TION OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCES
BERS OF AN ORGANIZATION

IESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF Ph.D.

CHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

NCE JOSEPH RHOADES

1973

ABSTRACT

THE PERCEPTION OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCES
BY MEMBERS OF AN ORGANIZATION

By

Lawrence Joseph Rhoades

The problem under investigation in this study was the perception of external influence by members of a social system. The specific goals of the investigation were (1) to determine the amount of influence two external sources were perceived to exert on the organization and (2) to isolate some variables which were related to the perception of that influence.

The actual and ideal influence of customers and local union officials were measured. Actual influence is the amount of influence the source does exert. Ideal influence is the amount of influence the source should exert. Actual influence was measured on the departmental and work group levels. Ideal influence was measured only on the departmental level.

The data for this secondary analysis were collected through self-administered questionnaires from workers in a district plant department of a telephone company. The 180 workers in the department were organized into 21 work groups. The group mean was used to compute mean rankings to determine the amount of influence exerted by the sources, and Kendall rank correlations were used to determine the degree of association between the variables.

Customers were perceived to exert more influence on the departmental and work group levels than local union officials. In addition, workers wanted customers to exert more influence on the departmental level than local union officials although the workers did reduce the gap between them.

Although customer and local union official influence are related to the same groups of variables the degree of relationship differs. Customer influence appears more highly related to the formal structure of the organization while local union official influence appears more highly related to the informal structure of the organization. The number and strength of the correlations relate customer influence more strongly to downward influence, upward influence, and external influence while local union official influence relates more strongly to external influence, intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relationships.

The influence of customers and local union officials negatively correlate with variables which appear to measure a bid for functional autonomy by the front-line of the organization and positively correlate with variables which reduce the functional autonomy of the front-line of the organization.

General statements are offered in regards to external sources of influence which call attention to the functional autonomy of the organization and its subparts, the dominance

of internal sources of control, the base of support the external source has in the organization, the point of entry into the organization, and the interdependence of external sources. Some suggestions are made for future research.

THE PERCEPTION OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCES BY MEMBERS OF AN ORGANIZATION

By

Lawrence Joseph Rhoades

A THESIS

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis could not have been completed without the guidance and assistance of several individuals and organizations. Appreciation is particularly expressed to my major professor, Philip M. Marcus, and other members of my committee, Frederick B. Waisanen, Harry Perlstadt, and Vincent J. Salvo. In addition, appreciation is expressed to the research team which originally collected the data analyzed in this study, to the researchers whose works are cited in this thesis and to Selz Mayo who provided a job atmosphere which enabled this thesis to be completed. Finally, the assistance rendered by the following organizations was extremely helpful in this endeavor: National Science Foundation, North Carolina State University Computer Center, Michigan State University Computer Center and the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES, continued

LIST OF TABLES, continued

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

External control of organizations is a highly salient issue in American society today. Advocates of several mass movements--consumer, environment, anti-war, women's liberation, civil rights--are attempting to exert influence on those organizations which are central to their concerns. Their attempts at exerting influence have met with a limited amount of success, leading many of the advocates to conclude that organizations cannot be influenced through legitimate means. The inability to influence organizations effectively further lends credence to what McKee calls the "mystique of bureaucracy"; the belief that the vast and complex social machinery of modern life has gone beyond humanly controllable dimensions.[1] Weber, however, has stated that the role played by organizations is dependent on the external forces operating upon it within a specific social structure.[2] And, as he put it ". . . the (bureaucratic mechanism)--in contrast to feudal orders based on personal piety--is easily made to function for anybody who knows how to gain control of it."[3] The problem, then, appears to be not whether organizations can or cannot be controlled by external forces, but why are some external forces more able to control them than others.

Many external forces which exert influence on organizations represent what Blau and Scott have called "publics."[4] Organizations are in contact with many publics, including customers, unions, a multitude of suppliers, and government agencies. These publics represent what has been called "constraints" and "contingencies" for organizations.[5] Constraints are unvarying conditions to which an organization must adapt for some meaningful period of time. Contingencies, on the other hand, may or may not vary, but they are not subject to arbitrary control by the organization. Nevertheless, organizational researchers have largely failed to include publics in their studies. Blau and Scott have labelled this failure a "serious shortcoming of most organizational research."[6]

One of the major reasons for the lack of interest in the relationship that exists between organizations and their publics has been the adoption by organizational researchers of the closed-system approach to the study of organizations.[7] This approach requires a severe limitation on the number of variables considered in an investigation, in order that, a determinant system be established which allows control over and reliable prediction of all the variables in the system and the relationships existing among them. Consequently, researchers employing the closed-system approach have focused their attention on the structure of the internal system of the organization while largely taking the structure of the external system of the organization as a given. The closed-system strategy permeates three major schools of thought on organizations: scientific management, administrative management and bureaucracy. In more recent times, organization researchers have indicated a greater interest in external influences on organizations through such concepts as organizations set or web of organizations,[8] domain,[9] and task environment;[10] through the use of an open-system approach which allows more variables to be included in the analysis;[11] and through a greater interest in inter-organizational studies.[12] This investigation is a further manifestation of that trend.

The problem, then, is the relationships which exist between organizations and their publics. As the preceding paragraphs amply demonstrate, the problem has practical and theoretical importance. However, the problem, as stated, is enormous and it may be attacked from numerous directions. Because of the limitations on this researcher's current resources--time, money, talent--this study is restricted to a small aspect of the problem which offers some hope of making a modest contribution to the existing knowledge in the area.

Therefore, this study is limited to the following general theoretical problem: the perception of external influence by members of a social system. The study deals with the perception of influence for two reasons: (1) Advocates of the phenomenological approach to the study of social reality have advanced a persuasive argument which asserts that human behavior is influenced as much or more by perceived or experienced reality as it is by objective reality. (2) The original study which furnished the data for this analysis does not contain objective measures of influence. In addition, two types of influence--actual and ideal--are analyzed. Actual influence is the amount of influence the source is perceived to exert. Ideal influence is the amount of influence the source should exert. Actual influence is measured on two organizational levels: Work group and department. Ideal influence is measured only on the departmental level. Finally, the study is limited to a single department in a single organization and to two publics--customers and local union officials.

More concretely, the study is concerned with the amount of actual and ideal influence customers and local union officials are perceived to exert on the operations of a plant department of a telephone company located in a suburb of a metropolitan center by members of the plant department. The study attempts to answer the following questions: How much influence do customers exert on the department or work group? How much influence do local union officials exert on the department or work group?

Who has more influence--customers or local union officials--on what organizational levels--department or work group? What are the factors which affect the perception of influence exerted by customers and/or local union officials on the departmental and/or work group levels? Are all factors pertinent to all sources of influence or are some factors pertinent only to some sources of influence? Are the factors which affect the perception of influence the same on all organizational levels? The major undertakings of the study, then, are the determination of the amount of influence customers and local union officials are perceived to exert on the department and work groups and the production of an inventory of independent variables which affect the perception of that influence.

Review of Literature

Two general orientations guide this review of literature: the structuralist approach to the study of organizations and the field-theoretical approach to the study of human behavior. Consequently, this review of literature reflects the interdisciplinary nature of organizational research; for it cuts across the disciplines of sociology, social psychology and psychology.

The structuralist approach to the study of organizations is an attempt at synthesizing and expanding the two predominant approaches in the field: scientific management and human relations.[13] Scientific management views organizations as planned structures striving for efficiency through rationality. It places its emphasis on economic rewards as a motivating force and the formal structure of the organization as its most important aspect. The formal structure of an organization is composed of those parts of the organization which have been consciously planned and constructed to produce desired results. Scientific management pays particular attention to the division of labor and the hierarchy of authority. Human relations, on the other hand, views organizations as emotional-laden, spontaneously created structures striving for efficiency through the creation of happy members. It places emphasis on social rewards as a motivating force and the informal structure of the organization as its most important aspect. The informal structure is not consciously planned, but naturally evolves from the interaction of the members. Human relations pays particular attention to friendship and social groupings among workers, informal leadership, communication between ranks, participation in decision-making, and democratic leadership. Both approaches have three shortcomings: (1) their studies are limited to the lower ranks of organizations; (2) their studies do not consider environmental influences; and (3) their studies are limited to work organizations. The structuralist approach has synthesized and expanded organizational analysis to include: (1) the formal and the informal aspects of an organization and their articulation; (2) the scope of informal groups and the relations between such groups inside and outside the organization; (3) the lower and the higher ranks in the organization; (4) the social and the material rewards available to organizations and their effects on each other; (5) the interaction between the organization and its environment; and (6) non-work as well as work organizations.

Field theory is the most general theoretical orientation employed to analyze human behavior in this study. According to Lewin the basic statements of field theory are that (a) behavior must be derived from a totality of coexisting facts, and (b) these coexisting facts have the character of a "dynamic field" in that the state of any part of the field depends on every other part of the field.[14] In short, the explanation of human behavior requires the investigator to consider the total situation composed of interdependent parts. Shepherd has cited five basic assumptions underlying the theory: (1) the phenomena to be studied are what the individual perceives in his environment; this assumption leads to the concept of the psychological field or life space of the individual; (2) that a person occupies a position in this life space which is related (near or far) to the objects of which it is composed; (3) that a person is oriented toward goals, which ordinarily involve a change in the relative positions of the individual and the objects in the life space; (4) that the individual behaves in certain ways to achieve these goals, or locomotes; and (5) that in the process of locomotion toward goals the individual may encounter barriers which have to be surmounted or circumvented, or which result in a change in goals or in life space or both.[15]

One of the major problems facing this review of literature is the specification of the concept of life space. To some extent this problem has been solved through the use of the field theory approach on the group level of analysis. This application of field theory on the group level has come to be known as "group dynamics." The extension to the group level, however, has required the addition of several concepts to the field theory framework: norms, referring to the rules governing the behavior of group members; roles, especially leadership, referring to the relative status and prestige of members and to their rights and obligations as group members; power and influence, referring to the kind and amount of control members have over each other; cohesion, referring to the degree of attachment members have for the group; valence, indicating the potency of goals or of objects in the life space; interaction, referring to the type and degree of communication between members; and consensus, indicating the degree of agreement regarding goals, norms, roles, and other aspects of the group.[16]

Phenomenological Position

The use of perceptual data is justified by the phenomenological position taken in the field theory approach and in the empirical data gathered by organizational researchers. The phenomenological position asserts that the phenomena to which the investigator should direct his attention are what the individual subjectively perceives, not what the observer perceives as the objective reality.[17] The phenomenological approach underlies the cognitive theories in social psychology, and these theories have their intellectual roots in Gestalt psychology which places heavy emphasis on processes of perception and perceptual organization.

As their name indicates cognitive theories emphasize the process of cognition: the gaining of information and understanding of the world. Consequently, these theories argue that the analysis of human behavior requires an explanation of the manner in which individuals organize their experiences of their worlds into coherent interpretations; for they assume the individual seeks "to order his experience, to have it make sense, and to experience the world as balanced, symmetrical, structured, and organized."[18] Conscious experience, then, is of paramount importance to cognitive theories.

External stimulus conditions are regarded as important only as they are represented in experience or, stated differently, as they are perceived by the individual. This claim runs counter to the belief of many social scientists that stimuli situations have objective existence and the implicit assumption that a given stimulus is interpreted or perceived in the same way by different individuals, although they may respond differently to it. Lewin and other cognitive theorists criticize this assumption vigorously.[19] They claim objective stimuli are always perceived in a context of personal experiences and tendencies, past and present. This does not mean that objective properties of stimuli situations are unimportant. What it does mean is that objective properties never determine completely the observer's interpretation. As Lewin puts it, the objective or physical environment, interpreted by the individual makes up his "behavioral" or "psychological" environment. And it is this psychological environment with which investigators must deal to understand learning or any other form of social behavior. Among the most important elements in the phenomenal life space of an individual are experience representations of other people, and social and cultural institutions.[20]

Other social scientists, besides Lewin, who have offered support for the phenomenological approach include W. I. Thomas, Herbert Blumer, E. Wight Bakke, Joseph A. Litterer, F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, and Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch. Thomas stated that "in human behavior it is not the objective situation that leads to social action but the individual's perception and definition of the situation."[21] Blumer made essentially the same argument when he cited the need for including an "interpretative process" between the stimulus condition and the behavioral response.[22] Bakke suggests that some of the most difficult problems in organizations stem "from a lack of consistency in the experienced content for different groups of bonds assumed to be 'the same for every one."[23] He elaborated his position in the following manner:[24]

> Not only is it clear from our observations that the social system or bonds supposedly the same for all participants is given varying content by experience, and that the system experienced by individuals is the real and actual one affecting their behavior, but that the system contains elements for some which others have no opportunity to experience at all.

Litterer has stated that "perceptions are of extreme importance to understanding organizational behavior, for people act on the basis of what they think they see or understand."[25] Roethlisberger and Dickson, in the classic Hawthorne studies, found that although the workers' beliefs had little objective basis, they influenced, if not determined, the level of production in the factory.[26] Finally, Lawrence and Lorsch, in a study of environmental influences on organizations, stated that "influence is essentially a matter of perceptions that arise from transactions among people. If these transactions are heavily constricted and limited, the people in toto will see themselves as having very little influence on decisions, and we can accurately say that the system has a comparatively limited total amount of influence."[27] In addition, all organizational studies employing research techniques requiring self-reports end up using perceptual data. Two prominent techniques employing self-reports are survey and interviews.

Internal-external Dichotomy

The structuralist approach to the study of organizations and the field-theoretical approach to the study of human behavior exhibit the internal-external dichotomy which appears in the works of several social scientists, including Homans, Loomis and Parsons.

According to Homans, a total social system is composed of an external and an internal system.[28] The two subsystems are distinguished from each other in the following manner:

> We shall not go far wrong if, for the moment, we think of the external system as group behavior that enables the group to survive in its environment and think of the internal system as group behavior that is an expression of the sentiments towards one another developed by members of the group in the course of their life together.[29]

In addition, the internal and external systems are partially interdependent and partially independent:

> Thus the external system first gives us a set of initial conditions from which our exposition can take its departure and then takes account of the fact that the adaptation of the group to its

> environment, while leaving us free later to show how this adaptation is also in part determined by the internal development of the group.[30]

Loomis recognizes the internal-external dichotomy in two of the master processes outlined in his PAS Model: boundary maintenance and systemic linkage. Boundary maintenance corresponds to the internal system for it "preserves the solidarity, identity and interaction patterns within the system."[31] Systemic linkage contains the same notion as the external system; for it is concerned with the relations between "members of at least two systems."[32] Finally, Parsons believes that the action generated within any social system is in part directed toward its external situation and in part toward its internal situation.[33] He employs the internal-external dichotomy in discussing the functional prerequisites for a social system: the adaptive and goal attainment functions are primarily concerned with the external system while the pattern maintenance-tension management function as well as the integrative function are primarily concerned with the internal system.

This internal-external dichotomy is a useful framework for attacking the problem under investigation; for customers and local union officials are parts of the external system of the organization while the internal system of the organization represents the most relevant external system for the individual. Our data do not allow us to consider the internal system of the individual in any detail.

External System of Organization

Several organizational theorists have called attention to the influence of the external system on organizations. Blau and Scott used the concept of organizational sets or web of organizations to call attention to "the various other organizations to which any one organization is related."[34] Dill used the concept of task environment to explicitly name some of the elements of the environment which have a bearing on goal setting and goal attainment.[35] Among the elements are (1) customers (both distributors and users); (2) suppliers of materials, labor, capital, equipment, and work space; (3) competitors for both markets and resources; and (4) regulatory groups, including governmental agencies, unions and interfirm associations. Levine and White used the concept of domain to indicate the "claims which an organization stakes out for itself in terms of (1) diseases (products) covered, (2) populations served, and (3) services rendered."[36] Finally, Thompson recognized the importance of the external system when he called attention to boundary-spanning units:[37]

> Because organizations are always embedded in larger systems of action, some parts of the organization must be interdependent with organizations not subordinated to the organization, hence not subject to authoritative specification or permissible action. The crucial problem for boundary-spanning units of an organization, therefore, is not coordination (of variables under control) but adjustment to constraints and contingencies not controlled by the organization--to what the economist calls exogenous variables.

Type of Organization

Up to this point the discussion has been about organizations in general. Now, it is necessary to discuss the particular type of organization under investigation because its unique characteristics have a definite bearing on the organization's relationship with its external system.

The data on which this study is based were gathered in the plant department of a local branch of the Michigan Bell Telephone Company. This fact is important for two reasons: First, as a regional corporate unit in one of the nation's largest vertical and horizontal combinations of companies, Michigan Bell certainly represents the type of organization to which the "mystique of bureaucracy" refers. In addition, the organization of the company faithfully follows the criteria laid down by Weber in his model of bureaucracy.[38] Second, as a public utility Michigan Bell is a government franchised monopoly that has explicit legal responsibilities for providing service to the public. However, its monopoly position in the area of instantaneous voice communication somewhat removes it from the market economy, and consequently, from control through consumption by customers. Since both of these characteristics have an important bearing on the organization's susceptibility to environmental influences, a brief description of the Bell System and the characteristics of a public utility will be presented in this section.

The Bell System is composed of American Telephone & Telegraph Company, a holding-operating company; 23 subsidiary or affiliated operating companies providing telephone service to the public; the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., a research and development subsidiary; Western Electric Company, Inc., a manufacturing and purchasing subsidiary; and several miscellaneous subsidiaries holding real estate.[39] Michigan Bell is one of the 23 associated companies and a wholly-owned subsidiary of American Telephone & Telegraph.

Troxel outlines the connection between subsidiary companies and AT&T in the following manner: "In addition to providing long-distance connections, AT&T agrees to provide the following services to its associated companies: (1) advice and assistance in general engineering, plant, traffic, operating, commercial, accounting, patent, legal, administrative, and other matters; (2) advice and assistance in any required financing; (3) cooperation in employee relations; and (4) maintenance of needed technical specialists and information to assure the smooth running of the business."[40]

Michigan Bell is the dominant telephone firm in Michigan. The other major company in the state is the General Telephone Company. Michigan Bell operates primarily in urban areas; General Telephone is primarily in rural or small town areas. The companies are not in direct competitive relations:

> Thus, each of these two firms represents the classic public utility case of a single-firm monopoly, and apparently has no plans to be anything else. Each of them is an enfranchised monopolist, unchallenged by other firms in its established markets. Each is free to grow, innovate and request higher prices and more revenue from the Michigan (Public Service) Commission, unfearful of territorial invasions by the other one.[41]

Each local branch of Michigan Bell is divided into four departments: (1) traffic, which completes telephone calls; (2) commercial, which arranges for service to subscribers; (3) accounting, which keeps the books and records; and (4) plant, which is responsible for the engineering and construction of the outside plant, the installation and connection of telephones, and maintenance of the entire plant including motor vehicles, tools and special equipment.[42]

As a public utility Michigan Bell is part of a general class of businesses which are designated by our laws and courts as "business affected with a public interest."[43] The most common public utilities are electricity, natural and manufactured gas, water, telephone and telegraph communication, and urban mass transportation. The public utility industry was second only to manufacturing in size in the American economy in 1960 as it had total assets of $89.9 billion.

Public utilities are distinguished from stock companies by the following characteristics: They operate under government franchise which provides them with an exclusive right to serve a specific service area free of competition from another seller of the same service. They provide a service which is indispensable to modern living. Their prices and profits are regulated by public commissions on the state and federal levels in an attempt to achieve the results of competition in the form of reasonable rates, reasonable profits and adequate service to customers. Public utilities are legally required to serve every financially responsible customer in their service areas at reasonable rates and without unjust discrimination. They must not enter a new market, supply a new service, or abandon an existing market without the consent of public authority. They must exercise care to protect the safety of the public. Finally, they are granted the power of eminent domain by law.[44]

Influence of Customers and Union Officials

This review of literature may be viewed as an attempt to establish objective reality in terms of the amount of influence customers and union officials exert upon organizations. Before proceeding with that task, however, it appears necessary, at least, to indicate what is meant by the term "influence."

The concept of influence, as used in this study, has a very broad meaning. It is defined as "any process in which a person or group of persons or organization of persons determines, that is, intentionally affects, the behavior of another person, group or organization."[45] This definition largely ignores the terminological disputes in the literature which attempt to distinguish influence from such concepts as power, coercion, persuasion, control and authority.[46] In effect, the use of influence in this study allows any and all of these concepts to be included under its global nature. The major justification for this definition is the assumption that the subjects of the study most likely do not make the fine distinctions that the analyst feels should be made.

Influence of Customers

The unique relationship between a customer and a public utility has definite repercussions for the customer's ability to influence the producer.[47] The public utility is a natural monopoly which supplies a particular product or service which is a necessity and for which there is no ready substitute. The producer cannot attract customers beyond a precisely defined area, and the customer cannot patronize anyone else. The seller goes to the buyer, and frequently, installs facilities on the buyer's property. These facilities are physically connected with those of the producer, thereby, depriving the customer of any choice between producers of the service. Consequently, even if more than one firm operated in the area, the consumer most likely would not be connected to more than one of them at the same time.

Nevertheless, the customer has several resources available to him which he can use to exert influence: economic, political, legal, ideological and social. Classical economic theory claims customers hold the survival of organizations in their hands because of the control their purchasing power exerts over the production and distribution of goods and services.[48] The maxim suggested by the theory seems to be: Conform to customer demands or perish. Etzioni questions this conception of the economic power of customers.[49] He believes the connection between consumption and control which previously was embodied in the role of customer has been broken; the customer has retained his consumption function, but has largely relinquished his control function. Etzioni argues that two major processes are responsible for the separation of consumption and control: (1) the separation of consumption from direct financing and (2) the development of private and public monopolies. He further points out that customers are only one source of pressure, and certainly, they are not the most organized or the most powerful when compared to government agencies, trade unions, shareholders and financiers. Canes, comparing state-owned telephone companies in England with commercially operated telephone companies in this country, concluded that commercial redress is the best weapon the American consumer has because the telephone companies are willing to meet his demands in order to insure a steady stream of profit.[50]

However, when the methods available to the customer for exercising his economic resource are considered, it appears that Etzioni is more correct than Canes. For the most part customers are what Blau and Scott call "unorganized publics"; an aggregate of people unrelated to one another and who have only intermittent contact with an institution.[51] In addition, Etzioni asserts most customers "have only a segmentary, limited interest in most products and are unwilling to devote energy, time, and money to the aim of organizing a consumers' strike."[52] Finally, the ultimate economic resource available to a customer of the telephone company, cancellation of service, may be an excellent example of Cartwright's discussion of the costs of exerting influence outweighing the benefits derived from that exertion of influence.[53] There is no adequate alternative to the telephone for instantaneous voice communication.

Etzioni thinks political power is the significant power in the hands of customers.[54] By political power he means the ability of the consumer to exert pressure on political authorities to intervene in economic processes on his behalf. The consumer's ability to influence political authorities, however, will depend on his voting power and his communication abilities. Canes also sees the possibility of exerting political pressure through the public utility commissions.[55] However, he does not think a single complaint will be effective in obtaining commission action because committee hearings take weeks and sometimes months to conclude. In addition, a series of complaints would be necessary before the standing of the company would be impaired to the extent that future decisions on rates of return and tariffs would be affected.

Canes calls attention to a legal resource when he raises the possibility of court action against delinquent companies.[56] However, this course of action is open to relatively few customers because of the expense involved.

Etzioni cites an ideological resource when he calls attention to the "idea of service" which plays an important role in the telephone industry.[57] The base of this resource is the provisions for service cited in the charter the telephone company receives from the government as a public utility. Etzioni addresses himself to the idea of service in the following manner:[58]

> The idea of service to the consumer implies that those who serve him will accept the idea, be rewarded for behavior conforming to its standards, and be deprived for deviating from it. It would be of much interest to study if and how the service idea can be institutionalized. We would suggest that some basic features of administrative structures make this norm difficult to reinforce.

The basic features Etzioni has in mind are the orientation of employees who are in contact with customers, the reward system and the mobility system. He hypothesized that many lower-level clerks and sales workers who are in contact with customers are organization-oriented and not customer-oriented. He cited a study of retail grocery workers which showed that only five per cent of the workers classified customers as the most important aspect of their job while 22 per cent mentioned "like associates"; another 22 per cent named supervision, and 29 per cent chose future advancement.[59]

> Thus it appears that co-workers and supervisors with whom clerks and sales workers interact intimately (as compared to the relatively impersonal contact with customers) are often the 'significant others' toward whom they are sensitized. This would be of little consequence if promotion, supervisors' approval, and co-workers' attitudes were geared to service orientation toward customers. The degree to which this is really so must still be explored, and the conditions that support versus those that suppress a customer orientation must be spelled out. It seems that promotion and other supervisory sanctions depend partly on other factors (e.g., obedience), while co-workers' attitudes are more influenced by other values such as friendliness and loyalty.[60]

Etzioni further asserts it is relatively unrewarding in many organizations to be client-oriented and to transmit clients' demands upward. He suggests it is personally advantageous to stick to the organizational norm rather than to bend the norm to meet the clients' demands. In addition, he asserts that a reduction in client-orientation is functional for upward-mobility because it prepares the person for the less-client-oriented upper levels. Finally, the idea of service appears to be related to the definition of customer. He states the term, customer, suggests "actors who have no moral commitment to their sources of products or services."[61]

Bakke and Etzioni suggest that customers have a social resource, in that they can reward telephone employees through expressions of personal approval.[62] The customer's ability to exercise this resource depends on the quality of interaction, the frequency of contact, and the degree of identification the employee has with the customer. In addition, the customer must compete with other segments of the organization which have several bases of power: personal approval, money and/or materials, physical comfort facilities, freedom, enlargement of functions, tenure, personal advancement, stimulating work and cooperation.[63]

Etzioni sums up the relationship of customers to the control structure of organizations in the following manner:[64]

> For the purpose of studying the consumer's relation to control, the traditional organizational chart has to be expanded in two directions: (a) the differentiation of consumer publics and their various contacts, lines of communication, and ways of exerting pressure has to be incorporated on one end and (b) the various 'political' organs which control public administration and regulate some private economic activities have to be brought into the frame on the other end and the relationships between the consumer and these political authorities has to be analyzed.

This review of literature on the influence of customers is more suggestive of pertinent variables than it is of testable relationships. In fact, the conflict among the hypotheses suggested by the literature makes it difficult to predict the level of customer influence. For instance, the hypotheses suggested by the discussions of legal responsibility, the idea of service, and the possibilities for economic, political, legal and social pressure call for some customer influence. On the other hand, the hypotheses suggested by the discussion of the monopoly position the telephone company holds on instantaneous voice communication, the difficulties involved in bringing economic, political and legal pressure to bear, plus the organization-orientation of workers predict a low level of customer influence.

Influence of Union Officials

This review of literature may also be viewed as an attempt to establish objective reality in terms of the influence of union officials on organizations.

Almost without exception, every local union of Bell System employees is an outgrowth of a company union.[65] The company unions were started in 1919 and they were not organized as separate entities until 1937. The dominant union in the telephone industry, Communication Workers of America, an affiliate of AFL-CIO, was not founded until 1949. In his history of the CWA, Barbash states unions and collective bargaining "either as an idea or in action, have historically not been an acceptable part of Bell System's scheme of labor relations."[66]

In a summary statement based on twenty-five years of research in organizations, including the telephone industry, Bakke asserts the basic issue between unions and management is the conception of power in relative terms. He said, "Each appears to the other to be attempting to accumulate or regain power and sovereignty for their own organizations in ways that threatened the power and sovereignty of the other."[67]

Gillmore came to the same conclusion in his study of the labor economics in the telephone industry. He felt Bell management's attitudes toward unions has crystallized around the following points:[68]

> (1) Union growth competes with management growth. (2) Telephone unions are apparently here to stay. (3) Union gains must be kept at a minimum each year because one gain is merely a point of departure for others. This attitude is summed up in the phrase 'hold-the-line.' (4) The weaker the unions, the better; except that measures to weaken them must be tempered with enough caution to prevent their demise, when they might be followed by even stronger unions.

The concept of "dual allegiance" advanced by Purcell is also relevant to this study. Dual allegiance "means acceptance of the company as an institution (and therefore acceptance of its existence and primary objectives), and acceptance of the union as an institution."[69]

Purcell found stewards had more dual allegiance than the work force in general. He explained this finding by saying stewards are more union-minded but not much less company-minded than the rank-and-file workers. His data, collected in a meat packing plant, showed positive attitudes toward the company being expressed by 88 percent of the stewards and 91 percent of the workers while positive attitudes toward the union were expressed by all stewards and 79 per cent of the workers.

Only a slight majority, 57 per cent, of the foremen in the same plant had dual allegiance. Twenty-seven per cent of the foremen were opposed to the union as an institution. Purcell concluded that a sizeable minority of supervisors did not hold dual allegiance, primarily because they did not accept the union "as a necessary and important component in the plant community."[70]

A summary statement based on case studies of twenty local unions in four northeastern communities by Sayles and Strauss sheds additional light on the amount of influence workers want their unions to have:[71]

> In summary, then 'working harmony' or 'industrial peace' means that the union official accepts increasing responsibility in areas at one time under the sole control of management. In turn, the official becomes charged by the members with additional responsibility for working conditions . . . . Increasingly, members tend to vent upon the union some of the feelings which would otherwise be directed against management. Thus, wherever the union is strongly organized, the worker perceives his working conditions as to some extent being determined by both the union and the company.

Bakke corroborates the above view to some extent; for he has pointed out that union officials have almost as many ways of rewarding and punishing employees as does management.[72] Two management prerogatives, not shared by union officials, are the right to grant tenure and the ability to provide stimulating work. Among the rights management shares with union officials are personal approval, money and/or materials; physical comfort facilities; amount of freedom; enlargement of functions and personal advancement.

A study of a telephone company by Seidman and associates showed the strongest union sentiments were held by employees of the plant department whose members are predominantly male technicians.[73] Some females were in the department to handle clerical duties. Of the 375 workers in the department, 296, almost four-fifths, were members of the union. According to Seidman, most workers joined the union, even though they held a very favorable view of the telephone company, because they wanted protection available should it become necessary; because of a background of union membership in their families; because they became friendly toward the idea after joining the company; and because they wanted to go along with the group. Reasons given for not joining the union included an unwillingness to pay dues, particularly since non-members received the same benefits; prejudice against unions; company orientation; fear of losing promotion opportunities, and a fear of being involved in strikes.

Seidman states the workers generally felt that the union's achievements were substantial in such areas as wages, working conditions, job security, and the opportunity to settle complaints and individual problems. The workers were sharply divided on the effect of the union on their treatment by supervisors. The most prevalent opinion was that the union had no effect since the supervisors had always treated them well. The union was criticized for being, too, aggressive toward the company, for asking for too much money, for calling strikes, and for attacking the company too often and too bitterly in its publications. Seidman concluded, "attitudes such as these, which reflect middle-class values combined with a high degree of identification with a paternalistic employer, are seldom encountered among industrial employees."[74] Barbash agrees that telephone workers consider themselves middle class.[75]

Gillmore gives a somewhat different appraisal of the influence and accomplishments of telephone unions:[76]

> Even the cumulative effect of telephone unions has not been very great. They have had little effect on wages and fringe-benefits. Their greatest impact has been upon job opportunity control, where they have strengthened the role of seniority in promotions, movement up the wage progression schedules, selection of hours of work and vacations, transfers, layoffs, and rehiring. They have also gained a voice in discharges and demotions. But a large proportion of employees are still working under contracts that do not provide for arbitration of provisions relating to control of job opportunities. Furthermore, the provisions covering seniority in layoffs and rehiring have not yet been put to test. And much of the union impact has been via government bodies.
>
> But we should not overlook the less tangible nature of union impact. Unions must be dealt with, not only in formal bargaining sessions but in the day-to-day give and take of the grievance procedure. They stand ready for at all times to challenge management actions affecting employees, and in many cases the issues involved can be carried outside the realm of management decision to the arbitrators. Such vigilance puts management, especially on the bottom level of supervision, on its good behavior, and greatly insures against arbitrary treatment of employees.

Gillmore attributes the lack of bargaining power on the part of telephone unions to the following conditions: Telephone unions are unable to withhold all labor when they strike; they cannot withhold labor long enough to cause great employer loss compared with union cost; the degree of automated equipment used in the telephone industry; the union's inability to influence public opinion to a great degree; and the fact that unions have already improved the employee-employer communication channel as much as they ever will.[77]

Two factors contributing to the bargaining power of unions are the general climate of opinion on labor relations matters and the unions' abilities to harass management at little cost to themselves.[78]

This review of literature on the influence of union officials also is more suggestive of pertinent variables than it is of testable relationships. Again, the conflict among the hypotheses suggested by the literature makes it difficult to predict the level of influence.

External System of Individual

The field-theoretical orientation certainly emphasizes the importance of the external system for human behavior. Although this orientation gives priority to the subjective nature of the external system through the concept of life space, it also recognized the importance of the objective nature of the external system. Consequently, it behooves us to specify the subjective and objective aspects of the external system which appear to be relevant. In order to specify the subjective nature of the external system we have turned to several middle range theories or perspectives--self-concept, balance, social comparison, role, reference individuals and groups. In order to specify the objective nature of the external system we have turned to organizational theory; for the most relevant aspect of the objective environment for the subjects of this study is the internal structure of the department.

The formalized theory of the self-concept directs our attention to the external system of the individual because it asserts the responses of others affects the concept the individual has of himself. The self-concept, in turn, affects the behavior of the individual including his perception of the external system.[79] The problem with the above formulation is the global nature of the concept "other." An individual would find it impossible to respond to all others. Consequently, he must select the particular others to whom he will respond. It is at this point other middle-range theories fit into the picture. First, the two perspectives originating from cognitive theory--balance and social comparison. Simply put, balance theory states that an individual finds cognitive imbalance painful, or, at least, psychologically disturbing, and so, he will attempt to maintain a balanced state among and between his cognitions and take steps to restore balance when imbalance occurs.[80] Although it was originally formulated to account for intrapersonal phenomenon, the framework has been extended to interpersonal phenomenon.[81] The theory of social comparison moves us a step further toward specification by indicating to whom the individual will attempt to remain consistent. The theory states an individual will attempt to compare himself with those individuals with whom he is similar.[82] Besides enabling the individual to stay cognitively balanced the comparison with individuals who are similar may also enable him to maintain self-esteem which social psychological research indicates is one of several "needs" individuals possess.[83]

The remaining middle range perspectives--role, reference groups and individuals, organization--further specify who the others are. Biddle and Thomas have provided a definition of the role perspective which appears particularly relevant to this investigation:[84]

> When actors portray a character in a play, their performance is determined by the script, the director's instructions, the performance of fellow actors, and reactions of the audience as well as the acting talents of the players. Apart from differences between actors in the interpretation of their parts, the performance of each actor is programmed by all of these external factors; consequently, there are significant similarities in the performances of actors taking the same part, no matter who the actors are . . . . This emphasis on the controlling power of one's immediate environment--past and present--reflects a doctrine of limited social determinism. The behavior of the individual is examined in terms of how it is shaped by the demands and rules of others, by their sanctions, for his conforming and nonconforming behavior, and by the individual's own understanding and conceptions of what his behavior should be.

The reference group-individual perspective enters the picture because when an individual compares himself with others and adopts their standards or outlook he has made that group his reference group. Shibutani suggests that[85]

> Men are primarily responsive to the judgments of those who constitute their reference groups. One gains a sense of personal identity by locating himself within a meaningful social world and he seeks recognition within this web of social relationships. He becomes concerned with the expectations and responses of those who share his outlook. . . .

A reference group is "that group, real or imaginary, whose standpoint is being used as the frame of reference by the actors."[86] However, the groups to which a person belongs need not serve as his reference groups nor need he be a member of his reference groups. Shibutani suggests that membership groups may be more influential than non-membership groups.[87] Besides designations as membership, non-membership, reference and non-reference, groups also may be classified as primary or secondary. Olmsted offers the following definitions of these two types of groups:[88]

> In the primary group, members have warm, intimate, and personal ties with one another; their solidarity is unselfconscious, a matter of sentiment rather than calculation. Such groups are usually of the small, face-to-face sort, spontaneous in their interpersonal behavior and devoted, though not necessarily explicitly, to mutual or common ends.
>
> The characteristics of the secondary group are the opposite or complement of those of the primary group. Relations among members are cool, impersonal, rational, contractual, and formal. People participate not as whole personalities but only in delimited and special capacities; the group is not an end in itself but a means to other ends. Secondary groups are typically large and members have usually only

> intermittent contacts, often indirectly through the written rather than the spoken word.

Shibutani contends that many primary groups are formed involuntarily. For instance, work crews initially formed for the pursuit of other interests in which close ties develop among the members. An extensive quote from Shibutani follows, but I think, it is pertinent to this study:[89]

> These primary groups differ from others in that the contributions expected of each individual are in part specified by the formal social structure; the goals of many of their common activities are dictated by the requirements of the larger unit of which they are a part. Whatever may be done for the personal satisfaction of the members is often subsidiary. Furthermore, authority patterns are imposed from without; sergeants and foremen are rarely selected by the men who serve under them. Since there is not much choice in the selection of one's associates, the ties in these primary groups are often less intimate than those found in the more spontaneously formed groupings. Indeed, in most cases smaller cliques arise within these groups. Nonetheless, the importance of these groups is not to be underestimated. What any person experiences of the larger organization is necessarily filtered through the eyes of those with whom he is in immediate contact. The particular ways in which he interprets new policies and events depend to a large extent upon the view of those around him. Thus, each local unit develops a perspective and a set of norms, and the particular standards that arise make a difference in the manner in which official regulations are enforced. Such primary groups, even when the participants are not too intimate, exercise considerable control over the conduct of most of their members.

Up to this point the discussion of reference groups has centered on membership groups as reference groups. Merton, however, claims the distinctive concern of reference group theory is the orientation of individuals to non-membership groups.[90] He offers three conditions which may produce a greater selection of non-membership groups as reference groups: (1) If status and prestige is bestowed upon the non-membership group by the social structure; (2) if the individual is an isolate in his membership group; (3) if the social system of which the groups are elements has a high rate of mobility.[91] In addition, he calls attention to the in-group vs out-group dichotomy advanced by Sumner, but he casts doubt upon the inner cohesion and outer hostility hypothesis.[92]

Merton also raises the question of conflicting value-orientations among members of the primary group.[93] When this occurs he expects the modal orientations of the larger social environment to become more influential while the influence of primary group members decreases or even becomes negligible.

Merton further calls attention to the classification of reference groups--normative and comparative--and to the distinction between groups, collectivities and categories. The normative reference group sets and maintains standards for the individual while the comparative reference group provides a frame of comparison relative to which the individual evaluates himself and others.[94] He distinguishes these types from what Turner has called "interaction groups." Interaction groups are "simply parts of the social environment" which must be taken into account but which have no normative or comparative significance.[95] The primary bases upon which Merton distinguishes between groups, collectivities and categories are the existence of social interaction and a common body of norms.[96] A group is characterized by normative social interaction. A collectivity may have a common body of norms, but there is little interaction among its members. A social category has neither social interaction or a body of common norms.

Finally, Merton indicates the complexity of the situation when he discusses the existence of multiple group affiliations and multiple reference groups.[97] His major concern in this regard is the characterization of the social situation in terms which "leads to one rather than another of these several group affiliations being taken as the significant context."[98]

The importance of organizational theory for the problem under investigation should be fairly evident at this point; for it sheds considerable light on the immediate social environment of its members through the concepts of formal structure and informal structure. The formal structure composed, in part, of a division of labor and systems of authority, standards, and rewards, partially determines the role to be played by each member, his role partners, some of his reference groups and significant others, his standards of comparison, and the kind of social and material support he will receive. In addition, the formal structure may develop through the establishment of work groups and the assignment of workers to each group. Litterer emphasizes the formal-informal dichotomy in his list of organizational attributes which affect perception: the amount of stress present in the situation; group pressures, particularly for conformity; the level of interaction among members; the role the individual plays in the organization; the reference groups it contains; the hierarchical position occupied by the individual and the reward system of the organization.[99]

Finally, a considerable amount of the literature reviewed here calls attention to the immediate social environment of the individual and the other individuals it contains. This guidance directs our attention to the importance of the work group. And our earlier discussion of group dynamics suggests some of the attributes of the work group which may be important to the perception of influence: norms, status and prestige, power and influence, cohesion, interaction and consensus. Blau offers some empirical data on work groups which suggests relationships between seniority, informal status, orientation to clients, reference group selection and reaction to clients.[100] In his study of a welfare agency, Blau divided informal status along two analytical dimensions: informal rank and social integration. Informal rank was defined as the respect the individual and his opinions commanded among his peers. Social integration was defined as social acceptance or the degree to which an individual was drawn into interaction by his peers. He found that social integration influenced orientation to clients only among newer workers, three years or less seniority.

> Among workers with less than three years' experience, more than half of the highly integrated but less than a quarter of the unintegrated were oriented toward service rather than toward eligibility procedures, but among old-timers (over three years' experience), integration among peers did not affect orientation to clients.[101]

Blau also found that low status newcomers (less than one year) and high status veterans had peer-group orientations:

> It appears that newcomers who have already gained some popularity can turn their attention from their jobs--to their relations with clients and superiors. Newcomers who have not yet become popular continue to direct much of their energies toward achieving social status among peers. Older workers, on the other hand, have had time to adapt in some way to the social situation; if they have failed to win friends among peers they do not continue to look for social support to their colleagues but rather turn to clients or superiors. If oldtimers have achieved popularity, however, the colleague group tends to be an important source of satisfaction for them and, hence, the reference group to which they often are oriented.[102]

Finally, Blau found that membership in cohesive work groups leads to an impersonal reaction toward clients regardless of the popularity of the individual in the group:

> These results suggest that cohesive ties make the work group a source of strong social support for members. In the absence of such peer-group support, the caseworker's relations with his clients tend to become an important source of ego support for him, and his resulting dependence on clients leads him to react to them in personal terms. Group cohesion furnishes social support that makes relations with clients less significant for the caseworker and helps

> him to remain more impersonal toward them, while having personal ties with colleagues apparently does not furnish the social support needed for such independence from clients.[103]

In summary, few testable relationships can be based on this review of literature, primarily because published studies which have a direct bearing on the research problem under consideration could not be found. However, this review was more productive in suggesting variables and general orientations for an initial exploration of the problem. Consequently, this study should be categorized as an exploratory rather than a hypothesis-testing investigation.

Outline of Study

The research problem under consideration in this study is the perception of external influence by members of an organization. The organization is a plant department of a telephone company. The members are the craftsmen or workers employed in the department. The sources of external influence are customers and local union officials. Two types of influence--actual and ideal--are measured. Actual influence is measured on two organizational levels--department and work group. Ideal influence is only measured on the departmental level.

The dependent variables in this study are the perception of actual customer influence on the department; the perception of actual local union official influence on the department; the perception of actual customer influence on the work group; the perception of actual local union official influence on the work group; the perception of ideal customer influence on the department and the perception of ideal local union official influence on the department.

The objectives of this study were (1) to determine the amount of influence members of the organization perceived the external sources exerted on the organization and (2) to isolate independent variables which were related to the dependent variables.

The exploration of the data, in order to find the independent variables, was conducted along the lines suggested by the two general orientations presented in this review: the field theoretical orientation to the study of human behavior and the structuralist approach to the study of organizations. Both of these perspectives argue for a confrontation of the complexity of the situation even though the probability of getting lost in that complexity increases considerably. Consequently, a comprehensive approach to the data was adopted which required an investigation of formal structure, work group characteristics, interpersonal relationships, and intrapersonal phenomena.

Footnotes

1. James B. McKee. Introduction to Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. 1969. pp. 166-169.

2. Nicos P. Mouzelis. Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co. 1967. p. 26.

3. Ibid., p. 25.

4. Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.

5. James D. Thompson. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1967. p. 24.

6. Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 74.

7. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 4-6.

8. Blau and Scott, op. cit., pp. 195-199.

9. Sol Levine and Paul E. White. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, (5), March 1961. pp. 583-601.

10. William R. Dill. "Environment as an Influence on Managerial Autonomy," Administrative Science Quarterly, (2), March 1958. pp. 409-443.

11. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

12. Eugene Litwak & L. F. Hylton. "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, (6), 1962, pp. 395-420; Roland Warren, "Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation," Administrative Science Quarterly, (12), December 1967, pp. 396-419.

13. Amitai Etzioni. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964. pp. 20-49.

14. Kurt Lewin. Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper-Row, Publisher. 1951. p. 25.

15. Clovis R. Shepherd. Small Groups: Some Sociological Perspectives. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co. 1964. pp. 24-25.

16. _Ibid_., p. 25.

17. John W. McDavid and Herbert Harari. _Social Psychology: Individuals, Groups, Societies_. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. 1968. pp. 30-32; S. Stansfeld Sargent and Robert C. Williamson. _Social Psychology_. New York: The Ronald Press Co. 1966. pp. 21-22, 212-241.

18. McDavid and Harari, _op. cit_., p. 31.

19. S. Stansfeld Sargent and Robert C. Williamson. _Social Psychology_, 3rd edition. New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1966. pp. 213-214.

20. McDavid and Harari, _op. cit_., p. 32.

21. Robert A. Nisbet. _Social Bond_. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1970. p. 39.

22. Herbert Blumer. _Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method_. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969. pp. 2-6, 90-100.

23. E. Wight Bakke. _Bonds of Organization_. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books. 1966. p. 206.

24. _Ibid_., p. 206.

25. Joseph A. Litterer. _The Analysis of Organizations_. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1967. p. 62.

26. Etzioni, _op. cit_., p. 35.

27. Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch. _Organization and Environment_. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. 1967.

28. George C. Homans. _The Human Group_. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1950. pp. 81-155.

29. _Ibid_., pp. 109-110.

30. _Ibid_., p. 95.

31. Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis. _Modern Social Theories_. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1965. p. 16.

32. _Ibid_., p. 16.

33. Talcott Parsons. _The Social System_. New York: The Free Press. 1951.

34. Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 195.

35. Dill, op. cit., pp. 409-443.

36. Levine and White, op. cit., pp. 583-601.

37. Thompson, Organizations in Action, pp. 66-73.

38. Max Weber. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: The Free Press. 1964. pp. 329-336.

39. C. Emery Troxel. "Telephone Regulation in Michigan" in Utility Regulation, edited by William C. Shepherd and Thomas G. Gies. New York: Random House. 1966. p. 450.

40. Ibid., p. 451.

41. Ibid., pp. 146-147.

42. Jack Barbash. Unions and Telephones. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers. 1952. p. 161; Joel Seidman, Jack London, Bernard Karsh, Daisy L. Tagliacozzo. "Telephone Workers: White Collar Unionism" in The Worker Views His Union. The Univ. of Chicago Press. 1958. p. 140.

43. Paul J. Garfield and Wallace F. Lovejoy. Public Utility Economics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964. p. 2.

44. Ibid., pp. 1-3; Dudley F. Pegrum. Public Regulation of Business. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1959. pp. 596-601.

45. Arnold S. Tannenbaum. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1968. p. 5.

46. R. A. Dahl. "The Concept of Power" in Behavioral Science, (2), 1957. pp. 201-218; Dorwin Cartwright. "Influence, Leadership, Control" in Handbook of Organizations, edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company. 1965. pp. 1-47; H. Goldhammer and E. A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status" in American Journal of Sociology, (45) 1939, pp. 171-182; Amitai Etzioni. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press. 1961; Max Weber. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, edited by Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press, 1964. p. 152; John Day. "Authority" in Political Studies (11) October 1963, pp. 257-271; James D. Thompson. "Authority and Power in 'Identical'

Organizations" in American Journal of Sociology, (62), November 1956, pp. 290-301; Robert V. Presthus. "Authority in Organizations" in Public Administration Review (20) Spring 1960. pp. 86-91.

47. Pegrum, op. cit., pp. 596-598.

48. Amitai Etzioni. "Administration and the Consumer" in Administrative Science Quarterly, (3), 1958. p. 251.

49. Ibid., pp. 251-257.

50. Michael Canes. Telephones--Public or Private? London: The Institute of Economic Affairs. 1966. p. 54.

51. Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 79.

52. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., p. 262.

53. Cartwright, op. cit., pp. 8-10.

54. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., pp. 263-264.

55. Canes, op. cit., p. 52.

56. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

57. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., pp. 258-260.

58. Ibid., pp. 258-259.

59. Mason Haire and Josephine S. Gottsdanker. "Factors Influencing Industrial Morale" in Personnel, (27), May 1951. pp. 445-454.

60. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., p. 259.

61. Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, op. cit., pp. 10-18.

62. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., p. 264; Bakke, op. cit., pp. 118-119.

63. Bakke, op. cit., pp. 122-125.

64. Etzioni, "Administration and the Consumer," op. cit., p. 264.

65. Seidman, et al., op. cit., p. 144.

66. Barbash, _op_. _cit_., p. 170.

67. E. Wight Bakke. _Mutual Survival: The Goal of Unions and Management_. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books. 1966.

68. Curry W. Gillmore. _Bell Telephone Labor Economics_. Ph. D. dissertation. Columbia University. 1952. p. 123.

69. Theodore V. Purcell. _The Worker Speaks His Mind on Company and Union_. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1954.

70. _Ibid_., p. 265.

71. Leonard R. Sayles and George Strauss. _The Local Union_. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1953. p. 235.

72. Bakke, _Bonds of Organizations_, _op_. _cit_., pp. 122-125.

73. Seidman, et al., _op_. _cit_., p. 148.

74. _Ibid_., pp. 158-159.

75. Barbash, _op_. _cit_., p. 223.

76. Gillmore, _op_. _cit_., p. 115.

77. _Ibid_., pp. 117-120.

78. _Ibid_., pp. 120.

79. John W. Kinch. "A Formalized Theory of the Self-Concept" in _Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology_, edited by Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1967. pp. 232-240.

80. Fritz Heider. _The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations_. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1958. pp. 174-217.

81. Theodore M. Newcomb. "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts" in _Psychological Review_, (60), 1953. pp. 393-404.

82. Morton Deutsch and Robert M. Krauss. _Theories in Social Psychology_. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1965. pp. 62-68.

83. Arnold S. Tannenbaum. _Social Psychology of the Work Organization_. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. 1966. pp. 27-31.

84. Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1966. p. 4.

85. Tamotsu Shibutani. Society and Personality. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1961. p. 274.

86. Ibid., p. 257.

87. Ibid., p. 258.

88. Michael S. Olmsted. The Small Group. New York: Random House. 1959. pp. 17-19.

89. Shibutani, op. cit., pp. 406-407.

90. Robert K. Merton. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press. 1964. p. 234.

91. Ibid., p. 305.

92. Ibid., p. 298.

93. Ibid., p. 333.

94. Ibid., p. 283.

95. Ibid., p. 284.

96. Ibid., pp. 299-300.

97. Ibid., p. 239.

98. Ibid., p. 239.

99. Litterer, op. cit., pp. 51-62.

100. Blau and Scott, op. cit., pp. 96-108.

101. Ibid., pp. 97-98.

102. Ibid., pp. 99-100.

103. Ibid., pp. 107-108.

CHAPTER II

DATA AND METHOD

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the methodology employed in the study. It is divided into four sections: (1) collection of data, (2) description of population, (3) operationalization of variables and (4) analysis of data.

Collection of Data

The data for this study were collected in a pilot study of a district plant department of the Michigan Bell Telephone Company.[1] The district is located in a suburb of a metropolitan center. The study was conducted from September, 1963 to May, 1964 by a research team from the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.

The research design incorporated various methods of data collection: Field observation, company records, depth interviews, and self-administered questionnaires. The latter were administered in May, 1964 to the total population of the department. The questionnaire was pretested on retired telephone employees and active supervisors and workers from another district before it was administered for the purposes of this study.

Through the questionnaire the respondents provided data on themselves, their jobs, their supervisors, and their work groups. Except for sociometric items and some item completions, the questionnaire was composed of close-ended questions. Usually, five point rating scales measured intensity, degree, importance and frequency.

The overall quality of the data is very good. All respondents returned completed questionnaires. The non-response rate to specific questions was rather low. Respondents were able to discriminate among the various sources of control; blanket answers were seldom given. Finally, the use of close-ended questions eliminated the possibility of interpretation errors in coding.

Two sources of bias, however, are inherent in the data collection procedures. The first source is similar to the problem of multiple testing in experimental studies.[2] The research team informally interviewed a number of respondents before they were asked to complete the questionnaire. The effect of this bias, however, is apparently negligible because comparisons between those workers interviewed and those not interviewed showed no difference. The second possible source of bias is contamination. The self-administered questionnaires were not simultaneously completed by all members of the department. Consequently, it cannot be assumed that the answers to all the questions are independent of each other. However, the questionnaires were simultaneously administered to members of work groups.

The effect of this possible bias is apparently negligible, too, because comparisons between those work groups which filled out the questionnaires earlier and those work groups which filled out the questionnaires later showed no differences.

Description of Population

In order to acquaint the reader with the subjects under investigation this section analyzes the population along several dimensions on the individual and work group levels of analysis. On the individual level the population is described in terms of sex, age, formal education, marital status, number of children, time in system and occupation. On the work group level the population is described in terms of size, occupational composition and sexual composition.

The plant department contained 180 workers; 164 males and 16 females. Females represent 9 per cent of the worker group. The vast majority of the workers are in the "over 30" generation. The mean age is 36.7 years. High school is the dominant and modal level of formal education. The mean is 12.0 years. Almost all workers are or have been married. The mean number of children is 2.5. Consequently, the worker population of the plant department may be succinctly described as family men of the "over 30" generation who have high school educations (see Table 1).

Table 1: Demographic description of work population (n=180)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	164	91
Female	16	9
Age		
27 years or less	26	14
28 - 31 years	26	14
32 - 34 years	22	12
35 - 36 years	18	10
37 - 40 years	29	16
41 - 42 years	20	11
43 - 44 years	19	11
45 years and over	20	11
Mean	36.7	
Formal Education		
Completed grade school	2	1
Some high school	26	14
Completed high school	117	65
Some college	29	16
Completed college	2	1
No response	4	2
Mean	12.0	
Marital Status		
Married	164	91
Single	8	4
Divorced or separated	8	4
Number of Children		
None	26	14
One	20	11
Two	54	30
Three	30	17
Four	29	16
Five	9	5
Six	2	1
Seven or more	7	4
No response	3	2
Mean	2.5	

The plant department also contains 27 management personnel, but they are not included in this study.

Workers certainly appear to have made their jobs with Michigan Bell a career. In addition, the formal relationships within Michigan Bell appear to be rather stable. The mean years of employment for workers is 15.1. In addition, 133 workers have worked with most members of their current work group for over five years. Finally, 142 workers have worked for their present supervisor for at least one year (see Table 2). This stability is important; for perceptual accuracy is supposed to increase as familiarity with the situation increases, as familiarity with others in the situation increases, and as the social visibility of the situation increases.[3]

The worker group contains 17 occupations which vary in job content, skill level and level of remuneration. Five occupations--station installer, switchman, PBX installer, installer-repairman, station repairman--account for 67 per cent of the group. In addition, 12 occupations are exclusively male, four are exclusively female, and one is sexually heterogeneous (see Table 3).

Finally, the 180 workers in our population are divided into 21 work groups. The size of the work groups varies from 3-13 members with 17 groups in the 6-11 range. The mean group size is 8.5. Besides their size the work groups vary on the bases of occupational and sexual homogeneity. Most groups (13) contain a single occupation while some

Table 2: Workers' time in system and sub-systems (n=180)

	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Time in Company</u>		
Seven years or less	17	9
Eight years	28	16
Nine years	26	14
Ten to sixteen years	27	15
Seventeen years	29	16
Eighteen to twenty-three years	26	14
Twenty-four years or more	27	15
Mean	15.1	
<u>Time with Most Members of Work Group</u>		
One year or less	14	8
Two to five years	33	18
Over five years	133	74
<u>Time under Present Supervisor</u>		
Two months or less	1	1
Three to five months	16	9
Six to eleven months	20	11
One year	23	13
Two to five years	61	34
Over five years	58	32
No response	1	1

Table 3: Worker population by sex, job title and skill level (n=180)

Job Title	Males	Females	Total	Percentages
Skill level #1				
Clerk	0	1	1	1
Order desk clerk	0	6	6	3
Test Center clerk	0	6	6	3
Skill level #2				
Assignment clerk	0	1	1	1
Switchroom helper	3	2	5	3
Skill level #3				
Plant assigner	5	0	5	3
Skill level #4				
Station installer	43	0	43	24
Station repairman	12	0	12	7
Skill level #5				
PBX installer	17	0	17	9
PBX repairman	9	0	9	5
Local testman	6	0	6	3
Skill level #6				
Estimate assigner	3	0	3	2
Exchange repairman	9	0	9	5
Installer-repairman	14	0	14	8
Skill level #7				
Switchman	34	0	34	19
Switchboardman	3	0	3	2
Toll testman	5	0	5	3
Missing	1	0	1	1
Totals	164	16	180	102

contain as many as three occupations. All but four work groups are exclusively male; one is exclusively female (see Table 4).

Operationalization of Variables

The operationalization of dependent and independent variables is presented in this section. Most variables are operationalized on the basis of the question(s) asked to produce the data.

Dependent Variables

Six dependent variables were used in this study. Three variables dealt with the actual and ideal influence of customers and three variables dealt with the actual and ideal influence of local union officials. The variables were measured on a five point scale: a very great deal, great deal, quite a bit, some, little or no. Since the variables are identical for customers and local union officials, the operationalization of each variable is presented only once.

1. Actual influence on department

   In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups have on what goes on in the Plant Department of......District?

2. Actual influence on work group

   In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups have on what goes on in your work group?

Table 4: Work groups by size, occupational and sexual composition (n=21)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Size:		
Three members	1	5
Four members	1	5
Six members	3	14
Seven members	1	5
Eight members	5	24
Nine members	1	5
Ten members	4	19
Eleven members	3	14
Twelve members	1	5
Thirteen members	1	5
Mean	8.5	
Occupational composition:		
One occupation	13	62
Two occupations	1	5
Three occupations	7	33
Sexual composition:		
All male	17	81
All female	1	5
Male and female	3	14

3. Ideal influence on department

In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups should have on what goes on in the Plant Department of.......District?

Independent Variables

Since this study was of an exploratory nature, an attempt was made to find as many independent variables as possible in the data. This section, however, limits the operationalization of independent variables to those variables whose relationships to the dependent variables were strong enough to be included in the findings. The operationalization of the independent variables is reported under the same headings which are used to report the findings in the next two chapters: influence structure; intra-individual phenomena; work group characteristics; superior-subordinate relationships and other.

Influence Structure

The workers' perception of the influence structure was approached through seven questions. Six questions dealt with actual influence; one dealt with ideal influence. Two questions dealing with actual influence asked about the amount of influence ten sources exerted on two organizational levels: departmental and work group. The ideal influence question asked how much influence the same sources should exert on the department. The remaining four questions asked about the amount of actual influence company personnel, the district manager, craftsmen and first line supervisors exert on other sources of influence in the district. All of these questions measure the amount of influence on a five point scale: a very great deal, a great deal, quite a bit, some, little or no.

> In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups have on what goes on in the Plant Department of.......District?

> In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups have on what goes on in your work group?

> In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following persons or groups should have on what goes on in the Plant Department of....... District?

Sources included in all three questions above were AT&T, company, division, district manager, second line supervisor, first line supervisor, workers, individual, customers and local union officials. The following additional sources were included in the question on the work group level: job specifications, tools and equipment, units of productivity and equipment designer.

> In general, how much say or influence do the <u>craftsmen</u>.......have on what the following groups do in the District?

> In general, how much say or influence do the <u>company level people</u>.......have on what the following groups do in the District?

> In general, how much say or influence does the <u>plant manager</u>.......have on what the following groups do in the District?

> In general, how much say or influence do the <u>first line supervisors</u>.......have on what the following groups do in the District?

The groups referred to in the above questions are AT&T people, company level people, division level people, district level manager, second line supervisors, first line supervisors, craftsmen, the individual and local union officials.

Intra-individual Phenomena

The variables in this category which were found to correlate with one or more of the dependent variables were operationalized in the following manner:

> Level of Satisfaction.--How satisfied are you with the following?

The question asked for the worker's level of satisfaction with the company, work group, type of work, chances for promotion, and pay. His response was measured on the following scale: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied.

> Reference Individuals and Groups.--For each of the following persons or groups, how important is it that you maintain their good opinion of you and your accomplishments?

The individuals and groups named were immediate supervisor, supervisor's supervisor, division and company management, customers, work group members, local union officials, peers not in work group, non-Bell friends, the respondent, his family, and persons who belong to the same organizations and clubs. The scale contained the following choices: No importance, little importance, somewhat important, quite important, very important.

Freedom to Set Own Work Pace.--How free do you feel to set your own work pace?

Choices given were no freedom, little freedom, some freedom, quite a bit of freedom and completely free.

Amount of responsibility.--How do you feel about the amount of responsibility you have in your job?

The choices given were like much more, like a little more, exactly the right amount, little too much and too much.

Sense of Belonging.--How strong a "sense of belonging" do you feel you have to the group that reports to your supervisor? How much do you really feel a part of this group?

The choices given were little or no, some and strong.

Skill Level.--What is your present job title?

The ranking of job titles by skill was made by a staff supervisor of Michigan Bell.

Work Group Characteristics

The variables in this category which were found to correlate with one or more of the dependent variables were operationalized in the following manner:

Cohesiveness of Group.--How do the people who report to your supervisor compare with other groups in the ....District that do similar work when it comes to sticking together and helping each other out?

Choices were one of the poorest, not as good as most, about the same as most, better than most, one of the best.

Consensus in Group.--Thinking only of the people who report to your supervisor, how much do they agree among themselves in their opinions about the company and the job?

Choices were no, little, some, good deal and complete.

Attitude toward Best Salesman.--How do the persons in your work group feel about the one who is tops in sales?

Attitude toward Highest Producer.--How do the persons in your work group feel about the one who is the highest producer?

The choices for both of the above questions were dislike him a lot, dislike him quite a bit, no difference, like him quite a bit, like him a lot.

Size of Group.--The number of members in the group.

Time Worked with Group Members.--How long have you been working with most of the members of your present work group at Michigan Bell?

Superior-subordinate Relationships

The variables in this category which were found to correlate with one or more of the dependent variables were operationalized in the following manner:

Conflict between Work Group and Supervisor.--On the whole, would you say there is any tension or conflict between your supervisor and the group which reports to him?

Choices were no, very little, some, considerable and a great deal.

Supervisor's Willingness to Accept Suggestions.--How likely is it that your supervisor will accept a good suggestion concerning the work which you might make?

Choices were not likely at all, not too likely, somewhat likely, quite likely, very likely.

Supervisor's Interest in Welfare of Men.--To what extent is your immediate supervisor interested in the welfare of the men?

Choices were not, slightly, fairly, quite a bit, and very much.

Compliments from Supervisor.--In an average month, how frequently are you complimented by your supervisor about your work?

Time under Present Supervisor.--How long have you been working for your present supervisor?

Other

The variables in this category which were found to correlate with one or more of the dependent variables were operationalized in the following manner:

Frequency of Contact.--In general, how often do you see each of the following groups or persons on the job, whether or not you actually speak to them?

The groups and persons were customers, workers, AT&T people, first line supervisors, second line supervisors, local union officials, company level people, district level manager and division level people. Frequency was measured in the following manner: never, rarely, sometimes, often and very often.

Membership in Other Organizations.--List the names of any organizations to which you belong. Include organizations such as church groups, civic groups, fraternal orders, Pioneers, social groups, etc. If you belong to more than five such organizations, list only the five in which you are most active.

Responses to the above questions were coded in the following manner: Bell organizations, Bell and non-Bell organizations, non-Bell organizations.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of the data was governed by the explora- tory nature of the study. Consequently, the open system model was adopted and the investigation proceeded on three levels: social structure, interpersonal relationships and intra-individual phenomena. These levels of analysis cut across sociology, social psychology and psychology and demonstrate the multi-disciplinary nature of organizational research.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study and the adoption of the open system model, an attempt was made to find as many independent variables in the data as possible. All prospective independent variables were run against all dependent variables. The number of independent variables was considerably cut, however, by the decision to base the correlations on group means rather than individual scores. Nevertheless, a fairly large number of independent variables appeared, and an attempt was made to classify the variables under general headings suggested by previous research on organizations. The findings only report those variables which correlate with a dependent variable at .25 and above. A coefficient of .25 was set as the cutoff point for retaining or discarding a variable because a variable which accounts for less than 6.25 per cent of the variance was considered of negligible importance. A complete listing of the correlations are in Appendix A.

Group means rather than individual scores were used in the correlations because the mean is a more reliable statistic since it compensates for idiosyncratic responses by allowing individual errors to cancel themselves out.

The use of the mean reduced the sample size to 21 and limited the search for independent variables to that phenomena for which means can be computed.

Nonparametric statistics were chosen to measure the relationship between variables because they do not depend upon a normal distribution or on the metric quality of interval scales. They only require that the variables be at least ordinal in scale and numeric in type.[4] Our data are ordinal in scale and numeric in type. In addition, Kendall coefficients were chosen because our data classify a large number of cases into a relatively small number of categories, and the Kendall coefficient is supposed to be "somewhat more meaningful (than Spearman coefficients) when the data contain a large number of tied ranks."[5] Listwise deletion was employed in the correlational analysis to handle missing data because we wanted the zero-order and the partial correlations to be derived from identical populations.[6]

Tests of significance were not used in the analysis because the research design of the original study does not meet the fundamental assumptions on which such tests are based. Morrison and Henkel address themselves to those assumptions in the following manner:[7]

> . . . the notions of sampling distribution and sampling error have no meaning in statistical inference apart from the assumption of randomness in the sample selection procedure--randomness being a central feature incorporated in all probability sampling designs.

> ...a common misuse of significance tests occurs when they are employed on a set of cases termed a "population" rather than a sample." Were it literally true that the cases constitute a population, significance tests would be both inapplicable and unnecessary, since the probability relation of a sample and a population is by definition unity when they are the same. What seems more likely is that the researcher actually considers that his cases do not constitute his conceptual population, regardless of the fact that they exhaust some population that he has specified for study. Significance tests in such an instance are applicable only if the cases at hand have been selected by probability methods--a very unlikely possibility, given that the researcher terms his cases a "population."

The research design of this study did not meet either of these assumptions. The plant department studied was not selected randomly. The selection was purposive and convenient. The Michigan Bell Telephone Company had agreed to finance a study of its operation and the selection of the plant department launched the study. The location of the plant department was convenient for the research team since it did not require excess travel or overnight accommodations. In addition, the cases studied represent a population and not a sample.

Although tests of significance are not appropriate for this study, some readers may feel more comfortable assessing the findings if significance levels were stated. Therefore, the following guidelines are given for two-tailed tests of significance for Kendall rank order correlations in a sample size of 21: Kendall correlation of .25 has a significance level of .11; Kendall correlation

.31, significance level .05; Kendall correlation .40, significance level .01.

The correlations cited in the following chapters are zero-order correlations. Partial correlations are not cited because it is difficult to ascertain the meaning of Kendall partial correlations.

Footnotes

1. Philip M. Marcus and Glenn Jones. _Michigan Bell: Survey of Pontiac Plant Department_. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. September, 1964. Mimeograph.

2. Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley. _Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research_. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co. 1963. pp. 5-61.

3. John W. Kinch. "A Formalized Theory of the Self-Concept" in _Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology_, edited by Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1967. pp. 236-237.

4. Norman H. Nie, Dale H. Bent, C. Hadlai Hull. _Statistical Package for the Social Sciences_. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1970. p. 153.

5. _Ibid_., p. 153.

6. _Ibid_., pp. 148-149.

7. Denton E. Morrison and Ramon E. Henkel. "Significance Tests Reconsidered" in _The American Sociologist_ (4) May, 1969. pp. 133-134.

CHAPTER III

CUSTOMER INFLUENCE

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings which are related to customer influence. The findings are presented in three sections: (1) customer influence on the department, (2) customer influence on the work group and (3) ideal influence of customers on the department. Each of these sections is divided into two parts--amount of influence and correlates of influence. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Customer Influence on Department

Amount of Influence

The plant department, like most social systems, must contend with influence attempts from several sources. Measurement of ten sources of influence on the department were available for this study. The sources are AT&T, company level people, division level people, district manager, second line supervisor, first line supervisor, customers, local union officials, workers and the respondent himself. The measurement scale contained the following categories--little or no, some, quite a bit, a great deal and a very great deal. A mean ranking of the sources was constructed to determine the amount of influence exerted by each source and their positions relative to each other (see Table 5).

Table 5: Mean rankings of sources of influence on departmental level

Source	Mean
District manager	4.0
Division level people	4.0
AT&T level people	3.9
Company level people	3.7
Second line supervisors	3.2
Customers	2.9
First line supervisors	2.5
Local union officials	2.2
Workers	1.8
Respondent himself	1.4

Customers hold a middle rank in the influence structure with a mean of 2.9. They rank below the district manager, division level people, AT&T level people, company level people and second line supervisors. They rank above first line supervisors, local union officials, workers and the respondent himself. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places customers at the high end of the "some influence" category. The means range from 1.4 to 4.0.

Mean differences were computed between customers and other sources of influence on the department in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence customers exerted on the department (see Table 6). These differences show customers exercise considerably less influence on the department than the district manager (1.1), division (1.1), AT&T (1.0), and company (.8). They further indicate customers are slightly less powerful than second line supervisors (.3) and slightly more powerful than first line supervisors (.4). Finally, they show customers exercise considerably more influence than local union officials (.7), workers (1.1) and the respondent himself (1.5). Customers, then, are perceived by workers to exert little more influence than the lowest level of management and a lot more than workers and their representatives.

Table 6: Mean differences between customers and other sources of influence on the departmental level

Source	Mean Difference
District manager	1.1
Division level people	1.1
AT&T level people	1.0
Company level people	0.8
Second line supervisors	0.3
Customers	0.0
First line supervisors	-0.4
Local union officials	-0.7
Workers	-1.1
Respondent himself	-1.5

The most powerful sources of influence on the department are well within the boundaries of the Bell System. The organizational distance which separates these sources from customers is considerable; for customers must penetrate several organizational layers to reach them. The district manager is the most powerful source of influence most accessible to the general public.

The least powerful sources of influence, on the other hand, sit on the boundary of the organization or spend most of their time beyond the organizational boundary. Customers are in frequent and direct contact with them. However, the ability to influence the least influential is not highly productive. The least influential have more of a problem exerting upward influence in the organization than do customers, as the mean rankings indicate. In addition, Kendall correlations presented in the next section of this chapter indicate that upward influence is negatively related to customer influence when the influence attempt originates with workers and first line supervisors and is directed at second line supervisors and the district manager (see Table 7).

Correlates of Influence

Three perspectives are useful in interpreting the eighteen variables and indexes which were found to correlate with customer influence on the department: the organization as a whole, the organization composed of subparts, and the individual worker. These perspectives are most helpful when the organization, its subparts and the individual worker are conceptualized as open systems seeking closure in order to pursue goals through decision making in bounded rationality. The twelve variables which

Table 7: Indexes and variables which correlate with customer influence on the departmental level (n=21)

Indexes and Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
<u>Downward Influence</u>	
District manager on first line supervisors/workers	.41
District management on department	.35
District manager on respondent himself	.27
Second line supervisor on work group	.26
Company on second line supervisor	.26
<u>Upward Influence</u>	
District manager on distant management	.55
First line supervisor on distant management	.47
First line supervisor on department	.29
Workers on district manager	-.26
First line supervisor on local management	-.25
<u>External Influence</u>	
Workers/management on local union officials	.44
Management on local union officials	.39
Customers on work group	.37
<u>Intra-individual Phenomena</u>	
Freedom to set own work pace	-.47
Satisfaction with work	-.32
Skill level	-.23
<u>Work Group Characteristics</u>	
Time worked with group members	-.29
<u>Superior-subordinate Relationships</u>	
Compliments from supervisor	.26

positively correlate with customer influence on the department can most readily be interpreted from the organizational subparts and individual worker perspectives (see Table 7).

Assuming an organization is purposively created for the pursuit of specific goals, we can expect the formal structure of the organization to support these goals. Since the organization is an open system, we can further expect the organization to take steps to control adverse environmental pressure while supporting beneficial environmental pressures. This framework is reflected in the data through the major classes of variables which were found to correlate with customer influence on the department: downward influence, upward influence and external influence.

All twelve variables which are positively correlated with customer influence on the department are, for the most part, positively correlated with each other (see Table 8). This finding indicates that our list of variables may be some of the components of a global variable called commitment to customer service. A closer look at the positively correlated variables in now in order.

All five variables which measure downward influence are positively correlated with customer influence: district manager on first line supervisors/workers (.41), distant management on department (.35), district manager on respondent himself (.27), second line supervisor on work group (.26), and company on second line supervisor (.26). Distant management is defined as division,

Table 8: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with customer influence on the departmental level

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
1	Manager on first line/workers		.22	.35	.19	.53	.32	.13	.33	.33	.16	.26	.21	1
2	Distant management on dept			.07	.25	.19	.16	.28	.24	.02	-.06	.09	-.04	2
3	Second line on work group				.31	.29	.28	.22	.38	.35	.26	.29	.14	3
4	Company on second line					.20	.02	.39	.25	.32	.38	.22	.03	4
5	Manager on respondent himself						.15	.20	.42	.21	.15	-.06	.01	5
6	Manager on distant management							.35	.16	.23	.12	.27	.24	6
7	First line on distant management								.29	.25	.17	.23	.35	7
8	First line on department									.26	.29	-.07	.16	8
9	Workers/mgmt on local union										.70	.36	.36	9
10	Management on local union											.34	.20	10
11	Customers on work group												.18	11
12	Compliments from supervisor													12

company and AT&T. These correlations indicate that internal pressure is being exerted by the formal authority structure on behalf of customers. The pressure, however, is not overwhelming, judging by the number and strength of the correlations.

Upward influence exercised by the district manager and first line supervisors on distant management is positively correlated with customer influence: district manager on distant management (.55) and first line supervisors on distant management (.47). These correlations indicate that the perception of customer influence on the department is related to the ability of local management to successfully represent the customer to higher levels of management. This representation, most likely, is aimed at securing additional organizational resources for customer service: technical assistance, rapid delivery of equipment, overtime, additional facilities, more workers and quality production. This interpretation seems plausible since these two forms of upward influence positively correlate with downward influence in the organization and customer influence on the work group.

The external flow of influence from management and workers to local union officials positively correlates with customer influence: workers/management on local union officials (.44) and management on local union officials (.39). Management is defined as company and district manager. The ability of management and workers to control local union officials positively correlates with downward influence within the district and with upward influence of the district manager and first line supervisors on distant management. Customer influence on the department, then, may be related to the efficient employment of resources, particularly manpower resources, on the district level. This finding points to the interdependence of the elements of the task environment.

External influence is not only beneficial for customer influence on the department when the influence flows from the organization to local union officials, but also when the influence flows from customers to the organization and enters at a different level: customer influence on work group (.37). The conditions which enable customers to exert influence on one level are related to the conditions which enable customers to exert influence on other levels. The downward pressure for customer service on the department filters down to the work group. While the upward influence which produces customer influence on the department, most likely, starts at the work group level.

One other variable positively correlates with customer influence on the department: compliments from supervisor (.26). Compliments from the supervisor correlates with upward influence on distant management and worker/management control of local union officials (see Table 8). Consequently, the compliment from the supervisor may represent favorable feedback from a customer for whom the worker and organization provided a special service.

Just as the positively correlated variables correlated positively with each other, so do the variables which negatively correlate with customer influence positively correlate with each other. Consequently, we assume these variables are also components of a global variable called functional autonomy (see Table 9).

Upward influence which negatively correlates with customer influence originates at the front line of the organization with first line supervisors and workers: workers on district manager (-.26) and first line supervisors on local management (-.25). These correlations are interpreted as an attempt by the front-line to defend itself against over-zealous pursuit of customer service. It should be noted this buffer is only against local management - district manager and second line supervisors.

The four remaining negative correlations shed some light on the conditions which enable workers to close themselves off from external influence: freedom to set own work pace (-.47), satisfaction with work (-.32), skill level (-.23) and time worked with group members (-.29). A person who feels free to set his own work pace has successfully insulated himself from external sources of influence. Satisfaction with the type of work being done dampens mobility aspirations, and consequently, reduces the person's sensitivity to external pressure. Skill

Table 9: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with customer influence on the departmental level

		1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	Workers on district manager		.10	-.01	.11	.02	-.11	1
2	First line on local management			.16	.04	.34	.12	2
3	Freedom to set own work pace				.29	.36	.27	3
4	Satisfaction with work					.27	.11	4
5	Skill level						.31	5
6	Time worked with group members							6

level may tie the worker into complex tasks or complex technology which precludes influence attempts from the company or customers. Finally, the longer members of a group work together the more likely it is that they will develop a definition of the situation on which most members of the group agree.

Our argument, then, is that customer influence on the departmental level is the product of two conflicting processes. On the one hand, the organization is exerting pressure on its members and on an element of the task environment on behalf of customers while, on the other hand, the front line of the organization is making a bid for functional autonomy. Our analysis points to some of the factors which promote functional autonomy. The plausibility of this argument is enhanced when it is noted that the variables which positively correlate with customer influence and the variables which negatively correlate with customer influence are negatively correlated with each other (see Table 10).

Customer Influence on Work Group

Amount of Influence

Fourteen sources of influence were measured on the work group level of organization. Four measures of impersonal control--tools and equipment, job specifications, units of productivity, equipment designer--were added to the ten sources already cited in the discussion

Table 10: Intercorrelations between variables which positively correlate and variables which negatively correlate with customer influence on departmental level

	Workers on Mgr	1st Line/ Local Mgmt	Freedom Set Work Pace	Satis-faction Work Type	Skill Level	Time Worked with Grp
Manager on 1st line/workers	-.48	-.24	-.04	.06	-.13	.05
Distant mgmt on department	-.21	-.06	-.06	-.17	.21	.22
Second line on work group	-.16	-.35	-.23	.01	-.22	.02
Company on second line	-.13	-.31	-.12	-.09	-.23	.14
Manager on respondent himself	-.46	-.11	.06	-.08	-.05	.07
Manager on distant mgmt	-.03	-.19	-.26	-.05	-.02	-.29
First line on distant mgmt	0.00	-.12	-.21	-.23	-.08	-.14
First line on department	-.19	-.04	-.08	.02	-.05	.07
Workers/mgmt on local union	-.21	-.28	-.27	-.23	-.42	-.13
Management on local union	-.08	-.26	-.27	-.21	-.38	.01
Customers on work group	-.13	-.26	-.26	-.29	-.33	-.13
Compliments from supervisor	.13	-.01	-.36	-.07	-.29	-.14

of customer influence on the department. A mean ranking was constructed to measure the amount of influence customers exercised on the work group and their position relative to other sources of influence (see Table 11).

Table 11: Mean rankings of various sources of influence on work group level

Source	Mean
First line supervisors	3.7
Second line supervisors	3.4
District manager	3.4
Tools and equipment	3.2
Job specifications	3.2
Division level people	3.2
Units of productivity	3.0
Customers	2.9
Company level people	2.9
Workers	2.9
AT&T level people	2.7
Equipment designer	2.6
Local union officials	2.1
Respondent himself	2.0

Customers hold a middle rank in the influence structure with a mean of 2.9. They rank below first line supervisors, second line supervisors, district manager, tools and equipment, job specifications, division, and units of productivity. They are equal to company and workers. They rank above AT&T, equipment designer, local union officials and the respondent himself. A qualitative interpretation of the mean keeps customers at the high end of the "some influence" category. The means range from 2.0 to 3.7.

Mean differences were computed between customers and other sources of influence on the work group in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence customers exerted on the work group (see Table 12). These differences show customers only exercise considerably less influence on the work group than first line supervisors (.8). They further indicate that customers are slightly less powerful than second line supervisors (.5), district manager (.5), tools and equipment (.3), job specifications (.3), division (.3) and units of productivity (.1). On the other hand, customers are considerably more powerful than local union officials (.8) and the respondent himself (.9). In addition, customers are slightly more influential than AT&T (.2) and equipment designer (.3) and equal to company and workers.

Table 12: Mean differences between customers and other sources of influence on work group level

Source	Mean Difference
First line supervisors	.8
Second line supervisors	.5
District manager	.5
Tools and equipment	.3
Job specifications	.3
Division level people	.3
Units of productivity	.1
Customers	.0
Company level people	.0
Workers	.0
AT&T level people	-.2
Equipment designer	-.3
Local union officials	-.8
Respondent himself	-.9

Some changes have occurred in the influence structure on the work group level as compared with the departmental level which are worthy of note. First, the range of means has decreased considerably on the work group level as compared to the departmental level. The mean difference between the most powerful and least powerful on the work group level is 1.7. On the departmental level the mean difference is 2.6. Second, the influence on the work group is much more evenly distributed. Customers are not considerably more powerful or considerably less powerful than most other sources of influence. Third, the most powerful sources of influence on the work group sit closer to the boundary of the organization and spend some of their time beyond the organizational boundary. Consequently, they are more accessible to customers than were the most powerful sources on the department. Fourth, the sources of influence which supported customer influence on the department appear to be less influential on the work group while the sources which attempted to block customer influence on the department appear to be stronger.

It is difficult to be at ease with the above comparisons because the addition of the four impersonal controls prevents a direct comparison of customer influence on the department and the work group from being made. Inclusion of the control mechanisms may, in fact, distort the position of influence customers hold on the work group. According to the ranking customers are above company management and AT&T but below tools and equipment, job specifications, and units of productivity. However, these impersonal controls are largely in the hands of company management and AT&T personnel.

Correlates of Influence

Customer influence on the work group exhibits the same pattern which was revealed in the analysis of customer influence on the departmental level. The three perspectives--organization as a whole, organization composed of subparts, and the individual--which were useful on the departmental level are also useful on the work group level. The organization as a whole perspective largely accounts for the variables which are positively related to customer influence while the organization composed of subparts and the individual perspectives account for the negative correlations (see Table 13).

All variables which positively correlate with customer influence on the work group positively correlate with each other (see Table 14). Again, we interpret the list of variables to be components of a global variable called commitment to customer service.

Five measures of downward influence positively correlate with customer influence on the work group: local/distant management on work group (.35); district manager on first line supervisors (.32); first line supervisors on workers (.29); company on work group (.23); and

Table 13: Indexes and variables which correlate with customer influence on the work group level (n=21)

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Downward influence	
Local/distant management on work group	.35
District manager on first line supervisors	.32
First line supervisors on workers	.29
Company level people on work group	.23
Impersonal controls on work group	.23
Upward influence	
First line supervisors on AT&T level people	.32
District manager on division level people	.31
First line supervisors on division level people	.29
First line supervisors on district manager	-.28
First line supervisors on second line supervisors	-.26
Workers on departmental level	-.26
External influence	
Company/district manager on local union officials	.44
Customers on departmental level	.37
Management on local union officials	.34
Local union officials on work group	.30
Intra-individual phenomena	
Identification with customers as reference group	.38
Skill level	-.33
Satisfaction with work	-.29
Freedom to set own work pace	-.26
Work group characteristics	
Consensus in work group on job and company	-.31

Table 14: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with customer influence on the work group level

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Local/distant mgmt on work group		.04	.13	.45	.17	.29	.09	.38	.15	.15	.11	.25	.21	1
2	District manager on first line			.26	.01	.03	.02	.12	.13	.24	.35	.20	.19	.07	2
3	First line on workers				.08	.29	.21	.18	.01	.27	.16	.17	.26	.15	3
4	Company on work group					.58	.28	.24	.30	-.08	.10	-.12	-.04	.20	4
5	Impersonal controls on work group						.23	.03	.08	-.02	.09	-.01	-.04	.31	5
6	First line on AT&T							.23	.61	.24	.35	.12	-.06	-.04	6
7	District manager on division								.28	.21	.43	.14	.01	-.07	7
8	First line on division									.21	.43	.10	.08	-.08	8
9	Company/manager on local union										.40	.83	.47	.31	9
10	Customers on departmental level											.32	.20	.07	10
11	Management on local union												.51	.40	11
12	Local union on work group													.38	12
13	Reference group: customers														13

impersonal controls on work group (.23). Local/distant management is defined as AT&T, division, district manager and second line supervisors. Impersonal controls are defined as job specifications, equipment designer and units of productivity. These correlations are interpreted as evidence that the formal authority of the organization exerts pressure internally on behalf of customer service.

The upward flow of influence is positively correlated with customer influence when it flows from the district manager and first line supervisors to management levels above the district level: first line supervisors on AT&T (.32), district manager on division (.31), and first line supervisors on division (.29). Since the upward flow of influence between the district and higher management levels positively correlate with each other, the flow of influence is conceived as a feedback mechanism by which the operating forces call upon higher management levels for assistance in meeting the goal of customer service.

The external flow of influence continues to be positively correlated with customer influence. The flow of influence is from the organization to the environment and from the environment to the organization: company/district manager on local union officials (.44); customers on department (.37); management on local union officials (.34), and local union officials on work group (.30). Management is defined as company, district manager and first line supervisors. The flow of influence between the organization and the union is important to customer influence because the downward and upward flows of influence which are positively correlated with customer influence are positively correlated with management influence over union officials. Consequently, the amount of influence an external source of influence exerts on the organization appears to be related to the ability of the organization to exert influence over other external sources of influence.

Identification with customers as a reference group is the only variable under intra-individual phenomena which positively correlates with customer influence (.38). Acceptance of a class of individuals as a reference group includes the adoption of that group's frame of reference. Consequently, workers who accept customers as a reference group are more likely to see their jobs from the standpoint of customers. Therefore, they are more open to influence attempts made by customers or on behalf of customers.

The seven variables which negatively correlate with customer influence on the work group positively correlate with each other. These variables, therefore, are again interpreted as components of a global variable called functional autonomy. The variables point to the front-line as the organizational subpart seeking functional autonomy and they call attention to the factors which allow functional autonomy to develop (see Table 15).

Table 15: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with customer influence on the work group level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	First line on district manager		.53	.23	.22	.05	.24	.17	1
2	First line on second line			.35	.40	.04	.10	.22	2
3	Workers on department				.14	.22	-.13	.10	3
4	Skill level					.27	.36	.06	4
5	Satisfaction with work						.29	.26	5
6	Freedom to set own work pace							.12	6
7	Consensus in group on job/company								7

Upward influence within the district level of organization negatively correlates with customer influence on the work group: first line supervisor on district manager (-.28); first line supervisor on second line supervisor (-.26), and workers on department (-.26). These correlations are interpreted as an attempt by the front-line--first line supervisors and workers--to insulate the work group from over-zealous pursuit of the customer service goal.

Three intra-individual variables which appeared on the departmental level remain on the work group level: skill level (-.33); satisfaction with work (-.29) and freedom to set own work pace (-.26). All three of these variables enable the individual to close himself off from external influences. The arguments for the above conclusion were given in the previous section.

The final negatively related variable is consensus in work group on job and company (-.31). Consensus among group members on the definition of the situation provides the members with peer support for their actions. With peer support the individual may feel more comfortable engaging in behavior which is deviant from the organizational perspective.

Consequently, we continue to advance the argument that customer influence is the product of two conflicting processes--compliance to customer service goal and a bid for functional autonomy. Therefore, we expect the variables which positively correlate with customer influence and the variables which negatively correlate with customer influence to be negatively correlated with each other. They are (see Table 16).

Ideal Influence on Department

Amount of Influence

The composition of the influence structure on the department and the ideal influence structure on the department is identical. A mean ranking of these sources was constructed to determine the amount of influence each source should exert on the department and their relative position to each other (see Table 17).

Customers hold a middle rank with a mean of 3.3. They are below division, district manager and company. They are above first line supervisors, local union officials, workers and the respondent himself. They are equal to AT&T and second line supervisors. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places customers in the "quite a bit" category. The means range from 2.0 to 3.7.

Mean differences were computed between customers and other sources of influence on the department in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence customers should exert on the department (see Table 18). These differences show customers should exert less influence than division (.4), district manager (.4) and company (.1), but not much less. Customers should be as influential as

Table 16: Intercorrelations between variables which positively correlate and variables which negatively correlate with customer influence on the work group level

	1st Line on Mgr	1st Line on 2nd Line	Workers on Dept	Skill Level	Satisfaction with Work	Freedom Set Work Pace	Consensus
Local/distant mgmt on work grp	-.38	-.36	-.10	-.17	-.13	-.11	.11
District manager on first line	-.07	-.27	-.20	-.22	.12	-.02	-.12
First line on workers	-.16	.12	.06	.00	.05	-.15	.02
Company on work group	-.36	-.24	-.11	-.04	-.16	-.10	.05
Impersonal controls on work grp	-.31	-.09	-.10	.13	-.16	-.12	-.11
First line on AT&T	-.11	-.03	-.07	.02	-.20	-.15	.04
District manager on division	-.28	.00	.06	-.08	-.08	-.35	-.13
First line on division	-.07	-.16	-.20	-.16	-.22	-.20	.02
Company/mgr on local union	-.18	-.21	-.23	-.41	-.26	-.32	-.11
Customers on department	-.22	-.22	-.09	-.23	-.32	-.47	-.12
Management on local union	-.18	-.22	-.18	-.38	-.21	-.27	-.07
Local union on work group	-.20	-.32	-.10	-.43	-.18	-.25	-.05
Reference group: customers	-.26	-.35	-.19	-.28	-.19	-.10	-.16

Table 17: Mean ranking of influence sources should ideally exert on the departmental level

Source	Mean
Division level people	3.7
District manager	3.7
Company level people	3.4
Customers	3.3
AT&T level people	3.3
Second line supervisors	3.3
First line supervisors	3.1
Local union officials	2.9
Workers	2.6
Respondent himself	2.0

Table 18: Mean differences between customers and other sources of influence in the ideal influence structure of the department

Source	Mean Difference
Division level people	.4
District manager	.4
Company level people	.1
Customers	.0
AT&T level people	.0
Second line supervisors	.0
First line supervisors	-.2
Local union officials	-.4
Workers	-.7
Respondent himself	-1.3

AT&T and second line supervisors and they should exercise slightly more influence than first line supervisors (.2) and local union officials (.4). In addition, customers should exert considerably more influence than workers (.7) and the respondent himself (1.3).

A comparison between the actual and ideal influence structures on the department gives some indication as to how the new situation should develop for customers (see Table 19). The ideal influence structure gives increases in influence to workers (.8), local union officials (.7), first line supervisors (.6), the respondent himself (.6), customers (.4) and second line supervisors (.1) while it decreases the influence of AT&T (.6), company (.3), division (.3) and district manager (.3). This adjustment in the influence structure indicates workers are seeking more functional autonomy from the upper levels of management for the plant department, but, more particularly, for the work group. External sources of influence, customers and local union officials, increase in power.

Changes in the mean differences between customers and other sources of influence in the actual and ideal influence structures support this argument (see Table 20). The power differential between customers and second line supervisors, district manager and distant management are considerably reduced, thereby, creating greater pressure for customer service from customers. However, the power differential between customers and first line supervisors,

Table 19: Mean differences between the actual and ideal influence structures on the departmental level

Source	Actual	Ideal	Difference
Division level people	4.0	3.7	-.3
District manager	4.0	3.7	-.3
Company level people	3.7	3.4	-.3
AT&T people	3.9	3.3	-.6
Second line supervisors	3.2	3.3	.1
Customers	2.9	3.3	.4
First line supervisors	2.5	3.1	.6
Local union officials	2.2	2.9	.7
Workers	1.8	2.6	.8
Respondent himself	1.4	2.0	.6

Table 20: Changes in the mean differences between customers and other sources of influence in the actual and ideal influence structures on the departmental level

Source	Actual	Ideal	Difference
District manager	1.1	.4	.7
Division level people	1.1	.4	.7
AT&T level people	1.0	.0	1.0
Company level people	.8	.1	.7
Second line supervisors	.3	0.0	.3
Customers	0.0	0.0	0.0
First line supervisors	-.4	-.2	-.2
Local union officials	-.7	-.4	-.3
Workers	-1.1	-.7	-.4
Respondent himself	-1.5	-1.3	-.2

local union officials, workers and the respondent himself is also reduced, thereby, giving the front line of the organization some autonomy in deciding how it is to go about providing the service desired by customers.

Correlates of Influence

The same basic pattern which was revealed in the analysis of influence on the department and on the work group reappears in the analysis of ideal influence of customers on the department. Two of the perspectives used in the previous sections continue to be useful: organization as a whole and organization composed of subparts. The individual perspective does not appear to apply to ideal influence (see Table 21).

All of the variables which positively relate to the ideal influence of customers on the department are positively related to each other. Consequently, we again interpret this finding to mean our variables are components of a more global variable: commitment to customer service (see Table 22).

Three measures of downward influence positively correlate with ideal influence: company on second line/first line/workers (.40), local/distant management on workers (.35) and manager on manager/first line/workers (.30). Local/distant management is defined as AT&T, division, manager and second line supervisors. These correlations may be interpreted in the following manner. The downward

Table 21: Indexes and variables which correlate with ideal influence of customers on the departmental level (n=21)

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Downward influence	
Company on second line/first line/workers	.40
Local/distant management on workers	.35
Manager on manager/first line/workers	.30
Upward influence	
First line supervisors on AT&T/division	.24
First line supervisor on district manager	-.47
First line supervisor on second line supervisor	-.38
Workers on local management	-.32
External influence	
Customers on work group level	.45
District manager on local union officials	.27
Customers on departmental level	.26
Work group characteristics	
Consensus in work group on job and company	-.31
Other	
Membership in other organizations	.34
Contact with workers	.26

Table 22: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with the ideal influence of customers on the departmental level

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1	Company on second line/first line/workers		.26	.23	.48	.26	.11	.20	.18	.08	1
2	Local/distant mgmt on workers			.03	.33	.35	.20	.15	.16	-.14	2
3	Manager on manager/first line/workers				.07	.32	.31	.37	.00	.32	3
4	First line on AT&T/division					.29	.08	.45	.08	-.03	4
5	Customers on work group level						.38	.37	.07	.19	5
6	Manager on local union officials							.32	.03	.15	6
7	Customers on departmental level								.06	.22	7
8	Membership in organizations									.03	8
9	Contact with workers										9

influence from management is impressing upon the workers the necessity for greater service to customers. This downward pressure, however, is not followed by a sufficient commitment of resources. Consequently, the more pressure the company exerts on the workers for customer service the more influence the workers want the customers to exert on management in order to get the resources needed to provide the service customers desire.

The ability of first line supervisors to influence distant management positively correlates with ideal influence of customers: first line supervisors on AT&T/division (.24). The more influence first line supervisors can exert on the upper levels of management the more resources and cooperation they can secure from these levels in providing customer service. Under these conditions workers are willing to give customers more influence on the department.

External influence positively correlates with ideal influence: customers on work group level (.45), district manager on local union officials (.27) and customers on departmental level (.26). Again, we find that actual influence is related to ideal influence. The interesting point is that the correlation is much stronger on the work group level than it is on the departmental level. The difference in the strength of the correlations on the two levels may be accounted for by assuming that much of the influence customers exert on the work group requires action on the departmental level. Consequently, the more influence customers exert on the work group the more influence workers want them to exert on the departmental level. Since the ability of customers to exert influence on the department may require workers to extend special services, workers do not want to give customers more influence unless the district manager can influence local union officials in order to prevent labor-management difficulties over the situation.

Two other variables positively correlate with ideal influence of customers on the department: membership in other organizations (.34) and contact with workers (.26). Membership in other organizations places workers in contact with customers on an extended basis in primary group situations. Consequently, workers may see the customer perspective more clearly. Finally, contact with workers may positively correlate with ideal influence of customers because workers receive most of the negative feedback when customers are unable to exert influence on the department.

The four variables which negatively correlate with ideal influence of customers on the department positively correlate with each other. Again, we suggest that these variables are components of a more global variable called functional autonomy (see Table 23).

Three of the negatively correlated variables are measures of upward influence within the district level of organization: first line supervisor on district manager

Table 23: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with the ideal influence of customers on the departmental level

		1	2	3	4	
1	First line on district manager		.53	.15	.17	1
2	First line on second line			.31	.22	2
3	Workers on local management				.41	3
4	Consensus on job and company					4

(-.47), first line supervisor on second line supervisor (-.38), and workers on local management (-.32). These correlations suggest that customers may be a countervailing power which workers employ in their bid for functional autonomy. If workers are unable to govern their own affairs, they want customers to be influential. If workers can govern their own affairs, they do not want customers interfering.

Consensus in the work group on job and company is also negatively correlated with ideal influence of customers (-.31). Consensus within the group provides a barrier to external influence.

As in the previous sections we find that the variables which positively relate with ideal influence and the variables which negatively relate with ideal influence are negatively related to each other. This finding is interpreted as evidence for our conclusion that customer influence is a product of two conflicting processes: commitment to customer service and a bid for functional autonomy by the front-line of the organization (see Table 24).

Summary

Customers appear to exert a moderate amount of influence on the department and work group. On both organizational levels, however, they rank below several levels of management and above organizational members most directly responsible for customer service. Workers would slightly increase the amount of influence customers exert on the department, but they give more influence to the front-line of the organization, thereby, reducing the gap between customers and themselves.

The variables which correlate with customer influence exhibit a consistent pattern which holds across type of influence and level of organization on which influence is exerted. The consistent pattern is revealed when the variables are classified under seven headings: downward influence, upward influence, external influence, intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics, superior-subordinate relationships and other.

Downward influence is positively related to customer influence. Upward influence is positively related to customer influence when it originates within the district and is directed toward distant management. Upward influence is negatively related when it originates with the front-line of the organization and is directed toward local

Table 24: Intercorrelations between variables which positively correlate and variables which negatively correlate with ideal influence of customers on the departmental level

	1st Line on Mgr	1st Line on 2nd Line	Workers on Local Mgmt	Consensus
Company on second line/first line/workers	-.14	-.14	-.09	-.09
Local/distant management on workers	-.38	-.36	.06	.11
Manager on manager/first line/workers	-.08	-.20	-.41	-.17
First line on AT&T/division	-.09	-.08	.12	.02
Customers on work group	-.28	-.26	-.21	-.31
Manager on local union	-.24	-.25	-.30	-.18
Customers on department	-.22	-.22	-.20	-.12
Membership in organizations	-.36	-.14	-.25	-.21
Contact with workers	-.32	-.02	-.19	-.21

management. External influence is positively related whether the flow of influence is from the organization to local union officials, from customers to the organization or from local union officials to the organization. Intra-individual phenomena, for the most part, negatively relate with customer influence. Work group characteristics were negatively correlated while the superior-subordinate relationships were positively correlated. The other category also produced positive correlations.

Customer influence, consequently, appears to be the product of two conflicting processes: commitment of the organization to customer service and a bid for functional autonomy by the organizational members most directly responsible for customer service.

CHAPTER IV

LOCAL UNION OFFICIAL INFLUENCE

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings which are related to local union official influence. The findings are presented in three sections: (1) local union official influence on the department, (2) local union official influence on the work group and (3) ideal influence of local union officials on the department. Each of these sections is divided into two parts--amount of influence and correlates of influence. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Local Union Influence on Department

Amount of Influence

The plant department, like most social systems, must contend with influence attempts from several sources. Measurement of ten sources of influence on the department were available for this study. The sources are AT&T level people, company level people, division level people, district manager, second line supervisor, first line supervisor, customers, local union officials, workers and the respondent himself. The measurement scale contained the following categories--little or no, some, quite a bit, a great deal and a very great deal. A mean ranking of the sources was constructed to determine the amount of influence exerted by each source and their positions relative to each other (see Table 5).

Local union officials hold a low rank in the influence structure with a mean of 2.2. They rank below the district manager, division, AT&T, company, second line supervisors, customers and first line supervisors. They rank above workers and the respondent himself. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places local union officials at the low end of the "some influence" category. The means range from 1.4 to 4.0.

Mean differences were computed between local union officials and other sources of influence on the department in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence local union officials exerted on the department (see Table 25). These differences show local union officials exercise considerably less influence on the department than the district manager (1.8), division (1.8), AT&T (1.7), company (1.5), second line supervisors (1.0), and customers (.7). They further indicate local union officials exercise slightly less influence than first line supervisors (.3) and slightly more than the workers as a group (.4). Local union officials are only considerably more influential than the individual worker (.8). Local union officials, then, exert a low amount of influence on the department and they rank below customers and all levels of management.

They only exert more influence than the individuals they represent.

Table 25: Mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence on the departmental level

Source	Mean Difference
District manager	1.8
Division level people	1.8
AT&T level people	1.7
Company level people	1.5
Second line supervisors	1.0
Customers	.7
First line supervisors	.3
Local union officials	0.0
Workers	- .4
Respondent himself	- .8

Local union officials face a problem also encountered by customers: the organizational distance separating the local union official from the most powerful sources of influence on the department is considerable. In fact, the problem may be more acute for local union officials as they must work through the organizational structure of the union as well as the organizational structure of the company in order to reach the most powerful sources of influence on the department.

Correlates of Influence

The classes of variables which correlate with local union official influence on the department are different than the classes of variables which correlate with customer influence on the department. Local union official influence appears to be related to the individual worker, his work situation and his interaction with union officials more than it is related to the formal authority structure within the organization (see Table 26).

The variables which correlate with local union official influence on the department appear to be most readily understood from the perspective of the individual worker rather than from the perspective of the organization. These variables appear to revolve around the ability of the worker to create a viable life space in which he can function on a day-to-day basis. These variables suggest that the more successful the worker is in creating a viable life space the less influence he perceives local union officials to have. The viability of the worker's life space may reduce the perceived influence of local union officials in two ways: (1) it may reduce the amount of assistance workers need from local union officials, thereby, limiting their opportunities to exercise influence; (2) it may reduce the dependence on local union officials, thereby, reducing the obligation workers feel toward following union leadership.

The argument that a viable life space for workers reduces the influence local union officials exercise on the department is based on the variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence on the department. These variables, for the most part, are

Table 26: Indexes and variables which correlate with local union official influence on the departmental level (n=21)

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Downward influence	
Impersonal controls on work group	-.35
Company on workers	-.28
Upward influence	
Respondent himself on work group	-.40
External influence	
Local union officials on work group	.37
Workers and district manager on local union officials	.30
Company/district manager/first line on local union officials	.27
Intra-individual phenomena	
Indentification with local union officials as reference group	.25
Satisfaction with type of work	-.33
Sense of belonging to work group/cohesiveness of work group	-.33
Skill level	-.27
Satisfaction with pay	-.25
Work group characteristics	
Time worked with members of work group	-.31
Attitude toward best salesman and high producer	-.30
Superior-subordinate relationships	
Time under present supervisor	-.39
Other	
Contact with local union officials	.31
Membership in other organizations	-.25

positively correlated with each other which suggests that they may be components of the global variable we are calling a viable life space (see Table 27).

Several correlations suggest that a stable working situation characterized by primary relations among peers, harmonious relations with superiors and norms supportive of company goals results in the reduction of local union official influence. The influence of stability is based on the correlations between union influence and time under present supervisor (-.39) and time worked with members of group (-.31). These correlations imply that an enduring social relationship among members of a work group and between workers and their supervisor reduces the perception of union influence. Why? Given the existence of an enduring social relationship, it can be inferred, even in imperatively coordinated activities, that consensus has developed on the definition of the situation. The definition of the situation, then, provides guidelines for behavior which tend to reduce the level of conflict among peers and between superior and his subordinates. The reduction or elimination of conflict reduces the perception of local union official influence because it reduces the opportunities for union officials to exercise influence.

Several correlations suggest that the influence of local union officials decreases as the dependency on union protection decreases: influence of respondent on work

Table 27: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence on the departmental level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
1	Company on workers		.05	.32	.06	.39	.08	.11	.12	.10	.18	.08	1
2	Impersonal controls on work group			-.03	-.16	-.03	.05	.13	.06	.39	.24	.35	2
3	Respondent himself on work group				.30	.39	.41	.41	.43	.04	.14	.02	3
4	Satisfaction with work					.16	.16	.27	.12	.11	-.06	.19	4
5	Satisfaction with pay						.34	.27	.26	.06	.14	.25	5
6	Belonging/cohesiveness of work group							.30	.22	.07	.04	.14	6
7	Skill level								.14	.31	.26	.21	7
8	Attitude toward salesman/ producer									-.07	.15	.24	8
9	Time worked with grp members										.20	.49	9
10	Membership in other organizations											.47	10
11	Time under present supervisor												11

group (-.40), satisfaction with type of work (-.33), sense of belonging to group/cohesiveness of group (-.33), satisfaction with pay (-.25), skill level (-.27) and attitude toward best salesman and high producer (-.30).

If a person perceives personal control over his work group, he is less likely to develop grievances. If grievances occur, he should be able to solve them as well as the union official can. By solving the problem himself he reduces his dependence on the union, and consequently, reduces its control of him. Satisfaction with type of work and satisfaction with pay reduces the worker's dependency on the union in two areas in which unions have traditionally based their appeal to workers. A sense of belonging to the work group removes the individual from the highly vulnerable position of the isolated individual and gives him another base of support besides the union. In addition, the greater his sense of belonging to the group the more loyal he will be to it. The more loyal he is to the group the less likely he is to act contrary to the wishes of group members. Consequently, if he develops grievances which are in line with the group's definition of the situation he can count on the group's support and need not get union officials involved. In addition, cohesiveness and sense of belonging negatively correlate with conflict between work group and its supervisor (-.40 and -.35 respectively). This indicates that groups with strong interpersonal bonds do not get into conflict with their supervisors, possibly because the supervisor does not want a mutiny on his hands. Finally, favorable feelings in the group toward the high producer and the top salesman are not likely to create problems for the group either with its supervisor in the department or with upper levels of management. In fact, attitudes which are favorable toward high productivity are likely to bring the group favorable reactions from management when problems occur. Again, the dependency on union officials is reduced.

Two other correlations suggest that union official influence decreases because workers do not feel the union can improve the situation they face: company on workers (-.28) and impersonal controls on work group (-.35). Both of these impingements on the worker's life space originate from sources outside of the power sphere of local union officials.

Finally, membership in other organizations correlates negatively with union official influence (-.25). Membership in other organizations may place the worker in contact with individuals who view the union as an ineffective organization.

The variables which positively correlate with local union official influence are positively correlated to each other. This suggests that these variables are components of a more general phenomenon. However, it is difficult to put a name on that phenomenon. It appears that local union official influence on the department is linked to the willingness of union officials to cooperate with management (see Table 28).

Five variables positively correlate with union influence on the department: workers/manager on local union officials (.30), local union officials on work group (.37), company/manager/first line on union officials (.27), reference group: local union officials (.25) and contact with local union officials (.31).

The external flow of influence from management and workers to local union officials and from local union officials to the work group suggests that local union officials increase their influence on the department when they act as agents of control for the company. Local union officials can exercise upward influence in the company when they demonstrate the ability to control their own members. This ability to act as an agent of control, apparently, leads some union members to identify with local union officials. Contact with local union officials enables workers to see the union officials in action and enables the officials to justify their actions to members.

Finally, the variables which are negatively correlated with local union official influence on the department and the variables which are positively related with local union official influence on the department are negatively correlated to each other. These findings suggest that the construction of a viable life space results in the isolation of the worker from the union. Workers with a viable

Table 28: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with local union official influence on the departmental level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Workers/manager on local union officials		.54	.49	.24	.30	1
2	Local union officials on work group			.51	.41	.33	2
3	Company/manager/first line on union officials				.31	.27	3
4	Reference group: local union officials					.11	4
5	Contact with local union officials						5

life space appear to see union officials as more independent from workers and management and less able to control union members (see Table 29).

Local Union Influence on Work Group

Amount of Influence

Fourteen sources of influence were measured on the work group level of organization. Four measures of impersonal control--tools and equipment, job specifications, units of productivity, equipment designer--were added to the ten sources already cited in the discussion of local union official influence on the department. A mean ranking was constructed to measure the amount of influence local union officials exercised on the work group and their position relative to other sources of influence (see Table 11).

Local union officials hold a low rank in the influence structure on the work group level with a mean of 2.1. They rank below first line supervisors, second line supervisors, district manager, tools and equipment, job specifications, division level people, units of productivity, customers, company level people, workers, AT&T level people and equipment designer. They only rank above the respondent himself. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places local union officials at the low end of the "some influence" category. The means range from 2.0 to 3.7.

Table 29: Intercorrelations between variables which negatively correlate and variables which positively correlate with local union official influence on the departmental level

	Workers/ Mgr on Union	Union on Work Group	Company/Mgr/ 1st Line on Union	Reference: Union	Contact: Union
Company on workers	.03	-.08	.09	-.12	.07
Impersonal controls on work group	-.24	-.04	-.01	.03	-.08
Respondent himself on work group	-.17	-.31	-.14	-.31	-.10
Satisfaction with work	-.16	-.18	-.21	-.35	-.19
Satisfaction with pay	-.11	-.31	-.26	-.40	-.16
Belonging/cohesiveness of group	-.15	-.18	-.16	-.26	-.04
Skill level	-.35	-.43	-.38	-.34	-.43
Attitude toward salesman/producer	-.24	-.37	-.14	-.40	-.13
Time worked with group members	-.25	-.19	.01	-.15	-.26
Membership in other organizations	-.21	-.37	-.13	-.12	-.08
Time under present supervisor	-.26	-.24	-.20	-.40	-.27

Mean differences were computed between local union officials and other sources of influence on the work group in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence local union officials exerted on the work group (see Table 30). These differences show that local union officials exercise considerably less influence than first line supervisors (1.6), second line supervisors (1.3), district manager (1.3), tools and equipment (1.1), job specifications (1.1), division (1.1), units of productivity (.9), customers (.8), company (.8), workers (.8), AT&T (.6) and equipment designer (.5). Local union officials only exercise slightly more influence than the respondent himself (.1).

Table 30: Mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence on the work group level

Source	Mean Difference
First line supervisors	1.6
Second line supervisors	1.3
District manager	1.3
Tools and equipment	1.1
Job specifications	1.1
Division level people	1.1
Units of productivity	.9
Customers	.8
Company	.8
Workers	.8
AT&T level people	.6
Equipment designer	.5
Local union officials	0.0
Respondent himself	- .1

Some of the changes which have occurred in the influence structure on the work group level as compared with the departmental level have already been noted in the section on customer influence on the work group. An additional change which appears pertinent to local union official influence is that union officials exercise considerably less influence on the work group than do workers as a group and only slightly more influence than the respondent himself. On the departmental level local union officials exercise more influence than workers and the respondent himself.

Correlates of Influence

Local union official influence on the work group exhibits the same pattern which was revealed in the analysis of local union official influence on the department. Local union influence continues to be negatively related to a viable life space and positively related to the willingness of local union officials to cooperate with management (see Table 31).

All the variables which are negatively related to local union official influence on the work group are positively related to each other. This finding is interpreted to mean these variables are components of a more global variable which we are calling a viable life space (see Table 32).

Several variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence on the work group also

Table 31: Indexes and variables which correlate with local union official influence on work group level (n=21)

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
<u>Downward influence</u>	
Second line supervisors on work group level	.35
District manager on work group level	.27
First line supervisors on workers	.26
<u>Upward influence</u>	
First line supervisor on second line supervisor	-.32
Respondent himself on work group level	-.31
<u>External influence</u>	
Workers, manager, company, first line on union officials	.59
Manager, company, first line on union officials	.51
Workers on workers, union officials, respondent himself	.39
Local union officials on departmental level	.37
<u>Intra-individual phenomena</u>	
Identification with local union officials as reference group	.41
Identification with customers as reference group	.38
Skill level	-.43
Satisfaction with pay	-.31
Freedom to set work pace	-.25

Table 31, continued

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Work group characteristics	
Size	.28
Attitude toward best salesman and high producer	-.37
Superior-subordinate relationships	
Supervisor's interest in welfare of men	.25
Contact with first line supervisors	-.38
Supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions	-.27
Other	
Contact with customers	.36
Contact with local union officials	.33
Membership in other organizations	-.37

Table 32: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence on the work group level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1	First line on second line		.39	.40	.22	.10	.28	.19	.16	-.14	1
2	Respondent himself on work group			.41	.39	.16	.43	.31	.34	.14	2
3	Skill level				.27	.36	.14	.40	.13	.26	3
4	Satisfaction with pay					.14	.26	.46	.07	.14	4
5	Freedom to set work pace						-.10	.08	-.14	.05	5
6	Attitude toward salesman/producer							.17	.44	.15	6
7	Supervisor accepts suggestions								.13	-.01	7
8	Contact with first line									.22	8
9	Membership in other organizations										9

negatively correlated with local union official influence on the department: respondent himself on work group (-.31), skill level (-.43), satisfaction with pay (-.31), attitude toward best salesman and high producer (-.37), and membership in other organizations (-.37). It is assumed that the interpretations given to these correlations on the departmental level also hold on the work group level.

Four other negatively correlated variables appear at the work group level which did not appear on the departmental level: first line supervisor on second line supervisor (-.32), freedom to set one's own work pace (-.25), contact with first line supervisors (-.38) and supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions (-.27).

Influence of the first line supervisor on the second line supervisor may be negatively correlated with local union official influence because the first line supervisor may be using his upward influence to meet the demands of his workers and to improve their working situation.

Freedom to set one's own work pace may be negatively correlated with union official influence because the perception of freedom reduces the ability of union officials to exercise control.

Contact with first line supervisors may correlate with union influence for the following reasons: (1) the contact may produce beneficial results for the workers and consequently decrease their dependence on the union; (2) the contact may lead to grievances which the union official cannot do anything about; (3) the contact may lead to identification with the supervisor and a pro-management attitude.

Supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions negatively correlates with union official influence because the acceptance of suggestions may eliminate possible sources of irritation. In addition, the acceptance of suggestions may lead to friendlier relations between the supervisor and his subordinates. It most likely reduces the level of conflict which might exist between the work group and the supervisor.

A considerably greater number of variables were found to correlate positively with local union official influence on the work group level than on the departmental level. Again, all the variables which positively relate to local union official influence are positively related to each other. The additional variables which appear on the work group level appear to strengthen the argument that local union official influence is related to the willingness of the officials to cooperate with management; for a number of new variables measure the effectiveness of the formal authority structure and the commitment of workers to the goal of customer service. In short, the influence of local union officials is related to their ability to discipline union members to perform their roles in the system (see Table 33).

Table 33: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with local union official influence on the work group level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Second line on work group		.66	.44	.33	.08	.33	.26	.02	.10	.16	.24	.05	.37	1
2	Manager on work group			.28	.07	.02	.15	.24	.15	.22	.21	.16	.02	.30	2
3	First line on workers				.33	-.08	.23	.17	-.07	.15	.09	.40	.32	.12	3
4	Workers on workers/union/ respondent					.10	.50	.36	.09	-.01	.17	.26	.15	.30	4
5	Union officials on department						.28	.27	.25	-.07	.02	.10	-.04	.31	5
6	Workers/manager/company/ first line on union							.84	.33	.33	.23	.10	.23	.34	6
7	Manager/company/first line on union								.31	.39	.27	.03	.27	.26	7
8	Reference: local union officials									.48	.32	-.17	.22	.11	8
9	Reference: customers										.38	-.03	.46	-.05	9
10	Size of work group											-.07	.32	.01	10
11	Supervisor: welfare of men												.10	.27	11
12	Contact with customers													-.07	12
13	Contact with union officials														13

Three variables which measure the downward flow of influence within the district positively correlate with local union official influence on the work group: second line supervisor on work group (.35); district manager on work group (.27), and first line supervisor on workers (.26). These correlations suggest that union officials exert influence on the work groups to the extent that their influence facilitates orderly operations within the department.

The external flow of influence from management and workers to local union officials and from local union officials to the organization positively correlates with local union official influence on the work group: workers, manager, company, first line supervisors on union officials (.59), manager, company, first line supervisors on union officials (.51), local union officials on the department (.37) and workers on workers, local union officials and the respondent himself (.39). These correlations suggest the following interpretation: local union officials exert influence on the work group when they take actions with which the management of the company and/or union members agree. Union officials are able to get cooperation from the company when they learn how to play ball with the company. Local union officials get cooperation and backing from workers when they take actions which are supported by union members. In addition, union officials increase their influence when workers are able to exercise control over their co-workers. Finally, their ability to exercise influence on a higher organizational level allows or contributes to their ability to exercise influence on a lower level.

Six other variables are positively correlated with local union official influence on the work group: reference group: local union officials (.41); reference group: customers (.38); group size (.28); supervisor: welfare of men (.25); contact with customers (.36); contact with local union officials (.33). These variables suggest that the influence of local union officials on the work group increases as they come under the influence of management and reinforces the exercise of organizational authority that is aimed at providing customer service.

Finally, the variables which negatively relate to local union official influence on the work group negatively relate to the variables which positively relate to local union official influence on the work group. This finding suggests that local union official influence on the work group is the product of two conflicting processes. The influence of local union officials increases as their actions support the exercise of formal authority that is aimed at the goal of customer service. The influence of local union officials decreases as workers are able to construct a viable life space which gives them some functional autonomy (see Table 34).

Table 34: Intercorrelations between variables which negatively correlate and variables which positively correlate with local union official influence on the work group level

	First on 2nd	Self on Group	Skill Level	Pay	Work Pace	Hi Sales Producer	Sug-ges-tions	Contact 1st Line	Other Orgs
Second line on work group	-.25	-.16	-.22	-.06	-.23	.04	-.04	.08	-.04
Manager on work group	-.42	-.22	-.30	-.11	-.08	.00	-.15	.07	.05
First line on workers	.02	-.01	.00	-.11	-.15	.01	.22	-.06	-.28
Workers on workers/union/self	.08	.01	-.26	-.09	-.27	-.17	-.04	-.08	-.40
Union officials on dept	-.16	-.40	-.27	-.25	-.23	-.30	-.22	-.10	-.25
Workers/mgr/co/1st line on union	-.20	-.12	-.43	-.20	-.35	-.19	-.28	-.22	-.25
Manager/co/1st line on union	-.22	-.14	-.38	-.26	-.27	-.14	-.31	-.17	-.13
Reference: union officials	-.26	-.31	-.34	-.40	-.07	-.40	-.50	-.19	-.12
Reference: customers	-.35	-.32	-.28	-.21	-.10	-.28	-.22	-.42	-.04
Size of work group	-.18	-.26	-.20	-.28	-.14	-.24	-.35	-.35	-.13
Supervisor: welfare of men	-.11	-.18	-.18	-.03	-.03	-.13	.17	-.19	-.31
Contact with customers	-.05	-.19	-.16	-.19	.02	-.23	-.10	-.50	-.35
Contact with union officials	-.23	-.10	-.43	-.16	-.42	-.13	-.07	.09	-.08

Ideal Influence on Department

Amount of Influence

The composition of the influence structure on the department and the ideal influence structure on the department is identical. A mean ranking of these sources was constructed to determine the amount of influence each source should exert on the department and their relative position to each other (see Table 17).

Local union officials hold a low rank in the ideal influence structure of the department with a mean of 2.9. They rank below division, district manager, company, customers, AT&T, second line supervisors and first line supervisors. They rank above workers and the respondent himself. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places local union officials at the high end of the "some influence" category. The means range from 2.0 to 3.7.

Mean differences were computed between local union officials and other sources of influence on the department in order to get a clearer picture of the relative influence local union officials should exert on the department (see Table 35). These differences show local union officials should exert considerably less influence than division (.8), district manager (.8) and company (.5) and slightly less than customers (.4), AT&T (.4), second line supervisors (.4) and first line supervisors (.2). Local union officials should exert slightly more than workers as a group (.3) and considerably more than the respondent himself (.9).

Table 35: Mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence in the ideal influence structure of the department

Source	Mean Difference
Division level people	.8
District manager	.8
Company level people	.5
Customer	.4
AT&T level people	.4
Second line supervisors	.4
First line supervisors	.2
Local union officials	.0
Workers	-.3
Respondent himself	-.9

Although the rank of local union officials does not change between the actual and ideal influence structures of the department, their relative influence certainly does. The relative influence of local union officials is increased in two ways. First, local union officials receive the second highest increase in influence. Second, the influence of several other sources is reduced. This process results in a shorter range of means and a more equal distribution of influence (see Table 19).

A comparison of the mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence in the actual and ideal influence structures shows that local union officials would gain on all other sources of influence except workers if the ideal influence structure became reality (see Table 36). The ideal influence structure gives local union officials considerable gains over AT&T (1.2), company (1.1), district manager (1.0), division (1.0) and second line supervisors (.6). Minor gains are granted to local union officials over customers (.3), first line supervisors (.1) and the respondent himself (.1). The ideal influence structure, however, would reduce the difference in influence which local union officials and workers have on the department (-.1).

Table 36: Changes in the mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence in the actual and ideal influence structures in the department

Source	Actual	Ideal	Change
District manager	1.8	.8	1.0
Division level people	1.8	.8	1.0
AT&T level people	1.7	.5	1.2
Company level people	1.5	.4	1.1
Second line supervisors	1.0	.4	.6
Customers	.7	.4	.3
First line supervisors	.3	.2	.1
Workers	- .4	-.3	- .1
Respondent himself	- .8	-.9	.1

These findings suggest that workers want to increase the capability of local union officials to protect them from customers and management, particularly second line supervisors and above. Workers want slightly more protection from first line supervisors; however, they do not want to increase the power of local union officials on the department relative to their own power. In fact, workers want to decrease the power differential between themselves and local union officials. Finally, workers feel local union officials should be considerably more powerful than any individual worker, possibly to protect the group against any deviant individual.

Correlates of Influence

The basic pattern which was revealed in the analysis of influence on the department and on the work group reappears in the analysis of ideal influence of local union officials on the department. A viable life space continues to be negatively related to local union official influence and the willingness of local union officials to cooperate with management continues to be positively related to local union official influence (see Table 37).

All variables which negatively correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials positively correlate with each other. Again, we suggest that these variables are components of a global variable which we are calling a viable life space (see Table 38).

The following variables are considered components of a viable life space: workers on district manager and first line supervisors (-.36); individual on work group (-.35); first line supervisors on second line supervisors (-.27); a sense of belonging to work group (-.42); satisfaction with work and pay (-.40); skill level (-.31);

Table 37: Indexes and variables which correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials on the departmental level (n=21)

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Downward influence	
Company on division	-.26
Company on work group level	-.25
Upward influence	
Workers on district manager/first line supervisors	-.36
Respondent himself on work group level	-.35
First line supervisors on second line supervisors	-.27
External influence	
District manager on local union officials	.52
Local union officials on departmental level	.47
First line supervisors on local union officials	.34
Local union officials on work group level	.32
Customers on the departmental level	.27
Ideal influence	
District manager on departmental level	.33
Respondent himself on departmental level	.26

Table 37, continued

Indexes/Variables	Kendall Rank Correlations
Intra-individual phenomena	
Identification with local union officials as reference group	.31
Sense of belonging to group	-.42
Satisfaction with type of work/pay	-.40
Skill level	-.31
Amount of responsibility given on job	-.27
Work group characteristics	
Attitude toward best salesman and high producer	-.38
Cohesiveness of group	-.30
Consensus in group on job and company	-.30
Superior-subordinate relationships	
Conflict between work group and supervisor	.26
Supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions	-.35

Table 38: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which negatively correlate with ideal influence of local union officials on the departmental level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Company on division		.36	.04	.17	-.07	.33	.06	.22	.46	-.05	.32	.02	.35	1
2	Company on work group			-.10	-.03	-.24	.02	-.15	-.04	.13	.13	-.10	.05	.07	2
3	Workers on manager/1st line				.27	.34	.28	.16	.06	.16	.29	.18	.36	.05	3
4	Respondent himself on work grp					.39	.32	.40	.41	.00	.43	.38	.34	.31	4
5	First line on second line						.30	.15	.40	-.12	.28	.30	.22	.19	5
6	Belonging to work group							.21	.18	.22	.28	.58	.26	.44	6
7	Satisfaction with work/pay								.25	.21	.25	.38	.26	.41	7
8	Skill level									.03	.14	.32	.06	.40	8
9	Amount of responsibility										.02	.29	-.02	.17	9
10	Attitude toward salesman/producer											.13	.33	.17	10
11	Cohesiveness of work group												.27	.40	11
12	Consensus on job and company													.00	12
13	Supervisor: accepts suggestions														13

amount of responsibility given on job (-.27); attitude toward best salesman and high producer (-.38); cohesiveness of group (-.30); consensus in group on job and company (-.30); and supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions (-.35).

The first three variables listed above can be classified as measures of upward influence. The more upward influence workers can exert on their behalf the less they need union officials to intercede for them. Consequently, the less influence they want to give them. The ability of first line supervisors to influence second line supervisors may negatively correlate with ideal influence of local union officials because the upward influence attempts by first line supervisors may be in support of better working conditions for the workers.

Four other variables which negatively correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials measure intra-individual phenomena. When a worker develops a sense of belonging to his work group, he is no longer an isolated individual. He forms primary relationships with his co-workers and he no longer feels like an outsider. In addition, he can count on his co-workers for support independent of any support he may receive from union officials. Satisfaction with type of work and pay makes the work situation more tolerable for the individual feels that he is getting an adequate return for doing something he likes to do. As his skill level increases he becomes more indispensable to the company and less able to be assisted by the union because of his link to technology. As the amount of responsibility the worker is given on the job increases to the point where it is burdensome, the union official is seen as having little influence on his job.

Several work group characteristics also contribute to the viable work situation. The feelings in the group toward the highest producer and top salesman are attitudes which support the company goals and consequently the relationships between the work group and its superiors should be amiable. Cohesion allows the group to act as a unit rather than as separate individuals. Consequently, it is more able to protect its members and to get its demands met than the less cohesive group. Consensus on job and company enables the work group to develop a definition of the situation which will guide its member's actions. A common definition of the situation should reduce grievances and therefore reduce the need for union intervention.

Superior-subordinate relationships also play a role. Acceptance of suggestions by the supervisor may eliminate irritations as well as give the worker some control over their jobs. It also provides the worker with opportunities for self-enhancement. The correlations between company influence on the division and work group levels and ideal influence of local union officials are not readily explainable.

All variables which positively relate to the ideal influence of local union officials are positively related to each other. This suggests that these variables are components of a more global variable which we are calling the willingness of union officials to cooperate with management in providing customer service (see Table 39).

Most of the variables which positively relate to ideal influence of local union officials are measures of the flow of influence from management to local union officials and from local union officials to the two organizational levels: district manager on local union officials (.52), first line supervisors on local union officials (.34), local union officials on department (.47), local union officials on work group (.32) and customers on department (.27).

These correlations suggest that the ideal influence of union officials is related to the willingness of union officials to support the demands made by management on workers in the name of customer service. When this occurs, it appears workers are more likely to take local union officials as a reference group (.31).

Three other variables suggest the possibility that the increase in the influence of local union officials is associated with the conception of the union as a countervailing power: ideal influence of manager (.33), respondent himself on department (.26) and conflict between work group and supervisor (.26).

Table 39: Intercorrelational matrix of variables which positively correlate with ideal influence of local union officials on the departmental level (n=21)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1	Manager on union officials		.25	.44	.46	.32	.26	.17	.27	.24	1
2	Union officials on department			.19	.37	.25	.17	.02	.25	.14	2
3	First line on union officials				.38	.12	-.03	.15	.27	.17	3
4	Union officials on work group					.20	.08	.13	.41	.02	4
5	Customers on department						.29	.14	.02	.19	5
6	Ideal influence of manager							.12	.11	.25	6
7	Ideal influence of respondent himself								-.05	.05	7
8	Reference: union officials									.30	8
9	Conflict with supervisor										9

The variables which positively correlate with ideal influence of local union officials and the variables which negatively correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials are negatively correlated with each other (see Table 40). This suggests that the ideal influence of local union officials is a product of conflicting processes: the attempt by workers to develop a viable life space which includes functional autonomy and the willingness of local union officials to support demands made by management on workers for customer service. Ideal influence of local union officials also appears related to the conception of the union as a countervailing power.

Summary

Local union officials appear to exert a low amount of influence on the departmental and work group levels. On the departmental level they rank below all other sources of influence except workers and the respondent himself. On the work group level they rank below all other sources of influence except the respondent himself. On both organizational levels the mean differences separating local union officials from other sources of influence are considerable. The rank position does not change for local union officials in the ideal influence structure; however, their relative influence increases as they receive the second largest increase in power while the most powerful sources suffer decreases in influence.

Table 40: Intercorrelations between variables which negatively correlate and variables which positively correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials on the departmental level

	Mgr on Union	Union on Dept	1st on Union	Union on Grp	Customers Dept	Ideal Mgr	Ideal Self	Ref: Union	Conflict
Company on division	-.08	-.20	-.17	.00	-.04	-.13	.18	-.11	-.26
Company on work group	-.07	-.17	-.29	-.04	.10	.11	.25	.08	.18
Workers on manager/first line	-.32	.08	-.07	-.10	-.18	-.41	-.35	-.19	-.11
Respondent himself on work grp	-.16	-.40	-.22	-.31	-.07	-.25	-.29	-.31	-.12
First line on second line	-.25	-.16	-.13	-.32	-.22	-.25	-.41	-.26	-.18
Belonging to work group	-.26	-.26	-.18	-.09	-.02	-.16	-.25	-.28	-.35
Satisfaction with work/pay	-.28	-.30	-.19	-.23	-.06	-.09	-.20	-.46	-.28
Skill level	-.27	-.27	-.30	-.42	-.23	-.24	-.16	-.34	-.16
Amount of responsibility	-.16	-.13	-.07	.02	-.22	-.11	.22	-.19	-.31
Attitude: salesman/producer	-.20	-.30	-.20	-.37	.12	-.10	-.08	-.40	.04
Cohesiveness of work group	-.28	-.26	-.18	-.18	-.19	-.20	-.28	-.22	-.40
Consensus on job and company	-.18	-.09	.00	-.05	-.12	-.05	-.20	-.11	-.03
Supervisor: accepts suggestions	-.33	-.23	-.44	-.27	.06	-.07	-.14	-.50	-.45

The variables which correlate with local union official influence exhibit a consistent pattern which holds across type of influence and level of organization on which influence is exerted. The consistent pattern is revealed when the variables are classified under six headings: downward influence, upward influence, external influence, intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relationships.

Downward influence negatively relates to local union official influence when it originates above the district and positively relates when it originates within the district. Upward influence is negatively related to local union official influence. External influence is positively related to union influence whether the flow of influence is from the organization to local union officials, from customers to the organization or from local union officials to the organization. Intra-individual phenomena, for the most part, negatively relate with local union official influence. Work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relations also negatively relate to the local union official influence in most cases.

Local union official influence, consequently, appears to be the product of two conflicting processes: construction of a viable life space by workers which allows them some functional autonomy and the willingness of union officials to support demands made by management in the name of customer service.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The problem under investigation in this study was the perception of external influence by members of an organization. The specific goals of the investigation were (1) to determine the amount of influence the external sources were perceived to exert on the organization and (2) to isolate some variables which were related, positively or negatively, to the perception of external influence.

The data for this secondary analysis were collected in a district plant department of the Michigan Bell Telephone Company. The population of the plant department included 180 workers and 27 supervisors. This study is limited to the workers who were organized into 21 work groups. These work groups were primarily responsible for the construction of the outside plant and for the installation and maintenance of telephones and related equipment.

Two sources of external influence were investigated in this study--customers and local union officials. Both of these sources are considered part of the task environment of a work organization. The influence of customers and local union officials is measured on two organizational levels--departmental and work group.

Two types of influence are measured--actual and ideal. Actual influence is the amount of influence the source does exert on the organization. Ideal influence is the amount of influence the source should exert on the organization. Actual influence is measured on the departmental and work group levels. Ideal influence is measured only on the departmental level.

Perceptual data are employed in the study because advocates of the phenomenological approach to the study of social reality have advanced a persuasive argument which asserts that human behavior is influenced as much or more by perceived or experienced reality as it is by objective reality.

The unit of analysis is the work group. The population contains 21 cases. The measure of association is Kendall rank correlation. Group means are employed in the correlations rather than individual scores because the group means are more stable and reliable; for the random errors of individuals are much more likely to cancel each other out.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into the following parts: (1) Customer influence, (2) Local union official influence, (3) Customer vs local union official influence, (4) External sources of influence and (5) Future research.

Customer Influence

Amount of Influence

Customers are a moderate source of actual influence on the plant department. The mean influence of customers on the departmental and work group levels is identical, 2.9. Customers rank sixth among the ten sources of influence measured on the departmental level and they rank eighth among the 14 sources of influence measured on the work group level. A qualitative interpretation of this mean places customers at the high end of the "some influence" category. The sources of influence measured on the departmental level were AT&T, company, division, district manager, second line supervisor, first line supervisor, customers, local union officials, workers and the respondent himself. Four additional sources were measured on the work group level: job specifications, units of productivity, tools and equipment and equipment designer.

Although the absolute amount of actual influence customers are perceived to exert on both organizational levels is identical, the relative amount of influence customers exert on the two levels is quite different. In part, this is due to the difference in the range of means on the two organizational levels--1.4 to 4.0 on the departmental level and 2.0 to 3.7 on the work group level. Customers are considerably less powerful than four sources of influence on the departmental level and considerably more powerful than three sources. On the work group level customers are considerably less influential than only one other source and considerably more influential than two sources.

Sources much more powerful than customers on the departmental level are the district manager, division, AT&T and company. Customers are considerably more powerful than the respondent himself, workers and local union officials. Customers are slightly less powerful than second line supervisors and slightly more powerful than first line supervisors. The major sources of influence on the departmental level, then, are well within the boundaries of the Bell System, but above the department in the organizational hierarchy. Customers are only more influential than the front-line of the organization--the first line supervisors and workers who directly provide them with service.

The picture changes somewhat on the work group level where the range of means decreases sharply because of a more even distribution of influence among the 14 sources measured. Consequently, customers only exercise considerably less influence than first line supervisors and considerably more influence than the respondent himself and local union officials. The other sources of influence are either slightly above the customers--second line supervisors, district manager, tools and equipment, job specifications, and division--or slightly below customers--equipment designer, AT&T, and workers. Customers exert about the same amount of influence on the work group level as the company and units of productivity.

It is difficult to be at ease with the above comparison because the addition of the four impersonal controls on the work group level prevents a direct comparison of customer influence on the two levels from being made. Inclusion of the control mechanisms may, in fact, distort the position of influence customers hold on the work group. According to the ranking, customers are above the company and AT&T but below tools and equipment, job specifications and units of productivity. However, these impersonal controls are largely in the hands of the company and AT&T.

The position of customers improves in the ideal influence structure on the departmental level. The mean increases to 3.3 and customers move up the ranking structure to a tie for fourth place. A qualitative interpretation of the mean places customers in the "quite a bit" category. The means range from 2.0 to 3.7 in the ideal structure which is identical to the range of means on the work group level. Customers do not exercise considerably less influence than any other source, but they do exercise considerably more influence than the respondent himself. Customers should exercise slightly less influence than division, the district manager and the company and they should exercise slightly more influence than local union officials and first line supervisors. Customers should be about equal with AT&T and second line supervisors.

The improvement in the position of customers in the ideal influence structure on the departmental level is due to two factors: (1) an increase of influence for customers and (2) a redistribution of influence within the Bell System. The amount of influence customers should exert on the departmental level was slightly increased. The redistribution of influence within the Bell System took influence away from AT&T, company, district manager, division and gave additional influence to workers, local union officials, first line supervisors, the respondent himself, and second line supervisors. This adjustment in the influence structure indicates workers are seeking more functional autonomy for the plant department, but, more particularly, the front line of the organization--first line supervisors and the workers--from the upper levels of management and customers. In addition, the redistribution of influence reduces the influence gap separating customers from upper management; however, it also reduces the influence gap separating customers from the front-line of the organization. Consequently, this change in the structure would allow customers to exert more pressure on upper management for service, but it would also allow the front-line of the organization more autonomy in deciding how the service would be provided.

Correlates of Influence

The variables which correlate with customer influence exhibit a consistent pattern which holds across type of influence and level of organization on which influence is exerted. The consistent pattern is revealed when the variables are classified under five headings: downward influence, upward influence, external influence, intra-individual phenomena and work group characteristics.

Downward influence is positively related to actual customer influence on both organizational levels and to ideal customer influence on the departmental level. Customer influence on the departmental level positively correlates with the following measures of downward influence: district manager on first line supervisors and workers, distant management on department, second line supervisor on work group, company on second line supervisor, and district manager on the respondent himself. Distant management is defined as AT&T, company and division. On the work group level, customer influence positively correlates with the following measures of downward influence: local and distant management on work group, district manager on first line supervisors, first line supervisors on workers, company on work group, and impersonal control on work group. Local management is defined as district manager and second line supervisors. Impersonal control is defined as job specifications, units of productivity and equipment designer. Ideal customer influence also positively correlates with three measures of downward influence: company on second line supervisors, first line supervisors and workers, local and distant management on workers and manager on manager, first line supervisor and workers.

The correlation between the downward flow of influence within the organization and the perception of customer influence on the organization is consistent with existing organizational theory. The Michigan Bell Telephone Company is an organization in business to make a profit by selling a service to customers. Consequently, it can be assumed that customer service is a goal of that organization. Given that assumption and taking a functional perspective, one would expect the formal authority structure to exert internal pressure on behalf of customers. The number and strength of the correlations, however, suggest the pressure is not overwhelming.

The upward flow of influence within the organization also correlates with the perception of customer influence. Some of the correlations are positive; others are negative. The nature of the correlation appears to depend on the source and the destination of the influence attempt. Upward influence positively correlates with the actual influence of customers on both organizational levels when the influence flows from the district manager and first line supervisors to distant management. Two correlations reflect this relationship on the departmental level:

district manager on distant management and first line supervisor on distant management. Three correlations support this conclusion on the work group level: first line supervisors on AT&T, district manager on division and first line supervisor on division. The relationship between upward influence and ideal customer influence is consistent, but weak: first line supervisors on AT&T and division.

Upward influence which originates at the front-line of the organization and is directed at local management negatively correlates with the actual influence of customers on both organizational levels and with the ideal influence of customers. Two correlations on the departmental level support this conclusion: workers on district manager and first line supervisor on local management. Three correlations appear to support the finding on the work group level: first line supervisor on district manager, first line supervisors on second line supervisors and workers on department. The upward flow of influence from the front line of the organization to local management is much more strongly related to ideal influence of customers than it is related to the actual influence of customers. This conclusion is based on the following correlations: first line supervisor on district manager, first line supervisor on second line supervisor, and workers on local management.

The upward flow of influence which positively correlates with customer influence may be interpreted in terms of real and stated goals of an organization. The downward flow of influence, most likely, promotes customer service as a stated goal. Actions, however, speak louder than words. Consequently, the perception of customer influence increases when upper levels of management accede to demands made upon organizational resources by organizational members who are directly responsible for providing customer service. The upward influence which negatively correlates with customer influence appears to be a bid for functional autonomy by members of the front-line of the organization; for it negatively correlates with downward influence, upward influence on distant management and ideal influence of customers. Consequently, this flow of influence appears to be boundary maintaining activity by the front-line, possibly to defend itself against overzealous pursuit of customer service by either local management or customers.

External influence which measures the flow of influence between the organization and its task environment appears to be positively related to the actual influence of customers on both organizational levels and to the ideal influence of customers. The flow of influence moves along three paths: (1) organization to local union officials, (2) local union officials to organization, and (3) customers to organization. The data did not contain a measure of the influence flowing from the organization to customers. The flow of influence from the organization to local union officials correlates with customer influence on the departmental level--workers and management on local union officials and management on local union officials--and with customer influence on the work group level--management on local union officials. Management is defined as company and district manager. The influence flow from the organization to local union official also correlates with the ideal influence of customers--district manager on local union officials. The reverse of the above flow--local union officials to organization--only correlates with customer influence on the work group--local union officials on work group. The flow of influence from customer to organization shows the ability to influence one organizational level correlates with the ability to influence the other level. In addition, the ideal influence of customers correlates with the actual influence of customers on the departmental level and the work group level.

The flow of influence from the organization to local union officials may positively correlate with customer influence because the ability of management to influence local union officials may result in fewer work stoppages or slowdowns and to a liberal interpretation of the work rules in the contract which increases the organization's flexibility in handling demands for customer service. The flow of influence from local union officials to the organization may positively correlate with customer influence because local union officials may enforce work rules and productivity standards. Finally, the ability of customers to exert influence on one organizational level may be related to their ability to exert influence on another level because once the boundary of the organization is spanned the organizational members who have responsibilities in the area must respond. Their response to the influence attempt may involve other organizational levels.

Intra-individual phenomena only correlates with the actual influence of customers and the correlations are primarily negative. Three variables account for the negative correlations on both organizational levels: freedom to set own work pace, satisfaction with kind of work performed and skill level. The only positive correlation was between customer influence on the work group level and identification with customers as a reference group.

The intra-individual phenomena may negatively correlate with customer influence because the specific variables measured decrease the individual's sensitivity to environmental pressure. The one variable which positively correlates with customer influence links the worker with the customer and consequently opens him to influence attempts from customers.

Work group characteristics also negatively correlate with customer influence. Consensus on job and company negatively correlates with actual influence of customers on work group level and with ideal customer influence. Time worked with group members negatively correlated with actual customer influence on the department. These variables support the argument that functional autonomy decreases the perception of customer influence.

Three other variables which positively correlate with customer influence strengthen the functional autonomy argument because they reduce functional autonomy. Actual influence of customers on the departmental level correlates with compliments from supervisor while the ideal influence of customers correlates with membership in other organizations and contact with workers.

Finally, it should be noted that the variables which positively correlate with customer influence on each organizational level positively correlate with each other while those variables which negatively correlate with customer influence positively correlate with each other. Consequently, customer influence appears to be the product of two conflicting processes: commitment to the goal of customer service and the bid for functional autonomy by the front line of the organization. The commitment to customer service can be seen in the downward flow of influence, the upward flow of influence to distant management, the external flow of influence and the adoption of customers as a reference group. The bid for functional autonomy is exhibited in the influence attempts the front-line makes on local management, the intra-individual phenomena and work group characteristics.

Local Union Official Influence

Amount of Influence

Local union officials are a low source of actual influence on the plant department. The mean influence of local union officials on the departmental level is 2.2; on the work group level it is 2.1. A qualitative interpretation of these means places local union officials at the low end of the "some influence" category. Local union officials rank eighth among the ten sources of influence measured on the departmental level and thirteenth among the fourteen sources of influence measured on the work group level. The sources of influence measured on the departmental and work group levels are given in the section on customer influence.

The ranges of means on the two organizational levels--1.4 to 4.0 on the departmental level and 2.0 to 3.7 on the work group level--are quite different. However, the relative position of local union officials remains approximately the same. Local union officials are considerably less powerful than several sources on both organizational levels. On the departmental level mean differences show local union officials exercise considerably less influence than the district manager, division, AT&T, company, second line supervisors and customers. They further indicate local union officials exercise slightly less influence than first line supervisors and slightly more than the workers as a group. Local union officials are only considerably more influential than the respondent himself. Local union officials, then, exert a low amount of influence on the departmental level and they rank below all levels of management and customers. They only exert more influence than the individuals they represent.

On the work group level, mean differences show that local union officials exercise considerably less influence than first line supervisors, second line supervisors, district manager, tools and equipment, job specifications, division, units of productivity, customers, company, workers, AT&T and equipment designer. Local union officials only exercise slightly more influence than the respondent himself.

Local union officials continue to rank eighth in a field of ten in the ideal influence structure on the departmental level; however, the absolute amount of influence they should exert increases and their relative position improves. Mean differences show local union officials should exert considerably less influence than division, district manager, company and slightly less than customers, AT&T, second line supervisors and first line supervisors. Local union officials should exert slightly more influence than workers as a group and considerably more influence than the respondent himself.

A comparison of the mean differences between local union officials and other sources of influence in the actual and ideal influence structures shows that local union officials would gain on all other sources of influence except workers if the ideal influence structure became reality. The ideal influence structure gives local union officials considerable gains on AT&T, company, district manager, division, and second line supervisors. Minor gains are granted local union officials over customers and first line supervisors. The ideal influence structure, however, does not give local union officials any gain on the respondent himself and reduces the difference between local union officials and workers.

These findings suggest workers want to increase the capability of local union officials to protect them from customers and management, particularly second line supervisors and above. In addition, the findings suggest workers do not want local union officials to have additional influence over the front line of the organization: first line supervisors and workers. The large differential which is maintained between local union officials and the respondent himself suggests the local union officials should keep individual workers in line.

Correlates of Influence

The variables which correlate with local union official influence also exhibit a consistent pattern which holds across type of influence and level of organization on which the influence is exerted. The consistent pattern is revealed when the variables are classified under six headings: downward influence, upward influence, external influence, intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relationships.

Downward influence is positively and negatively related to local union official influence. The positive relationship only appears at the work group level: second line supervisor on work group, district manager on work group and first line supervisor on workers. The negative relationship only appears at the departmental level, but it includes both types of influence. Actual influence of local union officials on the departmental level negatively correlates with impersonal controls on work group and with company on workers. The ideal influence of local union officials negatively correlates with company on division and company on work group level.

The positive correlations between the actual influence of local union officials on the work group level and downward influence suggests local union officials increase their influence by supporting the formal authority structure within the district. By supporting the formal authority structure local union officials obligate local management to respond fairly to their requests. The negative correlations between the actual influence of local union officials on the departmental level and downward influence indicates the limitations which local union officials have on their influence. The company level of management appears to be outside of their sphere of influence. The negative correlations between the ideal influence of local union officials and downward influence may be the result of pro-company attitudes.

Upward influence is negatively correlated with the actual influence of local union officials on both organizational levels and to their ideal influence on the departmental level. On the departmental level the actual influence of local union officials negatively correlates with the amount of influence the respondent himself has on the work group. On the work group level the actual influence of local union officials negatively correlates with the influence of first line supervisors on second line supervisors and with the respondent himself on work group. Ideal influence of local union officials negatively correlates with workers' influence on district manager and first line supervisors, influence of respondent himself on work group and first line supervisors on second line supervisors.

The flow of upward influence which correlates with the influence of local union officials is contained within the district; it does not involve distant management. These correlations suggest the more influence the front line can exert over its behavior the less influence local union officials are perceived to have. The functional autonomy of the front line may reduce the perception of local union official influence because it may reduce the number of grievances and quickly solve those which do arise.

External influence which measures the flow of influence between the organization and its task environment appears to be positively related to the actual influence of local union officials on both organizational levels and to the ideal influence of local union officials. The flow of influence moves along three paths: (1) organization to local union officials, (2) local union officials to organization, and (3) customers to organization. The data did not contain a measure of the influence flowing from the organization to customers. The flow of influence from the organization to local union officials correlates with local union official influence on the departmental level--workers and district manager on local union officials and company, district manager and first line supervisors on local union officials--and with local union official influence on the work group level--workers, district manager, company and first line supervisors on local union officials and district manager, company, first line supervisors on local union officials and district manager, company, first line supervisors on local union officials. The influence flow from the organization to local union officials also correlates with the ideal influence of local union officials--district manager on local union officials and first line supervisors on local union officials. The reverse of the above flow--local union officials to organization--shows the ability to influence one organizational level correlates with the ability to influence the other level. In addition, the ideal influence of local union officials correlates with the actual influence of local union officials--local union officials on department and local union officials on work group. The flow of influence from customer to organization is only related to the ideal influence of local union officials--customers on the departmental level.

The flow of influence from the organization to local union officials positively correlates with local union official influence because local union officials lack a base of support given the technology employed in the telephone industry and the ambivalent attitude workers have toward the union. Therefore, the influence of local union officials is based on the support they give the formal authority structure. The more local union officials support the formal authority structure the more they come under the control of management. The positive correlation between management control of union officials and the ideal influence of local union officials indicates the membership is satisfied with the situation. The ability of local union officials to exercise influence at one organizational level may be related to their ability to exert influence on another level because the interdependence of the levels may require action at other levels when influence is successfully exerted at any level. Finally, the correlation between the ideal influence of local union officials and the actual influence of customers on the department indicates that local union officials may be a countervailing power of customers. Another correlation which links the ideal influence of local union officials with the actual influence of the district manager on the department supports the conceptualization of local union officials as a countervailing power.

Intra-individual phenomena is positively and negatively correlated with local union official influence on both organizational levels and with the ideal influence of local union officials. The positive correlations are all related to reference group phenomena: identification with local union officials as reference group on department, on work group, and ideal influence. Identification with customers as a reference group also positively correlates with local union official influence on the work group level. Four variables negatively correlate with local union official influence on the departmental level: satisfaction with type of work, sense of belonging to work group and cohesiveness of work group, skill level and satisfaction with pay. Three variables negatively correlate with local union official influence on the work group level: skill level, satisfaction with pay and freedom to set work pace. Four variables negatively correlate with the ideal influence of local union officials: sense of belonging to work group, satisfaction with type of work and pay, skill level and amount of responsibility given on job.

The reference group variables positively correlate with the perception of local union official influence because the adoption of a reference group opens the individual to influence attempts from the reference group since he has adopted its definition of the situation. Consequently, he is more likely to perceive influence attempts from it and to use the attempts as guidelines for his behavior. The variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence reduce the perception of union influence because they reduce the worker's reliance upon the union to provide him with an amenable work environment.

Work group characteristics also positively and negatively correlate with local union official influence. Two variables positively correlate with union official influence--size on work group level and conflict between work group and supervisor with ideal influence. Attitude in work group toward best salesman and high producer negatively correlates with union official influence on the departmental level, on the work group level, and with ideal influence. Another variable which negatively correlates on the departmental level is time worked with members of work group. Two other variables negatively correlate on the work group level: cohesiveness of work group and consensus in group on job and company.

Local union official influence is related to size of work group because the largest work groups are the least skilled work groups. Conflict between work group and supervisor is positively correlated to the ideal influence of local union officials because workers need more representation when they are in conflict with their superiors, and consequently, they want more influence for their protectors--union officials. The negatively correlated variables contribute to a productive working relationship between the workers and their superiors and provide the security of a stable, closely-knit work group which agrees on the definition of the situation. These conditions further reduce the worker's reliance on union officials and consequently leads them to perceive less influence.

Superior-subordinate relations positively and negatively correlate with local union official influence. There is only one positive correlation in this group--supervisor's interest in the welfare of his men with union influence on the work group level. Four negative correlations appear in this group. On the departmental level local union official influence negatively correlates with time under present supervisor. On the work group level local union official influence negatively correlates with contact with first line supervisors and with supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions. Ideal influence of local union officials negatively correlates with supervisor's willingness to accept suggestions.

The positive correlation between supervisor's interest in the welfare of his men and union influence on the work group level indicates the union is given some credit for this interest. The negatively correlated variables again suggest that stable relationships between superiors and subordinates which are characterized by frequent contact and the superior's willingness to listen to his subordinates reduces the dependability of the worker on the union, and therefore, reduces his perception of union influence.

Three other variables appear to be moderately correlated with local union official influence. Membership in other organizations is negatively related to union influence on the department and on the work group. Contact with local union officials positively correlates with union influence on the department and on the work group. Contact with customers positively correlates with union influence on the work group.

Membership in other organizations may negatively correlate with union influence because it puts the worker in contact with other individuals who may convince him of the ineffectiveness of the union. Contact with local union officials, on the other hand, positively correlates with union influence because the contact allows union officials to report their successes and defend their failures.

Finally, it should be noted that the variables which positively correlate with labor union influence on each organizational level positively correlate with each other while those variables which negatively correlate with local union official influence positively correlate with each other and negatively correlate with the positively correlated variables. Local union official influence, consequently, appears to be the product of two conflicting processes: construction of a viable life space by workers which allows them some functional autonomy and the willingness of union officials to support demands made by management in the name of customer service. The bid for functional autonomy is exhibited in the influence attempts the front-line makes on local management, the intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relationships. The willingness of union officials to support management can be seen in the downward flow of influence within the district, the external flow of influence and the adoption of local union officials as a reference group.

Customers vs Local Union Officials

Amount of Influence

Customers exert more influence on the department and work group levels than do local union officials and the workers want customers to exert more influence on the departmental level than do local union officials although the workers did reduce the gap between them.

Customers have an identical mean, 2.9, on both organizational levels. They rank sixth on the departmental level and eighth on the work group level. Local union officials have a mean of 2.2 on the departmental level and 2.1 on the work group. They rank eighth on the departmental level and thirteenth on the work group level. The amount of influence customers and local union officials exert on one organizational level approximately equals the amount of influence they exert on the other level.

Both customers and local union officials receive increases in power in the ideal influence structure. Customers move to a mean of 3.3 and a tie for fourth place. Local union officials move to a mean of 2.8 but retain their eighth rank. The mean increase for customers was .4 while the increase for local union officials was .7, thereby, decreasing the gap between customers and local union officials by .3.

Correlates of Influence

The influence of customers and local union officials appear to be related to the same groups of variables--downward influence, upward influence, external influence, intra-individual phenomena and work group characteristics. The influence of local union officials also relates to superior-subordinate relationships. The correlations between these groups of variables and customer and local union official influence support the broad approach taken toward the problem in this exploratory study.

Although customers and local union officials' influence are related to the same groups of variables, the degree of relationship differs. Customer influence appears more highly related to the formal structure of the organization while local union official influence appears more highly related to the informal structure of the organization. The number and strength of the correlations relate customer influence more strongly to the flow of influence within the organization while local union official influence relates more strongly to intra-individual phenomena, work group characteristics and superior-subordinate relationships. External influence appears important to customer and local union official influence.

Customer influence appears to be actively supported by the organization. The formal authority structure exerts pressure on behalf of customers and it is receptive to pressures originating from customers. In addition, the organization takes steps to control relevant elements of the task environment which may take actions that are harmful to customers.

Local union official influence is more directly related to the life space of the individual worker than it is to the formal authority of the organization. Local union officials appear to lose influence when the life space of the individual improves while their influence appears to increase when the life space of the individual worker deteriorates. In comparison with customer influence, the influence of local union officials seems to increase as they actively support the formal authority structure rather than the other way around.

Finally, both customers' and local union officials' influence negatively correlates with variables which appear to measure a bid for functional autonomy by the front-line of the organization and positively correlate with variables which reduce the functional autonomy of the front-line of the organization.

External Sources of Influence

Up to this point the conclusions of this study have stayed close to the data. Since one of the tasks of science is to produce general statements which cover a wide range of phenomena, the remaining conclusions of this study will be stated at a higher level of abstraction. Consequently, these statements will be phrased in terms of external sources of influence rather than the influence of customers and local union officials.

The data presented in the preceding section of this chapter suggest the following five general statements about external sources of influence:

1. The amount of influence external sources may exert on an organization is inversely related to the functional autonomy of the organization and its subparts.

This is the most general statement suggested by this study. The statement, in fact, is true by definition;

for the more autonomous the organization the less open it is to external pressure. The statement, however, is not limited to the organization as a whole. It also deals with the organization composed of many subparts all of which are seeking functional autonomy. The functional autonomy of the organization as a whole determines whether the external system will be able to enter the internal system. The functional autonomy of the subparts determines the scope of the impact the external pressure will have on the internal system.

2. External sources of influence are subordinate to one or more internal sources of influence.

This statement is based on the finding that in all three influence structures the external sources of influence are always less influential than one or more internal sources of influence. Our definition of an organization as an open system seeking closure in order to pursue goals through decision making in bounded rationality would lead one to expect this result. An organization whose major sources of influence on the internal system were in the external system would find it difficult to pursue its goals rationally because of the constraints and contingencies the external sources would pose for them. In addition, the basic opposition between in-groups and out-groups argues against the control of in-groups by out-groups.

3. The amount of influence an external source of influence exerts on an organization depends upon its base of support in the organization.

The amount of influence customers and local union officials did and should exercise on the plant department differed. Customers consistently exercised more influence than did local union officials. The difference may be due to the fact that the formal authority structure of the organization supported the influence of customers but not the influence of local union officials. The influence of customers was more directly related to organizational goals while the influence of local union officials was more directly related to individual goals. In addition, the organization depends on customers more than it depends on the union.

4. The ability of an external source of influence to exert influence on one organizational level provides a basis for exerting influence on other levels.

The ability of customers and local union officials to exert influence on the departmental and work group levels is moderately correlated. This means the ability to influence one organizational level provides a basis, but it does not guarantee the ability to influence other organizational levels. The ability to influence one organizational level correlates with the ability to influence another level because once the external source of influence crosses the organizational boundary at one point it has entered the internal system. Then, the part of the internal system at which the pressure is being applied may or may not be able to exert pressure on other parts on behalf of the external source. This reasoning draws attention to the point at which the influence attempt enters the organization and the distance between that point and the position of authority which must be influenced.

5. External sources of influence are interdependent.

The amount of influence an external source of influence can exert on an organization is related to the amount of influence other external sources of influence can exert on the organization. In fact, the influence of one source may depend on the ability of the organization to counter influence attempts from other sources. This is demonstrated by the correlations between management control of local union officials and customer influence and the correlations between customer influence and local union official influence. In addition, the correlations between membership in other organizations and customer influence and local union influence indicate that environmental elements not included in the task environment may affect the influence elements of the task environment have on an organization.

Future Research

In this section some suggestions are offered for future research which call for modifications in existing organizational theory and research strategies. The suggestions are concerned with the flow of influence from environment to organization; the flow of influence from organization to environment; the interdependence which exists between the flows of influence between the organization and its environment; the definition of organization; and the global nature of the concepts of organization and environment.

The findings of this study provide empirical support for the proposition that the external system or environment exerts influence on the internal system or organization. The influence of the environment, however, was hardly deterministic and the environmental forces were always subordinated to internal sources of influence. These findings seriously question the ability of the environment to exert substantial influence on the internal system and, therefore, point to the necessity of determining which characteristics of organizations coupled with which characteristics of environments permit the environment to exert more or less influence over which types of organizational behavior. In other words, we suggest looking for the factors which affect the dependency relationship which exists between the organization and its environment and asking which organizational behavior can the environment affect when the dependency relationship is in its favor. This study suggests four variables which strengthen the position of the organization: monopoly of a necessity, size, chronological maturity and automated equipment.

Organizational theorists appear primarily concerned with the flow of influence from the environment to the organization, largely ignoring the fact that organizations do not passively accept influence from the environment, but actively seek to shape, block, and control the type and amount of influence the environment can exert upon it. Consequently, it appears necessary to determine which characteristics of environments permit the organization to exert more or less influence over which types of environmental behavior. These factors may or may not be the same factors which allow the environment to exert influence on the organization. This study points to this dimension in the findings reported on the ability of the organization to control local union officials.

Another line of thought worth pursuing is the interdependence which exists between the flows of influence between the organization and the environment; for the ability of the environment to influence the organization may rest on the ability of the organization to influence the environment. Remember the ability of local union officials to influence the organization depended upon the ability of the organization to influence local union officials. In addition, the influence of customers was linked to the ability of the organization to influence local union officials. These findings also point to the necessity of differentiating the concept of environment into its component parts.

The above conceptualization of the relationship between the organization and its environment questions the definition of an organization as an open system seeking closure in order to pursue goals through decision making in bounded rationality. Rather than seeking closure it appears the organization attempts to regulate the permeability of its boundary in order to obtain the information about the environment which leads to the predictability required by the organization in order to pursue goals through decision making in bounded rationality. Closure is not a sufficient condition for the reduction of uncertainty. In fact, the rational pursuit of goals may require a boundary whose permeability varies with the amount of information required from the environment.

Another obstacle in doing research on the relationships which exist between the organization and its environment is the use of the global concept organization and conceiving it as a highly integrated, homogeneous unit. This study suggests a model which conceptualizes the organization as a set of interrelated systems, all of which are engaged in boundary maintenance activities in order to pursue their own goals in bounded rationality. This model should be extended to all subparts of the organization, including individuals. Using the above model it becomes difficult to refer to environmental influences on the organization. Instead, one is interested in environmental influences on parts of the organization. If one is to determine environmental influences on an organization, one must know how that influence is felt throughout the organization. A straight summation of the amount of influence the environment exerts on each part is not an appropriate measure, however, because the parts must be weighted for their dominance in the organization and their concern for whatever is being influenced. The question, then, is no longer what influence does the environment exert on the organization, but what amounts of influence are exerted by the environment on what parts of the organization. The bonds which unite parts of the organization to the same external sources of influence are different as well as the bonds which unite the same organizational part to different external sources. Consequently, the relationships to analyze are not limited to the organization and its environment, but also include what part of the organization is related to the environment. As our study indicates some organizational parts want more environmental influence. Others may want less.

The above conceptualization also calls attention to the concepts of entry point, organizational distance, interdependence, functional autonomy and power differentials. Entry point is the part of the internal system on which the external influence is originally applied. Organizational distance is the number of levels of authorities and roles which stand between the entry point and the authority position which must act on the influence attempt. Interdependence is the type and degree of interrelationship which exists between the subparts. Functional autonomy is the ability a subpart has to act independently of the other subparts. Power differentials are the ability various subparts have to affect the action of other subparts even in face of opposition. Consideration of these concepts indicates the ability of the environment to influence the organization appears to be a much more complex undertaking than has been heretofore recognized. The ability of the environment to influence an organization, then, depends to a large extent, on the structural arrangements within the organization.

Just as the global concept organization needs to be differentiated into its component parts so must the global concept environment be differentiated into its component parts. The environment is not an integrated, homogeneous unit either. Just as it is a part of the organization and not the organization as a whole which is being affected so it is part of the environment and not the whole environment which is exerting the influence. Consequently, the problem of organization-environment relationships needs to be posed in a very specific manner: how much influence can this part of the environment bring to bear on this part of the organization over this type of issue?

The first distinction which may be used to differentiate the global concept environment into its component parts is the degree of relatedness environmental elements have to goal accomplishment by the organization. This distinction yields two categories: task environment and non-task environment. The task environment has already been classified into four sub-categories: customers, suppliers, regulatory agencies and interfirm associations. These categories, however, are not homogeneous. Customers are not all alike; neither are suppliers, regulatory agencies or interfirm associations. Therefore, an effort should be made to discover the dimensions on which these various environmental elements differ. In addition, little is known about the interdependence which exists within and between these categories. The other major classification, non-task environment, is totally underdeveloped. This category may include other organizations, families and social groups to which the members of the focus organization belong. The major classifications, task and non-task, may be further categorized as to whether they provide inputs for the organization or absorb outputs or both.

All of the above suggests that a much more comprehensive research design is required for investigations of the relationships which exist between the organization and its environment. The study should be designed to provide information on the bilateral flow of influence between the organization and its environment; the characteristics of the organization and the environment which affects the influence flow on specified issues; the differentiation of the organization and the environment into their component parts and the relationships which exist between and among these parts. Since this depth of data would be expensive and difficult to gather on a comparative basis, it is suggested that several case studies be conducted in order to build a more tightly knit conceptual framework which, then, can be checked out through comparative research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakke, E. Wight. Bonds of Organization. Hamden, Conn.: Books. 1966.

Mutual Survival: The Goals of Unions and Management. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books. 1966.

Barbash, Jack. Unions and Telephones. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1952.

Biddle, Bruce J. and Edwin J. Thomas. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1966.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co. 1962.

Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co. 1963.

Canes, Michael. Telephones--Public or Private? London: The Institute of Economic Affairs. 1966.

Cartwright, Dorwin. "Influence, Leadership, Control" in Handbook of Organizations, edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company. 1965. pp. 1-47.

Dahl, R. A. "The Concept of Power" in Behavioral Science, (2), 1957. pp. 201-218.

Day, John. "Authority" in Political Studies, (11), October 1963. pp. 257-271.

Deutsch, Morton and Robert M. Krauss. Theories in Social Psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1965.

Dill, William R. "Environment as an Influence on Managerial Autonomy," in Administrative Science Quarterly, (2), March 1958. pp. 409-443.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Administration and the Consumer" in Administrative Science Quarterly, (3), 1958.

A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press. 1961.

Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964.

Garfield, Paul J. and Wallace F. Lovejoy. Public Utility Economics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964.

Gillmore, Curry W. Bell Telephone Labor Economics. Ph. D. dissertation. Columbia University. 1952.

Goldhammer, H. and E. A. Shils. "Types of Power and Status" in American Journal of Sociology, (45), 1939. pp. 171-182.

Haire, Mason and Josephine S. Gottsdanker. "Factors Influencing Industrial Morale" in Personnel, (27), May 1951. pp. 445-454.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1950.

Heider, Fritz. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1958.

Kinch, John W. "A Formalized Theory of the Self-Concept" in Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology, edited by Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1967. pp. 232-240.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. Organization and Environment. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. 1967.

Levine, Sol and Paul E. White. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships" in Administrative Science Quarterly, (5), March 1961. pp. 583-601.

Lewin, Kurt. Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper-Row, Publisher. 1951.

Litterer, Joseph A. The Analysis of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1967.

Litwak, Eugene and L. F. Hylton. "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies" in Administrative Science Quarterly, (6), 1962. pp. 395-420.

Loomis, Charles P. and Zona K. Loomis. Modern Social Theories. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1965.

Marcus, Philip M. and Glenn Jones. Michigan Bell: Survey of Pontiac Plant Department. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. September, 1964. Mimeograph.

McDavid, John W. and Herbert Harari. Social Psychology: Individuals, Groups, Societies. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. 1968.

McKee, James B. Introduction to Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. 1969.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press. 1964.

Morrison, Denton E. and Ramon E. Henkel. "Significance Tests Reconsidered" in The American Sociologist (4), May 1969. pp. 133-134.

Mouzelis, Nicos P. Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co. 1967.

Newcomb, Theodore M. "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts" in Psychological Review, (60), 1953.

Nie, Norman H., Dale H. Bent, C. Hadlai Hull. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1970.

Nisbet, Robert A. Social Bond. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1970.

Olmsted, Michael S. The Small Group. New York: Random House. 1959.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. New York: The Free Press. 1951.

Pegrum, Dudley F. Public Regulation of Business. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1959.

Presthus, Robert V. "Authority in Organizations" in Public Administration Review, (20), Spring 1960. pp. 86-91.

Purcell, Theodore V. The Worker Speaks His Mind on Company and Union. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1954.

Sargent, S. Stansfeld and Robert C. Williamson. Social Psychology. New York: The Ronald Press Co. 1966.

Sayles, Leonard R. and George Strauss. The Local Union. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1953.

Seidman, Joel, Jack London, Bernard Karsh, Daisy L. Tagliacozzo. "Telephone Workers: White-Collar Unionism" in The Worker Views His Union. The University of Chicago Press. 1958.

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

Shibutani, Tamotsu. Society and Personality. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1961.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1968.

Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. 1966.

Thompson, James D. "Authority and Power in 'Identical' Organizations" in American Journal of Sociology, (62), November 1956. pp. 290-301.

Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1967.

Troxel, C. Emery. "Telephone Regulation in Michigan" in Utility Regulation, edited by William C. Shepherd and Thomas G. Gies. New York: Random House. 1966.

Warren, Roland. "Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation" in Administrative Science Quarterly, (12), December 1967. pp. 396-419.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, edited by Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press. 1964.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Zero-order correlations between dependent variables and independent variables (n=21)

	Actual Influence/Dept		Ideal Influence/Dept		Actual Influence/Grp	
Independent Variables	Customers	Union	Customers	Union	Customers	Union
<u>Actual</u> <u>Influence</u>/<u>Dept</u>						
Workers	-.09	.03	-.16	-.10	-.26	-.10
Division level people	.19	-.12	-.05	.00	-.06	-.24
Company level people	.26	.02	-.03	.09	-.05	-.12
Respondent himself	.03	.09	.00	.05	.00	.18
First line supervisor	.29	.14	.02	.21	-.07	.23
Local union officials	.25		-.20	.47	-.01	.37
Customers		.25	.26	.27	.37	.20
Second line supervisors	.08	.04	-.19	.10	-.13	.06
AT&T level people	.31	-.01	.17	.04	.17	-.09
District manager	.17	.16	-.17	.16	-.02	.17
<u>Ideal</u> <u>Influence</u>/<u>Dept</u>						
AT&T level people	.30	.12	-.01	.07	.00	.12
Local union officials	.27	.47	.02		.04	.32
Customers	.26	-.20		.02	.45	.12
First line supervisors	.17	-.02	.10	-.04	.29	.20
District manager	.29	.17	.04	.33	.07	.08
Workers	.01	.10	-.04	.19	-.08	.05
Respondent himself	.14	.02	.20	.26	.15	.13
Second line supervisor	.04	-.16	-.09	-.06	-.07	.03
Company level people	.32	.08	.15	.12	-.01	-.01
Division level people	.23	.02	.07	.18	-.19	.02

Appendix A, continued

Independent Variables	Actual Influence/Dept Customers	Actual Influence/Dept Union	Ideal Influence/Dept Customers	Ideal Influence/Dept Union	Actual Influence/Grp Customers	Actual Influence/Grp Union
Actual Influence/Group						
Workers	.06	-.14	.00	-.10	.21	.13
Customers	.37	-.01	.45	.04		.30
Local union officials	.20	.37	.12	.32	.30	
District manager	.14	.02	.38	-.02	.34	.27
Second line supervisors	.27	.08	.31	.02	.29	.35
AT&T level people	.08	-.11	.29	-.16	.31	.13
Division level people	.13	-.03	.39	-.11	.29	.10
First line supervisors	.11	-.08	.00	-.16	.14	.13
Respondent himself	-.07	-.40	.01	-.35	-.15	-.31
Company level people	.10	-.17	.20	-.25	.23	-.04
Job specifications	.11	-.30	.14	-.13	.16	-.12
Tools and equipment	.03	-.15	.23	-.07	.28	.14
Equipment designer	.00	-.23	.30	-.01	.26	.11
Units of productivity	.13	-.27	.11	-.16	.17	-.08
Company Influence/District						
Second line supervisors	.26	-.02	.25	.12	.22	.09
Local union officials	.37	.17	.23	.14	.39	.36
District manager	-.11	-.13	.02	-.03	.13	-.07
Company level people	.11	-.10	.12	-.06	.14	-.04
AT&T level people	.08	.02	.00	-.15	-.07	.08
Division level people	-.04	-.20	.19	-.26	.07	.00
Respondent himself	.10	-.19	.28	-.08	.20	-.06
Workers	.09	-.28	.33	-.17	.24	-.08
First line supervisors	.15	-.08	.20	-.16	.11	-.08

Appendix A, continued

Independent Variables	Actual Influence/Dept Customers	Actual Influence/Dept Union	Ideal Influence/Dept Customers	Ideal Influence/Dept Union	Actual Influence/Grp Customers	Actual Influence/Grp Union
<u>Manager Influence/District</u>						
Company level people	.50	.20	.03	.08	.04	.13
Second line supervisors	.20	.07	-.10	.04	-.06	.13
AT&T level people	.30	.04	.10	-.20	.15	.03
Workers	.38	-.03	.20	.10	.17	.06
Respondent himself	.27	-.10	.12	.13	-.06	.00
District manager	.19	-.19	.22	.00	.30	.10
Local union officials	.32	.25	.27	.52	.38	.46
First line supervisors	.35	-.09	.26	.13	.32	.19
Division level people	.43	.01	.24	-.05	.31	.00
<u>First Line Influence/District</u>						
District manager	-.22	.05	-.47	-.11	-.28	-.20
Company level people	.26	.13	-.02	.05	-.11	-.01
Second line supervisor	-.22	-.16	-.38	-.27	-.26	-.33
AT&T level people	.35	.00	.26	-.21	.32	-.06
Respondent himself	-.07	-.03	-.07	.10	.07	.10
Division level people	.43	.17	.20	-.06	.29	.08
First line supervisors	.12	-.18	.16	-.11	.17	.15
Local union officials	.12	.19	.02	.34	.05	.38
Workers	.16	-.07	.17	-.09	.29	.26

Appendix A, continued

	Actual Influence/Dept		Ideal Influence/Dept		Actual Influence/Grp	
Independent Variables	Customers	Union	Customers	Union	Customers	Union
Workers Influence/District						
Division level people	-.10	.14	-.16	-.16	-.11	.13
Respondent himself	.15	.04	-.05	-.14	.17	.28
First line supervisors	-.04	.08	-.20	-.31	-.05	-.01
AT&T level people	-.05	-.08	.14	-.23	.00	-.03
Local union officials	.33	.21	.03	.20	.06	.35
Second line supervisors	-.17	.09	-.30	-.16	-.16	.10
Workers	.12	-.08	.04	.04	.11	.19
Company level people	-.05	-.15	.10	-.24	.10	.00
District manager	-.26	-.01	-.13	-.30	-.13	-.09
Satisfaction						
Company	.00	-.21	.03	-.17	-.10	-.19
Work group	-.06	-.09	-.04	-.08	-.10	.04
Type of work	-.32	-.33	-.02	-.29	-.29	-.18
Chances for promotion	.00	-.12	-.11	-.17	-.20	-.09
Pay	.08	-.25	.06	-.32	.00	-.31
Recognition	-.08	-.13	-.03	-.25	-.21	-.11
Index	-.10	-.25	-.05	-.25	-.19	-.10

Appendix A, continued

	Actual Influence/Dept		Ideal Influence/Dept		Actual Influence/Grp	
Independent Variables	Customers	Union	Customers	Union	Customers	Union
<u>Frequency of Contact</u>						
Customers	-.16	-.04	-.15	.11	.11	.36
Workers	.22	-.19	.26	.11	.19	.07
AT&T level people	-.07	-.20	.15	-.10	-.15	-.14
First line supervisors	.13	-.10	.04	-.18	.03	-.38
Second line supervisors	.34	.04	.19	-.13	.14	-.11
Local union officials	.27	.31	.23	.18	.12	.33
Company level people	.27	.22	.16	-.11	.14	.07
District manager	.07	-.11	.03	-.37	.00	-.22
Division level people	.20	-.09	.08	-.36	.06	-.15
<u>Superior/Subordinate Relationships</u>						
Acceptance of suggestions	.06	-.22	.10	-.35	.00	-.27
Compliments from supervisor	.26	.04	.23	-.05	.18	.10
Knowledge of supervisor	.08	-.02	.11	-.17	.05	-.02
Freedom to discuss personal problems with supervisor	.05	-.05	.32	.03	.00	.06
Welfare of men	.04	.10	.15	.00	.13	.25
Expectations of supervisor	-.06	-.13	.01	.07	-.14	.02
Supervisor cannot solve problems; worker feels better	.02	.09	-.04	.02	-.24	.03

Appendix A, continued

Independent Variables	Actual Influence/Dept Customers	Actual Influence/Dept Union	Ideal Influence/Dept Customers	Ideal Influence/Dept Union	Actual Influence/Grp Customers	Actual Influence/Grp Union
Supervisor solves problem; do not like solutions	.09	-.09	.07	-.19	-.05	.04
Conflict	.19	.14	.01	.26	.04	.01
Work Group Characteristics						
Cohesiveness	-.19	-.26	-.01	-.30	-.11	-.18
Sense of belonging	-.02	-.26	.04	-.41	.06	-.09
Consensus about job	-.12	-.09	-.31	-.30	-.31	-.05
Feeling about high producer	.10	-.25	-.01	-.31	.07	-.29
Feeling about high salesman	.15	-.15	.01	-.35	.10	-.33
Co-worker compliments	.01	-.18	.02	-.13	.00	-.12
Size of work group	-.07	.12	.03	.08	-.01	.28
Occupational heterogeneity	.07	-.07	-.05	-.07	-.12	-.19
Reference Individuals/Groups						
Immediate supervisor	.05	-.11	.22	-.15	.19	.03
Supervisor's supervisor	.17	-.02	.10	.05	.10	.11
Division/company mgmt	.20	.00	.16	.17	.05	.06
Customers	.07	-.07	.17	.17	.38	.38
Work group members	.09	-.16	.16	-.04	.22	.00

Appendix A, continued

	Actual Influence/Dept		Ideal Influence/Dept		Actual Influence/Grp	
Independent Variables	Customers	Union	Customers	Union	Customers	Union
Local union officials	.02	.25	.00	.31	.20	.41
Peers not in work group	.22	-.03	.09	-.02	.00	-.12
Non-Bell friends	.12	-.05	.03	.00	.15	.05
Respondent himself	-.16	-.12	.11	-.20	.14	.24
Family	.08	.01	.10	-.14	.23	.22
Persons who belong to same organizations/ clubs	.23	.17	.10	-.04	.20	-.04
<u>Other</u>						
Formal education	-.06	.00	-.03	.08	.09	-.10
Time in group	-.29	-.31	-.05	-.14	-.13	-.19
Time with supervisor	-.12	-.39	.17	-.19	.02	-.24
Number at retirement party	.05	.14	.16	.13	-.04	.03
Membership in organizations	.06	-.25	.34	-.01	.07	-.37
Amount of responsibility	-.22	-.12	.07	-.27	.01	.02
Freedom to set work pace	-.47	-.23	-.16	-.13	-.26	-.25
Times worked hard	.00	.08	-.01	.02	.03	.01