Designing groups for judgmental decisions. Academy of Management Review. October 1979.

Summers, D. B. Understanding the process by which new employees enter work groups. Personnel Journal, August 1977.

Susman, G. I. The impact of automation on work groups, autonomy and task specialization. Human Relations, 1970.

Tausky, Curt. Work Organizations. Illinois: P. E. Peacock Publishing, Inc., 1970.

Tichy, Noel. An analysis of clique formation and structure in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1973.

Tilman, Rollie, Jr. Problems in review: committees on trial. Harvard Business Review, June 1960.

Thomas, Edwin, & Fink, Clifton. Effects of group size. Psychological Bulletin, July 1963.

Thomas, Kenneth W. Pedagogy toward multi-dimensional values in teaching: the example of conflict behaviors. Academy of Management Review, July 1977.

Thompson, James. Organizational management of conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1960.

Twomey, Daniel F. The effects of power properties on conflict resolution. Academy of Management, January 1978.

Van De Ven, A., & Delbecq, A. L. Normal versus interacting group processes for committee decision-making effectiveness. Academy of Management Journal, June 1971.

Vroom, Victor, & Yago, A. G. Decision-making as a social process. Decision Sciences, October 1974.

Walton, Richard. Interpersonal confrontation and basic third party functions: a case study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, July, August, September 1968.

Walton, Richard, & Dutton, John. The management of interdepartmental conflict: a model and review. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1969.

Walton, Richard, etal. Organizational context and interdepartmental conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1969.

Williams, G. Managing diverse work groups: the implications for management. Education, Leadership and Organizational Journal, 1983, 4(1).

Zald, Mayer, N., & Berger, Michael A. Social Movements in organizations; coup d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. American Journal of Sociology, January 1978.

Zander, Alvin. Motives and Goals in Groups. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Zander, Alvin. The psychology of the group process. The Annual Review of Psychology, 1979.