

---

---

## **Participative Decision Making(PDM) and Social Worker s job Performance: the moderating effect of transformational leadership**

*Jeong Ha Hwang\**

---

---

The purpose of this study is to identify the degree of PDM of Social Workers' in Social Welfare Center's(SWCs), to examine the relationship between the perception of PDM and job performance among the social workers, and the influence of PDM on the social worker's job performance, and to provide the implication for the effective organizational management of social service organizations.

First, the average degree of social workers' perception of PDM was 3.58 out of 5.00 point. Second, the average level of social workers' job performance was 3.59. Third, the effect of PDM on social workers' job performance was significant, especially the level of control on decision-making among the dimensions of PDM was showed significantly( $p<.01$ ). But, the actual and expected level of PDM was not significant in other dimensions of PDM. Finally, the result of examining the moderating effect of top executives' transformational leadership style in SWCs was shown as a significant variable.

**Key words:** Participative decision making(PDM), performance, transformational leadership, Social Worker, Social Welfare Center' s(SWCs)

---

\* Senior Specialist, Ministry of Planning and Budget

## I . Introduction

The participation of workers is becoming a major issue both in public and private organizational spheres. The area of participation includes the total process: the mission of the organization, clarification of purposes, proposal of job and strategies, overall quality enhancement, and problem solving. As a result, members of an organization can decide on matters concerning their jobs more freely than before (Pine, 1998; Vandervelde, 1979). This enhanced organizational renovation powers and also increased their flexibility which overall keeps organization going (Kanter, 1983).

Also participative decision making (PDM) that is a critical way to enable workers to participate systematically in the many of organizations' reform processes is being used more and more as an active coping tool in adapting to a quickly changing society. And when applying this to social welfare organizations, we can postulate that the active participation of social worker in the decision making process will enhance client-worker relationship and increase the quality of services. However, despite this assumption, some scholars have found it is even more difficult to apply the participative decision making to social welfare organizations than to apply it to business organizations. This is mostly due to the exclusive characteristics of social welfare organizations which are considerably different from private enterprises.

First of all, there is less severe or practically no competition among social welfare organizations. Thus, the relative absence of competition in

social welfare organizations often makes the participatory management less applicable (Au, 1996). Secondly, unlike private enterprises, social welfare organizations often have far less freedom in the process of decision making about whole management (Au, 1996). As a result, decision making in these organizations is largely top-down, not bottom-up (Packerd, 1993). Thirdly, there have been few literatures on change and development in human service organizations (Bargal & Schmid, 1992). Despite these characteristics of social welfare organizations, they are recently trying to constitute the values and methods of participatory management. Some scholars have even thought that participative decision making is highly congruent with social work values such as self-determination, empowerment, and human dignity (Edwards & Gumer, 1998).

On the other hand, in a social welfare organization the social worker is required to reexamine her role as a professional on top of the heavy workload thrust upon her. For this reason, it is important to measure job performances of social welfare organization for it provides us with clues on how to make the operation of these organizations systematic or scientific. It also enables us to look back on professionalism and job satisfaction of social workers and overall provides us with the methods of cost containment by reducing high turnovers and absenteeism of workers.

In addition, obtaining professionalism at work will be useless if there is not a rational assessment criterion to measure the level of professionalism and job performance. From this, we can consider job performance as one of the ways to measure professionalism. In other words, the assessment of performance or job achievement of social welfare workers can provide workers with identity, especially in the sense that the perception of social welfare workers as a professional is not widely accepted, and with this it

can provide a clue in enhancing job performance of social welfare workers. Despite this, up till now studies on job performance or job satisfaction of social welfare workers have only been used as a way to assess individual establishments or institutions.

This study looks at the level of the participative decision making and job performance as a way to enhance job performances of social welfare workers. Here we measure both of these components accordingly and examine the relationship empirically. Through this, social welfare organizations and their present situation will be analyzed objectively.

The purpose of this study is threefold. Firstly, to identify the PDM level of Social workers' in Social Welfare Centers (SWCs). Secondly, to examine the influence of PDM on the social worker's job performance. Thirdly, to analyze the moderating effect of the transformational leadership on PDM. Fourthly, to provide some implications for effective organizational management that can be used in social service organizations.

## II . Theoretical Review

### 1. *Participative Decision Making (PDM)*

Traditionally, 'participation' entails the participation level of workers in decision making (Miller & Monge, 1986). However, its meaning differs depending on whether it is compulsory or voluntary, formal or informal, and direct or indirect. It also has been applied to wide varieties specific initiatives. Participation initiative varies, from consultation on simple

management to complete power over a major decision. The scope of it also varies from a single project to the total working environment (Evans & Fischer, 1992: 1171).

Nowadays, participatory management takes different forms such as participative decision making (PDM) as well as indirect ways such as stock options for workers (Parnell et al., 1991). Here participative decision making has to do with the depth of workers participation, (Packard, 1989), and can be defined as "the specific participation actions (concerning who, what, when, where and how) of workers in an organizational environment (Vanderelde, 1979; Packer, 1989).

To date, there have been many studies on the definition, theory and the application of PDM (Black & Gregersen, 1997). Lock & Schweiger (1979) suggests participation as the major element of decision making. However, there is the limitation that they measure (PDM) through a single dimension. After their study, some scholars have argued that there are five dimensions in decision making processes, and they are, confirming the major issue, finding a solution for the issue, choosing a specific solution, planning the solution, and assessing the action outcome (Margulies & Black, 1987). Hoy, et al. (1993: 4) notes that if PDM is combined with the right strategy, the quality of a decision can be enhanced along with the collaboration amongst members of the organization and it is pointed out that PDM is correlated with other constructs. Recently the main focus has shifted from the studies that deal with various participation methods (Cotton et al., 1988) to studies dealing with the reason, may it be organizational or behavioral, for failure in making workers participate (Parnell & Crandall, 2001: 524).

## **2. Job Performance**

Job performance is concept that indicates the active and multi-dimensional activities done by the staff in charge of performance of individuals within an organization (Millar, 1992). This is a consequential goal of the manager trying to evaluate the effectiveness of individuals, groups, organizations (Kadushin, 1992). Also, job performance includes effectiveness and efficiency in obtaining the goal and purpose of the organization (Packerd, 1989; 59).

## **3. Transformational leadership**

Leadership is a complex phenomenon that can be explained or examined through various different perceptions (Lewis, et. al., 2001: 269). Leadership can also be defined as “the process in which you try to make others agree with, and understand how things should be done to achieve effectiveness, and the process that promotes the endeavor of individuals and groups to obtain the goal achieved in this way” (Yukl, 2002: 7).

Burns(1978) explains that there are two types of leadership, one being the transformational leadership, the other being bargaining leadership. The former is based on a unified ideology of both the leader and worker working for a purpose shared by both parties, while the latter does not need a unified ideology but rather believes that leadership is bourn through the bargaining of different interests (Lewis et al., 2001). In other words, the transformational leader enhances both his goal and aims with the workers needs, and the worker has a solid belief and conviction towards the leader and the organization, and shares the ideals and visions

given by the leader (Bass et al., 1989: 323). Based on the recent studies on the trend of leadership studies, I measure the level of transformational leadership as the skills of the leaders in SWCs.

## **4. Relationships between PDM, Job performance, and Transformational leadership**

There is a debate throughout government, business, and many academic fields over the effectiveness of participation in decision making (Miller & Monge, 1986: 727). Also the relationship between participative in decision making and job performance is still under discussion. In other words, it is disputed whether the two have a negative correlation or a positive one. Examining the literature, we can see that research settings, research methods, operational definition of the variables change the direction of the relationship (Steel & Mento, 1987: 412).

The studies concluding that PDM and job performance have positive correlations, base their theoretical grounds on human relationship theories or human resource theories. They suggest that increasing PDM leads to higher performance rates and results in higher job satisfaction (Miles, 1965). They also report that job satisfaction levels are shown to be higher in places where PDM levels are high (Connor, 1992; Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Miller & Monge, 1986; Sagie, 1994). Especially, PDM increases emersion in jobs and job satisfaction levels. In studies that deal with the relationship between the perception of a worker on their individual job and perceptual performance, we can see a strong correlation between participation and performance (Wagner & Gooding, 1987).

In addition, there are studies that show negative correlations between PDM and job performance. The main logic of this argument is that the

increase in the participation of workers in decision making processes can delay job processes and can be an obstacle in the effective progress of jobs. Also they believe that the participation of workers weakens the autonomy and control of managers and overall harms the manager's job security, and also sometime leads managers with the demand of substantive change in the way they manage (Parnell & Crandall, 2001: 525). These are some of the reasons why this line of literature disagrees in the use of PDM. Also, they note that if there is a lack of effort from the workers to participate in the process and lack of reorganization of jobs, PDM can rather have a negative effect on the organization (Hecksher, 1995; Parnell & Crandall, 2001: 524).

Other studies show mixed results in the relationship between PDM and its performances in various situations. Based on 16 empirical case studies, the increase in the performance through PDM is so trivial that it can be neglected (Sagie, 1994).

Table 1. Relationships between participation and performance

| Researcher                     | Year | Method           | Correlation    |
|--------------------------------|------|------------------|----------------|
| Lock & Schweiger               | 1979 | descriptive      | no significant |
| Lock, Feren, & McCaleb, et al. | 1980 | quantitative     | r=-.23         |
| Schweiger & Leana              | 1986 | descriptive      | no significant |
| Rogers & Hunter                | 1991 | meta-analysis    | r=-.23         |
| Miller & Monge                 | 1986 | meta-analysis    | r=-.15         |
| Wager & Gooding                | 1987 | meta-analysis    | r=-.16         |
| Spector                        | 1986 | meta-analysis    | r=-.18         |
| Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck       | 2002 | meta-analysis    | r=-.20         |
| Kleingeld, Tuijl, & Algera     | 2004 | quasi-experiment | positive       |

Source: based on Wagner (1994) and some renewed.

Up till now, studies on leadership have been focused on the relationship between types of transformational leadership and job performance rates (Bass, 1985). There have also been studies that show the relationship between PDM and job performance while using types of leadership and organizational settings as moderating variables (Miller & Monge, 1986). Other studies show that the relationship between PDM and performance was weaker when leadership style was manipulated in the study than when manipulation did not occur (Sagie, 1994: 228).

### III . Method

#### 1. Sample and data collection

In 2003, the number of SWCs in Korea is 348 and 92 in Seoul. We have circulated a total of 230 questionnaires to 33 SWCs based in Seoul, with 5 to 10 questionnaires per center. Before the actual survey, a pilot test was taken to examine the validity and reliability of the surveys based on 30 social welfare workers from 5 SWCs. Based on the result of this test, the questionnaire was changed slightly.

To achieve the research purposes given in the previous sections, samples of 230 social welfare workers were randomly selected from 33 SWCs (approximately seven workers per center) out of total 92 SWCs by in Seoul. The survey was conducted by mail. A total of 142 questionnaires from 20 SWCs were collected and finally used for analysis.

## 2. Variables and measurement

### 1) Independent variable

The independent variable of this study is the level of participative decision making of social workers working in SWCs, and we use the PDM measurement given by Kahnweiler & Thompson (2000) to measure its level. Before the actual survey, based on the pilot test, some questions were removed or revised. The question “My supervisor asks me about the monitoring of service quality or I want him/her to ask me about it” has been removed for reasons of lack of clarity and that it was hard to comprehend. Also, questions on “assessment on the performances of co-workers” and “purchase of important items” were removed from questionnaire for reasons of low reliability. At the end, nine questions were asked each on the actual level of PDM and expected PDM, and three on the control level of their jobs, making it 21 questions overall ( $\alpha = .92$ ). Rating were completed on a 0-5 scale, with 0 representing “Never” and 5 representing “Always”.

### 2) Dependent variable

The dependent variable of this study is the perceived level of job performance of social workers working in SWCs. We reconstructed the job performance measurement for social welfare workers devised by Kadushin (1992) to measure the perceived job performance of social workers. However, there were questions that were hard to understand and unlike the Kadushin's study, the focus of this study is on the individual performance of social welfare workers. For this reason, we have removed

the questions that were hard to comprehend and reconstructed the survey based on the questions that are more related to the individual performances of social welfare workers. Of the seven dimensions on the job performance measurement of social welfare workers, we chose four questions on client-worker relationship development, four on the management of workload by the social welfare worker, and seven on the professional attitude of the social welfare worker and their professional knowledge and skills, making it a total of 15 questions ( $\alpha = .85$ ). Responses were made on a 5-point scale (1 = “Never” to 5 = “Always”).

### 3) Moderating and Control variable

The moderating variable of this study is the transformational leadership type of the center director of the SWC. This is measured based on the Multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) made by Bass (1985). Transformational leadership was measured through the sub-dimensions of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized attention ( $\alpha = .95$ ). Responses were made on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing (1 = “Never” to 5 = “Always”).

Also the control variable was separated into the individual characteristic and organizational characteristics. For the individual characteristics, sex, age, education, job status, and total tenure was asked, and for the organizational characteristics, type of SWC, the main body of administration, duration of operation, the number of full-time employees were measured.

Table 2. Sub-dimensions by variables and reliability

| Variables                   | sub-dimensions  | items | Cronbach's alpha | source                                      |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|------------------|---|
| PDM                         | Actual participation                                  | 9     | .87              | Kahnweiler, W. M. & Thompson, M. A., (2000) |
|                             | Expected participation                                | 9     | .87              |   |
|                             | Job control   | 3     | .76              |   |
| Job performance             | Client-worker relationship                            | 4     | .70              | Kadushin. A., (1992)                        |
|                             | Management of work load                               | 4     | .73              |   |
|                             | Professional attitude, professional knowledge, skills | 7     | .82              |   |
| Transformational leadership | Charisma  | 10    | .95              | Bass, B.M., (1985)                          |
|                             | Intellectual stimulation                              | 3     | .95              |   |
|                             | Individualized attention                              | 4     | .95              |   |

## IV . Empirical findings

### 1. Descriptive results of the respondents

The socio-demographic characteristics of the 142 social welfare workers who responded to the survey are as follows. In the gender characteristics were more women than men, for there were 34men (23.9%) and 107 women (75.4%). For age groups, most were in their 20s 100 people (70.4%), 37 were in their 30s (26.1%), two in their 40s (1.4%), and three did not give an answer (2.1%). The average age of the survey respondents were 27.95. The job status of the respondents were as follows. 21 were executive manager and manager (14.8%), 117 were either senior social welfare workers or general social welfare workers (82.4%). Concerning education, two graduated from a community

college (1.4%), 99 from a university (69.7%), 16 were in the process of getting their masters degree (11.3%), and 24 people had obtained their post graduate degrees (16.9%).

This study is based on social welfare workers in 20 social welfare centers and the general characteristics of the social welfare centers where the respondents worked in were as the following.

The distribution of the welfare centers based on the year they were founded is as the following. There were nine centers (45%) which have been founded less than 10 years ago, where as the other eleven has been founded 10years ago or before (55%). For the type of the centers, there were eight centers that is categorized as type Ga<sup>1)</sup> (42%), and twelve centers that were type Na (58%). Nine (45%) of the centers that have been surveyed were administered by social welfare foundations, three (15%) by religious foundations, five (25%) by education foundation, and three (15%) by juridical foundations. Lastly, for the number of full-time employees that are working in the welfare centers, 14 (70%) of the centers had less than 30 employees, where as six (30%) had 30 or more full time employees.

### 2. Descriptive analysis of variables

The perception of PDM of social workers scored 3.58 which is higher than medium score of three. Also the difference between the perceived gap of social welfare workers on the actual PDM and expected PDM was .4773 and is about 67% of the standard variation of .6644. This means that the satisfaction level over total decision making is relatively high

1) Insert information on how Korea categorize their welfare centers.

Table 3. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

(n=142)

| Characteristics              |                                  | Frequency | Percent(%) |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender                       | Male                             | 34        | 23.9       |
|                              | Female                           | 107       | 75.4       |
| Age                          | 20-29 years old                  | 100       | 70.4       |
|                              | 30-39 years old                  | 37        | 26.1       |
|                              | 40 years old or more             | 2         | 1.4        |
| Job Status                   | manager                          | 21        | 14.8       |
|                              | social workers                   | 117       | 82.4       |
| Education                    | community college(2 years)       | 2         | 1.4        |
|                              | university(4 years)              | 99        | 69.7       |
|                              | in the process of masters degree | 16        | 11.3       |
|                              | graduate degrees                 | 24        | 16.9       |
| Tenure                       | less than a year                 | 30        | 21.1       |
|                              | one year but less than three     | 49        | 34.5       |
|                              | more than three years            | 63        | 11.4       |
| Founding year                | less than 10 years               | 11        | 55         |
|                              | more than 10 years               | 9         | 45         |
| Type of SWC                  | Ga                               | 8         | 42         |
|                              | Na                               | 12        | 58         |
| Foundation body              | social welfare foundation        | 9         | 45         |
|                              | religious foundation             | 3         | 15         |
|                              | educational foundation           | 5         | 25         |
|                              | juridical foundation             | 3         | 15         |
| Number of full-time employee | less than 30 employees           | 14        | 70         |
|                              | 30 or more employees             | 6         | 30         |

amongst social workers. We can see that social welfare workers have a relatively high level of job control over the decisions on their jobs, which shows a score of 3.72. In addition, the perceived job performance of social welfare workers was similar to the PDM level, shown above, with the score of 3.59. For the sub-categories, the development of client-

worker relationship scored the highest showing 3.59. In this study, the transformational leadership level of the director of the center was higher than the medium showing 3.25.

Table 4. Descriptive analysis results of the variables

(n=142)

| Variables                   |  | Mean | S.D  | min  | Max  |
|-----------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|
| PDM                         | Total PDM  | 3.58 | 0.53 | 2.10 | 5.00 |
|                             | Actual participation                                 | 3.33 | 0.69 | 1.11 | 5.00 |
|                             | Expected participation                               | 3.80 | 0.59 | 1.78 | 5.00 |
|                             | Job control  | 3.72 | 0.63 | 1.67 | 5.00 |
| Job Performance             | Total job performance                                | 3.59 | 0.46 | 2.00 | 5.00 |
|                             | Client-worker relationship                           | 3.65 | 0.48 | 2.25 | 5.00 |
|                             | Management of work load                              | 3.58 | 0.62 | 2.00 | 5.00 |
|                             | Professional attitude, professional knowledge skills | 3.55 | 0.54 | 2.00 | 5.00 |
| Transformational leadership |  | 3.25 | 0.75 | 1.13 | 5.00 |

Note: Likert 5-points measurement ('1=Never', '2=Seldom', '3=About as Often as Not', '4=Often', '5=Always').

### 3. Research results

#### 1) The effect of PDM on job performance

To find out the effect of the level of perceived PDM of social workers on their job performance, we controlled for the individual and organizational characteristics of the centers, and analyzed the actual participation level, the expected participation level and the job control over the decision making process. Job control over decision making, a sub-dimension of PDM was shown statistical significance ( $p < .01$ ). The model itself was also significant with the explanatory power of 34.7% ( $p < .000$ ).



Table 5. Multi-regression analysis of social worker's performance

| Variables                      |                        | B(S.E)        | $\beta$ |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------|
| Individual Characteristics     | gender                 | .106(.079)    | .102    |
|                                | age                    | .055(.087)    | .057    |
|                                | education              | .061(.043)    | .106    |
|                                | status                 | -.039(.116)   | -.031   |
|                                | experience             | .073(.076)    | .081    |
| Organizational Characteristics | founding year          | -.076(.083)   | -.083   |
|                                | Type or center         | -.023(.078)   | -.025   |
|                                | Foundation body        | -.166(.069)   | -.185*  |
|                                | Number of employees    | .061(.075)    | .068    |
| Independent variable           | Actual participation   | .005(.066)    | .007    |
|                                | Expected participation | .078(.065)    | .100    |
|                                | Job control            | .371(.072)    | .485**  |
| R <sup>2</sup>                 |                        | .407          |         |
| R <sup>2</sup> change          |                        | .253          |         |
| Adj R <sup>2</sup>             |                        | .347          |         |
| F(Sig.)                        |                        | 6.803(.000)** |         |

Note: † p < .1, \* p < .05, \*\*p < .01.

In conclusion, of the independent variables of PDM, job control over decision making by social workers, a sub-dimension of PDM was the only variable showing statistical significance. It also shows a strong effect on the job performance of social workers ( $\beta=.485$ ), which is the dependent variable. This is in-line with the results of previous studies (Kahnweiler, 1991; Thomson & Kahnweiler, 2000, Thomson & Kahnweiler, 2002: 282). However, unlike our predictions, other dimensions of level of PDM concerning specific job, co-workers, and goal of the organization does not show a statistical significance. The results of our study prove that of the sub-dimensions of PDM, control over one's job is the foremost important factor in job performance. As

shown in previous studies, because job control over decision making is the essential factor in every worker's participation in the organization, this is not a surprising outcome (Kahnweiler, 1991; Thomson & Kahnweiler, 2000, Thomson & Kahnweiler, 2002).

2) The moderating effect of the transformational leadership type of the director of social welfare centers

This study also aims to test the relationship between PDM and perceived job performance of social workers affected by the moderating effect of the director's transformational leadership abilities. Generally, moderating variables are used to test the interaction between the independent and dependent variable, interaction implying that the difference in the level and type of relationship between the two variables from the introduction of a third variable (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Ahn, 1999).

To measure the moderating effect, we first examine the specific processes needed. Here 'moderating' means that the causality of the two variables (independent and dependent) changes according to the function of the moderating variable. The differential effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable from the moderating variable is measured and is tested statistically<sup>2)</sup>.

To test the interaction effect of the moderating variable, we used the

2) In this study Moderated Regression Analysis is used. For that reason the independent variable and the moderating variables are considered continuous data, for this prevents the shortcomings of Fisher's Z' score of loss of information when dividing the moderating variable into sub-categories, also, it enables various types of moderating effect to harmonize, and reflects the relationship between the variables (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Ahn, 1999).

two steps successively. Firstly, for the first analysis, we compare the coefficient of determination of the regression equation without the interaction term and the one with it to test the statistical significance of the coefficient of determination through interaction. The change in the  $R^2$  of the coefficient of determination before and after adding the interaction term of the variables under analysis is examined. Through the test of interaction effect the F-test analysis outcome of the first step regression is as Table [6]. Testing the change in the coefficient of determination  $R^2$  value, we can see that when effecting job performance, the dependent variable, the independent variable, namely, the actual participation level, the expected participation level, and control over decision making, the transformational leadership of the director of the center increases the  $R^2$  of 4.4% and this has a statistical significance ( $p < .05$ ). In other words, if the type of the leadership of the director of the center is transformational, it has a role as a moderating variable.

This shows that the transformational leadership of directors of organizations has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between PDM and job performance.

Next, for the second stage of the analysis, we see if the variable that is presumed to be the moderating variable has an effect on the dependent variable, when the interaction effect is statistically significant. This is done through a regression analysis including the interaction term. Just by examining the differences in the  $R^2$  scores shows we cannot know to what direction transformational leadership has a moderating effect on the two variables, and to what extent the relationship between participative decision making and job performance changes depending on the level of transformational leadership. Like this, because the interaction term is shown to be statistically significant in the second stage analysis, we try to

Table 6.  $R^2$  value's change according to input of interaction variable

| Dependent         | Variables   |   | $R^2$              | $R^2$              | $\Delta R^2$ | Sig   |
|-------------------|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------|
|                   | Independent   | Moderating  |                    |                    |              |       |
| Job performance   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actual participation</li> <li>• Expected participation</li> <li>• Job control</li> </ul> | Transformational leadership   | .444 <sup>1)</sup> | .488 <sup>2)</sup> | .044         | .025* |
| Control variables | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual characters</li> <li>• Organizational characters</li> </ul>                    | gender, age, job status, education, tenure<br>Founding year, type of center, founding body,<br>number of full-time employee |                    |                    |              |       |

1)  $R^2$ : The  $R^2$  of the regression equation not including the interaction effect

2)  $R^2$ : The  $R^2$  of the regression equation including the interaction effect

Note: <sup>†</sup> $p < .1$ , \* $p < .05$ .

see if this moderating variable has an effect on the dependent variable through inserting the interaction term in the regression analysis. The outcome of the second stage regression analysis, which tests the interaction effect of the moderation variable, the model show an explanatory power of 41.6% and is shown to be statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ). If we analyze the interaction effect of the moderating variable in more detail, the interaction variable of expected participation level (expected participation level x transformational leadership), a sub-dimension of PDM shows to be statistically significant ( $p = .018$ ) while at the same time transformational leadership also shows statistical significance ( $p = .023$ ).

In other words, transformational leadership has the trait of a independent variable, because it has an independent effect, while having a quasi-moderator role, through the interaction with the perceived

participation level effects the dependent variable, job performance. Through this we can assume that the expected level of decision making of social workers has a synergy effect with the transformational leadership of the director of the organization, namely, the director's individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and ability to present vision for the future, when effecting job performances.

Table 7. Moderating effect analysis of transformational leadership over performance

| Variables   |                                | Before inserting the interaction term |         | After inserting the interaction term |                    |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
|             |                                | B(S.E)                                | $\beta$ | B(S.E)                               | $\beta$            |
| Independent | Actual participation(A)        | -.067(.069)                           | -.102   | -.274(.274)                          | -.418              |
|             | Expected participation(B)      | .105(.063)                            | .134    | -.462(.242)                          | -.591 <sup>†</sup> |
|             | Job control(C)                 | .321(.072)                            | .419**  | .346(.291)                           | .453               |
| Moderating  | Transformational leadership(Y) | .152(.054)                            | .253**  | -.684(.296)                          | -1.139*            |
|             | A × Y                          |                                       |         | .063(.082)                           | .589               |
|             | B × Y                          |                                       |         | .183(.076)                           | 1.494*             |
|             | C × Y                          |                                       |         | -.017(.091)                          | -.156              |
|             | Constant                       | 1.570**                               |         | 4.222**                              |                    |
|             | R <sup>2</sup>                 | .444                                  |         | .488                                 |                    |
|             | Adj R <sup>2</sup>             | .383                                  |         | .416                                 |                    |
|             | F(sig)                         | 7.258(.000)**                         |         | 6.838(.000)**                        |                    |

Note: <sup>†</sup> p < .1, \* p < .05, \*\*p < .01.

## V. Conclusion and implications

The main findings of this study can be summarized as follows.

Firstly, the average degree of social workers' perception of PDM was 3.58 out of 5.00. Due to respondents' social desirability, the finding cannot be judged as a high level. Nevertheless, the difference (0.477) between the actual level and the expected level of PDM was within the Standard Deviation (0.66). Therefore, the satisfaction of social workers on general decision-making in organizations was relatively high. Secondly, the average level of social workers' job performance was 3.59. This result showed within the standard deviation (0.46). When workers' job performance can be showed according to the specific dimensions (eg., clients-worker relationship, management of workload and professional knowledge, skill, and attitudes), they were 3.65, 3.58, 3.55 respectively. Thirdly, regarding the PDM by demographic characteristics, there were not significant differences in social worker's perception except for their organizational level. Fourthly, regarding the job performance by demographic characteristics, there was a significant difference in social worker's perception except for their educational level. Also, there was difference by their gender, age, organizational level, the tenure in social service organization. Fifthly, the effect of PDM on social workers' job performance was significant, especially the job control on decision-making among the dimensions of PDM was showed significantly (p < .01). However, the actual and expected level of PDM was not significant in other dimensions of PDM. Therefore, the assumption that the high

level of PDM would lead to high level of performance could not be always accepted. Finally, the result of examining the moderating effect of top executives' transformational leadership styles in SWCs was showed as a significant variable. Specially, interaction factors between the expected level of PDM and transformational leadership style influenced significantly on social workers' job performance ( $p < .05$ ).

On the basis of the research findings, this study suggests the following policy implications in increasing PDM of social workers for the improvement of social work organizations.

Firstly, job control over decision-making is the strongest factor from the dimensions of PDM, which is not a surprising result because this factor is the key essence in worker's involvement. If there is a transition toward organization cultures that enable social workers to deliver their ideas more freely not by top-down but by bottom-up, social worker's job control over decision making can also be facilitated. Secondly, the transformational leadership that strengthens the psychological bond between social workers and leaders can be a useful means in increasing workers' performance for their relationship is not considered as the transactional relationship such as one that is made through physical compensations. Thirdly, it can be most effective to expand the scope of social workers' actual participation in the process of assigning work and planning job training. Fourthly, it is important to establish decision-making systems in organizations. Because the issue is not what works but how it works. Fifthly, a basic level of trust and mutual respect must exist between social workers and leaders in social organizations. Therefore, it can be concluded that social welfare workers' willingness and ability to conduct PDM is needed to set up PDM in varieties of decision-making processes in social work organizations.

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, K.Y. (1999), "Moderating effects of personality on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, *Korean Personnel Administration Journal*, 23(1)
- Au, Chor-fai. (1996), *Rethinking Organizational Effectiveness: theoretical and methodological issues in the study of organizational effectiveness for social welfare organizations*, *Administration in social work*, Vol. 20(4).
- Bargal, D., & Schmid, H. (1992), *Organizational change and development in human service organizations: a prefatory essay*. *Administration in social work*, Vol. 16(3/4).
- Bass, B.M. (1985), 『Leadership and performance beyond expectations』, Free Press, New York.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990), 『Transformational Leadership Development: a manual for the multi-factor leadership questionnaire』, Palo Alto, C.A: Consulting Psychologist press.
- Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb., 1989, "Transformational leadership and the Falling Dominoes effect", *Organizational Behavior*, pp. 322~333.
- Black. J. S., & Gregersen. H. B, 1997, "Participative decision-making: An integration of multiple dimensions", *Human Relations*, vol. 50(7), pp. 859~878.
- Burns, J., 1978, 『Leadership』, New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983), 『Applied Multiple Regression Correlation analysis for the Behavior science』(2nd ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Association: N. J., Hillsdale.

- Connor, P. E. (1992), "Decision-making participation patterns: the role of organizational context", *Academy of management journal*, vol. 35(1).
- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D.A., Froggatt, K. L., Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K.R., 1988, "Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes.", *Academy of management Review*, 13(1), pp. 8~22.
- Edwards, R.M., & Gummer, B. (1988), *Management of social work: current perspectives and future trends*, New management in the human service, Silver Spring: NASW Press.
- Evans, B. K., & Fisher, D. G., 1992, "A hierarchical model of participatory decision making, job autonomy, and perceived control", *Human relations*, vol. 45(11), pp. 1169~1189.
- Hecksher, C. (1995), *The failure of participatory management*, *Across the board*, 11/12, pp.16~21.
- Hoy, Wayne K, Tarter, C John, 1993, "A normative theory of participative decision making in schools", vol. 31(3), pp. 4~16.
- Kahnweiler, W. M. & Thompson, M. A. (2000), "Level of desired, actual, and perceived control of employee involvement in decision making: an empirical investigation", *Journal of business and psychology*, vol. 14(3).
- Kadushin, A. (1992), 『Supervision in Social Work』, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kanter, R.M. (1983), 『The change master』, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kleingeld, Tuijl, & Algera. (2004), "Participation in the design of performance management systems: a quasi-experimental field study", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, pp.831~851.
- Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck. (2002), "Participative decision making and employee performance in different cultures: the moderating effects of Allocentrism/Idiocentrism and efficacy", *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 5.
- Loke, Feren, MaCaleb, et al., (1980), "The relative effectiveness of four methods of motivating employee performance", Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Locke, E. & Schweiger, D. (1979), "Participation in decision making: One more look.", *Research in Organizational Behavior*(1), pp. 265~339.
- Lewis et al, 2001, "Management of Human service programs", 3th edition, Wadsworth.
- Millar, K.I. (1992), "Performance appraisal of professional social workers", *Administration in social work*, Vol. 14(1).
- Miller, K. & Monge, P. (1986), "participation, satisfaction, productivity: A meta-analytic review", *Academy of Management Journal*, 29.
- Miles, R.E. (1965), "Human relations or human resources?", *Harvard Business Review*, 43, pp. 148~163.
- Packard, Thomas. (1989), "Participation in Decision Making, Performance, and Job Satisfaction in a Social Work Bureaucracy", *Administration in Social Work*; New York.
- Packard, Thomas. (1993), "Managers and Workers' view of the dimensions of Participation in Decision Making, *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 17(2).
- Pine, B., Warsh, R., & Malucci, A. (1998), "participatory management in a public child welfare agency: A key to effective change", *Administration in social work*, 22(1), pp. 19~32.
- Parnell, & Crandall. (2001), "Rethinking participative decision making: a

- refinement of the propensity for participative decision making scales”, *Personnel review*, vol. 30. pp. 523~609.
- Rogers, R., & Hunter, J.E., (1991), “Impact of management by objectives on organizational productivity, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 76.
- Sagie, A. (1994), “Participative decision making and performance: A moderator analysis”, *Journal of applied behavioral science*, vol. 30(2).
- Schweiger, D.M., & Jago, A. G. (1982), “Problem-solving styles and participative decision-making”, *Psychological reports*, 50, pp. 1311~1316.
- Schweiger, D.M., & Leana, C.R., (1986), “Participation in decision making”, *Generalizing from laboratory to field settings*: 147~166. MA: Lexington Books.
- Servan-Schreiber, J.J. (1968), 『The American Challenge』, New York.
- Spector, P.E., (1986), “Perceived control by employee: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work”, *Human Relations*, vol 39: 1005~1016.
- Steward, G.L. and Manz, .C.C. (1997), Understanding and overcoming supervisor resistance during the transition to employee empowerment, *Research in Organizational change and development*, Vol.10, pp.169~96.
- Steel & Mento. (1987), “The participation-performance controversy reconsidered”, vol. 12(4), pp. 411~423.
- Thomson, M. A. & Kahnweiler. W. M. (2002), “An exploratory investigation of learning culture theory and employee participation in decision making, vol. 13(3), pp. 271~288.
- Vanderelde, M. (1979), “The semantics of participation”, *Administration*

in social work, Vol.3.

- Wagner, J. A. (1994), “Participation’s effects on performance and satisfaction: a reconsideration of research evidence”, *Academy of management review*, vol. 19(2), pp. 312~330.
- Wagner, J. A. (1994), “Effects of societal trends on participation research”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 32: 241~262.
- Yukl, G. A. (2002), 『Leadership in organization』, 5th ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

## APPENDIX

Please circle the number that best describes how you feel about each of 21 items on the Participation Survey. As you do this, think about your current job and supervisor.

|  | Items                               | Never | Seldom | About as Often as Not | Often | Always |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------|-------|--------|
| MY supervisor/manager asks for my opinion about ...          |                                     |       |        |                       |       |        |
| 1  | How the work gets done.             | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 2  | How fast the work gets done.        | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 3  | How work is assigned.               | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 4  | When the work gets done.            | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 5  | Before hiring a coworker.           | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 6  | Before disciplining a coworker.     | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 7  | Training needs.                     | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 8  | Organizational goals.               | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 9  | Organizational policies and rules.  | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| I want my supervisor/manager to ask for my opinion about ... |                                     |       |        |                       |       |        |
| 10   | How the work gets done.             | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 11   | How fast the work gets done.        | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 12   | How work is assigned.               | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 13   | When the work gets done.            | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 14   | Before hiring a coworker.           | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 15   | Before disciplining a coworker.     | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 16   | Training needs.                     | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 17   | Organizational goals.               | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 18   | Organizational policies and rules.  | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 19   | I decide how to do my job.          | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 20   | My ideas get serious consideration. | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |
| 21   | I get credit for my idea.           | ①     | ②      | ③                     | ④     | ⑤      |

## Summary

### 참여적 의사결정이 사회복지사의 직무성과에 미치는 영향: 변혁적 리더십의 조절효과를 중심으로

황 정 하

오늘날 종사자의 의사결정 참여의 문제는 이념적인 근거와 실용주의적 근거 등으로 그 활용이 제기되고 있다. 즉, 이념적인 근거는 그 동안 종사자의 경영참여와 같은 조직의 민주적인 운영을 위해서 제기 되었으며, 실용적인 근거는 종사자의 의사결정 참여가 실질적으로 현장에 적용되기 앞서 조직성과에 영향을 미친다는 현실적인 증거에 토대를 두고 있다. 본 연구에서는 그 실용적인 근거를 위한 실증연구의 일환으로 수행되었다.

본 연구의 목적은 사회복지조직에 종사하는 사회복지사의 참여적 의사결정의 수준과 자신들이 지각한 직무성과의 수준을 파악하고, 참여적 의사결정이 직무성과에 얼마나 영향을 미치는 지를 분석하는 것이다. 이를 위해 서울시에 소재한 총 92개의 사회복지관 중에서 33개의 복지관을 대상으로 230명의 사회복지사들에게 우편을 통한 구조화된 설문지를 배포 및 회수하였다. 그 결과 20개의 복지관, 총 142명의 사회복지사로부터 설문지를 회수하여 분석에 사용하였다.

본 연구의 분석결과를 정리하면 다음과 같이 요약될 수 있다.

첫째, 사회복지사가 지각하는 참여적 의사결정의 수준은 총 5점 기준에서 평균 3.58점으로 보통 수준(3점)보다 높게 나타났다. 그러나, 응답자의 사회적 바람직성(social desirability)으로 인해 실제보다 높게 측정을 했을 가능성이 존재하기 때문에 그 수준이 높다고 판단할 수는 없다. 둘째, 사회복지사의 직무성과의 수준은 평균 3.59점으로 나타났다. 구체적인 각 차원별 직무성과의 수준을 살펴보면, 클라이언트와의 관계형성 3.65점, 업무수행 및 업무량관리 3.58점, 그리고 전문가적 지식, 기술 및 태도 3.55점

으로 나타났다. 셋째, 사회복지사의 인구사회학적 변인에 따른 참여적 의사결정의 차이를 검증해 본 결과, 응답자의 직위 이외에는 유의미한 차이가 존재하지 않았다. 넷째, 사회복지사의 인구사회학적 변인에 따른 직무성과의 차이를 검증해 본 결과, 응답자의 학력을 제외한 모든 변수에 유의미한 차이가 존재하였다. 즉, 응답자의 성별, 연령, 직위, 총 근무년수 등에 따라 직무성과의 차이가 존재하였다. 다섯째, 참여적 의사결정의 수준이 절대적으로 종사자의 직무성으로 직결되는 것은 아니라는 사실을 입증한 것이라고 볼 수 있다. 여섯째, 변혁적 리더십유형은 직무성으로 긍정적인 조절효과를 발휘하는 것으로 나타났다.

본 연구결과를 바탕으로 사회복지관의 관리개선을 위해 사회복지사의 참여적 의사결정을 제고하는 제언을 다음과 같이 하고자 한다.

첫째, 의사결정 통제수준이 참여적 의사결정에 있어서 본질적인 요인으로 작용한다. 따라서, 다양한 의사결정과정에서 구성원의 참여를 제도화하고 강화하기 위한 선결과제로 조직구성원 자신의 의지와 수행능력 대한 확신을 갖게 해주는 것이 요구된다. 둘째, 사회복지기관의 종사자인 사회복지사는 리더와의 관계가 물질적 보상들을 통한 교환적 관계라고 보기 어렵기 때문에, 조직과 종사자들간 심리적인 결속(psychological bond)을 강화하는 변혁적 리더십유형이 직무성으로 제고하는데 유용한 도구가 된다. 셋째, 사회복지사들의 참여를 확대하기 위해서는 특히 고려되어야 할 구체적인 내용은 업무의 할당과정이나 교육훈련을 계획하는 과정에 사회복지사의 실질적인 참여를 확대시키는 것이 가장 효과적인 방안으로 활용될 수 있다는 것이다. 넷째, 조직 내 참여적 의사결정의 시스템을 구축하는 것이 요구된다. 즉, 문제의 핵심은 참여가 제대로 이뤄지는게 아니라 그것을 어떻게 작동하게 하느냐이다. 다섯째, 조직의 리더와 사회복지사들간의 협조적인 파트너십의 형성이 요구된다. 이것은 성공적인 PDM 프로그램이 되기 위한 가장 기본적인 전제조건이 되기도 한다. 따라서, 양자간의 기본적인 신뢰관계와 상호존중이 이들 간에 존재해야만 한다.