



RETURNING MATERIALS:  
Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

~~DEC 5 '79~~  
NOV 15 1980  
FEB 7 1990  
APR 4 1990  
MAY 3 '90  
A-D 266

NOV 19 1990  
B22

WORKERS' RESPONSE TO WORKPLACE ORGANIZATION:  
A STUDY OF THE DIRECT CARE STAFF IN A  
FACILITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED

By  
Tullio Caputo

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1984

© Copyright by  
Tullio Caputo  
1984

## ABSTRACT

### WORKERS' RESPONSE TO WORKPLACE ORGANIZATION: A STUDY OF THE DIRECT CARE STAFF IN A FACILITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED

By

Tullio Caputo

This study focusses on the direct care staff of a large facility for the developmentally handicapped. These workers were selected for study since they are representative of a growing number of lower level, white collar workers in the labour force. For the most part, these workers are young, well educated women, who have had little previous work experience. They occupy a position at or near the bottom of the organization's white collar work force and perform their jobs mainly in accordance with a set of predetermined procedures. These workers are left with little opportunity to use their own initiative or to make their own decisions.

The particular configuration of demands and expectations which characterizes the work situation of these employees reflects the problems and contradictions which currently exist in the workplace. These types of white collar jobs were initially heralded as a means of eliminating the drudgery and monotony of heavy, dirty assembly line work and were seen as a means for ending alienation. This promise, however, has gone unfulfilled for many of the new white collar workers, and especially those in the types of jobs being examined here. The current period of economic recession has exacerbated the problems in the workplace and this, in turn, has lead to a renewed interest in both the concept of alienation and the "quality of working life". These



constructs represent the basis for this investigation.

Interviews were conducted with two hundred and sixty Residential Counsellors and their perceptions of need satisfaction at work were examined. It was anticipated that workers who perceived greater autonomy and control at work would also be more likely to experience greater satisfaction of their higher order needs, have more positive orientations to work and be more cooperative and less instrumental or confrontational at work.

The results obtained in this study indicated that the satisfaction of higher order needs was strongly related to the workers' perception of the amount of autonomy or control that they exercised at work. The satisfaction of basic and social needs by contrast, was less strongly related to these factors. In addition, the satisfaction of higher order needs was also found to be strongly related to both positive orientations to work and to positive behavioural responses by these workers.

The implications of these results are consistent with both the concept of alienation employed in this study as well as with the formulations of the advocates of the "quality of working life". It was shown that higher order need satisfaction is greater when people have the opportunity to be autonomous and to exercise control at work. This finding is particularly significant if we are to construct the types of work organizations which are effective and efficient and at the same time provide people the opportunity to grow and develop as human beings by using their skills and abilities at work.

To Mary Anne, Christine and Emily

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Janet Case and Dan Bullard for their enthusiasm and support in the early stages of this project. They helped make this study a reality. In addition, I would like to thank all the people at the Centre who assisted in making this research a very rewarding experience.

Throughout this project, the words of my teacher and friend Seymour Faber kept ringing in my ears. This was at once inspiring and frustrating but it always encouraged me to keep asking questions and to do my best. I will always be grateful to Seymour for being my "sociological" conscience.

Most people have only one thesis committee chairperson. I was fortunate enough to have two. Both Bill Ewens and Bill Faunce have been there for me whenever I have needed them. Their understanding and support have made doing this dissertation a much more enjoyable task. Their ideas and suggestions echo throughout these pages and both have had a tremendous impact on how I think about and make sense of the world. This project could not have been completed without their constant support and I am deeply indebted to them both.

I am grateful to the other members of my committee, Professors Kevin Kelly and James McKee for their help and cooperation.

Special thanks to my friends on the faculty at the University of Manitoba who have stood by me during the writing of this dissertation. They have all shared in the "birthing" pains and their friendship has served to make this experience a little easier.

As always, my parents Michele and Linda Caputo, continued to be a source of strength and love which makes my life fuller and more rewarding than it would otherwise be.

To my friends at Michigan State I send my heartfelt thanks. In particular, to Bill and Margaret Parsons, Kim Shopmeyer, Ginger Macheski, Marvin Finke, Alan Radke and Peter Grimes. They made those long drives to East Lansing worthwhile and made me feel at home when I was with them.

My thanks go to the women and men who work at the Centre, for putting aside their fears and reservations and allowing us to peer into their very private worlds. Their candid responses make this project extremely important and valuable.

I am very grateful to my typist Jean Anazia whose effort often went above and beyond the call of duty. Her patience and understanding during what seemed an endless number of revisions was crucial and much appreciated.

And finally, to my wife Mary Anne. I may have said it before but it is even more true this time around; her patience and understanding, her diligence and determination have helped to make this dissertation a reality. She took care of all the things that needed to be done that I didn't have the time to do. She understood when I had to spend yet another weekend working and couldn't be at home. Throughout this entire process, she managed to remain cheerful and supportive and to keep me headed in the right direction. For these and many other reasons, this project is dedicated to her and through her, to our children.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE. Introduction and Statement of The Problem .....	1
Summary .....	30
CHAPTER TWO. Theoretical Framework and Review of the Literature	35
I. Alienation .....	35
II. Applying the Concept .....	43
III. Alienation and Control: Taylor and Scientific Management .....	56
IV. Alienation and Control: Human Relations Movement ...	63
V. Alienation and Control: Recent Developments .....	77
VI. Alienation and the Quality of Working Life .....	85
VII. Workers' Response to Work .....	102
VIII. Summary .....	124
CHAPTER THREE. Methodology .....	127
I. The Research Site .....	127
II. Sample Selection and Data Collection .....	136
III. A Description of the Residential Counsellors .....	142
IV. Describing the Major Variables .....	147
(i) Alienation and the Quality of Working Life ...	147
(ii) Morale .....	152
(iii) Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation .....	156
(iv) Organizational Variables .....	161
(v) Worker Behaviour Patterns .....	170
CHAPTER FOUR. Data Analysis.....	176
(i) Alienation, QWL and Need Satisfaction .....	176
(ii) Morale .....	181
(iii) Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation .....	192
(iv) Organizational Factors .....	206
(v) The Residential Units .....	212
(vi) The Relationship Between Major Variables .....	228
CHAPTER FIVE. Discussion and Conclusion .....	236
APPENDIX A: Interview Schedule .....	254

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1A. Frequency Distribution for Age, Sex, Marital Status and Number of Dependents .....	143
1B. Frequency Distribution For Employment History Items .....	143
1C. Frequency Distribution of Parent's Occupation and Education .....	144
1D. Frequency Distribution for Religion Items .....	144
2. Frequency Distribution for Basic Need Satisfaction Items .....	149
3. Frequency Distribution for Social Need Satisfaction Items .....	151
4. Frequency Distribution for Higher Order Need Satisfaction Items .....	152
5. Frequency Distribution for Worker Morale Items .....	155
6. Frequency Distribution for Job Satisfaction Items .....	155
7. Frequency Distribution for Job Involvement Items .....	157
8. Frequency Distribution for Maturation Items .....	159
9. Frequency Distribution for Authoritarianism Items .....	162
10. Frequency Distribution for Autonomy Items .....	163
11. Frequency Distribution for Democratic Supervision Items .	164
12. Frequency Distribution of Confrontation Items .....	172
13. Frequency Distribution of Cooperation Items .....	174
14. Cooperation by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction .....	177
15. Confrontation by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction .....	178
16. Frequency Distribution for Items Affecting Morale .....	182
17. Morale by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction .....	187
18. Morale by Organizational Factors .....	188

TABLE	Page
19. Morale by Worker Behaviour Measures .....	191
20. Job Involvement by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction .....	193
21. Intrinsic Motivation by Basic, Social and High Order Need Satisfaction .....	193
22. Job Involvement by Organizational Factors .....	197
23. Intrinsic Motivation by Organizational Factors .....	197
24. Job Involvement by Worker Behaviour Measures .....	201
25. Intrinsic Motivation by Worker Behaviour Measures .....	201
26. Organizational Factors by Basic Need Satisfaction .....	207
27. Organizational Factors by Social Need Satisfaction .....	207
28. Organizational Factors by Higher Order Need Satisfaction .....	207
29. Organizational Factors by Cooperation .....	210
30. Organizational Factors by Confrontation .....	210
31. Frequency Distribution of Authoritarianism in the Four Residential Units .....	213
32. Frequency Distribution of Autonomy in the Four Residential Units .....	213
33. Frequency Distribution of Democratic Supervision in the Four Residential Units .....	213
34. Frequency Distribution of Basic Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units .....	216
35. Frequency Distribution of Social Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units .....	216
36. Frequency Distribution of Higher Order Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units .....	216
37. Frequency Distribution for Job Involvement in the Four Residential Units .....	219
38. Frequency Distribution for Intrinsic Motivation in the Four Residential Units .....	219

TABLE	Page
39. Frequency Distribution for Morale in the Four Residential Units .....	219
40. Frequency Distribution For Cooperation in the Four Residential Units .....	221
41. Frequency Distribution for Confrontation in the Four Residential Units .....	221
42. Frequency Distribution for Age and Sex in the Four Residential Units .....	223
43. Frequency Distribution of Length of Employment at the Centre for the Staff in the Four Residential Units .....	224
44. Frequency Distribution for "Difficulty in Getting a Promotion," Item for the Residential Staff in the Four Residential Units .....	225
45. Frequency Distribution for "How Important is a Promotion to you," Item for the Staff in the Four Residential Units .....	226
46. Frequency Distribution for How Closely Are Rules Followed, Item for the Staff in the Four Residential Units .....	227
47. Multiple Regression of Worker Behaviour and Morale Measures on Job Related Variables .....	228
48. Multiple Regression of Need Satisfaction Measures in Job Related Variables .....	233

#### LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure I. Factor Matrix Including Need Satisfaction and Job Orientation Items .....	151
Figure II. Factor Matrix Including Organizational Factors .	167
Figure III. Factors Matrix Including Behavioural Variables .	171



## Introduction and Statement of the Problem.

The workplace is like a bell curve. At one end are a few workers who will do anything for you, who will work hard no matter what. They'll give the company their all, sometimes more than it deserves. Then there are the majority of the workers in the middle. They'll do what is really necessary but no more. Finally at the other end are the bad ones. They're the guys who will look for any excuse to get out of work and try to find some way to goof off. The problem for your front line supervisors is to keep them from influencing the rest. If they get to the ones in the middle and begin to pull them down, you're in bad trouble."<sup>1</sup>

The manner in which work is organized in our society has undergone a number of significant changes since Taylor first made these observations about workers more than sixty years ago. While technological innovations and changes in management practice have completely reshaped the workplace, the way that people behave at work has remained remarkably unchanged and workers act today much as they did when Taylor was making his observations.

The purpose of this research is to examine some of the factors which affect the decisions that people make about their behaviour at work. What influences some workers to "give the company their all," for example, while others working right along side them "look for any excuse to get out of work"? What role does the organization of the workplace itself play in the apparent alienation and discontent being expressed by many workers today? By addressing these and other related issues, it is hoped that some insight will be gained into the various types of strategies adopted by workers as well as some understanding of the wide variation which exists in their verbal and behavioural responses to work.

This study focuses specifically on the direct care staff of a large institution for the developmentally handicapped. These workers, known as Residential Counsellors, are primarily responsible for the delivery of

personal and health care services to the clients/residents of the institution (The Centre). This particular group of workers was selected for study since their work roles and personal characteristics reflect those of a large and growing segment of the labour force in the service sector of the economy. Their situation is similar to that of people working in a number of lower level white collar occupations. The focus on this group of workers allows a comparison to be made between their responses and those of workers in both more traditional professional/technical industrial jobs as well as to those in related occupations.

Some specific similarities exist between these workers and others in this segment of the labour market on such variables as basic demographic characteristics, the educational requirements for their jobs, their positions in the institution's hierarchy, the specific nature of their work tasks, and the amount of autonomy they exercise at work. These are discussed in greater detail below.

A majority of the Residential Counsellors are young, well educated women, who have had little previous work experience. This is typical among many of the workers in this occupational category. Most of these jobs require specialized training or post secondary education. In the case of the Residential Counsellors (RC's), this consists of the completion of a two year community college programme as well as government certification in the field. These requirements represent a recent upgrading in the entrance level qualifications required for this position. In the past, people were hired with minimum formal qualifications and were given on the job training once hired. This is indicative of a trend which has been occurring in recent years in many of these occupations including laboratory

technologists, child care workers and respiratory and X-ray technologists among others.

The Residential Counsellors occupy a lower status position in the institution's "white collar" hierarchy. While they are accorded higher status than the maintenance workers, house keeping and dietary staff and the clerical staff, they are essentially at the bottom of the institutions client services and health care delivery system. As such, they make few "treatment" decisions of their own, usually following the orders of the doctors and psychologists working at the Centre. Their role is essentially that of a technician, who implements the decisions of higher status professionals by following an already established set of procedures. This is another common feature of jobs at this level and in this segment of the labour market.

Many of the new white collar workers are employed by the government and work in institutions such as schools or hospitals which deliver services directly to their clients. This has resulted in a number of specific problems for these workers, especially in the current period of prolonged economic recession. While they may not experience the same types of pressures which exists in the private, "production for profit" sector, the severe financial restrictions faced by government funded agencies has resulted in such problems as the chronic underfunding of programmes; greatly reduced staffing levels; the deferment of capital expenditures; cutbacks in materials and supplies; and a whole array of other costs cutting measures. This has placed a tremendous strain on already overburden services and has proven particularly difficult on the people who provide these services. The irony of the situation is that the demand for

these services is highest at precisely those times when the economy is weak and additional resources for these types of programmes are unavailable.

A final reason for selecting these particular workers for study, is based on the information garnered through several lengthy discussions with a number of well placed informants working at the Centre. It was discovered during the course of these conversations, that the recently appointed Administrator of the facility had instituted a series of programmes, which were aimed at improving the relations which exist between the RC staff and the Centre's administration. This included such things as an open door policy whereby the RC's could have direct access to the Administrator to discuss work related matters; regularly scheduled staff meetings; improved communications between the central administration and the RC's; the transmission of information to the RC staff concerning policy or programme changes which were being contemplated, etc.

The existence of this type of climate at the Centre was deemed important for the present study since it incorporates some of the key ideas which underlie the "quality of working life" movement. As such, the situation at the Centre provided an ideal opportunity to examine the impact that some of these ideas have on workers, especially in terms of their verbal and behavioural responses to work.

Recently, the "quality of working life" movement has been receiving renewed attention as a salient means of addressing the problems of alienation from work. Leaders from government, business and labour have given their support to QWL initiatives in this regard, with companies such as General Motors and Ford, in conjunction with the United Automobile Workers, leading the way. A number of major QWL programmes have been introduced by these organizations during the last several years. The initial indication

is that there is a potential for QWL based programmes to expand in the future and that this orientation may set the pattern for the emerging structure of industrial relations in this country.

The current research site does not have a formal QWL programme in operation however, as was noted above, the initiatives taken by the Administrator, reflect the philosophical assumptions which underlie the QWL movement. Conducting research of this type in an organization which has an ongoing QWL project would have been extremely difficult if not impossible since the staff in this situation is sensitized beforehand to the types of results they should expect from participation in the programme. This is precisely the type of information which the current research sought to gather. As it was, the RC staff expressed a wide range of opinions on the viability and usefulness of many of the conditions which affected their jobs at the Centre, including those related to the Administrator's actions.

The existence of and response to worker alienation provide the major focus for the current research. In fact, most of the factors described above in relation to the particular group of workers being studied here, addresses the problem of alienation in one way or another. For example, the development of the "quality of working life" movement can be seen as a direct response to this problem. Similarly, the growth of the white collar sector of the labour market was seen by some as the end of heavy, dirty, alienating work.

On the other hand, the principle cause of the problem of alienation for some, was the arrival onto the labour market, of a generation of new, highly educated workers, who were demanding much more from their jobs than their parents had. Their attitudes and behaviour lead some critics to suggest that the work ethic in America was dead.

These events occurred during a particularly turbulent period in American history. The issues and concerns voiced during this time continue to influence the manner in which we currently address the same problems. We begin, therefore, with a brief discussion of the historical circumstances which gave rise to both the growing awareness of the problem of alienation and to the development of the "quality of working life" movement as a response to this problem. This will provide the necessary background for understanding the development of each of these concepts as well as a basis from which to assess the viability of this approach in the present context. It is to this discussion that we now turn.

In January of 1973, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States Government, published a provocative and often controversial report entitled Work In America.<sup>2</sup> This report presented a comprehensive and critical assessment of the problems associated with the institution of work at that time. Both the substance and timing of the document were particularly significant given the political, social and economic climate of the period. The report called for fundamental changes in the way that work was organized and performed. It seemed to capture and crystallize the uneasy mood of the period by giving a specific focus to the concerns expressed. In fact, there was a widespread recognition of the increasing problems of worker alienation and dissatisfaction as well as mounting demands that something be done.

The tumultuous decade of the sixties was finding its expression in the labour force as hostility and disillusionment was on the rise among the nation's workers. It was becoming increasingly clear, to a growing number of observers, that some form of ameliorative action was required and the

Work In America report provided the parameters within which much of the subsequent discussion took place.

The seriousness of the situation had not escaped the view of the politicians of the day. In 1971, Senator Edward Kennedy, for example, introduced a bill entitled "The Worker Alienation Act", which called for an extensive study of the problem of alienation and the development of techniques to prevent its spread.<sup>3</sup> While this bill was eventually withdrawn, it provided the impetus needed to prompt the then Secretary of H.E.W., Elliot Richardson, to commission a special task force to study the matter. The ensuing investigation culminated in the publication of the Work In America report.

The political currency of the situation developing in the country's offices and factories continued to grow and in August of 1973, the United States Senate did pass a bill,

"the aim of which was to provide for research solutions to the problem of alienation among workers in all occupations and industries and technical assistance to those companies and unions, state and local governments seeking to find ways to deal with the problem..."

The Bill went on to recommend,

"the humanization of working conditions and work so as to increase worker satisfaction and diminish the negative effects of worker dissatisfaction; in so far as possible, work should be designed to maximize potentials for democracy."<sup>4</sup>

The concern expressed by the politicians was echoed by both union leaders and corporate executives. This was particularly evident in the contract negotiations which got underway in 1973 between the United Automobile Workers and the "big three" automakers. In these negotiations, the UAW demanded that a joint labour-management committee be established to deal with matters concerning the "Quality of Work Life" and that this request be included in the new contract.<sup>5</sup> During that same year, a letter





of agreement was, in fact, incorporated into the national General Motors-UAW master contract which called for the establishment of just such a committee! Its specific mandate was to encourage collaborative efforts by the union and the company, to solve problems related to work.<sup>6</sup>

As Stokes has noted, it had become readily apparent that "the traditional tools of economic management [had become] impotent in the face of worker alienation and growing economic stress."<sup>7</sup> What was needed was a new approach to deal with the problems of work. The traditional adversarial system of industrial relations which was in operation, contained many destructive elements and was clearly unable to deal with the current problems. He stated that,

"[it was] jerry-built to deal with work force instability, manual jobs fragmented into simple tasks, foremen with awesome disciplinary powers, and a deeply rooted sense that a wide gap existed between those who work and those who manage."<sup>8</sup>

This type of system was out of step with the existing situation. It had little to offer in the way of solutions and in fact served to exacerbate the situation in many ways.

The Work In America report noted that many industrial engineers had equated increased productivity almost exclusively with advances in technology.<sup>9</sup> The human dimension of the production process was completely ignored in their formulations. This was precisely the kind of thinking behind the construction of the General Motors automobile assembly plant in Lordstown, Ohio. The now famous events which took place at that plant serve as a testimony to the shortcomings of the "technology equals productivity" argument. The plant was rumoured to be the most modern and efficient in existence. Indeed, it was heralded as "the very model of automation at that time."<sup>10</sup> A great deal of attention had been paid to the impressive new technology which was introduced at the facility however

little attention was given to the people who worked there. Hostilities at the plant erupted over the pace of the assembly line and the robot-like tasks that the workers were asked to perform and a series of bitter strikes erupted there early in 1972.<sup>11</sup> The authors of *Work In America* pointed out that a serious miscalculation had been made. They state that,

"as the costs of absenteeism, wildcat strikes, turnover and industrial sabotage become an increasingly significant part of the cost of doing business, it is becoming clear that the current concept of industrial efficiency conveniently but mistakenly ignores the social half of the equation."<sup>12</sup>

It is significant that this was nowhere more evident than at the technically superior Lordstown plant!

The growing resistance referred to above indicated that workers were becoming much less willing to accept fragmented, dehumanizing jobs; were less committed to "keeping their noses to the grindstone"; and were less willing to submit to harsh and often arbitrary forms of discipline. This was becoming increasingly apparent in both their attitudes and behaviour and was particularly pronounced among workers who were under thirty-five. As Mills notes,

"The turnoff of the 1970's wasn't just attitude, it was being tabulated across the country in the rising error and rejection rates, in absenteeism and turnover rates, in increasing shoddiness and deteriorating quality of products and services and above all it was being tabulated in the alarming fall of productivity gains to all time lows, despite growing management - and some union - attempts to stem it."<sup>13</sup>

Stokes reports that, between 1968 and 1978, full time factory employees in the United States had an absentee rate of 4.2 percent.<sup>14</sup> The United States Labor Department estimated that this figure could have been cut in half! Moreover, the high absenteeism continued during this period despite high levels of unemployment. Stokes goes on to describe some of the deleterious effects that this has on production,

77

63

63

63

77

63

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

63

77

"the low quality of workmanship on assembly lines...is reflected in the standard American joke that one should not buy a car built on a Monday or a Friday when workers are particularly preoccupied."<sup>15</sup>

Although the problem of alienation described by many of the writers of the period was not new, it had become increasingly visible as the 1960's came to an end and the 1970's began. This may have been due at least in part, to the effects of several events which were taking place during the early 1970's on the international scene. These events served to exacerbate the the nation's problems since the events taking place on the international front contributed directly to the deteriorating domestic economy.

For example, the "alarming" fall in the productivity gains described above came at a time when American industry was beginning to experience mounting competition from goods manufactured abroad. Notably, Japanese and German industries were enjoying unprecedented growth rates brought about largely by their unusually high productivity rates. Their modern plants and more efficient work organizations meant that they were able to sell their products at very competitive prices in the American market. For the first time the monopoly position enjoyed by many American firms was being threatened.

Another factor which had a considerable impact at the time was the oil embargo and energy crisis of the early 1970's. This severely disrupted the domestic American economy and actually sent the nation plummeting headlong into a severe recession. The skyrocketing energy costs reverberated throughout the economy as prices for most goods rose to offset the increased energy costs. Inflation was climbing, as was unemployment, and the nation settled into a condition known as Stagflation.

It is not difficult to see why there was so much concern over worker alienation at this time, since it was linked directly to worker

productivity. It was imperative that some sort of solution to the problem be found in order to boost productivity to previous levels.

Each of the developments outlined above contributed in one way or another to the widespread concern that was expressed by business, union and government leaders, over the problems surrounding work. For many, the target was clearly the falling productivity levels. For others, however, the situation afforded an opportunity to critically examine some of the "structural" problems related to work in a more general sense. Quite often these two concerns were merged in the subsequent effort to discover the causes of worker alienation and especially in the search for a solution. While numerous factors were labelled as possible sources of the problem, several recurring themes began to emerge in the literature. The Work In America report outlines a number of the more important of these. These are discussed below.

Perhaps the most commonly cited cause for the problems of alienation was the entrance into the labour market of an increasing number of new, young, well educated workers. These workers were bringing new characteristics, new attitudes and new expectations with them, about what work should be like. On the opposite side, the structure of work had changed very little over time and could not meet these emerging expectations. The result of this mismatch was evident in the ensuing response made by these people to work.<sup>16</sup>

Several factors were identified as having a major impact on the situation. These included the increased educational attainment of the American population in general and of the new entrants into the labour market in particular. In addition, the relative prosperity experienced by the post war generation meant that many of these new workers had never

experienced economic hardships. Images of the depression existed only in novels and movies for these workers. These factors combined to create a generation of workers who were interested in more than simply earning a living and they were demanding a great deal more from their work.<sup>17</sup> Their schooling had taught them to aspire to high ideals such as democracy and freedom and few were prepared for the rigidly controlled, hierarchical and bureaucratic work organizations they encountered. Simply stated, they wanted more than was being offered. They wanted jobs that were challenging, satisfying and interesting.

"Simplified tasks for those who are not simple minded; close supervision by those whose legitimacy rests only on a hierarchical structure and jobs that have nothing but money to offer in an affluent age are simply rejected. For many of the new workers, the monotony of work, the scale of organization and their inability to control the pace and style of work are cause for resentment which they, unlike older workers, do not repress."<sup>18</sup>

Thus, the primary concern of these young workers centered on the nature of their jobs rather than on wages or security issues. This fact was reflected in a number of studies which focussed on the changing attitudes of workers. Herrick and Quinn, for example, examined the effects of various job factors thought to be related to job satisfaction and found that only one of the top ten of these factors, was associated with economic variables such as pay or job security.<sup>19</sup> The other nine were found to revolve around issues related to job control.

Similarly, in an extensive study conducted by the University of Michigan, workers were asked to rate twenty five aspects of work in the order of their importance. Here again, it was found that "good pay" was not at the top of the list but ranked fifth behind interesting work; enough help and equipment to get the job done; enough information to get the job done and enough authority to get the job done.<sup>20</sup>

The changing attitudes and expectations among the nation's workers was variously described as the demise of the work ethic in America or more sardonically as a reflection of the particularly singular mood of the times.<sup>21</sup> In any case, it was clear that the situation in the workplace was changing rapidly and as the Lordstown experience had shown, the social aspects of production could no longer be ignored. In a sense, the identification of the young workers and their expectations as the source of the unrest in the workplace provided a modicum of hope since it meant that the problems of work were not unresolvable. As the authors of *Work In America* note, "working conditions are far easier to change than demographic factors!"<sup>22</sup> Thus while work could be redesigned to accommodate the changing demands of the workforce, problems based on such factors as age, sex, race or class are more difficult to handle!

A second problem discussed in *Work In America* centers on the decreasing number of people in the United States who are self-employed.<sup>23</sup> The report indicated that fewer and fewer Americans would have the opportunity to be self-employed as time went on. What this signifies is that a growing number of people will not have the option of working for themselves, and in a very real sense, will lose the ability to control their own lives. Instead, a growing proportion of the labour force will find themselves working in large scale, authoritarian organizations, where they will have little opportunity to have any say in the decisions that affect their work lives.

For many years, the possibility of working for oneself allowed a significant number of American workers to apply their talents and expend their energies as they saw fit. Much of the folklore of the nation, in fact, rests on the image of the rugged frontiersman making his way alone

across uncharted territory. The thought of having to work for someone else, let alone alongside several thousand others, in a dirty, noisy, grimy factory, is wholly unpalatable in this context. The mythology reflected the idea that if a people worked hard, applied themselves, and their skills, talents and ingenuity properly, great success was not only possible but likely. Few can reach these algeristic heights however, while working on an assembly line! Most in fact stop dreaming of them!

A third and perhaps most important factor outlined in *Work In America*, describes the anachronistic nature of the existing industrial relations system. This was largely based on the system of "Scientific Management" developed by Fredrick W. Taylor at the turn of the century.

It was Taylor,

"the father of time and motion studies, who broke down each task into its component parts and then designed the single most efficient way to do the whole job. Concern for the worker got lost in the shuffle. "In the past, the man has been first," wrote Taylor. "In the future, the system must be first." Taylor's fanatical devotion to the rationalization of production led him to glorify the dehumanizing nature of his theories. "All possible brain work should be removed from the shop... the time during which the man stops to think is part of the time that he is not productive."<sup>24</sup>

This type of work organization is most often identified with the assembly line which has been widely cited as a major source of worker alienation.<sup>25</sup> "The psychological damage wrought by having one's human ingenuity and creativeness compacted into a nineteen second cycle" becomes readily apparent especially when the task has to be repeated 1500 times a day!<sup>26</sup> Reich describes work under this system as mindless, exhausting boring, servile, hateful and something to be endured.<sup>27</sup> The authors of *Work In America* suggest that a concept of efficiency based upon such a model ignores the costs of this system in terms of the harm it does to people as well as the production which is lost due to the hostility it



engenders. They conclude that the costs of this system far outweigh its benefits.<sup>28</sup>

A number of pronounced similarities exist between many of the factors discussed above with respect to their contributions to the existence of worker alienation. The most common and recurring theme among them is that of the control exercised over the labour process. For instance, many of the new members of the labour force found the lack of control they had in their jobs distasteful. The diminishing opportunities for self-employment also refers specifically to the fact that fewer and fewer workers will be able to be their own boss and thus control their own work lives. The anachronistic nature of Taylorism rests largely on the conscious and deliberate attempt of this system, to remove all control from the person doing the work and relocating it in the company's planning department.

Control over one's work is seen therefore as a major factor in the existence of worker alienation and thus as a vital feature in any attempt to solve the problem. This notion is incorporated throughout the Work In America report and is emphasized in particular in the prescriptions offered by the authors for change. They call for work to be redesigned in such a fashion as to provide workers with an opportunity to participate in the decisions that affect their lives.<sup>29</sup> The Quality of Working Life movement reflects many of these same concerns. Proponents of this approach argue that work should be designed so as to take into account the needs and abilities of the people who do the work and that these workers should have control over their work lives.<sup>30</sup>

These types of ideas began to emerge slowly during the early 1970's. Concern over the experiences of people at work began to grow in several quarters at that time, and while similar ideas were being expressed, it was

difficult, as Mills notes, to give the movement a name. It was described as "the quiet revolution"; "the quality of work phenomenon"; "the quality of work life"; "human productivity"; "the changing world of work" etc. etc. He chooses the term Human Resource Development to refer to these concerns.<sup>31</sup> In the 1980's, this area has increasingly become subsumed under the rubric of the "Quality of Working Life." (QWL).

Over the past decade, the QWL movement has undergone a number of significant changes. Initially, the impetus for work redesign and reorganization was spearheaded by proponents of the QWL approach as well as by the ideas of the researchers at the Tavistock Institute who were beginning to focus on the "socio-technical" nature of the workplace.<sup>32</sup> The initial response to these types of ideas was quite favourable.<sup>33</sup> Interest in "hot" new concepts such as job enrichment and worker participation spread rapidly and became quite fashionable among managers and with the public in general. However, as the results of many of the early and amateurish experiences proved unimpressive, the idea began to lose its currency and by the middle of the decade the movement began to fade. People were becoming more and more preoccupied with the worsening economic climate. This continued, for the most part, through to the end of the decade.

The 1980's have witnessed a steady resurgence of interest in the "Quality of Working Life" concept. Buttressed by a growing number of specialists in the field and the knowledge gained from past experiences, many organizations began showing an interest in establishing QWL programmes of their own. Support from the union movement also increased during this time and today they are active participants in, and in many instances, initiators of QWL projects. Government has also become quite active in

this area and a number of QWL centers have been established throughout the country with government support.<sup>34</sup>

One of the principle tasks of the present research is to examine the viability of some of the basic ideas upon which the QWL concept is built. Essential among these is the notion that worker participation in the decisions that affect his/her work life is the key to reducing worker alienation. While this is a central tenet of the QWL approach, it also forms the basis of the theoretical framework for the current research. This framework which is based on the concept of alienation developed by Karl Marx, will be described in greater detail below. It is important at this point however, to examine the similarities which exist between the philosophical underpinnings of the QWL approach and Marx's concept of alienation.

To begin with, both constructs define work as a central feature of human society. Work is seen to extend far beyond the factory gates and office walls and to reverberate throughout society. In the QWL model, work is looked at as an anchoring institution for the individual and what happens at work impacts directly on the rest of the person's life. For Marx, work, as human activity, provides both the means for staying alive in the physical sense as well as the means for expressing the uniquely human attributes which identify us as distinctly human beings. Work, in this sense, gives meaning to life and links individuals together with other members of the human "species".<sup>35</sup>

The major response to work alienation during the last decade has, in one way or another, reflected both the ideas about alienation and the importance of work. Thus work humanization, job enrichment, job enlargement and work redesign are based, to varying degrees, on the idea that

human work should be more than simply a means for making a living. The closer these programmes come to the Marxian position for solving alienation, the greater the amount of control placed in the hands of the worker. While job enlargement, for example, offers workers very little in the way of increased control over their work, QWL projects may range from being simple problem solving encounters, to "quality circles", to situations in which worker's control is the explicit goal of the project.

The amount of worker control extant in any particular work organization is indicative of the extent to which the organization in question reflects Tayloristic management principles or more democratic forms of work organization. The implication here is that the more "democratic" an organization, the less alienating it will be. It should be clear, however, that this does not mean that any existing organization can move beyond the parameters which define it as being part of a capitalist economic system. On the other hand, it would be unwise to ignore the fundamental differences which exist between organizations since some are clearly more democratic than others. In addition, the experience of increased participation and democratic decision making itself may have enormous implications for both the workers involved and for society in general. As was noted above, the increased educational level of young workers had a marked impact on the aspirations, expectations and behaviour of these workers. The potential impact of a generation of workers who have been even marginally exposed to democracy in the workplace is unclear. The consciousness which arises in this context, however, will be much different from that of workers who have no experience with democracy at all!

A second remedy to the problem of alienation which was advanced during this period was the hope that many placed in the increasing number of white

collar jobs that were supposed to be created. The labour market had been experiencing a shift away from the traditional industrial jobs, to jobs in the tertiary sector of the economy. The heavy, dirty, assembly line jobs in the old line industries were thought to be the inherent cause of much of the discontent. The new jobs, on the other hand, would be cleaner, more desirable, higher status, more challenging, etc. etc., and in this way would eliminate the source of the problem.

This represented the promise of the "white collar world."<sup>36</sup> It was based on the expansion of the service sector, especially in the knowledge processing and information industries. The lure of the computer age proved quite seductive, and many heralded its arrival. Unfortunately, the spanking new technology did little to alter the underlying production relations in the economy, and those who managed to find work in these new "high tech" industries, discovered that very little had changed. For the vast majority of people, the promise of the "white collar" society failed to materialize. Very few of those who were absorbed into the service sector found the challenge, status and desirability that had been forecast for these jobs.<sup>37</sup>

Several aspects of this development warrant further consideration. To begin with, the changes that have taken place in modern industry have resulted in a dramatic reduction in the proportion of people employed in the production sector of the labour market. This has been coupled with an increase in the number of people working in the distribution and service sector of the economy. Silverman and Yanowitch suggest that,

"under this heading one could list government workers of all kinds including teachers, those employed in many branches of the sales apparatus, including most of the personnel in the mass communications media, workers and salaried personnel in finance, insurance, and real estate; and the providers of many different kinds of personal services from beauty treatments to sports spectacles. In the United States today these job categories,

taken together, probably account for close to three quarters of the employed non-agricultural labour force."<sup>38</sup>

Mills echoes this appraisal in noting that, "by the late 1970's, already almost two jobs out of three had become people jobs providing services or information handling or both."<sup>39</sup>

Rinehart provides a lengthy analysis of the various implications contained in the promise of what he refers to as the "White Collar World".<sup>40</sup> In particular, he examines the prospects for the decrease of worker alienation through the introduction of a large number of white collar jobs into the labour market. He discusses this question with reference to both the quantitative and qualitative changes that have taken place in the labour market as a result of the dramatic increases described above in the service sector of the economy.

Rinehart begins by noting a number of shortcomings in the proposal that alienation would be reduced through white collar jobs. He suggests, for example, that there has in fact been a significant shift in the labour market towards the service sector, and that this has resulted in an increase in the number of white collar jobs available, but this has not come about through a reduction in the number of blue collar jobs. This has occurred, according to Rinehart, largely at the expense of the agricultural sector while the actual number of blue collar jobs in the economy has remained relatively constant over the last several decades. In this respect, the prospects of reducing the alienation experienced by significant numbers of blue collar workers through the creation of white collar jobs does not appear probable.

Additionally, and perhaps more importantly for the present purposes, most of the new white collar jobs which have been created in the service sector have been located at the bottom of this category. Most of the

people working in these occupations are engaged chiefly, in lower level clerical, sales and service jobs such as the one being examined in the present research. These jobs however, have proven in most cases to be neither challenging, complex, nor very rewarding. Workers in these occupations do not exercise the kinds of control and autonomy typically associated with white collar employment.

This situation has prevailed in many of the supposed high technology jobs, as well. This includes the knowledge jobs where a large percentage of them are classified as professional or technical. In many of these jobs, people are employed as sub-professionals, semi-professionals, or technicians. This, implies that these people do little in the way of creative thinking, exercise virtually no control over their work and are usually "professional" in name only. Most are involved in carrying out routine tasks which involve already established procedures. Rinehart estimates that roughly seventy percent of the people in these types of occupations can be described in this manner. Consistent with this appraisal, the authors of Work In America point out that,

"...it is illusory to believe that technology is opening new high level jobs that are replacing low-level jobs. Most new jobs offer little in the way of "career" mobility. <sup>41</sup>lab technicians do not advance along a path and become doctors."

Residential Counsellors do not advance along a path and become Psychologists, Social Workers or Doctors either!

Several important ramifications of this analysis need to be considered in light of the present research. First, many of these new white collar jobs are experiencing an artificial inflation in the credentials needed for entrance into the occupations, whether the jobs themselves require it or not. This upgrading of qualifications reflects the increasing level of education in the general population so that jobs which were once filled by

people with high school diploma are now being filled with college graduates. This is somewhat problematic and may contribute to worker discontent since,

"...the demand for higher academic credentials has not increased the prestige, status, pay, or difficulty of the job... It is not surprising then, that the Survey of Working Conditions found much of the greatest work dissatisfaction in the country among young, well-educated workers who were in low-paying, dull, routine and fractioned clerical positions."<sup>42</sup>

A consequence of this situation is reflected in the increasing hostility and militancy expressed by many of these new white collar workers. At one time, for example, people working as teachers, nurses and police officers considered themselves to be professionals and they belonged to various professional associations. For many of these workers today, the title of "association" remains in name only as more and more of them not only identify with but also employ the methods once used almost exclusively by the members of the traditional working class. This is especially evident in the use of strike tactics by such groups as teachers, fire-fighters, police officers, nurses and even doctors!<sup>43</sup> For these "professionals" the performance of one's duty had been approached as a form of social trust, to be carried out with the utmost responsibility. In the past, going out on strike represented a serious breach of this trust and was therefore unthinkable. The changes in the labour market described above, have obviously had a major impact on the way that these workers perceive themselves and their roles in society. It is obvious from their actions that neither of these appears to be moving in a positive direction!

Harry Braverman, in his seminal work "Labour and Monopoly Capital", presents a thorough analysis of the changes that have taken place in clerical and service sector occupations since the turn of the century.<sup>44</sup> The central thesis of this work is that many of the skills and



responsibilities traditionally found in these occupations have been eroded in a process which he labels "de-skilling". This, he says, has been the result of the increasing rationalization, fragmentation and mechanization of these jobs in much the manner that this occurred in the industrial sector earlier this century. He goes on to describe this as a deliberate and conscious process which is aimed at increasing the organization's (i.e., the management's) control over these employees. He refers to this process as "the degradation of work in the twentieth century," and traces much of it back to the philosophy underlying Taylor's system of "Scientific Management."

The promise of the white collar solution to the problem of worker alienation remains largely unfulfilled. The common thread in much of the analysis presented above revolves around the idea of worker's control. The very essence of the promise held by white collar work was based precisely on the ability of this type of employment to provide people with jobs in which they could exercise their decision making powers and have some control over their work. White collar jobs were to be high status, challenging and rewarding and the factor which made them this way was the control that people in these occupations traditionally enjoyed. Unfortunately, precious few of the new white collar jobs were actually able to fulfill the promises. In many of these jobs, "the tyranny of the machine" was replaced by the "tyranny of the bureaucracy."

"Alienation and work despair are not limited to the assembly line ... A similar pattern is faced by a growing number of white collar workers in industrial societies. As the service sector of an economy grows, fewer and fewer people are involved in the actual production of goods. Filing papers in an office or taking orders in a fast food restaurant, the kind of job that many people do today, is often soulless work. In fact, while many blue collar workers are experimenting with doing a variety of creative tasks, the white collar worker seems to be moving toward a narrower range of functions."<sup>45</sup>

The work situation being experienced by the Residential Counsellors studied in the present research reflects the occupational conditions which characterize the clerical workers described by Braverman in many respects. However, differences between these two groups of workers, do exist on a number of very significant dimensions. These have to do primarily with the manner in which each of these groups of workers experience control at work.

For many clerical and kindred workers, the process of control has developed through the rationalization and fragmentation of their jobs, coupled with the simultaneous development of new office technology which enhances this process. Studies of this practice in the computer industry, for example, depict the transformation of the general specialist in computers into a number of fractioned positions, such as systems analyst, programmer, key punch operator, and repair technician. Kraft for example notes that at one time all of these jobs were performed by a single individual in a craft-like manner.<sup>46</sup> He goes on to suggest that the lack of managerial control over these "professionals" however, eventually resulted in the job fragmentation which is now so evident in this occupation.

The introduction of word processing technology has had a similar effect on many secretarial jobs.<sup>47</sup> The hardware itself, in this instance, provides the means as well as the rationale for increasing the division of labour in this area. People who work with word processors, especially in large offices, are located in a "pool" of such workers in most cases and receive work from all quarters of the organization. While this may not appear to be a drastic change at first glance, the impact that this has on the people performing these jobs is enormous. For instance, secretaries have traditionally occupied positions in organizations which afforded them some impact on its effective operation. They formed a large part of the

organization's informal structure and their knowledge of the job and the work process enabled them to exercise a certain degree of control and influence at work. This also provided them with an understanding of the workings of the entire system and in particular, of the role they played in it.

As members of a typing pool working with word processors, no knowledge of the purpose of the work, the work routine, the goals of the organization etc., etc., is acquired by the workers. Error correction is so easy, in fact, that no substantive knowledge of what is being typed is required at all. The result of this change is quite dramatic. The person working on a word processor receives the work to be done in a detached way, has little understanding of or identification with either the work itself or the people that it is related to. While they may go to work in nicer clothes, work in a cleaner environment, have air conditioning and piped in music, the type of work that they actually do makes them much closer to people working on assembly lines than it does to the people who occupy the offices just a few feet away from them. Based on the way the work is organized, they could just as easily be attaching front fenders as typing form letters!

The most significant aspect of this situation is the nature of the control experienced by these workers. As has already been noted, the job that these people do represents only a small part of the job traditionally done by secretaries. This has been broken down into a number of fragmented tasks with a group of workers now responsible for only a small part of what was once the domain of a single occupation. Additionally, and perhaps more significantly for the present analysis, the technology which has been developed for these jobs, permits a level of control over these workers

which was previously unattainable.<sup>48</sup> By "tying" a worker to a particular piece of equipment and by incorporating into the design of the equipment a means for evaluating both the quality and quantity of the work performed, these workers are now subjected to much higher levels of scrutiny in their work performance.

People working at key punch machines provide an excellent example of this type of control. Each of these workers is given a production quota which can be easily checked since the machine automatically records the output produced. Moreover, the quality of the work done is also controllable since it can be traced back to the particular worker assigned to the various machines.<sup>49</sup> Even the assembly line cannot match this minute level of constant control! On an assembly line it is very difficult to discover which worker deliberately threw the wrench into the works to sabotage production!

The Residential Counsellors, unlike their clerical counterparts, are not subject to this type of control process at work. Instead, they experience what Perrow has called "unobtrusive controls", which work on the decision making processes of the employee.<sup>50</sup> According to Perrow, this system operates through the organization's ability to control the "premises" upon which the decisions that people make at work are based. It relies on the internalization of particular attitudes and beliefs by the employee and is based largely on the correct socialization of the individual.

Perrow discusses this form of control as one aspect of a three part typology he outlines.<sup>51</sup> This includes i) direct control, which consists of fully obtrusive acts such as giving orders, direct surveillance and rules and regulations; ii) bureaucratic controls, which are based on

factors which are fairly unobtrusive such as specialization, standardization and hierarchy, and iii) fully unobtrusive controls which seek to control the cognitive premises underlying action.

Perrow suggests that unobtrusive controls operate throughout organizations but are most important at the top because managerial work there is often less routine. He notes that,

"Premise controls are most important when work is non-routine (since such work cannot have standardized inputs, throughputs, and outputs, and cannot be specialized, nor governed by rules) and this is one reason scientists and other professionals have such latitude in organizations. Their premises are well set in training institutions and professional associations... This is why social class, ethnic origin and social networks are so important - they make it more likely that certain kinds of premises will exist...Further down the hierarchy, bureaucratic and direct controls increase in importance."<sup>52</sup>

With respect to Residential Counsellors, the existence of unobtrusive controls is readily apparent in the overwhelming sense of "service to the clients" reported by these workers in the interviews conducted with them. They are subjected to a rigorous training period during which they are thoroughly instructed as to the "premises" appropriate for guiding RC behaviour and decision making. As members of an identifiable group of health care workers, they are further inculcated with the proper "premises" of their particular station through the constant reinforcement received during interaction with co-workers, both formally during staff meetings etc., and informally in the context of the social interaction which these people engage in. There is a clear understanding of the expectations attached to the RC's role, including an understanding of what type of behaviour is proper for an RC and what is not.

The RC's position, at the lower end of the health care hierarchy in the particular institution being studied, is indicative of an increasing number of professional/technical jobs. As such, the current research

affords an opportunity to examine the operation of these unobtrusive controls among this particular group of workers. Many of these occupations do not lend themselves very well to other forms of control. Unlike the clerical workers, for example, there is neither the possibility nor much to be gained from any additional fragmentation of these jobs. Moreover, since little equipment is used by the RC's in the performance of their duties, they are not candidates for increased control through technological means. Management is forced to rely on these workers to carry out their roles in a desirable and efficient manner, largely of their own accord.

Rules, regulations and procedures do exist for these workers, however, their value is always subject to the interpretation of the particular situation by the RC. This fact reflects the uncertainty and unpredictability which is characteristic of their occupations and the reality of having to work with human beings as subjects. The RC's have to be able to assess and respond appropriately to a vast and constantly changing number of demands. Purely direct or bureaucratic controls would prove ineffective in this case since each circumstance requires a unique solution which must nevertheless, fit into the overall structure of expectations within which the RC's must work.

The specific type of control which operates in the case of the RC's creates a work situation which is particularly volatile. This is due to a number of contradictions inherent in the operation of the unobtrusive type of controls described above. Specifically, this includes the expectation on the part of management that the RC's will perform in a responsible and "professional" manner in carrying out their duties, especially in those instances which vary significantly from the Center's day to day routine.

This would occur, for example, in the handling of crisis situations involving the clients and for which no previously established procedures exist.

On this dimension, the RC's job resembles that of the "professionals" described above by Perrow. They have a great deal of latitude and decision making power in the organizations in which they work. On the other hand, however, as workers at the lower end of the health care hierarchy, the RC's jobs have been standardized and routinized as much as possible and are the focus of innumerable rules, regulations and procedural practices. The interaction of these dual control mechanisms, i.e., the unobtrusive and the more obtrusive ones, often results in conflicting demands being placed on the workers as well as providing them with divergent status cues. Thus, in some instances, these workers are expected to act independently and exercise their judgement in handling a difficult situation. Most of the time, however, they are required to follow standard operating procedures very closely and are fairly rigidly controlled in this. The altruism called forth by the former "professional" behaviour is dashed in the later circumstance. Many of these worker find this particularly frustrating and in some instances of worker-management confrontation, a work to rule campaign by the workers is used to emphasize the extent to which the organization expects them to behave as "professionals" without providing them with the benefits which usually accompany this status.

The use of unobtrusive types of control has become increasingly prevalent as the number of professional/technical jobs has grown. This practice is also used extensively among such middle level white collar workers as teachers, nurses and social workers. In fact, as the state of the economy deteriorates and the "fiscal crisis" in which the state finds itself intensifies, these workers will be subjected to increasing amounts





of control and closer scrutiny.<sup>53</sup> Their superiors will be forced to account more carefully for the resources which are expended and since staff payroll comprises the bulk of the expenditures in the organizations which employ these types of workers, the pressure on the staff will undoubtedly grow!

The potential for confrontation, given these kinds of considerations, is quite high. This has already been demonstrated in visible, if institutionalized, forms of behaviour engaged in by these workers such as strikes, etc. Other types of workers response to this situation go largely unreported, however, since most occur within the confines of the organizations themselves and are therefore hidden from view. While some descriptions do exist of the strategies adopted by blue collar workers in response to similar situations, little has been reported with respect to either lower or middle level white collar workers in this regard. The strain generated by the high level of "professionalism" expected of these workers, coupled with the small amounts of control they actually exercise in their day-to-day routines, creates a potentially explosive situation. The manner in which these workers respond to this situation is of particular concern in the present investigation.

#### Summary:

A review of the major components which comprise the present study may be useful at this point so that the various dimensions of the investigation outlined above can be placed in a more cohesive context. To begin with, the present work is chiefly concerned with the problem of worker alienation and discontent. This problem began to gain increasing attention following the unrest and agitation in the labour market during the late sixties and early seventies. This was evident in the growing number of strikes, the

high turnover and absentee rates, the plummeting productivity figures etc. which were taking place at that time. The response to this situation by business, labour and government leaders was to try to find the cause of this unrest and to quickly put an end to these problems.

The domestic situation was adversely affected by the mounting pressure on the economy from the competition emanating from abroad. Unemployment rates were soaring and inflation seemed out of control. In addition to all of this, the oil embargo and energy crisis further exacerbated the problems of an already unstable economy. The nation was floundering in the middle of a deep recession.

Many observers, at the time, identified the source of the problems at work with the changing attitudes and rising expectations of the new, young, highly educated workers. These workers were demanding much more from their jobs than simply their paychecks. For some, the attitude of these new workers spelled the death of the work ethic in America. For others, however, the challenges and criticisms raised by the new workers provided the opportunity to examine the conditions of work in an entirely new light. The meaning and importance of work in a person's life became a matter of much concern. These ideas eventually provided the impetus for the development of the "quality of working life" movement.

The major thrust of the "quality of working life" movement, revolved around the elimination of worker alienation through the humanization of work. This required that work be designed in such a way as to maximize human potential through the creation of desirable, challenging and satisfying jobs. One of the principle ways of achieving this goal was to ensure that the workers had a say in the decisions that affected them at work. It was deemed important that they be able to exercise control over their work



• • •

•

1

•••

42

22

44

• • •

...

3

374

•

230

22

22

372

•

4

22

10

• • •

1

2.

life. In this way, employee participation in decision making and workers' control formed central features of the QWL movement.

Another response to the problem of alienation which arose at this time, was based on the premise that many of the dirty, heavy industrial jobs which caused alienation were being rapidly replaced by new "white collar" jobs in the expanding service sector of the economy. It was felt that these jobs would provide people with more interesting, challenging and rewarding work, especially since they were to entail a greater degree of control and discretion for the workers. Unfortunately, while the number of jobs in the tertiary sector increased, few offered people the kinds of opportunities which had been predicted. Most of the new white collar jobs, in fact, were in the lower echelons of this segment of the labour market and they offered the incumbents very little in the way of control over their work lives.

The Residential Counsellors which were selected for study in this research project are representative of many of the lower level professional/-technical occupations that developed during this period. For example, the age, sex, work experience and job qualifications exhibited by these workers are comparable to the characteristics found among workers in many related occupations at the lower end of the white collar, service sector component of the labour market. This makes the RC's especially suitable for the present study.

An additional reason for selecting the Residential Counsellors as subjects for the present research project has to do with the type of control which they experience at work. This has been described as "unobtrusive control" and is based on the manipulation of the "premises" used in decision making. This type of control strategy reflects a growing trend in

the labour market since more and more of the new occupations are not amenable to more traditional forms of control.

As the "fiscal crisis of the state" intensifies, these control tactics will be expanded and this will result in increased scrutiny over the job performance of many lower and middle level workers in the service sector. The response of these workers to the mounting pressure has already been evidenced in their willingness to use traditional working class tactics. The way that this affects their behaviour during their day-to-day work experience is the subject of the current investigation.

We began this section of this report with a quote from Fredrick W. Taylor which suggested that there is a great variability in the behavioural responses of people at work. This continues to exist despite attempts made to alter this situation. We went on to suggest that very little has changed in this respect during the sixty or more years since Taylor made his observation. The purpose of this research is to examine and describe the various factors which affect the behavioural strategies adopted by people at work. In particular, this will focus on the manner in which various "quality of working life" variables affect the behavioural response of this group of lower level professional/technical workers. The principle concern which underscores this entire investigation is worker alienation and this is related in the present research project to the control that people exercise at work. This, in turn, is related to the opportunity which work affords people for the satisfaction of various human needs including basic needs such as food and shelter but also higher order needs which involve the use of wide range of human skills and abilities at work.

The satisfaction of human needs at work is examined with respect to the workers' perception of authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision. This is also related to the orientations that these workers have towards their jobs as well as to the verbal and behavioural responses that they make at work. In this way, the focus on the control that people exercise at work becomes a pivotal concern of this study. This is evident in the major variables employed in this research and these are discussed at length below.

## CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Framework and Review of the Literature

In the preceding chapter, we discussed a number of issues related to the problem of worker alienation. Of major importance was the nature of workplace organization and the struggle which has been waged over control of work. In the present chapter, some of the more salient issues related to these concerns are examined in greater detail.

This discussion begins with a consideration of the meaning and application of the concept of alienation. The impact of alienation of both Scientific Management and the Human Relations movement is then examined. This is followed by an assessment of the ideas which underscore the quality of working life movement.

Much of this discussion is based on the work of Marx, particularly in terms of his concept of alienation as well as his analysis of class antagonisms. His work represents a major contribution to our understanding of these ideas and thus warrants careful consideration. This is especially important in the present context given our focus on the struggle for control of work and worker alienation.

### I: Alienation.

Marx makes his most succinct statement on economic alienation in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.<sup>1</sup> The role played by human activity as wage labour forms the basis of this analysis. For Marx, people

create themselves and the world that they live in through their own activity. It is the uniquely human qualities expressed in this activity which differentiates human beings from other animals. Faunce discusses Marx's conceptualization and notes that,

"Particularly in his early writing, Marx was influenced by Hegel's idea that there is a "universal essence of man" which, as it is realized, constitutes the "self fulfillment of mankind." According to Marx, this process takes place only through productive or creative labour... It is through labour that people should achieve their full potentialities."<sup>2</sup>

Marx develops his discussion of alienation by describing how people are alienated in the process of production. In this context, he notes that alienation occurs when people sell their activity as wage-labour since this activity no longer belongs to them but exists as something external and 'alien'. Thus people neither assert nor create themselves in this activity but turn their life activity from a means of expressing their humanity into a means of simply staying alive.

Besides being alienated in the process of production, Marx notes that people are also alienated from the products that they produce. That is, the products they produce as wage labourers, no longer belong to them but confront them as alien and external entities which have power over them. The more a person produces, the greater the number of products in the world, the less he or she can have. As a result, the producer becomes increasingly devalued.

Marx describes the process of alienation in the following manner,

"the product is indeed only the resume' of the activity of production. Consequently, if the product of labour is alienation, production itself must be active alienation - the alienation of activity and the activity of alienation. The alienation of the object of labour merely summarizes the alienation in the work activity itself."<sup>3</sup>



In addition to being alienated from the process and products of their labour, Marx notes that people are alienated from their 'species being'. This activity no longer represents a means of expressing their uniquely human qualities and characteristics, but simply on instrumental task.

Marx also describes the alienation of people from other people. This occurs as people confront each other and the products that they produce in an impersonal market. In this instance, both the people and the products meet each other as commodities that are in competition. What had been a genuinely human interaction becomes transformed into an uneasy, suspicious and often antagonistic set of relationships between 'objectified', alien 'things'. People no longer relate to each other as members of the same species in these relationships but only as commodities in an impersonal market situation.

Marx's delineation of these four dimensions of alienation places his conceptualization squarely within the parameters of his economic analysis. He argues that the existence of alienation in fact, forms the basic category of the capitalist mode of production, namely private property. He describes this in the following way,

"private property is thus derived from the analysis of the concept of alienated labour; that is alienated man, alienated labour, alienated life and estranged man. We have, of course, derived the concept of alienated labour (alienated life) from political economy, from an analysis of the movement of private property. But the analysis of this concept shows that although private property appears to be the basis and cause of alienated labour, it is rather a consequence of the latter..."<sup>4</sup>

Marx's analysis of the reciprocal relationships between alienation and private property typifies what Ollman has described as the 'relational' quality of Marx's analysis.<sup>5</sup> For Marx, understanding social reality meant approaching it from a wholistic perspective. Specific components of the

whole can be isolated and singled out for analytical and heuristic purposes, however, this is, in effect, only an artificial process of abstraction. The part being examined makes sense, that is, it has meaning, only as part of the larger whole from which it was extracted. The "whole", in this case, is Capitalism.

Ollman points out that the specific type of practice employed by Marx throughout his analysis is based on what he terms the "Philosophy of Internal Relations." This, according to Ollman underscores Marx's entire conceptual scheme. He describes this as follows,

"The relation is the irreducible minimum for all units in Marx's conception of social reality. This is really the nub of our difficulty in understanding Marxism, whose subject matter is not simply society but society conceived of 'relationally'. Capital, labour, value, commodity, etc. are all grasped as relations, containing in themselves as integral elements of what they are, those parts with which we tend to see them externally tied. Essentially, a change of focus has occurred from viewing independent factors which are related, to viewing the particular way in which they are related in each factor, to grasping this tie as part of the meaning conveyed by its concept."<sup>6</sup>

This 'relational' aspect of Marx's analysis is vitally important in any consideration of the other categories employed by him as well as for understanding his conceptualization of alienation in particular. This orientation to social reality necessitates the adoption of a wholistic point of view, for example, such that wage-labour connotes both the existence of the labourer as well as that of the capitalist who buys his labour. Similarly, 'private property' not only defines the existence of identifiable physical objects, but also the specific nature of the relations which exist between people as well as that which exists between people and 'things'.

What are manifest as logically independent factors at the level of appearances, exist 'relationally' in Marx's scheme, only as parts of larger

clusters of factors. In addition, the dialectical nature of these relations are such that each factor derives its meaning from and at the same time confers meaning upon the whole. In this way, alienation has no meaning apart from the relations found in a system of capitalist production and this implies, in turn, that factors such as capital, wage-labour, commodities, value, etc., etc., are defined themselves by alienation. The subsequent characterization of each of these factors taken together constitute the essentials of the relations which comprise the capitalist mode of production.

The affect of alienation is poignantly expressed by Marx in the following classic passage from his work,

"within the capitalist system, all methods for raising the social productiveness of labour are brought about at the cost of the individual labourer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers; they mutilate the producer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange him from the intellectual potentialities of the labour-process in the proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they distort the conditions under which he works; subject him during the labour process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working-time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the Juggernaut of capital."<sup>7</sup>

In his analysis, Marx describes the conditions which give rise to and includes among them; the concentration of the means of production in the hands of a small but dominant capitalist class; production for exchange in an impersonal market versus the production of use values for the satisfaction of human needs; and an increasingly complex division of labour characterized by specialization and the separation of mental from manual labour.<sup>8</sup> Each of these has specific consequences for the concept of alienation.

The concentration of the means of production into fewer and fewer hands resulted in more and more people being dependent on the sale of their

labour for a livelihood. This exemplifies the nature of the emerging class relations of the time which were expressed in both the production process as well as in the general social structure. These relations reflect the inherent contradictions found in the capitalist system, and focus on the ensuing struggle over control of the labour process.

The second condition outlined by Marx focuses on the profound impact that production for an impersonal market has on the labour process. Since production is no longer based on the needs and desires of the producers in this system, but on the vagaries of unknown market forces, the major consideration in the actual process of production is the realization of a profit. Thus all other concerns are rendered secondary and this leads to the dehumanization of all factors of production including the people involved. The following statement by Rinehart makes this clear,

"prices and profits become the ultimate determinants of the means and ends of production, and people are compelled to make decisions based on pecuniary gains...human considerations are secondary to those of efficiency, productivity and profitability. Working people are evaluated according to market criteria. From the view of the employer, they become another cost of production. Workers thus become commodities like any other object which is bought and sold."<sup>9</sup>

Additionally, as a result of the response by workers to this kind of treatment, capitalist employers were compelled to employ various means in their attempts to subjugate workers to their own ends. This included the rationalization of the labour process, the introduction of machinery and other technological improvements, an increase in the division of labour and the separation of mental from manual labour. Each of these measures, in one way or another, attempted to consolidate the control that the capitalist class was able to wield over the labour process. But as history has revealed, this attempt was not always successful nor complete!

The rationalization of the labour process coupled with an increase in the division of labour served to reduce the power of the workers in a number of ways. Essentially, this came about through the reduction in the skill level required of individual workers. In this way each worker was rendered much less valuable as well. The training needed to do the job was drastically reduced in this process and this meant that workers could easily be replaced. Taken together these measures served to reduce both the bargaining power of the individual worker as well as the knowledge of the production process upon which this power is based.

This situation was further exacerbated through the separation of mental and manual labour. In this practice, all thinking, creativity and control over the production activity is removed from the purview of the individual worker and relocated within the company's planning or layout department. As a result, the worker is left with little to say over what, where, how or how much is to be produced. The worker is reduced, in this process, to a mass of bones and muscles detached from a mind. Human development through work activity is nowhere to be found in a system that turns workers into automatons!

With respect to the incorporation of machinery and other technology into the labour process, it will be argued below, that rather than serving to increase efficiency and productivity, the specific technological changes which have been introduced reflect the expressed nature of the production relations and are not designed to maximize efficiency as much as control over the labour process.<sup>10</sup>

The particular manner in which technology is used for control purposes is described by Edwards as "technical" control. This includes the manipulation of the machinery as well as the physical environment in the control

over the worker. This is perhaps nowhere more evident than in an assembly line application in which the machinery establishes the nature of the task to be performed, the speed it is to be performed at, the tools to be used as well as the place it is to be done in. This is usually accomplished by providing each worker on the assembly line with the proper equipment and raw materials required to be able to perform the assigned tasks. Workers in this situation never have to walk more than a few feet to obtain what they need. In some cases, individual work stations are identified by boldly coloured paint stripes on the floor which demarcate the end of one work station and the beginning of the next and workers are not permitted to leave their assigned stations during working hours. These types of measures clearly demonstrate the control functions which they are intended to perform.

In the discussion above, various aspects of 'technical' control over work were outlined. The struggle which developed over this type of control reflects the alienation which it engenders through the systematic attempt to strip workers of their control over their own activity as well as in the workers actions to resist this type of control. The implications that this has for the present study is based on the importance of work in peoples' lives and the responses that they make to work.

Alienation, as a dialectical concept, describes not only the attempt to subjugate workers to managerial control, but also the struggle which workers have waged against these very practices. Thus alienation identifies both the problem and the source of its solution. Work should be an activity in which people use their skills and abilities and grow and develop as human beings. When the range of expression of people's activity at work is not in their own control; when the work process is beyond the

control of the people who actually do the work; alienation is the result. The struggle which exist in the workplace often reflect the attempt by workers to humanize their work and to regain some control over their own work lives.

## II. Applying the Concept

The concept of alienation has experienced a long and varied history which both precedes and follows Marx's conceptualization of it. As it developed, it acquired such a wide variety of meanings and interpretations that today, many critics no longer consider it useful for scientific research. It has been described as being close to "a shorthand expression for all socially based psychological maladies of modern times."<sup>11</sup> While some have called for a clarification of the concept, others suggest that it be eliminated entirely from the sociological literature.<sup>12</sup> This warrants a careful examination of these charges as well as an explicit specification of the manner in which the concept is being applied in the present research.

An exhaustive examination of the charges levelled at the concept of alienation would take us too far afield of our present concerns and prove counterproductive in the long run. However, a consideration of several fundamental issues directly related to the use of the concept in the current research will be addressed. These focus on the manner in which the concept can be successfully utilized in research applications and include the following concerns: i) the issue of whether alienation is primarily a structural or psychological concept ii) a focus on the role that control over one's work activity plays in the construction and application of the

concept in conducting social research iii) the importance of work activity for human growth and development and the satisfaction of human needs.

The question of whether alienation is essentially a structural concept or a psychological one contains several key issues which need to be considered.<sup>13</sup> To begin with, perhaps the most prevalent usage of the term in sociological research is based upon Seeman's conceptualization of it.<sup>14</sup> He outlined five dimensions of alienation which included: i) powerlessness ii) meaninglessness iii) normlessness iv) isolation and v) self-estrangement. This construct has been widely applied in the study of alienation and in particular in the study of industrial workers. Blauner's oft cited study is typical in this regard as he applies Seeman's model of workers in various industrial settings.<sup>15</sup>

This orientation to the study of alienation has been criticized on a number of grounds.<sup>16</sup> To begin with, this research depends upon the actor's ability to articulate the subjective perceptions of alienation. This is seen as problematic for a number of reasons. Deutscher, for example, has demonstrated the difficulty in relating what people say to what they actually do.<sup>17</sup> The relationship between people's responses on an attitudinal survey and their behaviour at work falls into this category.

While this criticism points out the problems with attitudinal research in general, the concern here focusses specifically on the way that this is related to the expression of alienation. Some theorists have argued that the concept of alienation is based on the structural relations which people encounter at work. Measures of people's psychological responses to work thus represent one, and not necessarily the most useful indicator of the existence of alienation. Rinehart makes this quite explicit in the following statement,



"Structural alienation means that work is not organized in accordance with the needs and interests, talents and abilities of working people. However, a complex set of psychological, cultural and social forces influence the degree to which individuals RECOGNIZE the sources of alienation, ADAPT to alienating work, and EXPRESS verbally and behaviourally, their disenchantment with work. Obviously, not all working people are conscious of their alienated position in work organizations in the sense that they are able to locate and articulate the socioeconomic factors responsible for it. But all workers in objectively powerless circumstances do possess an ALIENATED CONSCIOUSNESS in that they directly experience and are acutely aware of the EFFECTS of structural alienation such as repetitive and insecure jobs, insufficient wages and arbitrary work rules. The test of the existence of alienated mental states is to be found not so much in the ability of the individuals to articulate the causes of alienation but primarily in their verbal and behavioural reactions to work."<sup>18</sup>

Archibald has made a thorough analysis of this issue and provides some valuable insight into it.<sup>19</sup> He notes that Marx mixes the normative and descriptive uses of the concept in his writing. In some instances, Marx uses the concept to condemn the subservience of individuals to the capitalist mode of production while in other's he uses the concept to describe the effects that this system has on individuals such as being treated like commodities or being repulsed by their work, etc. Archibald suggests that in one sense, alienation reflects the separation of individuals from their human potential but that in another, it connotes some clearly identifiable features of the relationships which exist between individuals and their work, their products, other individuals, etc., etc.<sup>20</sup>

The conclusion which Archibald draws from his analysis is that alienation can include both structural factors as well as psychological responses. Neither can be dismissed but both must be understood as part of the larger processes within which they are found. They reflect the nature of the work organization which exists as well as the social, political and economic context in which they occur.

The conceptualization of alienation being employed in the present research is consistent with that outlined by Rinehart in which he describes alienation as:

"a condition in which individuals have little or no control over (a) the purposes and products of the labour process, (b) the overall organization of the workplace, and (c) the immediate work process itself."<sup>21</sup>

As was noted above, Rinehart considers the existence of alienation to be manifested in both the verbal and behavioural responses which people make to work. In this way, the concept is related to the nature of the social relations of production which exist and the resulting worker behaviour is considered as part of an ongoing process of interaction which takes place in a larger social context. This gives the behaviour meaning beyond that of particular responses exhibited by isolated individuals. Workplace organization becomes a central factor in the analysis of alienation in this way and locates it directly in the social structure of the society.

This formulation is particularly useful if forms of hostile or unco-operative behaviour are examined since their explanation is not reduced to instances of maladaptation among the individuals involved but is understood as a specific response to a distinct set of social circumstances.<sup>22</sup> In some instances, this behaviour may reflect the frustration of a disgruntled individual however, it may also be indicative of a much more organized response to the workplace. In either case, this is an empirical question. The model being adopted here facilitates these types of questions being addressed.

An alternative manifestation of alienation is also identifiable by employing this construct. This consists of very passive responses to work in which the worker has completely withdrawn from this activity, and approaches it in an explicitly instrumental manner. This may, in fact, be

indicative of an extremely alienated response since this activity no longer holds meaning for the individual concerned. Given the importance placed on work activity in the present study, such an eventuality may represent a form of resignation. Workers who get upset or angry about what is going on in their jobs may be showing that they still care about them and are desirous of change. Hostile responses in particular, may represent attempts by the workers to challenge the control of management and in some way to regain some control for themselves. Apathetic or passive responses, on the other hand, demonstrate no such intent. They reflect alienation nonetheless.

The second concern outlined above focussed on the relationship between control and alienation. This underscores much of the present analysis and is seen as a vital component of the concept of alienation. In our discussion of Marx's work, the role played by the exercise of free and spontaneous human activity was defined as a central theme recurring throughout his model. Alienation was said to occur if this activity ceases to be free or as is the case with wage labour, no longer 'belongs' to the individual worker.

The definition went further than simply describing various dimensions of alienation and included a dialectical and relational component which suggests that while particular forms of workplace organization produce alienation, workers struggle to resist this control. Moreover, management is compelled to increase its subjugation activity over the workers, precisely because they resist being alienated. This struggle is the result of the inherent contradiction which exists and this helps us to understand the form that the resulting social interaction takes. Edwards describes simple hierarchical, technological and bureaucratic control in this sense.<sup>23</sup>

It is important to note at this point that the history of labour-management relations has been characterized by recurring violence and struggle.<sup>24</sup> Conflict and not cooperation best describes the prevailing relations. A great deal of this conflict occurred especially in the past, over the exercise of control over the labour process.<sup>25</sup> What had once been the exclusive domain of the workers was slowly, deliberately and often brutally stripped from them and taken over by the capitalists. However, this usurpation by management was usually never very easy nor was it complete. The continuing labour battles of the last two centuries testify to this fact.

The link between the present conceptualization of alienation and the concerns of the present research come about through a consideration of the changes which have occurred in the organization of work. In particular, this reflects the conflict which has accompanied the attempt by management to gain control over the labour process. It includes an examination of the various developments which have significantly affected the organization of work as well as those which have resulted in the existing relations between management and labour. The conditions which have given rise to such proposals as the "quality of working life" and demands for workplace democracy are equally important in this context.

Since the turn of the century, there have been a number of developments which have fundamentally altered the nature of the organization of work. Each has attempted to address the inherent conflict found in the existing production relations. Each has also attempted to expand the ability of management to direct the labour process. While most of the developments which are discussed in the subsequent sections of this report have been initiated by management, it is clear from the evidence cited that

workers did more than simply react to managerial initiatives and quite often were the original cause of management's actions. Moreover, the predominantly managerial view exhibited by many authors working in this field gives the impression that the events which have taken place have unfolded according to some predetermined management plan. Nothing could be farther from the reality. In fact the history of the labour process reveals a constant and ongoing struggle in which both management and labour have striven to attain their respective objectives. It is in the workers' struggle to overcome alienation, to humanize work, and to regain control over their activities in the workplace that we may best see the importance of a definition of alienation which focusses on the struggle to control work.

It is no mistake that work is organized the way it is in this society. The expression of control at work in particular, demonstrates the attempt by management to consolidate and maintain a position of dominance in labour-management relations. This is reflected in the establishment of the types of production systems which have consciously and deliberately maximized and emphasized their control over the labour process. Control therefore, has been a primary feature of the form that work organizations have taken in this society since the beginning of capitalist industry. Marglin, for example, has suggested that the move away from a cottage industry to a factory based system was due to the following concerns:

1. The physical control afforded by the factory served to minimize the level of potential employee embezzlement.
2. The rate of speed of work could be significantly increased.
3. Technological change could be used for capital accumulation as well as for the most obvious function of immediate use.

4. Production of the whole process rested with the owner of capital.<sup>26</sup>

The rest of Marglin's analysis goes on to demonstrate that quite apart from any alleged gains in efficiency or productivity which were attributed to this type of production system, control over the production process looms as the overriding consideration behind the move.<sup>27</sup> Thus the move from the putting-out system and cottage industry to the factory system had more to do with consolidating the position of power of the owners than it did with demands of technological necessity or efficiency.

This analysis suggested that both the organization of production as well as the particular technology employed reflect the desire to control the labour process. In this context, Clegg and Dunkerely note that technology is indeed anything but a neutral component of the production process, since a great deal of variability exists in the design and selection of what particular form of technology is utilized. Brecher and Costello concur and make the following observation in this regard,

"The key to understanding the workplace as it is experienced day to day is to recognize that it is shaped not only by the work to be done, but also by management's need to control those who do it. Insecurity of employment, the managerial structure, the selection and organization of equipment, the assignment of tasks, the hierarchy of jobs, the form in which worker's are paid -- these basic structures of work in our society, far from expressing any "technological necessity" are used as a means for the control of workers."<sup>28</sup>

They go on to demonstrate that the increased efficiency gained as a result of the implication of assembly line production techniques can be placed at roughly seventeen percent. They indicate that much of the gains made with the use of these techniques is due to the sheer "speed-up" of the work process which is under the control of management in this system rather than from any technological breakthrough inherent in the assembly line.

They suggest that detail work predates this form of work organization and that the modest gains realized by this system come at a very high cost, especially when human costs are considered.

A similar argument can be made with respect to the complex structure of organizations. Edwards, for example, points out that there is an essential difference between co-ordination and control and suggests that it is entirely possible to construct large scale, complex organizations which are based on a co-ordinating set of organizational principles as opposed to ones that are established primarily for control.<sup>29</sup> He also notes that the control functions extant in complex organizations are designed to fulfill the interests of those who manage or direct their activities. Once again, this analysis suggests that the particular forms that organizations take reflect more the concerns of the managers of these organizations to maximize their control over them rather than any considerations based on their superior efficiency.

The requisites of large scale, complex organizations include a substantial capacity for administrative processes which are essentially facilitative in nature and which require co-ordination more than control. The control factor expressed in organizations, according to Edwards, gives rise to many of the problems of alienation which were discussed above. These problems stem largely from the fact that workers lose the opportunity to express their skills and abilities at work since they make few decisions regarding the work process. This situation derives not so much from the inherent demands of the size or complexity of the organization as it does from the attempt by the masters of these organizations to retain control over them.

Perrow expresses a great deal of concern over this situation, especially in terms of the implications that this has for society in general. He describes organizations as "tools" in the hands of their masters and is quite disturbed by the lack of accountability which exists over these extremely powerful entities. He argues that the rationality embodied in these large scale, complex organizations may in fact be quite rational from the point of view of the masters of these organizations but that it may be quite the opposite for the people who work in them or for the people that are served by them:

Max Weber described the extreme form of work organization which he observed in America as substantively irrational.<sup>30</sup> Substantive rationality, according to Weber, refers to the satisfaction of the needs and requirements which are necessary for the organizations' continued existence. When this is examined with reference to any given society, the institutions of the society in question are then substantively rational if they provide for the satisfaction of the needs and requirements of both the people in the society as well as of the institutions themselves.

Formal rationality by contrast, refers only to the continued functioning of the organization irrespective of the needs and requirements of the society of which it is a part. While substantive rationality has been described as the "efficient coordination of collective action", formal rationality reflects the "logic of domination".<sup>31</sup> The former serves both formal and substantive functions in society while the latter represents a particularly dangerous situation since it completely neglects the satisfaction of basic needs. The result is that such a system operates very "efficiently" in terms of domination, but it fails to meet the very requirements for which it was originally established.



Faunce has identified a number of problems which he relates to the development of large scale, industrial societies. Among these he includes: an emphasis on continuous economic growth; a high level of structural differentiation; a low level of structural integration; the existence of large scale, complex work organizations and bureaucracies; rapid social change; and rationalized control structures.<sup>32</sup> He goes on to note how these conditions affect the self-esteem and status assignment processes in these societies. He then describes the deleterious effects that this has in terms of alienation from work and outlines such behaviour as apathy and over-conformity, etc. in this context.

In many respects, the concerns described by Faunce reflect the lack of control which people in these types of societies have over their lives. This is especially evident in the workplace since many largescale, complex, bureaucratic organizations provide few opportunities for the people who work in them to exercise control over their work. The analysis presented above suggests that it may be possible to have these types of organizations while at the same time avoiding the problems currently being experienced. This would be possible, for example, if these organizations were controlled by the people who work in them such that they exercised control over their work. The implication of this is that problem related to such things as size and rapid change may be minimized if a majority of the people most affected by these factors were both knowledgeable about and had some control over their outcomes.

The importance of control over work represents the essence of the present application of the concept of alienation. In the various examples discussed above, the particular forms that organizations have taken in this society were examined with respect to the manner in which control was

manifested. Both considerations of the specific technology employed as well as the very structure of the organizations themselves were related to the desire of the owners and managers of these organizations to retain control over them. This was held to obtain irrespective of any claims based on technical necessity

The consequence of this situation is that most working people have little or no control over their lives at work. It is in this sense that Rinehart's definition of alienation is particularly useful in terms of applying it to social research. The function of control is never absolute, such that people in various occupations experience different amounts of control over their work. Additionally, people are not passive objects and the reality of the control function in any existing organization may be quite different from that which appears on an organizational chart. These represent the types of empirical questions for which this application of the concept of alienation is most useful. This knowledge should provide a clearer picture of how our organizations operate as well as an indication of how the people who work in them make sense of their working lives.

The consideration of control over work leads directly to an examination of the third factor described above which focussed on the importance of work for human development and the satisfaction of human needs. The application of the concept of alienation in this context refers specifically to the inherent relationship implied in this concept between human growth and development and the exercise of skills and abilities at work. A conceptualization of alienation based on the notion of self estrangement, is consistent with these concerns.

This usage of the concept revolves around the important possibilities which work provides people for the expression of their unique

characteristics. It is through the use of their powers and abilities that people satisfy their human needs. This includes their more basic needs for such things as food, shelter and clothing, as well as for their more explicitly human needs for such things as emotional and cultural expression.

Ollman suggests that people grow and develop in the process of using their powers in the satisfaction of needs. This occurs as needs are satisfied and new needs are developed which in turn call for the use and development of further powers and needs in an ongoing progression. This possibility however, does not exist for a great many workers in this society. The organization of work affords few of these people the possibility of engaging in this type of activity. Faunce specifies the importance of this aspect of alienation in the following passage,

"The fact that we cannot achieve self-fulfillment unless we control the events that shape our lives, i.e., unless we are "the author and actor of our history"; the importance of creative work in this process; and the extent to which the contemporary industrial order involves work that can only be experienced as a means to other ends - these are theme's from Marx's<sup>33</sup> view of alienation which we have selected for emphasis."

The satisfaction of needs therefore and the satisfaction of higher order needs in particular reflects the ability of people to control their own lives and especially their lives at work. The extent to which this occurs should be indicative of the importance that people attach to work in terms of their own evaluations of self worth and the development of self identities. In this society, occupations in which people have a great deal of discretion and exercise considerable control over work are usually more highly valued. A person who occupies this type of position is more likely to derive positive images of self and base his or her definition of self worth on this valuable role. A person for whom such an evaluation is not

possible, on the other hand, is less likely to place much importance on the work role in terms of the satisfaction of such higher order needs, the development of self identity, or self actualization.

The structure of the labour market in this society precludes the satisfaction of these higher order needs for a majority of the members of the labour force. In the present conceptualization, this follows from the lack of control that most people have over their work. When people are not able to use their skills and abilities to their fullest, they are restricted in the extent to which they can develop their human powers as well as in their ability to satisfy increasingly higher order needs. This reduces work for many people, to a merely instrumental activity. This use of the concept of alienation relates the control over work directly to concerns over human growth and development. The extent to which people can develop higher levels of skills and use a wide range of their powers at work is related to the extent to which they exercise control over their work. For a great many people few such opportunities exist. In this sense, the present study seeks to examine how people perceive the organizations in which they work and how this in turn is related to their verbal and behavioural responses to work and to the satisfaction of their needs.

### III. Alienation and Control: Taylor and Scientific Management.

We begin this part of our discussion with a consideration of the work of Winslow Taylor. His work represents an important starting point since it has had a significant impact on the way that work has subsequently been organized in this society. While Taylor's "domain assumptions" are clearly visible in his approach to labour-management relations, he does, in a naive

way, attempt to address the conflict which he saw existing between labour and management.<sup>34</sup> A brief examination of his personal background is instructive at the outset of this investigation since it allows some insight into the manner and personal motivations of the man. It is to this examination that we now turn.

Fredrick W. Taylor was the son of a wealthy Philadelphia lawyer. He had made preparations to enter Harvard when,

"he suddenly dropped out, apparently in rebellion against his father, who was directing Taylor toward his own profession, the law. He then took a step quite extraordinary for anyone of his class, of starting a craft apprenticeship in a firm whose owners were social acquaintances of his parents."<sup>35</sup>

From these rather inauspicious beginnings, Taylor quickly made his way up the factory hierarchy and was soon appointed 'gang' boss over a group of machinists. This vantage point afforded him a first hand look at the conflict which occurred in the workplace. He was particularly disturbed with what he saw and became especially concerned with the practice of "soldiering". This involved the deliberate restriction of output by the workers, a situation he could scarcely tolerate. It is not difficult to understand either his repulsion of this type of activity or the vigor which he expressed in his efforts to eliminate it considering his class background and what Braverman has described as his "obsessive-compulsive" personality.<sup>36</sup> He was determined to get as much output from the factory's machines as was humanly possible and he was quite willing to fight the workers in the plant in order to do so. After describing a confrontation that he had had with a number of workers over this very issue, Taylor stated the following.

"Now that was the beginning of a piecework fight that lasted for nearly three years, as I remember it - two or three years - in which I was doing everything in my power to increase the output of the shop, while the men were absolutely determined that the

output should not be increased. Anyone who has been through such a fight knows and dreads the meanness of it and the bitterness of it."<sup>3/</sup>

Taylor felt that the production process could be organized to the mutual benefit of both labour and management and an end could be put to the needless waste caused by the constant conflict which he had seen. This could be accomplished however, only after management had gained control over the labour process. He realized that workers would not go along willingly with this transfer of power so he sought to win their co-operation by introducing a system of piece rate incentives. These, he thought, would convince the workers to participate in his plan if for no other reason than for self interest. This formed an important part of his management plan which he named "Scientific Management".

The production process, according to Taylor, was rife with unnecessary conflict. What was required was a method of organizing production which was both rational and efficient. For this, Taylor turned to the methods of science which he had studied as an apprentice machinist. He proposed that the conflict between management and labour could be resolved in much the same way that engineers solved their problems only, in this case, the problem revolved around what constituted both "a fair day's work" and "a fair day's pay." This could be calculated, according to Taylor, by applying the dictates of science. Once the question had been settled by the objective machinations of science, neither management nor labour would have reason to dispute the findings and both could begin to cooperate for their mutual aggrandizement.

Taylor felt that management would gain through adopting his proposals since the productivity of the workers would be greatly increased. Workers would also reap a number of benefits from their cooperation with his plan.

To begin with, the piece rate system which was to be implemented would insure a greater financial return for workers. Additionally, he argued that workers would benefit from this arrangement since they would share in the increased productivity which a scientifically designed work process would provide. Another benefit for the workers was the opportunities that the newly designed system would afford since many more would be allowed to gain the skills of machine operators thereby moving them beyond the lower labourer classification to which most had been restricted up to that time.

Taylor's ideas about human behaviour were based largely on a very narrow model of "economic man". In this conceptualization, people were acting in a "maximizing" way. They were identified as being completely rational, calculating agents who respond positively to economic incentives. When the logic of "Scientific Management" is examined against this backdrop, it is clear that Taylor relied quite heavily on economic self interest to convince both workers and management to adopt his plan. Perhaps what is most instructive about this approach is that he was certain that the method that he was proposing was itself rational and efficient and therefore above the petty disputes and conflict so characteristic of the labour-management relations of his day.

An additional component of Taylor's ideological scheme must be addressed. It was quite clear from his own calculations that the gains which would result from the introduction of a scientific labour process, would not be shared equally by labour and management. At best, the increased wages which would be returned to the workers from piece rates, represented only a small portion of the increases gained through worker productivity. What's more, he realized that the contest between labour and management would not end with the introduction of piece rates but would only renew

itself since as piecework or "incentive" systems allow the workers to increase their pay,...the output records...determine the setting and revision of pay rates.<sup>38</sup> In this way, the struggle is perpetuated ad infinitum.

Taylor understood this to be true because he realized that workers who were engaging in 'soldiering' were in fact acting rationally, while attempting to protect their own best interests. In fact, Braverman notes that when Taylor was asked by workers whether they should turn out more work, he answered that,

"as a truthful man, he had to tell them that if he were in their place he would fight turning out any more work, just as they were doing, because under the piece-work system they would be allowed to earn no more wages than they<sup>39</sup> had been earning, and yet they would be made to work harder."

The other aspect of this interaction which should be noted, is that Taylor felt that this situation was right and proper. Thus the company should get as much as they could from both its capital - including factories and machines - and the labour that it purchased. In addressing the issue of distributing the gains which resulted from the increased productivity, Taylor felt that the knowledge used to develop the new scientific methods belonged to management since it had spent its capital in conducting the experimentation needed to create the new system. Therefore, like its factories and machines, management should benefit from the new methods. Workers, on the other hand, had no claim to them for they could not afford the capital required to develop them. What's more, if the workers' should happen to discover a new, more efficient method of production by sheer chance, they were certain to keep it from management to protect their own self interests. In this way, only management could be relied upon to further the rationality and efficiency of the production process.



Since its introduction, Taylorism has had a profound impact on the way that work is organized in this society. As Clawson notes,

"What for Taylor was clearly a conscious process, and at one important level remains a conscious process, is now at the same time unconscious in that it is accepted without question (by both management and workers) as the self-evident way to organize work processes and is seen as "natural," "inevitable," or simply "most efficient."<sup>40</sup>

Both Braverman and Clawson agree that the influence of Scientific Management was not to be found in the limited applications that it experienced as a system of management but rather in the "way in which Taylorism marked a fundamental change in the control of the labour process."<sup>41</sup> Actual cases of Scientific Management's implementation were restricted to small, non-unionized enterprises since it was largely ignored by the industrial giants of the day. However, as was noted above, when seen as a set of ideas about how the production process should be organized, Taylorism's impact cannot be overstated.

In most cases, Scientific Management was fought to a standstill by workers wherever it was tried. It led to such a bitter and violent strike at the Watertown Arsenal in New York State, for example, that it prompted the United States House of Representatives to hold special hearings on Taylorism and other systems of management and their introduction into government arsenals! Taylor himself reported on the vigorous opposition he experienced in attempting to implement his plan. He describes the following interaction:

"Everytime I broke a rate or forced one of the new men whom I had trained to work at a reasonable and proper speed, some one of the machinists would deliberately break some part of his machine as an object lesson to demonstrate to the management that a fool foreman was driving the men to overload the machines until they broke. Almost every day ingenious accidents were planned and these happened to machines in different parts of the shops, and were, of course, laid to the fool foreman who was driving the men and the machines beyond their proper limit."<sup>42</sup>

In discussing workers struggles such as these, the tendency is to identify the workers' behaviour as reactive, as a response to management's actions. This is especially significant in terms of the present research which focuses specifically on the behavioural responses of workers. As Clawson notes however,

"Workers' activities were not derivative from what capital did: they fundamentally shaped what happened. Indeed, what capital did (specifically including Taylorism and the rise of bureaucracy) is hardly comprehensible except as a response to workers' success in resisting previous capitalist attempts at control."<sup>43</sup>

In his discussion of the labour process, Edwards comes to much the same conclusion. That is, that attempts to control workers have led to the development of increasingly more complex systems of control by management, as less sophisticated forms of control are rendered ineffective by workers' actions. He traces the development of control systems from "simple" control to more recent examples of "bureaucratic" control. This is particularly important in the present context since bureaucratic control has become a dominant form of control over work and especially among professionals and other white collar workers.<sup>44</sup>

When examined in this light, the legacy of Taylor is not entirely clear. As a response to the actions of workers, more specifically to 'soldiering', Taylorism did result in the establishment of an extremely more complex system of control than the one which had previously existed. Moreover, that the ideas underlying this system of control became so widespread and accepted reflects the tremendous impact that Taylorism did have. On the other hand, however, the fact that these ideas were adopted so readily indicates that management needed a more sophisticated means for controlling the behaviour of workers since the one that they had was ineffective.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of Taylorism lies in its relationship to the existence of alienation among workers as well as in the attempts by workers to overcome this alienation. The widespread resistance to Taylor's method demonstrates the inherent conflict which exists in the production process under capitalism and this method has been identified as a major source of the alienation which this system generates.<sup>45</sup>

The workplace that Taylor described contained only a few workers who were "willing to give the company their all." It should not be surprising that this situation has not changed much despite the attempts to increase management's control over the labour process. This is especially true in the case of Taylorism. As Mills notes,

"At the dawn of the twentieth century, Fredrick Taylor, often referred to as the father of "management science," urged dividing human and machine labour down into the smallest and easiest functions: to create dumb, foolproof jobs for dumb human beings, whom he characterized as essentially lazy, greedy, and demanding of discipline... To suggest that the old ways [Taylorism] aren't working any more is an overstatement. But to suggest they're not working as well as they used to, even twenty years ago, is not. And to suggest that in these days of our troubled economic history, an ever more urgent need is rising for a new way to win back the organizational involvement of the new breed of working men and women - with their more educated demands and needs for human dignity - is perhaps an understatement."<sup>46</sup>

#### IV. Alienation and Control: The Human Relations Movement.

A second major attempt to deal with the organization of the workplace, began to grow out of the work of Elton Mayo and his associates during the late 1920's. This has become known as the Human Relations Movement and it has also had a decisive impact on the way that work is organized in our society. Many of its proponents continue to be quite active in this field. In fact, the ideas upon which this approach is based have provided the impetus for much of the current managerial thinking and practice.

While conducting experiments on the effects of various environmental factors on worker productivity, Mayo and his colleagues discovered that people at work were very much affected by social factors.<sup>47</sup> For example, they found that regardless of how they manipulated the lighting or the length of rest periods in an experimental work situation, worker productivity continually went up. After pondering such perplexing results for some time, they began to realize that the productivity increases that they were observing were not due to the changes in the physical environment at all but rather that

"... the real change had been that management had taken an interest in the two groups of workers [being studied]. They were given special treatment and status as compared to the rest of the workers. The attention apparently raised morale and morale raised productivity. It was a happy thought!"<sup>48</sup>

This now famous discovery has become known as "the Hawthorne effect" and it has had a tremendous impact on the way that we think about people's behaviour in organizations. In contrast to the propositions of the "economic man" model of human behaviour found in Taylorism, this work demonstrated the fact that people respond to more than simply economic motives. Social factors and sentiments make up an important component of human behaviour and must be taken into account when trying to understand the behaviour of people in organizations.

In addition to social factors, Mayo and his associates documented the importance of work groups as well as the operation within organizations of an informal structure along side the formal one. These discoveries had to be taken into consideration when the problems of work were addressed since they provided important insights into the functioning of organizations.

The logic underlying the Human Relations approach is seductively simple and compelling. Basically stated, it notes that workers who are

happy and who are treated well at work, will have high morale. Furthermore, workers with high morale are more productive and cooperative. The task before management, therefore, is simply to find ways of keeping workers contented. According to this line of reasoning, conflict in the workplace and behaviour such as "soldiering" would be eliminated if workers could be kept happy. The two principal methods developed for accomplishing this goal were i) establishing "good human relations" in the organization and ii) practicing "good leadership".<sup>49</sup>

The idea of establishing good human relations follows directly from the assumptions of this approach. Thus, the Human Relations theorists believed that it was necessary to appeal to more than the economic interests of the worker. These alone were not enough to convince the worker to cooperate with management's goals. Workers had to be treated properly and attention had to be paid to their social nature.

The concept of "good leadership" puts these ideas into practice since being a good leader means being democratic and humane; able to understand and communicate with your workers. Good leaders rely upon example and not force to accomplish their objectives. It must be noted that this represented a considerable departure from the established management practices of the day which were based almost exclusively on authoritarian relations with employees.

Support for the Human Relations approach was gained through hours of careful and extensive observation by Mayo and his research team. They found, for example, that even 'soldiering', which had been understood previously only in economic terms, was greatly influenced by informal group pressure at work. They noted that,

"a "fair day's rate" was established informally [by the workers]

and policed by the group; "rate busters" were subject to ostracism, sabotage and physical reprisals."<sup>50</sup>

In this context, 'soldiering' took on a substantially different meaning from the one implied by Taylor's analysis. The informal structure of the work group must be taken into account if this behaviour is to be understood for what it really is. At the very least, it indicates that economic incentives alone are wholly inadequate for resolving the conflict in the workplace which is exemplified by behaviour such as 'soldiering'. In fact, the conscious, deliberate and planned nature of this activity casts conflict in the workplace in an entirely new light. Workers were seen to be engaging in self-protective behaviour as a group. Their activities were not the mindless acts of frustrated individuals but rather well orchestrated attempts by collectivities of workers to retain some control over the work process.

The Human Relations approach took this into consideration, to some extent, and sought to appeal to the workers' social sentiments through their values and attitudes about work. Rather than using the blunt edge of force on the workers, as Taylor had done through his use of piece rates and the "technical control" of the labour process, the Human Relations proponents employed more subtle techniques aimed at persuading and convincing workers to cooperate. They were certain that the informal structure of the organization could be turned to management's advantage in this endeavor, even if it only resulted in neutralizing some of the negative behavior of workers. Human relations theorists saw this as the least cost method for controlling the conflict in the workplace. It represented the best way of getting workers to go along with management's decisions and goals.

The ideological posture reflected in the Human Relations approach has led many critics to point out its excessively manipulative character.<sup>51</sup>

Some, in fact, have charged that the approach is little more than management attempting to convince workers to cooperate in their own exploitation. This is particularly distasteful, since by extension, this approach implies that any activity which workers engage in which contradicts management's agenda is by definition non-rational. The actions of management, on the other hand, are seen as inherently rational and legitimate. This includes participation in activities which are clearly not in the worker's own interest. Kerr voices his objection to this type of reasoning when he states,

"We cannot accept the view that rationality and initiative are vouchsafed only to the elite and that the common man is left only the virtues of faith and obedience."<sup>52</sup>

In recent years, Human Relations theorists have expanded their view to encompass a larger institutional perspective. While relying on the basic ideas described above, their emphasis has shifted from individual leaders and workers, to include a consideration of the actions of larger groups in the organizational complex. Recent examples of this approach place the responsibility for a positive organizational climate on all groups involved, from upper level management to workers on the shopfloor. This has emphasized the role of the organization's structure itself in enhancing worker morale. Examples of these types of programmes include job enrichment, job enlargement and participative management.

The idea that workers should be treated decently by the organization is being broadly translated in the current version of this theory, as follows; the organization should do what it can, within bounds of course, to provide workers with decent work, i.e., work fit for human beings to do. In addition, workers should be treated as human beings and perhaps even be allowed to have some say over what they do at work; that is, as long as it

doesn't affect productivity. This is a striking departure from the machine model introduced by Taylor in which workers were reduced to disembodied labour power.

Perhaps the most critical point of this entire discussion is that the underlying assumptions of the Human Relations approach have changed very little since they were first developed. While more "technical" terminology is introduced and a more sophisticated methodology employed, the basic premises remain the same. Happy workers produce more, so do what you can to keep the workers happy!

The major problem with this approach, as with Taylorism, is that neither address the source of the conflict between management and labour. In fact, Taylor came much closer to this than do Human Relations theorists, since he realized that as long as workers retain control over the labour process, the conflict would go on. He struggled, therefore, to strip workers of this control, by incorporating their knowledge of the labour process, the well spring of their power, into the company's planning and layout department. The Human Relations approach, by comparison, does little more than deflect and mask the conflict, by treating the symptoms of its continued existence.

The failure of both the Human Relations model and of Taylorism, in this respect, is evident in the continuous struggle which goes on between management and labour. In spite of the efforts of a wide variety of "management experts", worker alienation and discontent permeates most sectors of the labour market.

The authors of *Work In America* were particularly critical of Taylor's method. They are no less critical in their appraisal of the Human Relations approach. They note that this approach concentrates on the



enterprise as a social system in which workers are to be treated better. They suggest however, that "their jobs remain the same" and that "neither the satisfaction of workers nor their productivity is likely to improve greatly from the human relations approach."<sup>53</sup>

Modern manifestation of the Human Relations approach fare little better than their predecessors. Commenting on the viability of programmes such as job enrichment and participatory management, a spokesperson for the AFL-CIO finds little difference between the old and the new. He states that "much of what is passed off as new in the current surveys of worker dissatisfaction is an updating of the findings of Elton Mayo." He goes on to note that,

"The impetus for time and motion studies is pretty much the same as that behind job enrichment or participatory management. Substituting the sociologist's questionnaire for the stopwatch is likely to be no gain for the workers. While workers have a stake in productivity it is not always identical with that of management. Job enrichment programmes have cut jobs just as effectively as automation or engineer's stopwatches. And the rewards of productivity are not always equitably shared."<sup>54</sup>

The skepticism expressed by this union official about recent Human Relations strategies, demonstrates the concern which exists among organized labour over attempts to alter the labour process. The reasons for this distrust reside in the fact that experience has taught them that the new programmes may be nothing more than another attempt by management to gain control over the workers. Lessons about cooperation and piece rates were learned very quickly by workers and are not easily forgotten. This has meant that many new initiatives are given a luke warm response by many labour groups. A case in point involved a group of American auto workers who were sent to Sweden to work in the Saab-Scania engine plant which had introduced production processes much different from the assembly line techniques practiced in the United States. In the Swedish plants, the

workers were given more autonomy and responsibility and worked in teams as opposed to on assembly lines. The lack of enthusiasm about this work process on the part of the American workers, was widely reported in the press. The sentiments of these workers to the new methods is summed up succinctly in the following comment by one of these workers.

"If I have to bust my ass [for the job] to be meaningful, forget it; I'd rather [it] be monotonous."<sup>55</sup>

The meaning that work holds for these auto workers reflects the insight they have into the labour process. Their apparent lack of motivation and the instrumental orientation they demonstrated to their work may be a result of their understanding of the inherent contradictions in the organization of production. As the quote shows, the meaningfulness of work does not appear to be a high priority if it is gained only through increased output. Thus, the relationship between new methods such as job enrichment and job enlargement, and increased productivity, has not been lost on these workers; obviously many do not think the trade-off in increased autonomy is worth the extra effort required.

The crisis in the workplace of the late 1960's and early 1970's sparked a tremendous amount of investigation of work-related problems. Large numbers of sociologists and industrial psychologists descended on the workplace in an effort to analyze these problems and the failure of earlier attempts aimed at controlling the conflict in the workplace. Curiously, the main focus of much of this research was on individual workers and the supposed causes of "job dissatisfaction". Unfortunately, in most cases, much of this effort proved less than fruitful. Also, renewed efforts in the Human Relations area have not shown promising results either. In an article in the Harvard Business Review, Thomas Fitzgerald offers an

assessment of why programmes based on the Human Relation model or what he calls "motivation theory" do not work. He states the following,

"The fact that there is some congruence [between individual needs and organizational goals] can be readily admitted, but this does not change the tension that exists anymore than does the recognition of the inconsistency of certain needs within the individual himself. The difficulty is that attention to improving attitudes and undesirable behaviour is usually directed at surface symptoms without significant attempts to correct the underlying source."<sup>56</sup>

We would concur with Fitzgerald's assessment that what is required is a correction in the underlying source of the conflict in the workplace. Studying worker dissatisfaction alone is not enough. In order to accomplish this, it may be necessary to go much further than Fitzgerald intended. The conflict which exists in the workplace must be understood in the context of larger social structural and historical processes. Only when examined in this way can the basic relations of production in society become the centre of focus. The resulting analysis would then address the vary nature of these relations in order to locate the source of the conflict.

In the quotations cited above, both the representative of labour and business, pointed to the inherent contradictions which exist between labour and management in this system of production. One suggests that while workers do have a stake in production, it is not always identical to management's. The other notes that there is some congruence of goals between the worker and the organization but that this does not change the tension that exists. A more radical interpretation of this relationship is provided by Edwards who suggests that,

"conflict exists because the interests of workers and those of employers collide, and what is good for one is frequently costly for the other."<sup>57</sup>

Edwards locates his explanation of labour-management conflict in a broader discussion of Marx's Labour Theory of Value. He notes, in this regard, that employers in Capitalist economies, purchase labour power in the market place. Labour power, according to Marx's definition, is the worker's capacity to do work and is usually measured in time units i.e., number of hours or days, etc. But, as Edwards notes, the capacity to do work and the actual amount of work which gets done, are two entirely different things. Herein lies the source of the potential conflict. Since in a situation in which workers do not control their own labour, and for whom work is not a source of intrinsic need satisfaction but merely a source of wages, "any exertion beyond the minimum needed to avert boredom will not be in the worker's interests."<sup>58</sup> For the employer, on the other hand, the more production that can be wrung out of the purchased labour power, the farther ahead he or she will be. This is true for the Capitalist without limits. These two interest therefore reflect the inherent contradiction in this system of production.

An additional source of strain, which flows from this relationship, is the continuous pressure on the Capitalist to be competitive in the market place. This is based, largely, on the extent to which the Capitalist is successful in extracting surplus value from his or her employees. In Marx's analysis, surplus value is the difference between the value actually produced by the worker and that portion of the production which is returned to the worker in the form of wages. The difference between these two amounts represents the capitalist's profit.

Competition in the marketplace compels the capitalist to continually reduce the price of his or her commodities in order to retain a share of the market. The difficulty here is that this must be accomplished without



threatening the level of profits obtained. This feat can be carried out in a number of ways. For example, one way to lower prices without reducing profits is to lengthen the working day without increasing the wages paid to the employees. This practice, however, is restricted by a number of factors, including both the natural limits of human capacity for work as well as the organized resistance of workers to this type of strategy. Nevertheless, this practice has been adopted in many instances in the past. For the reasons mentioned above however, it has not proven very effective.

The second way of increasing surplus value is reducing the labour time necessary to produce the equivalent of the worker's wages. According to Mandel, this results in an increase in 'relative surplus value' based on the growth in the productivity of labour.<sup>59</sup> This usually comes about through the employment of new machinery, the implementation of more rational methods of work, a more advanced division of labour, etc. However, this possibility is itself restricted by the need for large amounts of capital to buy new machinery and/or the resistance of workers to these new methods. In addition, advantages gained by employing this method are soon lost as other capitalists acquire the same equipment, etc.

According to Mandel's analysis, the growth of 'absolute surplus value,' on the other hand, is the result of the intensification of labour. That is, "the worker is obliged to expend in ten hours of work, the same productive effort as previously he expended in thirteen or fourteen hours. Such intensification can be brought about by various methods: speeding up the pace of work; speeding up the machinery; increasing the number of machines to be watched (e.g., looms to be overlooked in textile mills), etc."<sup>60</sup> This type of strategy has been used much more often in the past and in fact, reflects the practices of Taylorism described above. In many

cases, the conflict in the workplace occurs precisely over the implementation of these practices.

This discussion of the inherent conflict between labour and management has been based on a Marxist analysis of the labour process. The utility of this conceptualization for research in the study of labour-management conflict, over other possible models which could be adopted, is discussed at length by Edwards and Scullion.<sup>61</sup> These authors note several advantages which the Marxist approach has over the other approaches for research in this area. They suggest, for example, that this particular perspective provides a valuable historical framework within which developments in the labour process can be examined in terms of the conflict in the workplace. Additionally, they argue that by locating conflict in the workplace in the very structure of the labour process itself, the source of the conflict is specified and a material basis for it established. They list a number of problems which this procedure avoids and indicate that,

"a crucial starting point in the analysis of conflict lies in the recognition that the forms on which labour power is expended constitute a basic conflict of interest between employers and workers."<sup>62</sup>

The third point made by Edwards and Scullion is based on the concept of the "effort bargain". This refers to the actual amount of effort that a worker will expend at work. While employers bargain over the rate of pay workers are to receive, no bargain is made over how much effort shall be expended for a particular wage. This becomes particularly evident in such behaviour as 'soldiering', which we noted was the deliberate restriction of output by workers. In this context, 'soldiering' represents another aspect of the basic conflict of interests in the labour process which must be taken into account.

Finally, Edwards and Scullion point out that a further benefit of adopting a Marxist perspective in this type of analysis accrues from the fact that it allows the behaviour of workers "to be viewed in a more rational light." This can be explicated by using the example of 'soldiering' once again. Self-preserving behaviour such as soldiering can be seen as much more than merely negative or hostile behaviour or even the reaction of frustrated individuals to a particular work situation. This type of behaviour can be seen instead in the context of an "overall strategy of resistance" and specifically as self-protective and rational behaviour on the part of workers. This seems to be consistent with much of the literature cited above which notes the relationship between worker behaviour and the resulting managerial response, i.e., usually newer and more effective control systems.

These authors note that there are several problems with the Marxist formulation. In particular, they point out the ease with which specific actors and actions such as soldiering are identified "as direct forms of resistance to an existing control system" but note that it is "more difficult to show that this is so."<sup>63</sup> Despite the difficulties, however, Edwards and Scullion conclude that this perspective is the most useful one available for this type of analysis.

In our discussion thus far, we have reviewed the developments of both Taylorism and the Human Relations approach. These have been identified as specific forms of managerial response to the conflict and resistance found in the workplace. In the case of Taylorism, for example, it was shown that control over the labour process was itself the prize in the struggle between labour and management. It has also been suggested that the



emergence of this system of control could be attributed to the failure of earlier control mechanisms to deal effectively with worker resistance.

Similarly, the development of more recent forms of managerial control have been related to the failure and inadequacies found in Taylorism itself. Thus in discussing the impetus for the emergence of the Human Relations programmes of recent years, Clegg and Dunkerely note that,

"The changes that have occurred have been almost totally management imposed changes, brought about largely through the increasing costs of scientific management (absenteeism, turnover, reduced productivity, poor quality etc.<sup>64</sup>

Once again the existing mechanisms of control, in this case scientific management, were rendered inadequate, in management's eyes, due to the resistance and conflict which were occurring in the workplace. It must be borne in mind however, that the range of possibilities for various types of managerial response is restricted by the existing social conditions of the historical period in which they occur. Thus, while lengthening the working day would have been possible in the early stages of industrial capitalism, it is less likely to be used in a situation in which workers hold considerable power in the form of union organizations or in which they have the force of the law on their side, such as in the present context.

This situation is also true of more authoritarian forms of control which have been used in the workplace, such as those described by Edwards as "simple control."<sup>65</sup> This system of control is particularly costly since it requires the close and constant supervision of employees. Even when it is applied, there is no guarantee that it will be effective.<sup>66</sup> In addition, this form of control presupposes the existence of a labour force which will submit to the types of coercive tactics which are characteristic of such a system of control. This type of system is especially



inappropriate in labour markets populated by an increasing number of white collar workers.

The problem for management at this point therefore, was to find a system of control which could respond to the conflict in the workplace more effectively than Taylorism and yet which would remain attuned to the social circumstances of the day. It is in this specific context that the Human Relations approach experienced a renewal.

"The work humanization or neo-human relations [approach] has a direct lineage from the early Hawthorne experiments, but equally can be seen as an adaptation of Taylorism to the new conditions of struggle in production, with the aim of preserving the profitability of capital rather than a radical revolution of the labour process."<sup>67</sup>

#### IV. Alienation and Control: Recent Developments

The recent developments in the Human Relations approach can be seen as providing one type of solution to the problems in the workplace. Rather than reverting to increased 'technical control' as Taylor had done, these theorists revived the ideas of Elton Mayo. They sought to influence workers (and thereby gain a measure of control over their behaviour) by appealing to their social nature. Programmes which advocated participation of the employees and the designing of more humane jobs, were not motivated by some altruistic concern over the well being of workers but rather with the level of profits enjoyed by the companies which employed them. As Clegg and Dunkerely note,

"What the Human Relations theorists did was to produce a highly developed ideological apparatus of normative control, of hegemony, for the management of organizations."<sup>68</sup>

The importance to this body of work therefore lies in the fact that it provides management with a means of exercising control at work which is effective and inexpensive (since no expensive technology is required) while

at the same time it legitimizes the very actions taken to extend its control over the production process. The logic encapsulated in the participatory programmes asserts the appropriateness of management's goals by making the workers' own livelihood dependent on their continued cooperation with management. Any other conclusions by the workers are rendered non-rational in this type of logic. It can be noted then that,

"the Human Relations movement has significance not as a body of scientific findings of a highly dubious nature, but as part of the apparatus whereby organizations attempt to impose and maintain control of production"<sup>69</sup>

As we noted above, the strategies developed by the Human Relations theorists sought to alter the interaction at work by appealing to the social nature of the workplace organization. It was also pointed out that this practice was deemed highly manipulative by many critics of the approach. The workers themselves soon learned that these programmes were not all that they appeared to be at first sight. In fact, many union organizations became vigorous in their opposition to human relations efforts.

This has also occurred with neo-human relations programmes such as job enrichment and participatory management. This was heightened by experiences that the labour movement had with "company unions", particularly in Great Britain.<sup>70</sup> These types of "unions" were used in the early part of this century to effectively block the development of indigenous workers' organizations in the companies which created them. They served largely to legitimate company activity to workers. In addition, they were an effective channel for any conflict which existed, thereby acting as an additional check on worker behaviour in the interests of management. Workers who were members of these company unions were often coopted into explaining and defending the company's position on contentious issues.

Another problem which concerned union people was the effect that the new human relations programmes had on the union's authority. Since the new participatory programmes resulted in direct contact between the worker and the company, many union leaders saw the role of the union being undermined by these programmes. The more "participatory" the plans were, the more they seemed to place the legitimacy (and power) of the unions in question. The unions did not sit idly by however but challenged the new programmes wherever they appeared.

The situation described thus far, reflects only a partial view of the interaction in the labour process. It is important to bear in mind that while management was adopting 'new' tactics in its attempt to retain control over the labour process, the workers and their unions were developing an agenda of their own. In addition to direct job action, such as strikes, wildcats, absenteeism, work-stoppages and slowdowns etc., various elements in the labour movement were beginning to articulate their own position on the way that work should be organized. This was the result, to some extent at least, of the apparent failure of the strategy adopted by the union movement after the Second World War in which productivity bargaining was emphasized over issues of workers' rights to control the labour process. This position was becoming increasingly unpopular among the rank and file and proving difficult for the union to defend. The deteriorating economic climate also made this position untenable in the mid 1970's.

This situation was given further impetus by the arrival of the "new" workers in the labour market during the mid to late sixties and early seventies. As was noted in *Work In America*:

"What these workers want most, as more than 100 studies in the past 20 years show, is to become masters of their immediate environment and to feel that their work and they themselves are important - the twin ingredients of self-esteem."<sup>1</sup>

Bolstered by the social climate of the time, the young workers and the labour movement in general began to call for increased participation in the decisions which affected their lives at work. "The cries of students for participatory democracy and of blacks for self-determination [were] heard all over the country."<sup>72</sup> This affected the labour movement as the discontent of the workers, and the young workers in particular, began to find expression in demands for Workplace Democracy and workers' control.

Management's response to the conflict in the workplace had been a neo-human relations based strategy. Programmes such as job enrichment, job enlargement and participatory management however proved less than successful. As they became increasingly criticized as manipulative and ineffective, a new direction was sought. Since authoritarian or coercive methods were not appropriate in the existing social context, more progressive theorists began to look at the idea of participation a little more closely and the concept of workers' control began to gain momentum. In this regard, Silverman and Yanowitch note that,

"It is significant that the idea of workers' control has re-emerged in "post-industrial" capitalism and is being given serious consideration by spokesmen for both liberal and radical thought."<sup>73</sup>

The range of programmes introduced by the neo-human relations theorists and the manner in which various interests were expressed in them, provided the context within which the convergence of liberal and radical thought was possible. The notion of workers' control could be adjusted to meet the requirements of both of these perspectives. The liberal theorists recognized the problems inherent in the structure of "post-industrial" society. Resolving the growing problems of bureaucratization and increasing the possibilities for democratic participation in large scale industrial organizations were consistent with the traditional liberal approach.

The

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

Their demands for workers' control therefore, reflects their analysis of the logic of modern capitalist development and this was seen as a viable means for gradually reforming modern industrial society.<sup>74</sup>

Radical theorists, on the other hand, defined the renewed interest in workers' control as a means of rekindling working class consciousness. Their goals in supporting this movement however, have nothing to do with solving management's control problems or reforming the system. Instead, they are aimed at initiating a direct and fundamental challenge to the control and power of capitalist institutions. Workers' control represents a strategy for the transformation of the capitalist relations of production and an attempt to realize socialist goals.<sup>75</sup>

In this way, and expressing entirely different motivations, liberal and radical theorists seized upon the idea of workers' control. The strategy of participation, introduced by the neo-human relations theorists had struck a responsive chord in the social milieu of the day. This fostered a number of developments in various directions which the human relations theorists clearly had not intended for their programmes.<sup>76</sup>

The support for workers' control touched off a number of controversies in both the liberal and radical camps however, over potential changes in the workplace. Since the idea of workers' control was so broadly and loosely defined, each observer was able to bring a different interpretation to the situation. Thus it was possible for representatives of management to adopt the new human relations strategies and claim that workers' control was being implemented in spite of the fact that the obvious goal of the particular programme being referred to was to diffuse conflict and to increase productivity!



from

effect

real

the

the

incre

in

de

con

exce

cent

the

which

sec

con

not

bas

system

they

need

the

possi

state

A great deal of concern was expressed about the effectiveness of these programmes among liberal theorists, radical theorists and the workers affected by them. The central issue revolved around the possibility for real change which workers' control provided on the one hand contrasted with the potential for manipulation which these types of programmes allowed on the other. At the same time, the problems in the workplace appeared to increase, especially after the energy crisis in the early seventies sparked an economic slump and with the increased competition for Japanese and German products discussed above. The response by many companies to these conditions was to abandon these "questionable" (and not profit producing) experiments and to concentrate on productivity and profits.<sup>77</sup>

In the radical camp in particular, the debate over workers' control centered around the issue of whether these programmes did anything to alter the basic relations which exist in the production process. The ease with which many of the programmes were abandoned when the economy began to decline, gave the critics of the plans a powerful example to use in their condemnations of them. They pointed out that they were implemented, in most cases, at the pleasure of management and could be halted just as easily by them.

Marx's analysis of worker self-management schemes and cooperative systems did not provide support for workers' control either. He noted that they would be unable to transform capitalist society and that what was needed was the transfer of society's productive forces into the hands of the producers themselves. For many, workers' control did not afford the possibility of this happening. Mandel echoes Marx's position when he states,

"The fundamental principle underlying self-management ... is unrealizable in an economy which allows the survival of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

competition ... it is thus to deceive the workers to lead them to believe that they can manage their own affairs at the level of the factory. In the present economic system, a whole series of decisions are inevitably taken at higher levels than the factory.<sup>78</sup>

This position is echoed by Rinehart when he points out that even the most radical schemes for industrial betterment are not directed at challenging the basic authority structure of complex organizations. He notes that employee discipline and control by the organization is never really eliminated but only removed to a higher level in the management hierarchy where it is exercised "indirectly" so long as the workers carry out their new tasks to management's satisfaction.<sup>79</sup>

Daniel Zwerdling offers an even more specific criticism of managerial methods including programmes such as job enrichment, job enlargement and worker participation, (especially as these have been put into operation by the A.T. and T corporation). He suggests that,

"The small freedoms and decision making powers that companies like A.T. and T. have granted do make work more bearable, but only because it was so unbearable before."<sup>80</sup>

However, he states elsewhere that there is some hope in this development and even much to be gained by workers being involved in the workplace democracy experiments which are being tried. He states,

"But all of the enterprises described here [experiments in workplace democracy] offer crucial lessons - both positive and negative - which can help workers in the future to continue on the difficult but rewarding journey towards democracy at work."<sup>81</sup>

Carole Pateman examined the issue of workers' control by conducting an empirical investigation of studies which have been carried out on worker participation. She concluded her analysis by noting that "participation is a central means of attitude change." She refers to a number of studies which indicate,

"that workplace participation generates general attitudes of political efficacy necessary to animate democratic citizenship, attitudes which have not been sufficiently developed by parliamentary democracy alone."<sup>82</sup>

Clawson approaches this issue from a different angle. He argues against the view that technological demands make it impossible to fundamentally change work and suggests instead, that meaningful changes in work can occur and that work can be satisfying, creative and stimulating while at the same time highly productive. He cites several examples in which this occurs when workers have control over production. He refers specifically to the writings of such authors as Blumberg and Hunius who have documented the positive benefits of worker participation and workers' control.

Blumberg's findings are particularly illuminating in this context since he makes some very strong statements about worker participation. After an extensive survey of studies on participation he states that,

"There is hardly a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced or that other generally acknowledged beneficial consequences accrue from a genuine increase in workers' decision making power. Such a consistency of findings, I submit, is rare in social research."<sup>83</sup>

The efficacy of worker participation programmes was incorporated into many of the ideas which underscore the quality of working life movement. The intent of QWL based initiatives, in fact, was to reduce or eliminate alienation in the workplace by promoting workers' participation. As we mentioned above, the possibility of eliminating alienation through workers' participation does not appear possible from a Marxist perspective since this does not entail any fundamental alteration of the existing relations of production. It is important to recognize, however, that many QWL objectives are essentially consistent with the types of changes required to

humanize the workplace. This is particularly true of those proposals which call for the genuine control of work by workers.

The central issue in this regard revolves around the viability of QWL programmes for reducing or eliminating alienation. As we noted above, there is a legitimate concern that QWL programmes can have little impact in a capitalist system. On the other hand, the result of workers experiences cannot be overlooked. Zwerdling has referred to both the positive as well as the negative experiences of workers with these types of initiatives. The effect of these lessons cannot at present be assessed, however, while QWL does not appear to pose a direct threat to capitalism, it represents yet another indication of the need to reconstruct the organization of work. It also shows how the changes in the workplace have moved away from the authoritarian model introduced by Taylor in the early part of this century. Thus, it may be seen as another stage in the struggle between labour and management over control of work. This development is significant since it addresses the workprocess in more than narrow economic terms or concerns with productivity by including a consideration of the needs of the workers involved. This represents a substantial change which is worthy of careful monitoring in order to gauge its impact on the emerging industrial relations in this society.

#### V. Alienation and the Quality of Working Life.

The serious and continuing economic recession of the early 1980's, coupled with intensified competition from abroad, created an environment in which the idea of the "Quality of Working Life." (QWL) began to attract serious attention. In particular, the growing realization by both big labour and big business of the disintegration of the post war coalition

which was based primarily on sharing productivity gains made the search for an alternative, acceptable to both, more compelling. This, in turn, gave QWL inspired programmes an opportunity to develop.

This is perhaps nowhere more evident today, than in the automobile industry. After struggling through several years of massive unemployment, enormous losses, wage concessions, poor sales and even poorer quality production, both the auto companies and the automobile worker's unions began to recognize that a new arrangement was essential. This led to many changes and included the implementation of a number of 'Quality of Working Life/Employee Involvement projects under the joint sponsorship of the U.A.W. and such companies as General Motors and the Ford Motor Company. These projects were given the full support of the top leadership of both the union and the companies involved.<sup>84</sup>

The much publicized success of the Japanese style of industrial relations has also given QWL initiatives a boost.<sup>85</sup> This model provides both companies and unions, such as those in the automobile industry, with a working example of one possible way that a production system utilizing both high technology and "cooperative" labour-management relations can be established. While some critics of the Japanese model have argued that it is not quite as "cooperative" as it seems at first glance, it does demonstrate that an alternative to what exists in this country is at least possible.<sup>86</sup>

The present research seeks to examine various dimensions of the QWL in order to assess their usefulness in the construction of the types of work organizations which will be required in future. According to proponents of QWL, those persons engaged in the design of work organizations should be concerned with both the needs of the workers doing the work as well as with

the requirements for efficient and highly productive work.<sup>87</sup> The assumptions upon which the QWL concept rests, indicate that regardless of the particular political system that a society has, it will need to be cognizant of both of these requirements of work organizations in future. In their view socialist societies can no more afford inefficient and/or inhumane work organization than can capitalist ones!

This is especially true of the way that work is organized under Capitalism for as Reich notes,

"the most profound impact of the commodity system and technology was on man's own individual being. The visible ravaging of the land and the social fabric was matched by an invisible ravaging of man within. Man was not merely alienated from environment and society, he was alienated from his own functions and needs. His principle activity - work - ceased to be self expression. He felt little of the normal satisfactions of work; he was a mere cog in production; his tasks no longer expressed his abilities. Man's most basic activity was dominated by the most impersonal of masters--money."<sup>88</sup>

Under these circumstances, it should not be surprising that work is often "shunned like the plague", as Marx noted in his description of alienated labour. Even Adam Smith was concerned with the consequences of this type of work organization when he wrote,

The man whose life is spent in performing a few simple operations of which the effects too are, perhaps, always the same, or very nearly the same, has no occasion to exert his understanding, or to exercise his inventions in finding out expedients for difficulties which never occur. He naturally loses, therefore, the habit of such exertion and generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become."<sup>89</sup>

In addition to the consequences that this type of work has for individual workers, the results of the resistance and conflict which such work generates is extremely costly for society as a whole. The type of behaviour this implies has already been described above and results in losses from such things as strikes, wildcats and other work stoppages, absenteeism and high turnover rates, sabotage and poor quality. Each of these affect



the productivity of labour and to the extent that the economic order of a particular nation is tied into the world market, some nations will pay exceedingly harsh penalties for low productivity and poor quality, etc. The permanent loss of thousands of jobs in the American automobile industry is a case in point. While this resulted from more than worker resistance and conflict on the shopfloor, these factors did have a significant impact on these results.

At a more general level of analysis, there is a growing awareness (and in some quarters concern) over the finite nature of the world's resources. Spawned in the wake of the energy crisis and ensuing economic recession of the early 1970's, this awareness has led to the realization that there are real limits to economic growth and in fact that negative growth is a distinct possibility. This represents a serious situation for an economic order predicated upon continued expansion and growth. The need for the judicious allocation and expenditure of scarce resources therefore is becoming apparent to many. "In a world increasingly concerned with the most efficient use of scarce resources, the potential energy and materials savings are an additional economic benefit of participation programmes."<sup>90</sup>

In terms of the present discussion, the message it is clear that the type of work organizations needed to meet the new challenges cannot support the waste and inefficiency which has characterized work organizations in the past. In particular, the costs of an adversarial system of industrial relations can no longer be sustained. What is required instead, is a system of production which is both effective and efficient and which does not generate conflict and resistance.<sup>91</sup>

A further area of concern, especially among advocates of QWL is the impact that work has on non-work activity and the realization that the work

experience extends beyond the plant gates. This idea was originally discussed in the academic literature under the rubric of the "compensation thesis" which held that people could "compensate" for unsatisfying working lives through their out of work actions.<sup>92</sup> This was related in particular, to the higher wages which were available to the workers in the "monopoly sector" of the economy.<sup>93</sup> It has been suggested that monotonous, boring and alienating jobs are the price that had to be paid for a higher standard of living and increased consumption by the working class.<sup>94</sup>

Research into the relationship between work and non-work behaviour suggested an alternative to the compensation thesis which pointed out that what was occurring was a "spill over" of work experience into non-work areas. Thus, several studies document the correlation between what a person does at work and what he or she does when off the job.<sup>95</sup> This notion has been extended in recent formulations by QWL advocates, who suggest that the overall quality of life experienced by people, depends to a great extent on the quality of their working lives. They go on to suggest that there are serious ramifications for a society which ignores this relationship, in terms of the social costs which it incurs as a result of poor or undesirable working lives among its citizens.

The clearest example of the social costs related to what goes on in the 'private' world of work are found in the area of work-related medical problems. Lauer lists a number of studies which link both mental illness and suicide to undesirable working conditions.<sup>96</sup> He describes a whole array of medical symptoms which have been associated with job related stress including such things as "coronary heart disease, migrains, peptic ulcers and hypertension".<sup>97</sup> He goes on to note that,

"people who are satisfied with their work ... tend to have fewer of these health problems and even seem to live longer."<sup>98</sup>

Further support for this position was presented in the Work in America report in which job dissatisfaction was associated with such things as low self esteem, anxiety, tension and worry.<sup>99</sup> The social costs of these problems is enormous both in terms of the direct costs of medical treatment and the loss of production which occurs. Lauer adds a further set of consequences and costs to this calculation when he describes the impact that undesirable and unsatisfying work have on interpersonal relations and other social institutions such as families. Problems such as alcoholism, interpersonal violence and family breakdown are discussed in this context. He cites one study which suggests that

"many of the interpersonal problems in the workplace can be traced to the nature of the work. Give any person a dead-end career ladder, a sense of powerlessness, and a feeling that the boss and co-workers are always watching, and he or she will go rigid and mean."<sup>100</sup>

This analysis is further extended to include the effects of unemployment and work hazards on workers and the costs that this has for society.<sup>101</sup> Lauer describes the serious problems which both of these factors contribute to and states that,

"when productivity in the workplace declines, the nations economy suffers and that means additional problems for a great proportion of Americans."<sup>102</sup>

Unemployment is then described as having a particularly devastating effect on people.

The evidence presented in the debate between the proponents of the "compensatory" thesis and the advocates of the "spill-over" thesis is not entirely conclusive. It is clear, however, that what goes on at work is related to the overall "quality of life" that a person experiences. It is also clear however, that a person can find gratification and positive sources of self-esteem outside of the workplace. It appears then, that

these two positions may not be mutually exclusive but may reflect a range of behaviour which people engage in in response to the particular threats to their self-esteem that they encounter. Thus, if a person perceives an opportunity to enhance his or her self-esteem at work, then he or she may choose to invest in this activity. If, on the other hand, no such opportunities are perceived, people may respond in a number of ways ranging from passivity to hostility, depending on the contingencies surrounding this interaction. Conversely, the opportunity for enhancing self esteem may or may not be present in people's non-work environment. People can choose to pursue or ignore these opportunities depending on their own circumstances.

The formulation employed in the present research places a great deal of emphasis on the importance of work as an arena in which human activity is expressed. When this activity is not perceived as providing the opportunity for establishing and maintaining a positive self image, a major portion of people's life activity is eliminated as a possible source for this process. This aspect of a person's life activity is rendered meaningless in this context. In a very real sense, these people are deprived of this period as a potential time for self related activity. This represents a major and significant loss given the importance of work in this culture and the sheer number of hours people spend each day in work related activities.

One group of people in the QWL movement address this by focussing on the interrelationship between workers' needs and the socio-technical environment at work.<sup>103</sup> The concern for them, is to design the types of work organizations which will eliminate the myriad of problems described above while at the same time providing efficient and productive work organizations. These two complimentary goals provide for both the

satisfaction of the needs of workers while at work and at the same time ensure a high standard of living through effective production methods. Unfortunately, in the past, the requirements of increased productivity and efficiency have been stressed at the expense of the satisfaction of needs. This situation has resulted, according to these QWL advocates, in the type of problems described above and must be altered if they are to be resolved.

Many of the studies discussed thus far, have indicated that worker participation and control provide a viable means for addressing the problems of alienation from work. Proponents of the QWL approach incorporated worker participation and employee involvement into their scheme. In many ways, the assumptions which underlie the concerns expressed by QWL advocates reflect the types of ideas discussed above in relation to control over work. It is important, at this point, to discuss the various notions which comprise the QWL movement.

The ideas which underscore the quality of working life movement began during the late sixties and early seventies. They coincided with the growing concern at that time over issues related to the general quality of life in this society. The social upheaval of the sixties had spawned a lively debate over such issues as human rights, the depletion of world resources, pollution of the environment, the state of the educational system, sexual liberation, etc., etc. The nature and quality of people's experiences at work formed part of this debate and reflected many of its humanistic assumptions.

As more and more people became interested in the problems surrounding work and the way in which it is organized, a cacophony of terms began to emerge to describe the various points of view being expressed. Each approach defined the problems of work from a slightly different

perspective, appealed to a particular audience and expressed specific concerns. Eventually however, a more homogeneous approach began to develop and while diversity remained one of its hallmarks there was sufficient convergence that a 'movement' subsumed under the umbrella term "the quality of working life" could be identified.<sup>104</sup> This underlying diversity makes the definition of QWL somewhat problematic since it does not reflect the ideas of one or even a few individuals but rather encompasses a wide variety of perspectives, policies and points of view. As Lawler notes,

"Unfortunately, there is no well-accepted or well-developed definition of the term quality of working life, a fact that is not surprising since the various groups interested in life in organizations have quite different vested interests in what such life is like. Some of these groups are primarily concerned with the degree to which an organization's work environment motivates effective job performance, others with the degree to which it safeguards the physical as well as psychological well being of employees, and still others with the degree to which it decreases the alienation of people from work and society."<sup>105</sup>

Each of the interests outlined by Lawler reflects a major constituency in the QWL movement and mirrors the growing concerns over the importance of work for society in general. The difficulty in defining QWL arises from the fact that it is used to refer to a whole host of quite diverse programmes, some of which are fundamentally incompatible. This feature of QWL has been both a source of problems as well as a source of strength since its vagueness has helped to get the idea of QWL accepted under circumstances where it otherwise might not have been welcome. The meaning attached to the term QWL has been so widely construed that its applications range from such things as the introduction of problem solving groups into the workplace and the development of quality circles, to the complete redesign of the socio-technical environment and the call for workplace democracy. As this list shows, the area which the term encompasses is enormous.

In spite of this apparent heterogeneity, some agreement over key elements of QWL does exist. The most general of these reflect the basic need to understand work in the broader context of a person's life and to attempt to ensure that work contributes to the overall well being of the person and the society of which he or she is a part. Advocates of QWL stress that it is more of an overall orientation which people have towards work rather than any specific programme or set of organizational principles. They describe it as a process which involves both workers and management in the active reconstruction of their work organizations to ensure that they are productive and efficient and at the same time sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the people who work in them.

The QWL process contains a number of recurring themes which include such things as the need to provide workers with decent, humane jobs which afford them dignity and respect; work experiences which provide them with the opportunity to grow and develop as human beings; democracy in the workplace such that people have a genuine opportunity to participate in the decisions that directly and immediately impact on their lives; and the establishment of effective and efficient organizational forms.

Faunce has summarized four principles for the "humanization" of work which he states are typical of the manner in which QWL is defined in the QWL movement. These include,

1. the principle of security at the workplace "implies the worker's need to be free from fear and anxiety concerning his health and safety, income, and future employment";
2. The principle of equity "implies that workers should be compensated commensurately with their contribution to the value of a service or product. Lack of equity (e.g., large difference in income between managers and workers and lack of sharing in profits) causes resentment and hostility";
3. The principle of individuation implies that "work should stimulate the development of unique abilities, craftsmanship, and the capacity for continued learning... individuation also...means that workers have maximum autonomy in

- determining the rhythm of their work and in planning how it should be done";
4. The principle of democracy implies that "wherever feasible, workers should manage themselves; authoritarian, hierarchical control should be replaced by cooperative, self-managed groups."<sup>106</sup>

The basis for much of the QWL approach reflects the importance which this orientation attaches to the meaning of work. The importance of work and the extent to which it impacts on a person's life has been commented on by a number of observers. The following statement from Bryant gives an indication of the scope this is given.

"One's standard of living, style of life, political ideology, basic orientation, choice of friends and spouse, health, daily routine, mode of child rearing and general satisfaction with life, to name only a few considerations, may well be the indirect, if not the direct, results of one's work speciality. We are shaped, molded, regulated, even assimilated by our work. Work is our behavioural product, but so, too, are we and our lives in many ways the products of our work."<sup>107</sup>

This should not be surprising considering the fact that most adults today spend between one-third and one-half of their waking hours either at work or preparing for it! The tremendous importance that work has for people therefore, cannot be overstated.

The specific importance placed on work activity as a means for expressing uniquely human qualities as well as the potential that it has for human growth and development, represent an important aspect of QWL.

A great deal of concern is expressed in the QWL literature with respect to human development, need satisfaction and self-actualization. This is approached primarily through the conceptualization of a "hierarchy of needs" developed by Maslow. In fact, in many instances, QWL is measured in terms of the opportunity that work affords people for fulfilling increasingly higher order needs. It is particularly important in the QWL approach that this type of situation exist at work.



"In Maslow's words, to organize people for work as if they are "mentally healthy adults seeking self-actualization is, in the long run and given certain qualifications, the path of success of any kind whatsoever, including financial success."<sup>108</sup>

Maslow's theory suggests that people have a needs-hierarchy ladder moving upwards from primary physical needs such as food, shelter and clothing, etc., to needs for social contact, safety, and to higher order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization. The model implies that the lower order needs must be satisfied before a person can satisfy higher order needs.

"As individuals mature, they seek opportunities for self-actualization that is, they seek the freedom to be creative, to develop their skills to the maximum, to exercise autonomy and the like."<sup>109</sup>

The nature of the control exercised over the workplace in most traditionally constructed organizations, whether they are based on Tayloristic or Human Relations principles or some combination of the two, are such that they rarely allow the kinds of self-actualizing behaviour described above to go on. This is especially true as you move down the organizational hierarchy. What is called for by QWL proponents, is a "genuine" opportunity for the employees to share in the decision making power which exists in the organization and which directly affects their lives. This would allow some opportunity for people to experience self-actualizing behaviour at work.

In our discussion of the concept of alienation, we focussed specifically on the way that control was exercised in work organizations. As a matter of definition in this construct, the lessening of alienation should follow from such practices as workers' control, workplace democracy and to some extent worker participation. The QWL literature addresses the same issues but does so from a different point of departure. Rather than

focussing primarily on workers and their control of work, the QWL movement, partially due to its origins, approaches the issue through an appeal to both management and organized labour to consider the consequences of the existing industrial relations.

Proponents of QWL often begin by outlining the problems and harm caused by the old style, hierarchical, authoritarian, control-based model of workplace organization. They point out the drawbacks of this approach for both management and labour, including considerations of alienation and rapidly falling productivity rates and suggest that there are advantages to be gained in an alternative form of social organization of work based on QWL principles. Cooperation and not confrontation is presented as the desirable way of thinking about industrial relations and this is described in terms of a genuine cooperative effort by both management and labour on a win-win as opposed to a win-lose basis.

The implications of the scenario outlined above is that power in organizations is not defined as a finite quantity or "zero-sum" any longer but is seen instead as an attribute of the organization which can be effectively utilized to assist the organization in achieving its goals. Thus, the benefits of cooperative relations are demonstrated through such programmes as cooperative work groups, worker participation in decision making and the increased flexibility of the organization gained through better communications and coordination resulting from non-hierarchical power structures.<sup>110</sup>

An additional and perhaps more salient difference between alienation and QWL follows directly from the different solutions each has concerning the resolution of the problems they identify. In this regard, the elimination of alienation is possible only through a fundamental transformation of

the existing relations of production.<sup>111</sup> This arises as a result of the irreconcilable contradictions which are seen as inherent qualities of the Capitalist mode of production. In the QWL movement, on the other hand, change is slow and gradual, building on and incorporating various elements of the existing structure. Concerns over the undesirable consequences of the existing forms of organization, or over inequality or other contradictions in the system are usually expressed in humanistic terms particularly as they contribute to the inhumane aspects of work. More often, however, much of the impetus for this approach comes about as a result of the keen self interest of the various parties involved especially during times of economic stress, falling productivity and growing worker unrest. Unfortunately, the worker is quite often rendered a passive by-stander in this entire process as business, labour, government and even academic concerns, all seem to precede those of the worker. The "new" programmes are aimed at the workers however, and they are expected to cooperate. The changes that are proposed, usually seek to modify, redesign or restructure the existing system rather than introduce a new one.

Given the differences that exist between alienation and QWL, in what sense can they be used in the current context? We do not wish to suggest that they coincide to any great extent, nor that any effort should be made to make them more compatible. However, in the particular areas in which they do overlap, notably in their humanistic concerns related to human development and self-actualization, a number of useful ideas do exist. For example, the QWL movement has been described above as a 'process' which attempts to ameliorate the existing conditions in organizations. This process allegedly results in a "better" quality of working life, however, we are never explicitly informed as to what this might look like but are

presented instead with a number of general humanistic goals, which most people would find difficult to oppose. These are centered around ideas which incorporate the importance of satisfying higher order needs in a process of self-development and self actualization.<sup>112</sup> The concept of alienation likewise offers an appeal to the need for humans to be able to develop and grow and satisfy higher order needs through the use of powers and abilities in the satisfaction of these needs.

The similarity between alienation and QWL is seen in the present study as resting on the positive evaluation each places on the free expression of human activity for self growth and consequently on the negative evaluation each has of structures which inhibit this development. In both cases, the manifestations of control over workers in workplace organizations represent a major source of this blockage in the present society. Thus, both stress the need for people to have genuine opportunities to satisfy their essential human needs through work, including their higher order needs.

It is precisely in this sense that alienation and QWL are seen to offer a viable insight to the present research. Specifically, the use of these concepts in the present research will focus on an assessment of the extent to which the organizational structure of the institution being examined affords these workers with the opportunity for the satisfaction of various types of human needs. This will include the following: i) Basic Needs - these are related to the provision of physical requirements and are based in this case on such things as the pay received, the benefits provided, and the amount of security people perceive they have in their jobs. ii) Social Needs - this refers to the extent to which the job provides people the opportunity to engage in social intercourse, and receive the mutual help and support of co-workers, etc. iii) Higher Order Needs -

these include the opportunity to use skills and abilities, to exercise autonomy at work, to continue to learn and develop, and to be treated as responsible adults with dignity and respect.

Several implications follow from this interpretation. The meanings which are attributed to the measures of need satisfaction in this particular application, require some clarification. Thus the thrust of the investigation is on the perception that the employees in the study have of the extent to which they can satisfy various needs at work. Need satisfaction, is not seen as a static condition, which can be easily quantified and whose existence is obvious to all. Nor is it the case that once satisfied, needs require no further attention. On the contrary, need satisfaction in this conceptualization represents a constant and ongoing process which theoretically never comes to an end but is rather, always in a state of becoming.

An additional aspect about the way that need satisfaction is being interpreted here needs to be considered. This relates to the meaning that need satisfaction has for both the continued existence of alienation and the extent of the quality of working life being experienced by the workers. Specifically, how does the satisfaction of needs relate to both the amount of alienation which is seen to exist and to the level of QWL being experienced. The understanding of these concepts and their use in the present investigation is such that they are not identified in quantitative or absolute terms but rather reflect the relational qualities of the concepts. Thus alienation is based on the nature of the existing relationships quite apart from the expression of the alienated psychological states among the actors involved. These are seen as one manifestation of the existence of alienation along with other verbal and behavioural responses of these

workers. However, the implication of this is that alienation will be more or less present depending on the opportunity people have for satisfying various needs at work.

In the same manner, QWL is seen as a "relational" entity based on the particular social, historical and economic conditions which exist. The relationship between QWL and need satisfaction is such that when the opportunity for needs to be satisfied exists in the work organization, there is a concomitant opportunity for people to experience a better quality of working life. This should translate both verbally and behaviourally into more positive responses to work on the part of the employees in terms of their attitudes towards their jobs and the performance of their duties. The converse of this would also apply.

A final point that needs to be considered with respect to the perceptions that people have of their own work situations deals with the particular way in which various individuals define objectively similar sets of circumstances. This involves an enormously complex set of processes which reflect the personal, social and institutional milieux within which the individuals find themselves. Since people are reflexive and do not respond automatically to the stimuli around them, the possibility exists that people in the same situation will define it in completely different ways. So too, the responses that they make to any given situation depend to a large extent on their particular definition of it and their assessment of what is either appropriate or possible given the existing circumstance.<sup>113</sup>

While this may reflect a general understanding of human behaviour, several points are worthy of note. First, people make definite choices about how to act or respond to given situations and these choices reflect

their concerns about and understanding of the situation. Second, they do not make these choices in a vacuum. Their choices are limited by the particular circumstances in which they find themselves. Thus Kanter notes,

"Life does not consist of infinite possibility because situations do not make all responses equally plausible or equally available. But the limits are not so much internal, rooted in the person, as they are structured or situational."<sup>114</sup>

The regularity we observe in patterns of social interaction, may be due in part, to the structural limitations which individuals perceive to exist. However, the constraints on human behaviour are seldom absolute and in most cases there exists a range of behavioural alternatives. This makes it possible for a number of individuals to choose different responses to what would appear to be similar structural situations.<sup>115</sup> In the case of Taylor's workers for example, some were actively cooperative while others were extremely instrumental in their actions. Still others displayed active resistance and hostility in the same situation. The particular response that people make is ultimately an empirical question. It does indicate, however, the pattern which the social relations take in a given context. The types of responses exhibited by the workers who participated in the present study are understood in precisely this manner.

#### VI.: Workers' Responses to Work.

"They had to throw away half a mile of Blackpool rock last year, for instead of the customary motif running through its length, it carried the terse injunction 'Fuck Off'...Our data include examples of acts which only temporarily disconcert management, and of those which have shut an entire factory. Sometimes the behaviour involves only one person, but often the active or passive cooperation of hundreds is observable. It may occur just once or twice in the history of the industry or be an almost daily experience in the worker's life."<sup>116</sup>

The types of responses which workers make to work range, as Taylor noted, from workers giving the company their all, to looking for any excuse

to get out of work. The present research attempts to describe the particular strategies adopted by the Residential Counsellors in terms of both their verbal and behavioural responses to work. The concepts of alienation and QWL provide the context within which this behaviour will be examined. Specifically, this will involve an assessment of the opportunities which the staff perceives to exist at the Centre for the satisfaction of various needs and the effects this has on their behaviour at work.

A major point of departure for the present study rests on the assumption that people are not merely passive recipients of action but rather play an active role in determining the nature of the social relations of which they are part. Thus while a great deal of the literature on workers depicts them as exploited, dominated and suffering inhuman working conditions, very little focuses on the actions which workers take in response to the situation which they encounter.

Similarly, much of the material which discusses work from a managerial point of view, outlines the strategy adopted by management and generally ignores the response made to it by the workers. One can find any number of texts in this area which describe the progression from classical management principles, to Taylorism and Fordism, to various applications of the Human Relations approach, with very little said about the response that workers made to this development.<sup>117</sup>

Recently, a number of excellent historical accounts of the development of the labour process have been introduced which do examine this from the workers' point of view.<sup>118</sup> Many more are needed to widen our understanding of this extremely important process. Even in this work, however, the types of activities focussed on include mainly public expressions of workers actions such as strikes or walkouts or more conventional organized



political activity. With the exception of a few ethnographies of workers experiences at work, very little deals with the day-to-day reality which workers encounter at the workplace.<sup>119</sup> In fact, the little which does exist is often criticized as being more 'journalistic' or 'pop' sociology than real scientific research.

Several important points emerge from this discussion about workers behaviour. First, workers are not simply victims but active participants in the situations that they confront at work. Second, the managerial perspective can be overwhelming since it represents the dominant ideology. It can be so powerful that it gives the impression that it alone defines the existing situation. However, as in the case of Scientific Management described above, managerial initiatives are not always complete nor successful and may often be themselves a reaction to the behaviour of workers!

A certain acceptability seems to accompany the passage of time making it legitimate to describe the struggles which occurred in the history of the labour process. Few studies, however, attempt to document the struggles going on at present. If the labour process is indeed a process, and if it hasn't ended but continues to exist, then there should be indications of it which are visible today. Very few studies of this process exist. Those that do, focus for the most part, on the experiences of blue collar workers. Some attention has also been given to sales and clerical workers in this regard. Professional and technical workers however, have not received a great deal of attention in the literature.

Perhaps this lack of attention is due to the perception that alienation is greatest among blue collar industrial workers and therefore they are the ones most suitable for study since the contradictions will be greatest in their case. Whatever the reasons, the trends discussed above

with reference to the conditions which characterize the professional/-technical occupations, warrants a careful consideration of their conditions.

The orientation towards workers' behaviour which informs the present analysis therefore is that people are constantly making choices about how to act in any situation that they encounter. The range of response for a given individual will depend on that person's perceptions of the situation which includes considerations of factors both inherent in and external to it. Thus, a worker may consider the state of the employment market in formulating a particular strategy since the loss of one's job may be more or less serious depending on the availability of alternative employment. As Clawson suggested in the quote cited above, workers use a variety of strategies and when one no longer works or becomes too costly, other approaches may be taken. Similarly, Brecher and Costello note that,

"There are a number of ways that workers attempt to deal with the power of their employers. We find it helpful to think of these as alternative strategies. This does not mean that workers always think out a conscious strategy. But even when these strategies are largely a matter of habit, they are still ways of acting to achieve a purpose in a context. Few individuals or groups use any one of these strategies exclusively; most workers resort to most of them at one time or another."<sup>120</sup>

This type of orientation to the behaviour of people in organizations is discussed by Chambliss and Seidman as "dialectical institutionalism".<sup>121</sup> In their conceptualization, these authors suggest that in order to understand how organizations operate, the choices made by the occupants in the various levels of the organization must be taken into account. They further suggest that people interpret the policies and programmes of the organization in terms of their own specific goals and interests and respond on the basis of the structural limitations which each perceives to exist.

Chambliss and Seidman point out that it is erroneous to assume that decisions which are made and implemented by those at the top of an organization are carried out in the manner expressed in the original instructions. They offer several examples of this including the apparent contradiction found in university organizations regarding the implementation of Title VII. While the law clearly states what the behaviour of the universities should be, little change has occurred in the actual employment of women in many of these institutions. Chambliss and Seidman describe how the particular choices made within the universities, and especially by those with vested interests, can account for this situation.

Politicians are also keenly aware of this reality and often make wholesale changes in the bureaucracies which they inherit when taking office. The actions of entrenched bureaucrats inimical to the position of the elected official in power, can be extremely harmful as reports get accidentally misfiled, incomplete information is communicated and deadlines are unavoidably missed!

Perrow makes a similar evaluation of the operation of organizations. He discusses the existence of conflict in organizations in this light and suggests that,

"Theory should see conflict as an inevitable part of organizational life stemming from organizational characteristics rather than from the characteristics of individuals. Why are sales and production in conflict in all firms - though to a greatly varying degree? Or faculty and the administration in colleges, doctors and nurses and administrators in hospitals, the treatment and custodial staff in prisons?...One answer is obvious enough: there is a never-ending struggle for values that are dear to the participants - security, power, survival, discretion, and autonomy - and a host of rewards. Because organizations do not consist of people sharing the same goals, since the members bring with them all sorts of needs and interests, and because control is far from complete, people will struggle for these kinds of values."<sup>122</sup>

The fact that people act in their own interests is not terribly surprising. What is noteworthy in the formulations of both Chambliss and Seidman and Perrow is that people make choices as incumbents of particular positions in organizations which often are in conflict with and contradict the overall goals of the organization. If Perrow is correct, conflict may be a normal part of organizational life. Additionally, the relations between labour and management presents an inherent source of conflict in this system. We should expect to find, conflict, therefore, in any organization that we examine. The problem is that conflict is usually defined only in gross categories such as strikes or walkouts or other public or dramatic forms of confrontation. The conflict which both Chambliss and Seidman and Perrow describe in their models, is most often covert, subtle and hidden from view!

There are several ways in which this occurs. Gouldner, for example, documented a case in which employees of a gypsum factory routinely appropriated tools and materials for their own personal use.<sup>123</sup> The people working at the plant defined this as completely acceptable behaviour. In another example, executives convicted in the "great electrical conspiracy" case reported that their obviously illegal behaviour had become so normal and routine that it had become defined as a standard operating procedure despite the fact that all the employees understood it to be illegal.<sup>124</sup>

Perhaps a more typical example involves the blatant way in which administrative memo's and directives are ignored in many organizations. The pattern usually consists of the ritualistic observance of a new set of orders and procedures during the period immediately following their issuance. Shortly thereafter, however, the organizational routine goes back to the way it was before the new procedures were put in place and they are

slowly rendered useless. This is especially apparent in workplaces which require safety equipment such as eyeglasses, hardhats or ear protection to be worn. This paraphernalia is usually kept nearby in case someone from outside the area should happen to come to investigate. But as a matter of practice, the equipment is routinely ignored. Perrow is quite right when he notes that control is never complete and that people will struggle to adhere to their own values!

Faber has described a number of strategies that workers sometimes adopt in response to the conditions they encounter at work.<sup>125</sup> His typology includes the following categories:

- i) Humanizing the workplace - this includes activities which make the work more bearable and the worktime pass more quickly for the workers. This includes such things as daydreaming, socializing, playing games, etc.
- ii) Restructuring the work relations - this includes a deliberate attempt on the part of the employees to challenge management's right to establish the organization of work and includes such things as 'soldiering', mutual aid among the employees, re-structuring jobs, ignoring established work routines, etc.
- iii) War on the shopfloor - this category includes those actions which workers take in defiance of management's control and authority. These are provocative and hostile responses differing from i) and ii) above in both quality and degree. This would include such actions as blatant insubordination, sabotage, vandalism, strikes, sitdowns, walkouts, etc.
- iv) The war within the worker - Faber included this category to reflect the internal struggle which alienation often promotes within individual workers, for regardless of how alienated people are, they can never be completely separated from their own activity. In some instances, they choose to express their skills, abilities and initiative beyond management's view. This often takes the form of designing labour saving devices or redesigning jobs to take advantage of shortcuts discovered through the familiarity acquired in the actual performance of the job. The war within the worker describes the worker's inability to utilize their skills and abilities to the fullest.

Each of these categories will be considered briefly below.

- i) Humanizing The Workplace.

The conditions of modern work for most people consist of dull, monotonous, repetitive tasks. Even in the white collar workforce, there is little opportunity to experience challenging or interesting work. Since most of the heavy work today is done by machines, the struggle more often than not is against the clock, a feature that workers often find most demanding about their jobs. In speaking of this type of time, of time as "duree", Daniel Bell notes,

"There are psychological modes which encompass the differing perceptions: the dull moments and the swift moments, the bleak moments and the moments of bliss, the agony of time prolonged and of time eclipsed, of time recalled and of time anticipated - in short, time not as a chronological function of space, but time felt as a function of experience."<sup>126</sup>

In order to escape from or relieve the monotony of the "metric" measurement of time, workers create various strategies. Donald Roy, for example, describes how workers informally broke up the workday into different "times" which would interrupt the normal routine and given the workers a chance to interact with each other, to stimulate enough interest and thought to get them through to the next "time".<sup>127</sup>

The onerous quality of time as duree is a constant element of a workprocess in which the individual worker does not have control over the work itself. In this type of situation, even little games such as switching the order in which tasks are performed or working on different sequences of the task can help the time go faster. While these are trivial examples of how some people deal with the monotony of work, Watson describes several much more dramatic techniques including "horseplay".<sup>128</sup>

Watson reports that a water fight took place in an automobile factory on a hot summer day, and what started out as a few men squirting each other turned into a standing hose fight in the "hot test" section of the motor

department. He stated that the fight lasted for several days and many of the men took to wearing bathing caps and raincoats to work!

"The fight usually involved about ten or fifteen hoses, each with the water pressure of a fire hose. With streams of cross-fire, shouting, laughing and running about, there was hardly a man in the mood for doing his job. The shop was regularly drenched from ceiling to floor with every man completely soaked."<sup>129</sup>

Needless to say, this type of behaviour was strictly forbidden by the company!

These are a few examples of the way that some workers attempt to humanize their jobs. While many more examples could have been cited, these provide an adequate sample of the range of behaviour included in this category. The specific strategies adopted by workers in this regard will usually depend on the particular circumstances which people find on their jobs.

#### ii) Restructuring The Work Relations

The restriction of output known as 'soldiering' has already been described above. This is one method workers use to restructure the work relations. Another example which is typical of this strategy involves workers helping each other, or restructuring tasks in ways which are prohibited by management. In this context, Faber describes a situation in which a number of workers get together to "carry" a fellow worker when there has been a death in the family, or the worker is ill and cannot "carry" his or her own job.<sup>130</sup> The other workers will actually do part or all of the other persons job for a while.

In another example of mutual aid, a worker described the following:

"Once in a while a fellow will get behind who ordinarily is a good worker. That sometimes happens to anyone. I know a fellow down there who did that and two other fellows went over and started helping him out...I think it's a good idea to help a fellow out once in a while. It makes all the difference in the world. It's a funny thing, I'll be working along and be behind,

and I'll feel all fagged out. Then someone comes over and starts in wiring on my equipment with me, and you know I perk up to beat the band. I don't know; it just seems to put new life into you, no matter if he only helps you for a couple of levels. I can pick up and work like the deuce then, uptill quitting time."<sup>131</sup>

Another strategy which workers use to restructure the workplace is known as "splitting" work or "doubling up". This practice involves two or more workers agreeing to work each other's jobs for a specified period of time, such that one person does both jobs for the interval while the other has "free" time and then they alternate. This eliminates the need for both to work continuously but requires each of them to work twice as hard when they are working. The free time gained by doing this is apparently worth the effort expended!

In discussing "doubling up" Watson writes that, "There is planning and counter-planning in the plant because there is clearly a situation of dual power."<sup>132</sup> He describes a number of extremely intricate operations that workers undertake to circumvent management's authority including such things as instituting alternative plans for carrying out the work by the workers; switching men and jobs throughout the plant so that friends might work together; and rearranging break times.

Each of these examples demonstrates how the social structure at work involves a dynamic process of interaction incorporating both the workers and management. It would be incorrect therefore to think that the organization of the workplace rests simply on the implementation of management's directives. The workplace represents an arena in which the interaction between workers and management takes place with each side both acting and reacting to the other. It is in this context that the notion of 'choice' described above is also quite evident. People choose to follow rules, to ignore them or to create others. The existence of management's



operational handbook is no guarantee that the proscriptions contained therein will be followed.

While management exercises superior power in most instances, the ability of workers to affect the organization's goals, policies and programmes cannot be neglected. Watson has quite correctly called this a situation of dual power and it should be understood as such. This is the essence of workers' acting to restructure the workplace and it reflects the extent of the power that they have.

### iii) War On The Shopfloor.

As we noted above, war on the shop floor includes those types of behaviour which seriously challenge managerial authority. They differ from the behaviours considered under i) and ii) in both quality and degree and in most cases, a great deal of hostility is involved. These acts, in fact, could result in the laying of serious criminal charges if the perpetrators were apprehended. The type of behaviour which falls under this category includes such things as sabotage, wildcat strikes, vandalism, sit downs, etc.

"But most workers, by and large, are not so articulate about their work. Their behaviour itself is a judgement...These take the form of crazy racings against the clock to vary the deadly monotony, of slowdowns - the silent war against production standards - and most spectacularly in the violent eruptions of wildcat strikes against "speed-ups," i.e., changes in the time required to complete a job."<sup>133</sup>

The spontaneity and determination shown by workers in wildcat strikes demonstrates the lengths to which they are willing to go to have their demands met. Thousands of dollars in lost production are the consequence of such action and the leaders of wildcat strikes know that their jobs may be at stake.

Sabotage is another form that the war on the shop floor takes. In a production system which utilizes moving assembly lines or conveyor belts, a well placed bolt or wrench brings the operation to a crashing halt, often to the cheers of the people working there. The result is that the workers get a few moments rest while the line is being repaired. Taylor and Walton offer the following examples.

"In the Christmas rush in a Knightsbridge store, the machine which shuttled change backwards and forwards suddenly ground to a halt. A frustrated salesman had demobilized it by ramming a cream bun down its gullet. In our researches we have been told by Woolworth's sales girls how they clank half a dozen buttons on the till simultaneously to win a few minutes' rest from 'ringing up'. Railwaymen have described how they block lines with trucks to delay shunting operations for a few hours. Materials are hidden in factories, conveyor belts jammed with sticks, cogs stopped with wire and ropes, lorries 'accidentally' backed into ditches. Electricians labour to put in weak fuses, textile workers 'knife' through carpets and farm workers cooperate to choke agricultural machinery with tree branches."<sup>134</sup>

In some cases, the 'breakdowns' are organized to take place throughout the day at various places in the organization. This avoids casting suspicion on any one worker but it is quite difficult to do. Watson describes one such situation in which fifty men counted off numbers to take their turns in this type of organized sabotage!<sup>135</sup> He describes this as a serious threat to management and a challenge to their authority. He reports that workers in the particular engine plant in which this took place, were extremely upset about the quality of a new engine that the company had introduced. The engineering and testing of the engine had been rushed and as a result, the product was of particularly poor quality. When the men discovered this, they reported the problem to their foreman but were ordered to keep working. When neither the plant management nor the union would do anything to resolve the situation the workers took matters into their own hands. With an incredible amount of plantwide coordination

and planning, the workers were able to bring production of the engine in question to a complete halt. After a number of failed attempts to get production going again, management was forced to reconsider its plans. It discontinued production of the new motor and returned to production of the older, more reliable engine!

While most cases of sabotage and vandalism are individual in nature, the examples presented above demonstrate that this is not always the case. The significance of this type of behaviour is that it represents more than simply one worker taking out his or her frustrations with the job, on the equipment or products. It is, in essence, a challenge to management's control over the work process. Workers have a direct impact on both the quantity and quality of their output. In addition, they are able to influence what goes on in many other areas of the organization. This behaviour forms a major part of the interaction which underscores the control which is exercised by management over the labour process. It also reflects the nature of conflict which exists in the workplace.

#### iv) The War Within The Worker.

This category consists of those actions which workers engage in, in their efforts to counteract the stultifying conditions which they encounter at work. The narrow duties and tasks of most jobs provide little outlet for the expression of individual skills and ability. Moreover, decisions concerning how jobs are to be done are usually made by engineers in the company's planning department or by some other management official, leaving little room for individual initiative on the part of the workers.

Several consequences of this situation are found in the way that people express themselves at work. In spite of the restrictions placed on them by management, workers often 'individualize' their workstations or

tools. Additionally, they may create labour saving devices or processes and constantly devise more efficient ways of doing their jobs. These are hidden from management however, both because they are illegal and because they might be used against them by management in order to get more output.

Both Faber and Roy describe a tactic known as "making out" in which workers work at break neck speeds in order to get their production quotas out as quickly as possible.<sup>136</sup> Not only does this free up some time for the workers but it also serves to demonstrate to both workers and the foremen what they "can do". This form of self expression is one way that workers use to test their abilities at work. As Faber notes, "This incident (a case of "making out") in addition to illustrating "the testing" process, shows the comaradery and solidarity that arises among workers which has as one of its consequences, invading management's right to plan and manage work."<sup>137</sup>

The war within the worker relates directly to the importance attached to human activity in both the concept of alienation and QWL described above. Human development, in this conceptualization requires the exercise of human powers and abilities in the satisfaction of human needs which in turn results in the development of new powers and new needs. The conditions of modern work stifle this form of growth and development to the extent that workers are prohibited from using their powers at work. The war within the worker is only another expression of the workers' struggle to overcome alienation and to enhance the quality of life they experience at work.

The four categories described above represent a number of strategies in which workers engage in response to the situations they encounter at work. The selection of any one or all of these strategies does not imply

that they represent the typical response of the particular worker or group of workers who chose them. They may be daily occurrences or isolated events. The purpose of the typology is to describe the types of actions that people take at work. These categories represent various types of responses to conditions which adversely affect the quality of their working lives. Its usefulness lies in its identification of the worker as an active participant in the labour process. In addition, it sensitizes us to the types of behaviours which do in fact occur.

Most of the examples presented above refer specifically to blue collar, industrial occupations and primarily to the prototypical industrial worker, i.e., the one who works on an automobile assembly line. One of the goals of the present research is to find out if the behavioural strategies adopted by these assembly line workers are similar to those adopted by professional/technical workers. Studies of clerical workers indicate that many of these behavioural categories do apply but reflect the specific conditions of their work. As we noted earlier, the type of control experienced by clerical workers approximates that of the assembly line worker much more so than it does that of the Residential Counsellors. The control of these workers incorporates "unobtrusive" elements more often found among professional occupations. The present research will allow an examination of the effectiveness of these types of control on these lower level professional/technical employees.

A number of questions were included in this project which focussed specifically on the types of behaviour outlined in this typology. Questions dealing with these responses were incorporated in the interview portion of this research project and included both open ended and forced choice type of questions. These were designed to assess the nature of the

responses which exist at the Centre; the degree of seriousness the workers themselves attach to the various types of behaviour reported; and the frequency of the various responses in question. In addition, a self-filled questionnaire was administered to these respondents which included a number of self-reported behaviour items. This was seen as preferable and potentially more viable than including these rather sensitive questions about serious personal behaviour in the body of the interview.

The questions included in this part of the research instrument were drawn from items developed by Faber which were outlined above. These had been used successfully before by Caputo in a study of high school students, and by Gardiner in a study of postal workers.<sup>138</sup> They are based on the types of actions which workers sometimes take in their attempts to "humanize" the workplace and reflect the inherent contradictions which exist there. This behaviour demonstrates the alienation of these workers in the lack of control that they have over their work. They often represent an attempt by these workers to assert themselves at work, to exercise some control over the workplace and to express themselves through their actions at work. They are concerned with what happens at work and both act and react to the situation that exists there.

For some workers however, work has no meaning or importance, save for the purely instrumental concerns of a pay check. Faunce suggests that it may be these workers who are the most alienated in the sense that they are satisfied with low quality jobs, which afford them little opportunity to grow or develop or to use their skills and abilities. These people have withdrawn their commitment from work and invest little of themselves in their jobs. They seek neither their identities nor their self worth in their jobs.<sup>139</sup>

Faunce discusses alienation as self-estrangement in this regard and points out that,

"Alienation means the opposite of commitment or identification as defined above. Alienation refers to a disjuncture between self-esteem maintenance and status-assignment processes. We are alienated from others or from any organization in which we are members to the extent that the criteria we use to evaluate ourselves are different from the criteria used by others in evaluating us."<sup>140</sup>

He notes that occupational achievement is considered an important source of self evaluation among middle class Americans but suggests that this need not be the case. Social status, according to Faunce, has a multidimensional character and people may choose non-work roles and achievements as the basis for their social status and self esteem evaluations. Thus, people are more likely to use those values that account for the high status experiences that they have, when they evaluate themselves. Conversely, they are likely to invest little of themselves in situations which have no direct relationship to how they think of themselves. It should not be surprising therefore, to find that people invest little of themselves in work situations where few opportunities exist for positive evaluations.

The processes of status assignment and self-esteem maintenance includes more than simply the evaluations that a person makes of him or herself. A "self-concept" is something that is acquired in our relations with others and reflects their reactions to us. According to Faunce, when these "reactions" or evaluations of us are infrequent or unimportant i.e., we do not evaluate ourselves on the same basis, we can accept a low evaluation and status with impunity. However, when we are evaluated by people with whom we are in frequent contact, it is much more difficult to avoid a

self evaluation on this basis even if we define the criteria used in this evaluation as unimportant.

Faunce focuses on the process of status assignment and self-esteem maintenance which occurs in the workplace. He discusses the various factors which affect this process and the relationship these have to worker alienation. He notes the importance of being evaluated by persons of higher or lower status in the process of self evaluation and suggests that it is difficult to avoid a self evaluation based on the work role when the work role places a person in regular contact with people at higher status levels. However, the pattern of this behaviour for lower level clerical workers, as well as for unskilled or semi-skilled machine operators, is one which reflects relatively "low interpositional status, meaningless intrapositional status distinctions, limited possibilities for upward mobility and the restriction of work associates to persons at the same status level." He goes on to suggest the following,

"Of course, not all persons in these occupations are alienated from work. Young people are, in particular, more likely to have a mobility orientation than to be alienated. The studies referred to above, however, suggest that a substantial proportion of the people in these jobs see their work as an instrumental activity, do not evaluate themselves in terms of work-related activities, and are therefore alienated from work in the sense in which we are using the term ..."<sup>141</sup>

This "instrumental" orientation to work is widespread in the workforce. Taylor noted that the majority of the workers he was observing did what was really required of them but no more. Faunce conservatively estimates that at least half of the American labour force is alienated to some extent according to this usage of the term. The question for the present study is how this use of the term relates to the one described above.



In our discussion, we noted the importance and meaning that is attached to work in this society. The definition of alienation subsequently developed was based, for the most part, on the role that human activity as work plays in the process of self development and growth. Alienation was then described as a situation in which individuals exercise little or no control over the purpose, process or products of their work. Faunce approaches the same process but from a different perspective. He recognizes the importance that exercising control over work has for self-fulfillment but points out that work is not the only factor that people use in their self evaluations and while it may be significant for some people, it is not entirely clear that this is universally so. He points to studies conducted by Dubin, Ozark, Lyman and Wilensky in this context which show that a wide variation exists in the way that people evaluate work.<sup>142</sup> For some it is extremely important but for others it has ceased to be a central life interest! In particular, these studies indicate that this is especially true among people in lower status occupations. "One response to the inability to confirm a favourable self-image at work is to evaluate one's self exclusively in non-work related values."<sup>143</sup> Hence, the instrumental response to work described above. He notes that,

"Although alienation, or a withdrawal of concern with achievement, is not the only response to low status, it is a common one and is likely to be more stable than other responses."<sup>144</sup>

The particular manifestation of alienation described by Faunce is included in the present study as an indicator of the extent to which people identify with or are committed to their jobs. This is consistent with the definition of alienation described above in the sense that work should afford people an opportunity to develop and maintain a positive self-image. In fact, a person's work should be the main vehicle for this process. If

this does not occur, and people withdraw their investments of self from their work roles, then they are alienated in a substantial portion of their lives especially since work occupies more than half of the waking hours of most people. In this sense, work does not contribute to their growth and development as human beings but merely provides the means for staying alive. Faunce notes that it is precisely those people who are satisfied with low status jobs that are the most alienated. People who are dissatisfied or reject low status jobs obviously continue to value their work roles and are seeking ways to improve their situations.

Two scales were included in this study in order to measure the extent of people's self investment in work. The first consists of the standard short form of the Lodahl and Kejner "Job Involvement Scale", and the second is based on the measure of intrinsic motivation developed by Lawler and Hall.<sup>145</sup> The Lodahl and Kejner scale was used in order to permit comparisons with a number of similar studies in this area, although its interpretation is somewhat problematic.

It is not entirely clear how the Lodahl and Kejner scale defines the meaning of job involvement since a number of different meanings are alluded to by these authors. Lawler and Hall point out for example, that Lodahl and Kejner report two distinct definitions of job involvement in their article, one based on "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image," and the other based on "the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self-esteem."<sup>146</sup>

Lawler and Hall go on to argue that these two definitions are quite distinct. Lawler, for example, has identified intrinsic motivation as, "the degree to which a job holder is motivated to perform well because of

some subjective rewards or feelings that he expects to receive or experience as a result of performance."<sup>147</sup> In this construct, esteem and feelings of growth are tied directly to performance. They suggest that in order to clarify the problems of definition which exist, it would be best to accept Lodahl and Kejner's first definition - the degree of psychological identification with one's work - as the definition of job involvement and to accept Lawler's definition of intrinsic motivation.<sup>148</sup>

A further clarification of this is offered by M.M. Moch who points out that Lodahl-Kejner actually identify three relatively stable components of job involvement in their article.<sup>149</sup> Moch indicates however, that none of these reflects the extent to which an employee is involved in the organization in which he or she works. He discusses this in the sense that it is possible for persons to identify with the organization in which they work and yet not be involved in their job and vice versa. Organizational involvement here refers to the degree to which employees take their identities from their organizations while job involvement is concerned with the degree to which employees take their identities from their jobs. Although the distinction is a subtle one it is important. He goes on to examine the effects of social integration and isolation on job involvement, organizational involvement and intrinsic motivation.

The important point in Moch's discussion, for our purposes, centres on the question of whether these job attitudes, that is, both job involvement and intrinsic motivation, are brought to the workplace by the individual employees or whether they arise as a consequence of the characteristics of the workplace itself. Some inconsistency exists here since, on the one hand, Lodahl and Kejner suggest that job characteristics such as meaningfulness of work, adequacy of supervision and social nearness to others at

work, etc. might affect job involvement. On the other hand, in their summary of research on job involvement, they conclude that it is relatively stable over time representing long established psychological response to work and is unaffected by changes in work organization.<sup>150</sup>

In the present research, the Lodahl-Kejner scale is understood as an inferential measure of investment in work such that both the personal and job characteristics are seen to be contributing factors in a person's involvement in work. The interpretation of intrinsic motivation is much less problematic since the relationship between performance and self-evaluation is quite clear in this case. Thus both scales will be used as indicators of the extent to which a person is committed or identifies with his or her job. Lack of commitment in either case is related to the existence of alienation.

A number of items were included in this study which measure the extent to which the employees cooperate at work. We sought to differentiate here between indications of the overall effort that the employees made while at work; their positive contributions to the achievement of organizational goals; and the type of behaviour which is unsolicited or required of the employee and which goes above and beyond the call of duty. It was felt that those employees who frequently engaged in this type of behaviour, identified work as a source of self esteem and a means for satisfying many of their needs, especially their higher order needs. This type of behaviour should also be accompanied by higher levels of commitment to and identification with their jobs on the part of these workers.

In our discussion of self evaluation above, the importance of the evaluations of co-workers and supervisors was briefly mentioned. In addition, the effect that mobility orientation has on the process of self

evaluation was referred to especially with respect to young workers. A number of measures of both of these factors are included in this study and these reflect the formulations described above. The frequency and criteria used in the formal evaluation process at the Centre, for example, or the perceptions of the RC staff of their opportunities for advancement, are two such measures.

Finally, a standard set of demographic items was used in this research including such variables as age; sex; marital status; father's occupation and education; and mother's occupation and education. These will be discussed at greater length in the data analysis below.

## VII. Summary

The purpose of this research is to describe the way that this particular group of workers, the Residential Counsellors, respond to and make sense of their work experiences. The patterns which are discernable in both their verbal and behavioural responses to work and the strategies that they develop in this regard, form the major concern of the current investigation. Various types of strategies which have been used by blue collar industrial workers were discussed above and an attempt will be made to compare these responses to those of the RC's being studied here. While many of these strategies involve behaviour which is inimical to management's interests, some attention will also be given to workers' behaviour which reflects an instrumental as well as a positive response to work.

Indications of the degree of Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation form another dimension of the current study. These seek to determine the level of commitment that people have to work. Both of these factors were

related to the status assignment and self-esteem maintenance processes which operate in the workplace. A number of questions concerning the evaluation process at the Centre for the RC's were included in the present study and will be discussed at length below. These types of variables seek to provide some indication of the extent to which these workers are able to establish and maintain positive self images through their jobs. This is extremely important given our emphasis on work as a major locus for experiencing human development and self-actualization. This is seen in terms of both alienation and the quality of working life.

Finally, this entire project is underscored by the concepts of alienation and QWL. The manner in which these concepts are being used here, is based on the importance that each attaches to the process of self development and growth experienced in the free and spontaneous expression of human activity. The meaning that this has in the present context depends upon the nature of the control over their activity that people experience at work. What is required for reducing alienation and enhancing QWL is the creation of work organizations in which people have the opportunity to satisfy their human needs. This includes basic, social and higher order needs and contains some of the following characteristics: the opportunity for workers to use and develop skills and abilities; the opportunity for workers to exercise control over the work process and to take part in the important decisions affecting their worklives; for workers to be treated with dignity and respect at work; and to have interesting, challenging and satisfying jobs. An assessment of the extent to which the organization of work at the Centre affords the RC's these types of opportunities forms another major aspect of the current research.

Neither alienation nor QWL is understood in the present context in an 'objectified', static manner. Instead, they are both seen to be based on the existence of particular types of relations at work. Thus, alienation and QWL are not 'things' whose existence can be verified and measured once and for all as one would measure the height of a mountain or the distance between two cities, etc. On the contrary, alienation and QWL are concepts which describe the characteristics that certain forms of interaction and specifically work in this instance, take under given social and historical circumstances. They reflect the dynamic interaction which is constantly renewed in the daily recreation of the existing social structure. Thus, for example, alienation is never total nor complete and its very existence implies the concomitant existence of activity aimed at its elimination.

This research seeks more to describe than to explain the manner in which a particular group of employees make sense of their working lives. It attempts to outline the various responses which these workers make to the structures they encounter in their daily experiences at work. It tries to understand how various aspects of this structure influence the choices they make. Finally, it seeks to compare the experiences of these particular workers with those of workers in both more traditional occupations and those whose work roles reflect the trends of the jobs of the future in this society.

## CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

## I. The Research Site.

This is a study of the direct care staff of a large facility for the developmentally handicapped. The facility, known as the Centre, was built in 1961 and houses approximately 622 individuals, most of whom are adults above the age of 18. Many of the clients have been at the Centre for a number of years and some since its opening. Although the general perception of the client population is that they are severely and profoundly retarded, in actual fact, the clients present a number of disabilities including: deafness, blindness, physical handicaps, sensory handicaps, speech impairments, deafness, maladaptive behaviours and various ranges of retardation based on I.Q. testing.

The Centre is located in a prosperous agricultural region which borders several major population centres. It provides service for a catchment area of approximately two and a quarter million people and forms part of a larger government run system which includes a number of such facilities. Most of the people who work at the Centre are from the surrounding area, however, its proximity to major urban centres insures that a pool of the necessary professional staff is readily available and can be recruited by the Centre.

The facility operates numerous programmes that specialize in dealing with the needs and requirements of its clients. Toward this end, the Centre maintains a fully staffed medical unit; a psychology department;



educational and vocational training units with various facilities including a woodworking shop and a operational farm and garden programme; a Speech and Language department; a Dietary department; and a Community services department among others. In general, the Centre is a self-contained facility which has all the necessary resources to fully meet the needs of its residents.

The Centre employs a staff of approximately 825 which includes both professional and non-professional employees. Many of these people are involved in providing support services to the various programme departments. The Centre, for example, operates its own power plant, has a maintenance staff which is responsible for the operation of the physical plant, a housekeeping staff, a laundry, and dietary staff, in addition to the people involved in the medical or residential programmes described above. The single largest group of employees at the Centre however, is the Residential Counselling staff, the RC's. These are the people who work directly with the residents and provide for their individual needs.

The Centre is comprised of a series of buildings or "pavillions" which are linked by connecting hallways or tunnels. These buildings contain the various departments of the Centre as well as a series of residential units in which the clients are housed. These are described at the Centre as follows:

i) East Unit, which contains nine subunits or "residences", ii) West Unit which contains seven residences, iii) Nursing/Developmental Unit which contains eight residences, iv) Special Units which contain three residences which are specifically designed for hearing or vision impaired residents, and a v) Behaviour Modification Unit which deals with residents who present special problems or are self-injurious. For the purposes of the present

research, the Special Units and the Behavioural Modification Unit were considered as one unit since they are both under the direction of the Psychology department and they have a number of characteristics in common which make them substantially different from the other residential units. These will be described in greater detail below.

While this intraorganizational classification identifies the different residences, there is little to distinguish them in their physical appearance. The different units (with the exception of Special/Behavioural Modification Unit) are all quite similar in their appointments. They each occupy two floors of a particular pavillion, with each of the subunits or residences leading off from a main corridor. When walking through the hallways in any of the pavillions, one gets the impression that there are only individual rooms adjacent to the main corridor, when in actuality, each of the residences extends outward for over one hundred feet. Within each residence are the eating, sleeping, recreational and lavatory facilities for the people living there.

Each of the Units is under the direction of a Residence Supervisor who is responsible for the staff and the programmes in his or her area. In addition, each unit is populated by different types of clients, which results in a variety of treatment and handling requirements for the different Units. These differences give each of the Units a unique character. These will be described below and a discussion of the implications of these differences for the present research will be presented.

The West Unit of the Centre occupies the entire West Pavillion of the Centre and contains seven residential subunits in addition to the three Special Units residences. The residences which are located on the first and second floor of this pavillion house and serve the developmental and

recreational needs of over two hundred adults. The West Unit provides residential services to its clients, such as direct care, treatment and training for both long and short term periods of admission as well as respite care.

The residences on the first floor of the West Unit provide services to approximately twenty severely or profoundly handicapped women. Immediate training needs of these clients include basic life skills or independent functioning such as dressing, eating and toilet skills. The units on the second floor of this section provide services to twenty men whose needs are similar to those of the women described above. Clients in the other four residences on the second floor are more independent in self-care skills and their immediate training needs include vocational or pre-vocational programmes and community orientation skills such as care of clothing and personal grooming or hygiene. Most of these clients are employed full-time in the facility through the Department of Vocational Services. This includes approximately forty men and seventy five women.

The East Unit is composed of nine residences, two housing female and seven housing male clients. While this Unit is similar to the West Unit in many respects, it differs in that many of the residents here are severely and profoundly retarded. All residents in this classification require close and constant supervision. The exceptions to this in East Unit include one residence that houses children and young adults, with intelligence levels ranging from moderate to profoundly retarded and one residence for women from six to twenty-five years of age with mental capabilities also in the moderate to profoundly retarded range.

One of the major differences between East and West Units is the level of functioning of their respective clients. While several of the

residences on East Unit are quite similar to their counterparts in West Unit, one in particular houses twenty three severely and profoundly retarded active, adult males. The functioning level of these individuals is probably the lowest of all residents at the facility and this necessitates a great deal of individual attention in all the basic life skills programmes undertaken in the area. This is perhaps one of the more difficult areas in the Centre to work in.

In addition, East Unit contains most of the adult male residents who work full time in the various shops at the Centre as well as on the farm facility. These residents are referred to by the staff as the "big boys" or "working boys" since most are full grown adults. These residents can prove difficult to handle on occasion by virtue of their physical size and strength. While male Residential Counsellors are prohibited from working in female residences, no such restriction exists for women RC's working in male residences. Occasionally, a small female RC is required to work with several large, strong, male residents. Several members of the RC staff indicated that this could prove particularly difficult at times.

The Nursing/Developmental Unit is located in the medical wing of the facility and is comprised of eight residences serving 160 clients. The Infirmary, which is one of these residences, is specifically designed to care for acutely ill clients from all Units of the facility. In addition three of the residences in this section house residents who are severely handicapped and who require a great deal of nursing care to meet their individual needs. The remaining residences in this section house multi-handicapped, developmentally delayed residents, but these residents do have the potential to participate in off-residence activities such as school,

workshops, pre-vocational programmes, Blissymbolics,<sup>1</sup> as well as various skill building programmes.

Twenty-six full-time and seven part-time nurses are on staff in this Unit with each residence having a Registered Nurse as a Supervisor in addition to twelve to fifteen qualified Residential Counsellors. Approximately one hundred Residential Counsellors are assigned to the Nursing/-Developmental Unit.

The final two Units include Special Units and the Behaviour Modification Unit which are both under the direction of the Psychology Department. The Special Units house residents with sensory impairments including one for the hearing impaired, one for the visually impaired and one for persons both hearing and visually impaired. The Behaviour Modification Unit (B. Mod.) accepts those clients who require intensive assistance, for example, those who are self-injurious.

The residents of these Units are comprised of clients who require highly specialized, intensive, and comprehensive services from highly trained Residential Counsellors and other professionals. This includes vocational, medical, psychological, recreational and educational personnel. The services provided in this Unit consist of self-care, skill building, behaviour management as well as the teaching job related skills. The Special Units are, therefore, a place in the facility where clients with special needs can receive the concentrated services of a host of professional staff members.

There are several features which make the Special/B.Mod. Unit quite different from the other Units in the Centre. In terms of physical appearance alone, the Special Units differ in a number of ways. For example, they are more richly appointed, including carpeted floors and finer

furnishings. They incorporate kitchen facilities, a recreational patio, a dining room and personalized sleeping areas which affords the residents in these Units a greater degree of privacy than that found in the other Units.

The other major difference between the Special/B.Mod. Unit and the other Units in the Centre is the low staff to resident ratio. For example, the Behaviour Modification Unit contains ten beds and has a staff of fifteen (including the Supervisor and Director). The other Special Units each house approximately fifteen residents and have a staff of fifteen. This is a much higher ratio than that found in any of the other non-medical residences. In the other residences, twelve to fifteen RC's are usually responsible for up to forty residents, depending on their level of functioning.

A final difference between the Special/B.Mod. Units and the other residential units of the Centre is the apparent prestige and status which the RC's attach to working in them. These are fairly new, experimental programme Units in the Centre and the staff selected for service in them was supposed to be the most highly trained and experienced among the RC's. Additionally, these Units provide the staff who work in them an opportunity to work very closely with a small number of clients and to apply the skills and training that they have acquired.

The implications that the differences that exist between these four Units have for the present research is based on a consideration of the way that each unit is organized and run as well as on the type of clients that each unit provides service to. The relatively low staff to client ratio's in the Special/B.Mod. Unit for example, provides the RC's working there with a different type of work experience compared to that of those workers in areas with higher staff to client ratio's.

An additional factor to be considered is the functioning level of the clients. The lower the functioning level of the clients, the more difficult it is to get intrinsic rewards from work. With higher functioning clients, progress in a skill building programme for example, is not only possible but visible. These clients can also express themselves to the RC's and this is another source of satisfaction and gratification for those working with them. When working with low functioning clients on the other hand, intrinsic sources of reward are less available and the RC staff member in this situation must rely more on external rewards and on those received from co-workers for satisfaction.

Another way in which the Units differ, which is important in the present context, is in the amount of control workers in each of these units exercise over their jobs. This is at least partially related to the type of work done in each of the Units. The Nursing staff in the Nursing/-Developmental Units for example, exercise more authority in their professional capacities than do many of the RC's in the other Units. Similarly, the staff in the Special/B.Mod. Unit is able to work much more independent of supervision than the staff in the other residential units. These differences should be important in the present research considering the framework outlined above.

Finally, it is important to point out the constant interaction at the Centre between the various Departments in the facility. The residents that any particular Residential Counsellor is responsible for may be subject to or involved in a whole array of programmes. The RC's therefore, are continually in contact with professionals from various departments throughout the Centre, including the medical staff, Psychologists, Speech Therapists, Physiotherapists, Occupational Therapists, Vocational Counsellors,

etc., etc. This again is important considering the formulation presented above.

The Residential Counsellors are the pivotal group of employees in the Centre since they are the ones who provide the care and services to the residents of the facility. While they are responsible for the residents, they actually make few of the treatment decisions concerning the clients well being. They are therefore at the bottom of the health care and service delivery system which operates at the Centre. The hierarchical standing of the various occupational groups working at the Centre is reinforced through the use of a number code to designate the level of the staff position that a person fills. For the Residential Counsellors, this consists of a four tier classification system ranging from RC I, for newly hired recruits or trainees; to RC II, which includes most of the RC staff; to RC III, which is a supervisory position; and finally to RC IV, which signifies a Unit Supervisor.

The other occupations in the Centre are similarly classified so that it is quite easy to compare a person's status with people working in other areas of the Centre. This has a number of ramifications for the staff, especially in terms of promotions and job postings. The RC staff appeared to be particularly cognisant of the staff hierarchy operating in the Centre and this was especially visible in both their dress and behaviour at the Centre, towards other staff working there. For example, the RC staff wears street clothes to work. At first sight this gives a relaxed, informal, non-institutional appearance to the facility, however, this is somewhat deceptive. Since the RC's are one of the only employee groups who do not wear a uniform of one sort or another, they are easily identifiable in the public or common areas of the Centre. In this way, their informal street



garb serves as a clear indication of who they are and what their role is in the Centre.

The secretarial staff at the Centre do not wear a uniform per se but they are distinguishable from the RC's in that they are more formally dressed in most cases. The cafeteria staff, housekeeping staff and maintenance each wear a different uniform. The people working in the Psychology Department wear laboratory coats while the Physicians on staff wear suits (both male and females in this case) with white jackets with their identification photo's on them. There is actually very little trouble in identifying either who people are or where they work once an understanding of the Centre is acquired. There are, of course, exceptions to these codes but they are adhered to, for the most part, by the staff at the facility.

## II. Sample Selection and Data Collection.

The data for this study collected over a five day period during the second week of August, 1982. At that time, all of the Residential Counseling staff working on the day and afternoon shifts at the Centre, who were willing to participate, were included in the study. The Residence Supervisor's (RC IV) as well as the RC III's were incorporated in the study at this time, however, the major focus was the front line workers, the RC I and RC II staff members. A total of 260 out of a possible 289 interviews were conducted among the RC staff on duty during this period. This results in a response rate of 89.9%. There is no reason for us to suspect that there is any systematic bias in the data based on the 10.1% of the RC staff who were unwilling to participate in the project.

An initial decision was made not to include the midnight shift in the study based on a number of logistical factors. To begin with, staffing levels on the midnight shift were such that it would have been extremely difficult for any of the residences to allow a staff member the time away from the Unit which was needed to participate in the study. Additionally, as noted above, the Centre is in a rural area approximately one and one quarter hours drive from the urban Centre where the research staff lived. It would have been difficult to recruit enough qualified research assistants to collect data on the midnight shift. Finally, shift rotation at the Centre occurred at mid-week and this permitted those workers who had been on midnights during the first part of the week to participate in the study at the end of the week if they wanted to.

The data collection procedure resulted in the collection of 208 useable interviews with RC I and RC II's. Of the initial 289 interviews conducted, 52 involved either Residence Supervisors or other supervisory personnel i.e., RC III's. These people were excluded from the analysis since their work roles placed them in a position of power and authority over the RC staff and it was felt that this could have influenced their responses in a number of ways and, in particular, in favour of the administration.

The instrument utilized in this study was made up of two parts; the first consisted of an interview schedule which included both forced choice and open ended type questions; and the second of a self-filled questionnaire. The entire procedure took an average of one hour and ten minutes to administer. Interviews were conducted in separate offices in each of the four Units specifically designated for this purpose during the week that the interviewing was in progress at the Centre.

A research staff of ten was recruited from a nearby University. Most of the researchers were graduate students in Sociology and had had previous research experience. The rest were University or College graduates and were familiar with social science research. A series of training sessions was held with the entire research staff which included discussions about interviewing techniques and coding procedures as well as a briefing on the purpose of the project. The researchers were given the opportunity to administer the instrument to each other several times so that they were familiar with it before they arrived at the actual site.

On each of the five days during which interviewing took place, the principle investigator and four research assistants arrived at the Centre shortly after the breakfast routine had been completed by the residents. Each interviewer was then assigned to one of the interview rooms and given the necessary equipment. This included a quantity of blank interview schedules which had appropriate identification codes on them. In addition, each received a list of the sequence in which each of the residences in the respective Units was to select one staff member to be interviewed. The interview rooms were equipped with telephones which permitted the interviewers to verify their schedules with the individual residences if required or alert residences of delays or errors in the interviewing process.

The principle investigator was in contact with all four interviewers at this time, as well as with the Supervisory staff member who had been made the liason person for the research project. Any scheduling problems or other difficulties were handled by this person and this insured the smooth operation of the interviewing process. The preparations for the study began two weeks before the interviewing team arrived at the Centre

and involved discussions with the Administration and the representatives of the Union. Both gave their full support and this was effectively communicated to the Supervisory staff and the RC's. Everyone cooperated to make the data collection process work very smoothly.

The scheduling of the interviews was based on a plan developed by the Facility Manager, the person in charge of staffing requirements and schedules. A familiar rotation system was implemented and each residence was given the freedom to send any one of their staff that was on duty when it was their turn in the interviewing rotation. This served to reassure the RC staff of their anonymity since they realized that the interviewers had no way of knowing who they were, beyond the fact that they worked in a particular residence.

The actual cooperation received during the week was quite remarkable as the residences took it upon themselves to trade interview slots when their internal work routines or staffing levels did not permit them to send a staff member at an appointed time. There were a number of open interview spaces at the end of the week to accommodate those people who were unable to come earlier. Each residence was called during this time as well and an opportunity to participate was extended to all staff who had previously not done so. It should be noted that the supervisory staff was very cooperative and facilitated the interviewing process wherever they could.

The instrument used in this project was pre-tested on the staff of a Day Care Centre who were qualified Early Childcare Workers. Additionally, a number of Registered Nurses were also interviewed during the pre-test phase. These workers are similar to the Residential Counsellors on a number of key dimensions. For example, they have comparable educational qualifications and both require government certification. Each of these

groups provides a service directly to people and in many ways their client groups are quite similar. In fact, the actual work routines involve many of the same types of activities such as teaching basic life skills, and supervising recreational and other activities. Each group of workers has the responsibility of caring for a group of people as part of their job.

The RC's and the Early Childcare Workers were also alike on a number of demographic characteristics. Most of these people were young women who had had little previous work experience. A further area of comparability is based on the nature of the supervision each of these groups experiences. The physical area of the Day Care in many respects resembled the residences at the Centre. People working in both of these places usually worked with the same people for a period of time, sharing the responsibility for the work which needed to be done. The nature of supervisory contact was quite similar as well, especially given the physical proximity in which this took place. The layout of the two work sites is such that the person supervising either group could have an excellent view of the "floor" from a vantage point near the front of each facility. This is precisely where the supervisor's office was located in both cases. The extent and type of supervision experienced by both groups of workers therefore was quite similar.

The instrument itself included a number of items adapted from existing scales whose reliability and validity has already been established. Two such scales, the Lodahl and Kejner "Job Involvement Scale" and Lawler's scale of Intrinsic Motivation, for example have already been described above. The others which were included were drawn from similar types of sources. In fact, many of the items adopted from Faber's work had been used successfully by the principal researcher in previous research applications.<sup>2</sup>

The pre-test served to identify several areas in the administration of the instrument which needed changing in order to facilitate its use. These changes were made and an acceptable format developed. The results of the pre-test demonstrated that there was sufficient variability in the response to each of the measures and depth interviews with the Child Care Workers after the administration of the pre-test indicated that the wording and intent of the items was satisfactory. A few minor alterations were required in terms of its administration and these were made.

The instrument incorporated a self-coding procedure such that the forced choice questions in both the interview and questionnaire portions contained the appropriate codes. Many of the items employed a five point Likert type scale and space was provided on the instrument itself for the particular response selected. For the open ended questions, the interviewers were briefed as to the intent of each question and instructed to write out complete responses. They were also told to probe in specific ways when the question was open ended and the intent of the question was either not clear to the respondent or the answer given was clearly evasive. The questionnaire portion of the instrument contained explicit instructions to the respondents about its completion. Few problems were encountered in this respect.

The commuting time between the Centre and the city in which the interviewers lived afforded an excellent opportunity for the principle investigator to deal with any coding problems which emerged during the course of the study. In this way, a continual series of debriefing sessions were conducted with the research staff and problems were quickly ironed out. Coding reliability problems were also avoided since the coding

of the open ended questions was done exclusively by the principle investigator in this study.

The data from the interview schedules was entered directly into a computer via a video display terminal. Each of the 208 cases required 182 columns to be entered. After the data entries had been "cleaned", ten percent of the cases were selected at random and a comparison was made between the original data on the interview schedule and the encoded data and an error rate of less than 1% was found to exist. No problems have been encountered in the computer manipulation of the data which are related to the encoding process utilized in this study.

### III. A Description of the Residential Counsellors.

In this section, an overview of the basic demographic characteristics of the Residential Counsellors who took part in the study will be presented. Table 1 contains the frequency distributions for the following variables: age; sex; marital status; and number of dependents. This information indicates that most of the RC's are women. In fact, 82.4% or 154 of the 187 people who answered this question were females as opposed to 17.6% or 33 male respondents. Table 1 also shows that 67.3% of the respondents were under 30 and 93.3% were under 40 years of age.

Of the 185 respondents who answered the question concerning marital status, 34.6% report being single, 53.0% said they were married while 23 respondents or 12.4% of those who answered stated they were either separated, divorced or widowed.

Table 1A. Frequency Distribution for Age, Marital Status  
and Number of Dependents. (in percents)

i) Age

Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55 and over	
15.9	10.1	13.5	12.5	10.6	24.0	9.1	3.4	1.0	N=208

ii) Sex

Male	Female	
17.6	82.4	N=187

iii) Marital Status

Single	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	
34.6	53.0	4.9	7.0	.5	N=185

iv) Number of Dependents

One	Two	Three	Four	Five or more	
33.7	43.2	12.6	9.5	1.1	N=95

Table 1B: Frequency Distribution for Employment History Items.  
(in percents)

Length of Occupation at the Centre.

Less than 2 years	from 2 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	ten years or more	
26.0	26.0	10.6	24.0	13.5	N=208

Number of Previous Full Time Jobs.

one	two	three	four	five or more	
60.5	19.5	11.3	6.2	2.6	N=195



Table 1C.: Frequency Distribution of Parent's Occupation and Education (in percents)

	Professional, Technical or Managerial	Clerical, Sales or Blue Collar	
<u>Father's Occupation</u>	28.7	71.3	N=202
<u>Mother's Occupation</u>	42.9	57.1	N=77
	Some grade school	some high school	some college or university
<u>Father's Education</u>	45.4	38.3	16.3 N=196
<u>Mother's Education</u>	32.3	47.5	20.2 N=198

Table 1D.: Frequency Distribution for Religion Items (in percents)

	Protestant	Catholic	Other	None	
<u>Religious Preference</u>	50.5	32.0	7.8	9.7	N=206
	Active	Not Active			
<u>How Active in Religion</u>	47.8	52.2			N=205

Table 1 indicates that 45% of the respondents had dependents. The majority of these (76.8%) report having one or two dependents while 12.6% stated that they had three dependents, 9.5% said they had four and 1.1% had five dependents. 113 respondents or 54.3% of the RC's reported having no dependents.

The RC's were asked how long they had worked at the Centre. The results in Table 1B show that 26.0% or just over one quarter of the respondents had been there for less than two years. An additional 26.0% report being there for from two to four years. Twenty four percent of the respondents said that they had been there between five and ten years while only 13.5% said they had been there for ten years or more. The interpretation

of these results, however, changes when the answer to the question concerning previous employment is considered. For example 60.5% of the respondents who answered this question stated that this was the only job they had held. An additional 19.5% indicated that this was the second full time job that they had held. Thus, for fully 80% of the respondents, working at the Centre was practically the only full time work experience they had had.

These findings somewhat lessen the importance of length of employment if the respondents work history is really the principle concern. In the present context, given the desperate state of the labour market, the employment patterns of these workers may be characteristic of some developing trends. The work patterns demonstrated by young female workers in the past, was that they worked for a while after marriage and then left the labour market to start families. This may no longer hold. Even for young women with no dependents, the lack of alternative employment opportunities may be forcing many of these people to hold on to the jobs that they do have. In either case, there do appear to be a number of people staying in these jobs beyond age thirty. In fact, fully 30.7% of the respondents were between thirty and fifty years of age.

A number of other items in the survey focussed on the demographic characteristics of the RC's. These included questions concerning the occupation and education of the respondent's parents. Table 1C shows that 58 or 28.7% of the respondents had fathers who were in either professional, managerial or technical occupations. This may be considered the traditional white collar component of the workforce. The rest of the respondents said that their fathers were employed in clerical, sales or blue collar occupations. This totaled 144 or 71.3% of the respondents who answered this question.

When asked what their mother's occupation was, 33 or 15.9% of the respondents indicated white collar occupations while 44 or 21.2% named clerical, sales or blue collar ones; 133 respondents or 63.0% reported that their mother's did not work.

The results of the items on parental education show that 16.3% of the fathers and 20.2% of the mothers of the respondents had some post secondary education. For both groups, an additional 38.3% of the fathers and 47.5% of the mothers had completed some high school education. Some grade school was reported for 45.4% of the fathers and 32.3% of the mothers. These results suggest that these workers have been exposed to parents who have had some experience in the educational system and for some, a great deal of education. This may influence the response of these worker in a number of important ways.

The final series of items which dealt with the respondents' personal backgrounds is presented in Table 1D and includes questions which ask both their religious affiliations and the extent of their religious activity. This showed that 104 or 50.5% of the respondents who answered these questions reported that they belonged to one of the Protestant denominations while 66 or 32.0% said that they were Catholic. Of the remaining group, 16 or 7.8% indicated another religion and 20 or 9.7% said that they had no religious affiliations. When queried as to their religious activity, 98 or 47.8% described themselves as either very active or somewhat active while 107 or 52.2% said they were not very active or not active at all.

#### IV. Describing the Major Variables.

##### i) Alienation and the Quality of Working Life.

In our discussion of alienation and the quality of working life presented above, control over one's activity at work was described as an essential aspect in the growth and development of human beings. Through the exercise of free human activities, people could both satisfy their needs and create their societies. The extent to which people are 'permitted' to exercise control over their work activities was related in this construct to their ability to satisfy increasingly higher needs.

The manner in which these concepts are operationalized in the present research reflects both of these concerns. There are measures, in the study, which focus on the extent to which people are afforded the opportunity to satisfy various levels of human needs as well as ones which examine the perceptions that the employees have of the extent of their control over their work. Neither of these, however, purports to measure alienation or the level of quality of working life experienced by the RC staff directly. On the other hand, both types of measures can be seen as indicators of the extent of alienation or of the actual quality of working life being experienced. Therefore, neither need satisfaction or control over work is itself equated with either alienation or QWL yet both demonstrate the perceptions that these workers have of their ability to exercise their human powers and abilities, to grow and develop at work and to satisfy their needs through work.

A series of items which dealt with various levels of need satisfaction were included in the interview schedule to measure the RC's perceptions of this occurring at the Centre. These items ranged from concerns with material rewards including such things as pay and benefits, to the satisfac-

tion of higher order needs. These included such things as the need to have social interaction at work or to use one's skills and abilities on one's job. A Factor analysis employing a Varimax Rotation was carried out on a number of these items. The resulting Martrix is presented in Figure 1 below.

The factor analysis identified seven 'factors' among the items included and three of these in particular appear to be directly related to the satisfaction of needs at work. The items in this matrix which reflect need satisfaction included the following:

1. Compared with people doing similar types of work in this community, I am well paid.
2. The benefits package in this job is very good.
3. Job security for people like me in this organization is very good.
4. People I work with encourage each other and work together.
5. Communications are good among my co-workers.
6. If I have a problem on the job, I can count on my co-workers for help and support.
7. If I should fall behind at work, I can count on my co-workers to cover for me while I get caught up.
8. My job requires that I use wide range of my abilities.
9. My job requires that I keep on learning new things.
10. How much of the time do you use your training and skills to the fullest on your job?

The first three items in this list deal with the satisfaction of basic needs. A frequency distribution for these basic needs satisfaction items is presented in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2: Frequency Distribution for Basic Need Satisfaction Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly		Neither		Strongly
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
<u>Item 1.</u> Compared with people doing similar types of work in this community, I am well paid.	19.8	53.1	11.1	12.1	3.9
<u>Item 2.</u> The benefits package in this job is very good.	14.5	62.8	11.1	9.7	1.9
<u>Item 3.</u> Job security for people like me in this organization is very good	16.9	65.7	7.7	7.7	1.9
					N=208

The Factor Matrix indicated that these three variables 'loaded' much higher on one of the factors. This includes Items 1,2, and 3 which appear to focus on the satisfaction of basic material needs. The items in this case deal with pay, benefits and job security. We will consider these items separate from the others and refer to them as basic need satisfaction measures. From Table 2, it is clear that there is widespread consensus among the RC staff that the level of material benefits accorded them in their jobs is quite good. In fact, between 72 and 82 percent of the staff answered each of these questions positively. This indicates that the perception of these workers is that their basic needs are being met through their job at the Centre.

The three items used to measure basic need satisfaction were then combined to form a single scale. These items were tested for scalability

in order to determine the appropriateness of this procedure, that is whether these three items were actually measuring different aspects of the same general concept. An Alpha score of .6153 was obtained after conducting a Reliability test on these three items. This met the minimum .6000 required to use these items in the construction of a scale. Therefore, based on these results as well as on the factor loadings which appeared in the Matrix displayed in Figure 1, a scale termed the "Basic Need Satisfaction Scale" was constructed using these three items. This will be used in the data analysis presented below.

A similar procedure was followed with respect to the next four items i.e., items 4,5,6 and 7. These four items also loaded on one factor in the factor matrix presented in Figure 1. In this case, the factor in question appears to be centered on the satisfaction of social needs through work. A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 3 below.

The items depicted in Table 3 indicate that there is moderate support for social need satisfaction among this particular group of workers. Positive responses on these items range from a low of 47.8% to a high of 76.9%. While not excessively high, these results show that for the most part, the interaction that staff members have with their co-workers while on the job is quite positive. There is some indication therefore, that the social needs of the workers are being met.

The items used to measure social need satisfaction were then tested for scalability using a Reliability procedure and an Alpha score of .8847 was obtained. This is very high and supports the combination of these items into a single scale. Once again, the results of the factor analysis described above also support this procedure since these items do load

FIGURE 1: Factor Matrix Including Need Satisfaction and Job Orientation Items

	Factor One	Factor Two	Factor Three	Factor Four	Factor Five	Factor Six	Factor Seven
Item 1. Compared to people doing similar types of work in this community, I am well paid.	.05	.02	.18	.06	-.09	.62	.14
Item 2. The benefits package in this job is very good.	.12	-.03	-.19	.03	.06	.46	.01
Item 3. Job security for people like me in this organization is very good.	.05	.02	.15	.05	.05	.70	-.05
Item 4. People I work with encourage each other and work together.	.87	.13	.08	-.02	.04	-.01	.04
Item 5. Communications are good among my co-workers.	.70	-.02	.08	.07	.10	.11	.14
Item 6. If I have problems on the job, I can count on my co-workers for help and support.	.79	.02	-.008	-.05	.03	.05	.13
Item 7. If I should fall behind at work, I can count on my co-workers to cover for me while I get caught up.	.69	.07	-.06	.02	-.13	.14	-.08
Item 8. My job requires that I use a wide range of my abilities.	.11	.14	.005	.14	.68	-.02	.02
Item 9. My job requires that I keep on learning new things.	.09	.15	.13	.20	.53	-.12	.19
Item 10. How much of the time do you use your skills and training to the fullest on your job?	.007	.16	.16	.14	.54	.04	.11
Item 11. Working here brings me the respect of my family and neighbours.	-.02	.02	.11	.02	.36	.09	-.009
Item 12. You can give an honest opinion around here without any worry.	.21	.002	.19	.02	.21	.06	.57
Item 13. I am proud to tell people where I work.	.07	.24	.44	.08	.42	-.05	.31
Item 14. Around here, I am treated as an adult.	.19	-.01	.23	.04	.27	.31	.40
Item 15. In general, my co-workers and I have a good attitude about working here.	.59	.09	.32	.11	.23	.08	.16
Item 16. I use to care more about work than I do now.	.10	.10	.57	.13	.11	.10	.20
Item 17. I often think of quitting.	.05	.12	.71	.19	.16	.10	.009
Item 18. If I could get a good paying job somewhere else, I'd leave this job in a minute.	-.007	.13	.64	.26	.22	.03	.03
Item 19. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	.0003	.15	.38	.63	.23	.005	.07
Item 20. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.	.06	.10	.15	.83	.15	.05	.05
Item 21. I live, eat and breathe my job.	-.05	.10	.11	.54	.24	.09	-.05
Item 22. Most things in life are more important than work.	.07	.08	.32	.35	-.02	.08	.08
Item 23. I am really a perfectionist about my work.	-.08	.04	.006	-.12	.12	-.03	-.20
Item 24. I am very much involved personally with my job.	.02	.33	.16	.19	.08	.10	-.12
Item 25. When I do my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and satisfaction.	.08	.58	.10	.35	-.02	-.0003	.22
Item 26. When I do my job well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.	.09	.75	.01	.07	.23	-.04	.03
Item 27. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	.14	.74	.12	.18	.05	-.02	.09
Item 28. Doing my job well increases my feelings of self esteem.	.03	.70	.15	.04	.10	.04	.02



TABLE 3: Frequency Distribution for Social Need Satisfaction Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>Item 4.</u> People I work with encourage each other and work together.	21.3	46.9	16.4	9.2	6.3
<u>Item 5.</u> Communications are good among my co-workers.	14.5	41.4	16.4	22.7	5.3
<u>Item 6.</u> If I have a problem on the job, I can count on my co-workers for help and support.	25.0	51.9	15.9	4.3	2.9
<u>Item 7.</u> If I should fall behind at work, I can count on my co-workers to cover for me while I get caught up.	18.0	51.9	15.0	11.7	3.4

N=208

significantly higher on one particular factor in the Matrix presented in Figure 1. Based on these results then, a scale named the "Social Need Satisfaction Scale" using these four items was constructed for use in further analysis.

The final three need satisfaction items relate to the use of skills and abilities or the learning of new ones. These processes focus on the satisfaction of self related needs or what we referred to in our discussion above as higher order needs. A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 4 below.

The results outlined in Table 4 suggest that there is a moderate degree of support for all the items used to measure higher order need satisfaction among the RC staff. Positive responses on these items range

from 47.1% to 65.7%. When these items were tested for scalability, an Alpha score of .6966 was obtained and this did meet the required .6000 level. Once again, additional support for this procedure was provided

TABLE 4.: Frequency Distribution for Higher Order Need Satisfaction Item. (in percent)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>Item 8.</u> My job requires that I use a wide range of my abilities.	23.7	42.0	13.5	17.3	3.4
<u>Item 9.</u> My job requires that I keep on learning new things.	13.0	39.1	15.0	25.6	7.2
<u>Item 10.</u> How much of the time do you use your training skills to the fullest on your job?	16.3	30.8	27.4	10.6	14.9

by the Factor analysis in which these items were included. The Matrix presented in Figure 1 showed that these items had high loadings on one particular factor. Based on these results, these items were combined to form a "Higher Order Need Satisfaction Scale" to be used in further analysis.

#### ii) Morale.

In this section, the variables used to measure worker morale will be discussed. These variables are included in this report, as indicators of the attitudes and perceptions that the staff have of their jobs at the Centre. In a sense, these items do not seek to assess the 'esprit de corps' of these workers as much as they do the individual orientations that each has to work and so 'morale' may well be a misnomer in this case. The

items reflect a range of perspectives that people sometimes take with regards to work. The items used to measure worker morale included the following:

1. In general, my co-workers and I have a good attitude about working here.
2. I used to care more about work than I do now.
3. I often think of quitting.
4. If I could get a good paying job somewhere else, I'd leave this job in a minute.
5. I am proud to tell people where I work.

A frequency distribution of these items is presented in Table 5 below.

It can be seen from Table 5 that there is low to moderate support for the items measuring morale. To make a comparison between items 1 and 5 and 2,3 and 4, it was necessary to reverse the order of the latter three variables. This was done, and it can be seen that the positive responses for these items range from 34.4, for item 2, to a high of 59.4 for item 5. The average positive response, however is approximately 45% which indicates that there is a degree of variability in the staff's perceptions of morale but that overall, morale at the Centre is quite low.

In interpreting these results, it may be important to examine the intent of these items more carefully. Items 1 and 5 offer the respondent an opportunity to express a positive response. Both of these items are phrased in such a way as to stress the positive. Items 2,3 and 4 on the other hand have a negative orientation and focus specifically on the types of responses one would expect from someone who does not care very much about his or her job. In this sense, a negative response on these items

indicates an instrumental orientation to work and reflects dissatisfaction with working in this institution.

When a Reliability test was performed on these items, an Alpha of .7821 was obtained. This is quite high which indicates that these items are in fact measuring different dimensions of a single concept. This was also evident in the factor loadings for these items shown in the Matrix displayed in Figure 1.<sup>3</sup> On this basis, a scale was constructed with these items and labelled the "Morale Scale."

Several other items were included in this study to measure morale and the satisfaction people expressed over their jobs. These included the following:

Item 1. How would you describe the morale where you work?

Item 2. Taking everything into account, how satisfied are you with your job as it is now?

It is clear from the results presented in Table 6 that there is some discrepancy between morale and job satisfaction scores. While 58.2% of the staff report being satisfied with their jobs, only 28.7% describe morale as high. This contradiction may be more apparent than real since interpreting what the job satisfaction questions measure is quite problematic. There is some question as to the meaning of job satisfaction scores in terms of their reference to what else is available to people or whether the responses are based on a comparison the worker is making to either not having a job at all or having a much worse job, with lower pay and poorer working conditions.

The morale items however, may be seen as a reflection of the scores on a number of specific dimensions related to their jobs. Thus morale is seen to be distinct from job satisfaction and to be related more directly with

TABLE 5: Frequency Distribution of Worker Morale Items

(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>Item 1.</u> In general my co-workers and I have a good attitude about working here.	13.0	34.0	24.2	24.2	7.2
<u>Item 2.</u> I used to care more about work than I do now.	19.4	32.0	14.1	25.2	9.2
<u>Item 3.</u> I often think of quitting.	12.1	28.0	14.5	31.9	13.5
<u>Item 4.</u> If I could get a good paying job somewhere else, I'd leave this job in a minute.	17.9	18.6	25.6	30.9	7.2
<u>Item 5.</u> I am proud to tell people where I work.	10.6	48.4	25.6	11.1	3.9

N=208

A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6: Frequency Distribution for Job Satisfaction Items.  
(in percents)

	High	Neither High Nor Low	Low
Item 1. How would you describe the morale where you work?	23.7	32.4	50.2
Item 2. Taking everything into account, how satisfied are you with your job as it is now?	<u>Satisfied</u> 58.2		<u>Dissatisfied</u> 41.8

N=208

the immediate work experience of the respondent as opposed to an overall assessment of the job itself. The results on the morale item in Table 6 reinforce those reported in Table 5 above and support the interpretation of

them presented there which suggested that morale was moderately positive among the staff.

iii) Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation.

In this section, two sets of items measuring Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation will be outlined. These concepts were discussed above as indicators of a person's particular orientation to work. Job Involvement was described as a person's psychological involvement in their work. The items used to measure this concept were taken from the Lodahl and Kejner "Job Involvement Scale" outlined in our discussion above. These include the following:

- Item 1. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
- Item 2. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
- Item 3. I live, eat, and breathe my job.
- Item 4. Most things in life are more important than work.
- Item 5. I am a real perfectionist about my work.
- Item 6. I am very much involved personally with my job.

These six items were included in the Factor analysis described above and appear in the resulting Matrix presented in Figure 1. An examination of the various factors identified through this procedure indicated that these items did load higher on one in particular. These loadings included Items 1 through 4 but did not include Items 5 or 6. The first four items were combined and a Reliability test was performed on them to ascertain their scalability. This produced an Alpha of .7258. Based on this, in addition to the results of the Factor analysis, these four items were

combined to form a Job Involvement Scale for use in further analysis.

A frequency distribution for the job involvement items is presented in Table 7 below.

TABLE 7: Frequency Distribution for Job Involvement  
Neither

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>Item 1.</u> The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	2.9	18.8	25.0	34.1	19.2
<u>Item 2.</u> The most important things that happen to me involve my job.	0.5	11.1	17.8	52.4	18.3
<u>Item 3.</u> I live, eat, and breathe my job.	0.5	1.9	5.8	36.1	55.8
<u>Item 4.</u> Most things in life are more important than work.	1.9	21.2	33.2	25.0	18.8

N=208

It is clear from Table 7 that the job involvement scores reported by the RC staff are quite low. Positive responses on these items range only from a high of 23.1% to a low of 2.4%. This suggests that many of these employees do not see their jobs as being that important since few identify with them. It is also indicative of a low level of self investment in the work role as either a source of self esteem or as a basis for the evaluations of self worth by these people. This is related to the perceptions that these employees have about the opportunity that work affords them for maintaining a positive self image through large investments of themselves in their jobs. This is apparently not the case for these workers.

Interpreting these results in terms of the broader theoretical concerns expressed above, it may well be that these workers are experiencing

alienation and little quality of working life. This occurs essentially because work is not seen as an area in which a person can satisfy higher order, self related needs, but only more basic ones. Work in this sense becomes a purely instrumental activity aimed at providing a pay check and little else while other areas of a person's life become defined as being increasingly more important to self related activities.

The procedure followed with respect to job involvement items was repeated for the intrinsic motivation items developed by Lawler. In this construct, intrinsic motivation was described in terms of the impact that job performance has on a person's self esteem. The performance component of this concept in particular differentiates it from job involvement and other work-related attitudes which reflect the self esteem maintenance process. This suggests that a person may be concerned with job performance and the self esteem derived from positive evaluations at work. In general, here however, these people may not define work as being a very important part of their lives. This would result in high intrinsic motivation scores and low job involvement scores. A similar distinction was pointed out in our discussion of Moch's work on job versus organizational involvement where it was suggested that people could be involved in their jobs and not in the work organization and vice versa.<sup>4</sup> This needs to be borne in mind while interpreting the results of these measures. The items used to measure intrinsic motivation included the following:

Item 1. When I do my job well it contributed to my personal growth and well being.

Item 2. When I do my job well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.

Item 3. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.



Item 4. Doing my job well increases my feelings of self esteem.

A frequency distribution of these items is presented in Table 8 below.

TABLE 8: Frequency Distribution for Intrinsic Motivation Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Item 1. When I do my job well it contributes to my personal growth and satisfaction.	18.3	67.3	10.1	2.8	1.9
Item 2. When I do my job well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.	24.0	69.7	4.3	1.9	0.0
Item 3. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well	35.1	54.3	8.2	1.9	0.5
Item 4. Doing my job well increase my feeling of self-esteem.	21.2	66.3	7.7	3.8	1.0

N=208

The responses to the items measuring intrinsic motivation were all very strong and positive. These results range from 85.6% to 93.7% in positive responses to these items. This makes it quite clear that work role performance is identified as valuable by these workers in terms of the way that it affects their self esteem and other measures of self worth. It is important to note that this is related primarily to job performance, given the types of results reported on the job involvement measures discussed above.

In our description of the Centre, we indicated that the RC's worked in a highly stratified status hierarchy and that their work involved a great

deal of contact with people in positions both higher and lower to theirs. In this case Faunce's analysis of this type of situation may best explain these results.<sup>5</sup> Faunce suggests that it is difficult to avoid evaluating yourself when you are constantly being evaluated by others who you have a great deal of interaction with, even if you don't agree with the basis for the evaluation. This is even more difficult when a high degree of status differentiation exists as is the case at the Centre. The disparity in these two measures therefore may be based on the recognition of the importance of job performance to self esteem while at the same time saying that work is not the most important thing in life.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and both alienation and QWL rests on the opportunity which work affords people for human growth and development. This includes the satisfaction of increasingly higher order needs through work. While intrinsic motivation does reflect a recognition of the importance of work role performance to this, it also reflects the nature of the immediate work environment. In some instances, it may be possible for people who have low job involvement, and thus approach work in an instrumental way, to avoid any type of evaluation at work which they are concerned about. These people should then also have low intrinsic motivation since job performance is rendered unimportant to self esteem in this instance. On the other hand, in the case of people like the RC's, it is very difficult to avoid evaluation at work and therefore job performance does take on some importance, even for those with low job involvement.

Perhaps the epitomy of an instrumental response to work would be that of a person who has very low levels of intrinsic motivation in a job in which frequent evaluations by peers and superiors is unavoidable. This would demonstrate a complete withdrawal of self from the work role even in

the face of explicit and continuous evaluations by people with whom you are forced to have frequent interaction. If Faunce is correct, this should prove quite difficult for people to do!

A Reliability test was performed on both the job involvement and intrinsic motivation items and this resulted in an Alpha score of .7259 for the job involvement items and .8137 for the intrinsic motivation items. Since both sets of items also loaded higher on a single factor in the factor Matrix presented in Figure 1 we felt justified in combining these sets of items into two scales named the "Job Involvement Scale" and the "Intrinsic Motivation Scale" respectively. These will also be used in further analysis.

#### iv) Organizational Variables.

In this section, a number of variables will be discussed which seek to describe various dimensions of the organizational structure at the Centre. Basically, these variables can be identified as the perceptions that the RC staff have in terms of the authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision they encounter in the organization of work. Each of these focuses specifically on one aspect of the operation of the Centre and the impact that this has on the nature of the jobs performed by the direct care staff.

Authoritarianism refers to the extent to which the staff perceives the administration at the Centre as being authoritarian in rule enforcement and discipline matters. Autonomy on the other hand, focuses on the amount of control these workers experience in performing their duties. Democratic supervision attempts to ascertain the extent of democratic leadership displayed by the supervisory staff at the Centre.

The items used to measure Authoritarianism included the following:

Item 1. I don't really like working here, all the rules and regulations make you feel like you're in prison.

Item 2. The administration is much too strict in enforcing the rules around here.

Item 3. Ultimately, my supervisor has too much control over my job.

A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 9 below.

TABLE 9: Frequency Distribution for Authoritarianism Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Item 1. I don't really like working here, all the rules and regulations make you feel like you're in prison.	6.8	13.5	23.2	42.5	14.0
Item 2. The administration is much too strict in enforcing the rules around here.	8.3	24.3	35.4	29.6	2.4
Item 3. Ultimately, my supervisor has too much control over my job.	6.3	12.1	28.0	45.4	8.2

N=208

The frequency distribution for the items measuring authoritarianism suggests that there is little support for these items among the staff. The positive responses in this case are quite low ranging from 18.4% to 32.6%. It appears that the staff do not perceive the administration as being excessively strict in rule enforcement or disciplinary matters.

The items used to measure Autonomy included the following:

Item 1. I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.

Item 2. My job allows me to determine my own workspace.

Item 3. I have a lot of say over how work tasks will be divided among myself and my work group.

Item 4. I have a great deal of freedom to run my own job.

A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 10 below.

TABLE 10: Frequency Distribution for Autonomy Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Item 1. I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.	2.4	28.8	24.0	35.1	9.6
Item 2. My job allows me to determine my own workspace.	8.2	37.5	24.5	26.0	3.8
Item 3. I have a lot of say over how work tasks will be divided among myself and my work group.	6.8	29.0	23.7	32.4	8.2
Item 4. I have a great deal of freedom to run my own job.	1.4	22.2	27.1	40.1	9.2

N=208

In table 10, the autonomy items are displayed. It can be seen from this table that the workers report moderate to low levels of autonomy on their jobs. The positive responses for these items range from a low of 23.6% to a high of 45.7%. Negative responses for these items are also moderate, however, suggesting a degree of variability in the workers' perceptions of this variable. The implications of this will be expanded upon when these items are related to behavioural and attitudinal responses to work as well as to other job factors.

The items used to measure Democratic Supervision included the following:

Item 1. My supervisor encourages me to participate in important decisions.

Item 2. My supervisor encourages those he/she supervises to develop new ways of doing things.

Item 3. My supervisor gives responsibility to those he/she supervises.

A frequency distribution for the democratic supervision items is presented in Table 11 below.

TABLE 11: Frequency Distribution for Democratic Supervision Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Item 1. My supervisor encourages me to participate in important decisions	20.7	46.2	15.9	14.9	2.6
Item 2. My supervisor encourages those he/she supervises to develop new ways of doing things.	13.5	52.2	18.8	20.3	4.18
Item 3. My supervisor gives responsibility to those he/she supervises	22.1	63.5	8.2	6.3	0.0

N=208

In discussing the results of Table 11, it is immediately apparent that there is considerable consensus among the staff on these items. Positive responses range from 56.0% to 85.6% while negative responses reflect a much narrower spread going from 6.3% to 25.1%. These results indicate that the supervisory staff at the Centre does employ democratic methods in their work. Once again, the meaning of this finding will be determined in terms

of the relationship which it has to the workers behavioural and attitudinal responses to work. This will be discussed below.

A Factor analysis employing a Varimax Rotation was performed which included these items as well as several other items related to authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision. The resulting Factor Matrix is presented in Figure 2. This indicates that four separate 'factors' were identified among these variables. The first factor identified in this Matrix loads significantly higher on items 9 through 11 which were the three items discussed above with respect to democratic supervision. The second factor had higher loadings on items 4 thru 8 which were the items included in our measure of autonomy, as well as on items 13 to 15 which also measured autonomy. The third factor had significantly higher loadings on the first three items which we included in our discussion of authoritarianism. Factor four indicated higher loadings on items 12 to 15 and these also all reflect autonomy.

The interpretation of the results obtained in this Factor matrix is complicated by the similarity which exists among the items dealing with both autonomy and democratic supervision. This is evident in Factor One in which items 4 and 6 demonstrate high factor loadings. The substantive import of items 9 through 11, however, focusses specifically on the activities of the supervisor as they relate to autonomous action on the part of the employees. Therefore, the use made of this factor analysis was to verify and substantiate scaling procedure undertaken with items 9 through 11 which refer specifically to democratic supervision.

A similar argument can be made with reference to items 4 through 8 in Factor Two. In this case, all the items have some degree of loading on both Factor One and Factor Two. Additionally, items 13 through 15

demonstrated high loadings on this factor. Once again, the import of this procedure was to verify the combining of various items into a scale which focussed on autonomy. A number of items were included in the interview schedule which were directed at this concept. Many were examined for inclusion in an autonomy scale. Items 4 through 8 emerged as the most suitable candidates in this regard after both the factor analysis procedure and reliability testing were performed. On this basis, therefore, these items were singled out for use as measures of autonomy. This also accounts for our rejection of items 12 through 15 which had high loadings on Factor Four, and which also measured autonomy.

The three groups of items used to measure organizational variables were each subjected to a Reliability test to determine their suitability for scaling. The results of this test showed an Alpha score of .6776 for the autonomy items, and one of .6958 for the democratic supervision items. The authoritarianism items however produced an Alpha of only .5647 which did not meet the required .6000 needed for combining these items into a scale. However, since the Alpha level was very close to the required threshold for scaling and with the results of the factor analysis which showed that these items did load together, it was decided to combine these items into a scale called the "Authoritarianism Scale." The same was done for the other two sets of items resulting in the construction of an "Autonomy Scale", and a "Democratic Supervision Scale." All three of these scales will be used in further analysis.

It is important to point out here the differences between these three scales, in terms of the meanings that they have for the types of work experiences these respondents have. The Authoritarianism scale reflects the staff's perceptions of the overall approach taken by the administration



FIGURE 2: Factor Matrix Including Organizational Factors.

	Factor One	Factor Two	Factor Three	Factor Four
Item 1. I don't really like working here, all the rules and regulations make me feel like you're in prison.	-.17	-.04	.67	-.03
Item 2. The administration is much too strict in enforcing the rules around here.	.06	-.20	.41	.008
Item 3. Ultimately, my supervisor has too much control over my job.	-.33	-.02	.53	-.27
Item 4. I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.	.59	.32	-.14	-.03
Item 5. My job allows me to determine my own workspace.	.21	.37	-.06	-.005
Item 6. I have a lot of say over how tasks will be divided among myself and my co-workers.	.53	.28	.05	.07
Item 7. I can influence the decisions that affect my job.	.35	.40	-.25	.10
Item 8. I have a great deal of freedom to run my own job.	.22	.52	-.05	.17
Item 9. My supervisor encourages me to participate in important decisions.	.70	-.01	-.23	.12
Item 10. My supervisor encourages those he/she supervises to develop new ways of doing things.	.53	.18	-.22	.09
Item 11. My supervisor gives responsibility to those he/she supervises.	.61	.08	.04	.13
Item 12. Most of the important decisions in my job are made by the supervisor alone.	.18	.11	-.008	.68
Item 13. I am told what I have to do on my job.	.02	.25	-.09	.44
Item 14. How much freedom do you have over what you do on your job?	.09	.46	-.16	.35
Item 15. When doing your job, do you decide how much time to spend on a particular task?	.04	.44	-.06	.20

when dealing with discipline or rules concerning behaviour at work.

Democratic supervision, on the other hand refers to the staff members

immediate supervisor so that this may have a stronger or more direct impact

on the behaviour and attitudes of these workers. A situation could exist in which the workers may perceive the administration as being excessively strict, while seeing their immediate supervisors as more democratic, or vice versa. In this way, the Democratic Supervision Scale may have more to tell us about the day-to-day work experiences of these people than the Authoritarianism Scale does.

Autonomy appears to be more closely related to the Democratic Supervision measures than it does to the Authoritarianism ones since it also focuses on the employees' immediate work experiences. In this case, workers may perceive a great deal of control over their immediate tasks and yet little control over the larger questions of how the organization is run. All the items in this particular scale are specifically related to the worker's own job and his or her own ability to exercise some degree of control over what happens on the job.

The results of Tables 9, 10 and 11 are consistent with our description of the control processes operating with this group of workers. They are not minutely controlled as are assembly line workers, thus do not perceive the administration as being overtly strict. Similarly, the nature of the tasks performed by these workers requires that they exercise a certain degree of discretion in selecting from a number of predetermined, appropriate response to the situations that they encounter in their daily work routines. The supervisors have to assume that these employees will be self directed since it would be practically impossible to tell each of them specifically what and how to do their jobs. This was described as an "unobtrusive" type of control structure above and relies on the training and "professional" socialization given to each of these workers. In a somewhat narrow sense, these people are in fact responsible for doing their

jobs properly and for the care and well being of the residents that they work with. However, the basic patterns to be followed at work and the techniques to be employed are clearly established well in advance and by people other than the RC's themselves.

This discussion becomes even more relevant when the Autonomy items are examined since these refer specifically to the jobs that these people do. This is based on the job in a very immediate sense, in terms of such things as having control over the workplace and dividing up work tasks among themselves. Several points are worthy of note here. First, the variability in the response to these items indicates that different workers in the Centre perceive various amounts of control over their jobs. In our analysis below, these items will be related to the particular units that these people are working in to ascertain if each of the units exhibits higher or lower scores on this dimension. Secondly, the measures of Autonomy may be another indication of the type of control experienced by these workers since they may be able to exercise their discretion on the job but this appears in the narrow and limited sense described above when dealing with Democratic Supervision. That is, these workers have a certain amount of latitude in their work roles which permits them to exercise their judgments within certain predetermined parameters. Once again, they have the responsibility for their work but may not have the power to make crucial decisions. This will be examined more closely with respect to the relationship that exists between this measure and the satisfaction of various levels of needs by these workers while on the job.

v) Worker Behaviour Patterns.

A number of items were included in this study which asked the workers how they responded in certain situations or whether they had ever taken part in various types of activities while working at the Centre. A series of twenty of these self reported behaviour items were included in an initial factor analysis. This procedure identified seven factors among these twenty items however, many of the factors were unintelligible. A second factor analysis was performed and eleven of the original twenty items were included. The particular items selected for this second analysis were those which appeared to be loading most highly on the identifiable factors in the first analysis conducted.

The second factor analysis procedure identified three factors which were more easily interpreted. The factor Matrix obtained in this process is presented in Figure 3 below. The eleven items included in this matrix were the following:

- Item 1. When I see something wrong at work, I try to figure out how to solve the problem and tell the supervisor about it.
- Item 2. At work, I always try to figure out better ways of doing my job.
- Item 3. I try to do a good job at work even if no one is around to see it.
- Item 4. Have you ever talked back to your supervisor or other superior?
- Item 5. Have you ever refused to follow a direct order from your supervisor?
- Item 6. Have you ever turned your back and avoided taking responsibility for things going on at work?
- Item 7. Have you ever walked off the job while on duty without permission?
- Item 8. Have you ever gotten really 'bitchy' or short tempered at work because you were angry or frustrated?
- Item 9. Have you ever yelled or screamed at a supervisor or other employee because you were angry or frustrated at work?
- Item 10. Have you ever 'deliberately' misplaced a report, memo or piece of equipment because you were angry or frustrated with what was going on at work?
- Item 11. Have you ever 'borrowed' anything from work for your own personal use?

FIGURE 3: Factor Matrix Including Behavioural Variables.

	Factor One	Factor Two	Factor Three
<u>Item 1.</u> When I see something wrong at work, I try to figure out how to solve the problem and tell the supervisor about it.	-.04	.57	.18
<u>Item 2.</u> At work, I always try to figure out better ways of doing my job.	.11	.79	-.05
<u>Item 3.</u> I try to do a good job at work even if no one is around to see it.	-.03	.56	.22
<u>Item 4.</u> Have you ever talked back to your supervisor or other superior?	.60	-.01	.18
<u>Item 5.</u> Have you ever refused to follow a direct order from your supervisor?	.43	-.01	.10
<u>Item 6.</u> Have you ever turned your back and avoided taking responsibility for things going on at work?	.14	.16	.52
<u>Item 7.</u> Have you ever walked off the job while on duty without permission?	.20	.01	.26
<u>Item 8.</u> Have you ever gotten really 'bitchy' or short tempered at work because you were angry or frustrated?	.50	.05	.26
<u>Item 9.</u> Have you ever yelled or screamed at a supervisor or other employee because you were angry or frustrated at work?	.61	.005	.12
<u>Item 10.</u> Have you ever 'deliberately' misplaced a report, memo or piece of equipment because you were angry or frustrated at work?	.26	.01	.32
<u>Item 11.</u> Have you ever 'borrowed' anything from work for your own personal use?	.24	.16	.65

The first factor outlined in the Matrix in Figure 3 shows that Items 4, 5, 8 and 9 loaded significantly higher on this factor than did the rest of the items. Upon closer examination, these items all appeared to be concerned with situations in which the staff confronted their superiors. These four items were then tested for scalability and Alpha of .6408 was

obtained indicating that they were in fact measuring various dimensions of a single concept. On the basis of both of these results, these items were combined to form a scale named the "Confrontation Scale". A frequency distribution for the individual items included in this scale is presented in Table 12 below.

TABLE 12: Frequency Distribution of Confrontation Items.  
(in percents)

	Often	Not very Often	No, Never
Item 1. Have you ever talked back to your supervisor or other superior?	25.5	24.0	51.4
Item 2. Have you ever refused to follow a direct order from your supervisor?	6.3	22.6	84.6
Item 3. Have you ever gotten really 'bitchy' or short tempered at work because you were angry or frustrated?	51.9	25.5	22.6
Item 4. Have you ever yelled or screamed at a supervisor or other employee because you were angry or frustrated at work?	13.9	20.7	65.4

The results displayed in Table 12 show that instances of confrontational behaviour decrease with the severity of the particular behaviour. Thus while 54.3% report getting bitchy at work quite frequently, and 30.3% stated that they talked back to their superiors frequently, incidence in the frequency category drop to 15.4% for yelling at superiors or co-workers and to 4.8% for refusing to follow a direct order. Clearly, refusing to follow direct orders is perhaps serious enough to warrant the dismissal of the employee involved. It is not surprising to find that there is little of this type of behaviour present. On the other hand, the work environment of these people and their place in the Centre's status hierarchy may

explain their willingness to verbalize displeasure, especially since the difference between the RC II's and the RC III's who supervise them is quite small and often based on little more than a few years of experience.

In fact, the RC III's have no additional training or qualifications and are often former co-workers of the RC II's. This does not appear to be seen as serious as refusing to follow a direct order. Similarly, yelling represents a visible display of behaviour and based on its limited frequency of occurrence, one which is considered quite serious by the RC staff.

The items included in the Confrontation Scale therefore range from very serious to less serious behaviour. The interpretation of this scale is based on a recognition of this and is treated as an indication of the extent to which an RC is involved generally in activity of this type. We are assuming that those people willing to engage in the more serious forms of behaviour are also willing to participate in less serious ones or vice versa. No attempt was made to assign weights to the individual items since the thrust of the scale was not to determine the seriousness of the behavioural responses of the workers as much as it was the extent of their participation in them. The Confrontation Scale will be discussed further in subsequent sections of this report.

The second factor identified in the Factor Matrix presented in Figure 3, was comprised of the first three items in the list. Each of these items is based on some form of cooperative behaviour which indicates a willingness on the part of the employee, to give more than the bare minimum required to do the job. The three items included here were:

Item 1. When I see something wrong at work, I try to figure out how to solve the problem and tell the supervisor about it.

Item 2. At work, I always try to figure out better ways of doing my job.

Item 3. I try to do a good job at work even if no one is around to see it.

A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 13 below.

TABLE 13: Frequency Distribution of Co-operation Items.  
(in percents)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Item 1. When I see something wrong at work, I try to figure out how to solve the problem and tell the supervisor about it.	18.4	61.8	10.1	9.2	0.5
Item 2. At work, I always try to figure out better ways of doing my job.	13.0	59.9	18.4	8.7	0.0
Item 3. I try to do a good job at work even if no one is around to see it.	27.5	71.0	0.5	1.0	0.0

N=208

An examination of Table 13 reveals that the staff at the Centre reports high levels of cooperation. Positive responses on these items range from 72.9% to 98.5%. When these items were tested for scalability, an Alpha of .6643 was obtained, indicating that these items could be combined to form a "Cooperation Scale". This was supported by the factor analysis described above as well.

The remaining items in the factor Matrix did not appear to be measuring a single concept since the third factor identified in the Matrix was largely unintelligible. The items which received the highest loadings in this case were item 6 which dealt with avoiding responsibility at work and item 11 which focussed on employee theft. There did not appear to be any



justification for considering these items together based on their substantive import. Therefore, some of these behaviour items along with others not included in this list will be dealt with separately in the data analysis below.

## CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

In this chapter, the goals of the research discussed at length above will be addressed. This will consist, for the most part, of an analysis of the relationships which exist between the major variables outlined in the previous section. However, it will also include a consideration of the differences which exist in the responses of the workers in the various units of the Centre. An attempt will be made to determine if working in the different parts of the facility is related to the job characteristics peculiar to each of the four residential units.

Finally, the interview format employed in the data collection, afforded us the opportunity to include a number of open ended questions in the interview schedule. The focus of these items range from gaining some insight into the method of evaluation experienced by the RC staff to describing the responses that the RC's made to a number of hypothetical situations. This information will be included at those points in our discussion where it best fits or where it will be most useful in clarifying or highlighting particular concepts.

i) Alienation, QWL and Need Satisfaction.

The relationship between alienation, QWL and need satisfaction has been elaborated upon a number of times in our discussion. It has been stated above that we do not purport to measure either alienation or QWL directly but focus instead on the extent to which people are afforded the opportunity to satisfy a variety of human needs at work. Alienation and

QWL were described on the basis of the opportunity that people have to exercise their powers and ability in the process of need satisfaction at work. In the QWL literature in particular, this aspect of work was related to the satisfaction of higher order (self-actualization) needs.

In the last chapter, a number of items were outlined which sought to measure need satisfaction among the RC staff. These were used to form three need satisfaction scales including (i) the Basic Need Satisfaction Scale, (ii) the Social Need Satisfaction Scale, and (iii) the Higher Order Need Satisfaction Scale.

These three scales were crosstabulated first with the two scales which dealt with the self reported behaviour items, the Confrontation Scale and the Cooperation Scale. The results of this procedure are presented in Tables 14 and 15 below.

TABLE 14: Cooperation by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction. (in percents)

	Basic		Social		Higher Order	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Cooperation						
High	69.4	62.2	72.0	60.4	78.6	55.6
Low	30.6	37.8	28.0	39.6	21.4	44.4
Gamma = .1581			Gamma = .2588		Gamma = .4915	
Chi Square = .8371			Chi Square = 2.602		Chi Square = 11.2066	
P=.36			P=.10		P=.001	

TABLE 15: Confrontation by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction. (in percents)

Confrontation	Basic		Social		Higher Order	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	49.2	60.2	50.0	55.7	41.8	64.2
Low	50.8	39.9	50.0	44.3	58.2	35.8
Gamma = .2202		Gamma = -.1132		Gamma = -.4278		
Chi Square = 2.0160 P = .15		Chi Square = .4540 P = .50		Chi Square = 9.5158 P = .001.		

The results of Table 14 indicate that there is a small positive relationship between basic needs satisfaction and Cooperation however this was not statistically significant. This produced a Gamma of .1581 which is quite low. The tables suggest that Cooperation is not affected very much by the level of basic need satisfaction experienced by these respondents.

The relationship between social need satisfaction and Cooperation is only slightly stronger than that reported for basic need satisfaction above. In this case the Gamma was .2558 indicating that a low to moderate, positive relationship exists here. Once again the relationship was not statistically significant. Social need satisfaction appears to be related to higher levels of Cooperation however, this relationship is not large.

The relationship between social need satisfaction and confrontation was found to be small and negative. The Gamma obtained in this case was -.1132. The respondents reported only slightly higher levels of confrontation when social need satisfaction was low than when it was high. Here again, the percentage differences across these categories was not large.

Unlike both basic and social need satisfaction, the relationship between higher order need satisfaction and both measures of worker behaviour was quite strong. In the case of cooperation, the Gamma obtained was .4915 indicating a strong, positive relationship between these variables.

A strong, negative relationship was found between higher order need satisfaction and confrontation producing a Gamma of  $-.4278$ . The portion of the table where this is displayed shows that Cooperation is especially high when higher order need satisfaction is high. Conversely, confrontation is high when higher order need satisfaction is low. Both relationships were found to be statistically significant. Higher order need satisfaction appears to have a marked effect on both Confrontation and Cooperation.

These findings are consistent with the theoretical formulation outlined above. To begin with, the behaviour of these workers is related much more closely to higher order need satisfaction than to either basic or social need satisfaction. This should be the case when higher order needs are being satisfied at work since work affords these people the opportunity to exercise their talents and abilities. This should be true of the Cooperation items in particular if the theoretical discussion presented above is viable since work is not defined narrowly or instrumentally but positively and cooperation contributes to the satisfaction of higher order needs. The 78.6% response rate in the high Cooperation, high, Higher Order Need Satisfaction category makes this abundantly clear.

The relatively low relationship between both basic and social need satisfaction and worker behaviour may be somewhat deceiving. The frequency distribution presented above for the items which make up both of these scales showed that most of the RC staff reported very positive responses for the satisfaction of both basic and social needs. The results for the items that measured higher order need satisfaction on the other hand were mixed, showing that a great deal of variability was present in the responses.

The relationship between both basic and social need satisfaction and worker behaviour may have been much different if these two were not widely perceived as being satisfied. In a situation where basic needs are not being met and work offers no social compensations, the likelihood of increased levels of Confrontation and decreased levels of Cooperation should be higher. In the present situation, it was precisely those workers who perceived basic, social and higher order needs as satisfied that were the most cooperative at work. Those workers who did not perceive higher order needs being satisfied were not nearly as cooperative as their co-workers who did! If this held true for all of these measures of need satisfaction, then the proposition that more Confrontation and less Cooperation would be likely when need satisfaction levels are low would be supported.

These results also lend strong support to the contentions of the QWL advocates. The items used to measure higher order need satisfaction are precisely those which reflect the opportunity which people perceive for need satisfaction occurring at work. In many cases they constitute the fundamental variables included in work redesign projects and they stress the importance of a work organization in which people are given the chance to use their skills and abilities and to grow and develop as human beings. Perhaps the strong and positive relationship which was found between higher order need satisfaction and Cooperation best attests to the viability of the QWL approach since it is based on variables which form part of the human dimension of work; a dimension which does not depend on technology whatsoever but rather on people and relationships. These are most accessible for changes in existing organizations according to the QWL supporters.

ii) Morale.

Our discussion of Morale thus far has served to identify the variables used to measure morale and to present the frequency distributions of these items. In this section, the relationship between morale and worker behaviour will be discussed in conjunction with a consideration of the relationship between morale and the organizational factors described above. It was noted in our earlier discussion that the morale among the direct care staff was moderately low, with only approximately 45% of the workers responding positively to the items in the Morale Scale. In order to determine what types of factors were affecting morale at the Centre, the following questions were asked:

- Item 1. What would you say is the one thing that most affects morale where you work?
- Item 2. Why are/you/not satisfied with your job?
- Item 3. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly interesting?
- Item 4. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly rewarding?
- Item 5. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly difficult?
- Item 6. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly undesirable?

A frequency distribution for these items is presented in Table 16 below.

It is clear from Table 16 that in Item 1, both the administration and the co-workers are a major source of morale. This is reflected in Item 2 of the Table as well since 44.6% of the respondents cited either i) lack of

TABLE 16: Frequency Distribution for Items Affecting Morale.

	Economic Factors	The Admin- istration	Co- Workers	Job Factors	Clients
Item 1. What would you say is the one thing that most affects morale where you work?	16.2	48.0	28.8	3.0	4.0 N=198
	Positive Responses Due To:				
	Nature of Job	Pay Received	Co- Workers	Autonomy On The Job	
Item 2. Why are you/are you not satisfied with your job?	3.0	1.5	7.4	1.5	
	Negative Responses Due to:				
	Lack of Autonomy	Administra- tion Action	Job Factors	Lack of Achievement With Clients	
	17.8	11.4	15.4	42.1 N=202	
Item 3. What one thing is there about your job that makes it part- icularly interesting?	Interaction With Clients	Meet Variety of People	Changing Routine	Autonomy On Job	
	51.8	7.5	32.2	8.5 N=199	
Item 4. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly rewarding?	Client Progress	Recognition of Effort	Money	Other	
	80.7	8.4	4.5	6.4 N=202	
Item 5. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly difficult?	Administra- tion Action	Other Staff	Other Job Factors	Lack of Response From Clients	
	80.7	21.4	34.3	11.4 N=201	
Item 6. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particular- ly undesirable?	Admin- stration	Lack of Client Progress	Fear of Physical Harm	Job Factors (shift Work, etc.)	
	20.3	10.7	7.0	60.0 N=187	



autonomy, ii) administrative action, or iii) job factors (which included relations with other co-workers among other things) as reasons for being dissatisfied with their jobs. This is consistent with our theoretical framework which suggests that social relations which characterize a workplace organization are reflected in various forms of administrative action which affects the ability of the workers to determine their own lives at work. In our analysis, this was related to both alienation and low levels of QWL and it may find expression in the verbal, attitudinal or behavioural responses of these workers. This may be precisely the case with respect to the measures of morale described above.

In Item 2 in this table, 42.1% of the staff report being dissatisfied with their jobs as a result of the "lack of achievement with clients." This particular label was attached to this category in a non-pejorative manner, in order to convey a certain level of frustration expressed by the direct care staff, with being unable to do more for the residents. Strictly speaking, this is not related to job satisfaction but reflects instead, a very high level of commitment to the clients on the part of these workers. The results reported in Item 3 and 4 substantiate this interpretation. For example, 51.8% of the staff reported that the clients are the one thing that makes their jobs interesting. Similarly, 80.7% identify "client progress" as the one thing that makes their jobs rewarding. Both of these items demonstrate the strong commitment that the residential counsellors have to the clients of the Centre and show why the staff is so concerned with client progress.

Item 5 of this table indicates that 54.2% of the RC's think that the administration and co-workers are the factors which make their jobs difficult. An additional 34.3% of the respondents cite job factors as

responsible for the difficulty. These factors include such things shift work, the "heavy" parts of the job, such as lifting or cleaning, and various other job related activities.

In Item 6, Job Factors was selected 60% of the time as being the one thing that makes the job particularly undesirable. Shift work and weekend work were reported most often in this regard and this is not surprising given the demographic characteristics of the RC staff.

The picture which emerges from the examination of the factors which affect morale among the residential counsellors suggests that both the administration and the relationships which exist between co-workers are vitally important for morale. In a very important sense, the administration affects both of these since it is directly responsible for the decisions which determine work assignments. Worker interaction can be ameliorated through scheduling practices which seek to establish compatible work groups. This is extremely important for these workers since their work routines require them to work in close proximity. Their staggered lunch and break shifts mean that they may have a limited number of people to socialize and to relax with. These times are especially important since it gives them a chance to "let off some steam" when they are off the units. There was little doubt after interviewing a number of these workers, that the job entails a great deal of pressure. This is primarily due to the unpredictability of the clients and the total responsibility that the RC staff has for their care and well being. It is essential that the people who work together in the various units cooperate and communicate with each other for the job to be done properly. When these positive relations do not exist, there is the potential for a very explosive situation to develop. In this particular institution, we were informed that in most cases,

the administration was willing to accommodate the wishes of the workers and transfers were arranged most of the time when they were requested by the staff for interpersonal reasons. This was usually affected by the unit supervisors themselves, who were in charge of scheduling and therefore could move people around to various shifts. Transfers between units however were much more difficult to obtain.

With respect to administrative action, the workers were sensitive to such things as having information about proposed changes in the institution, especially if these changes affected them personally. There was also some concern expressed by the staff about a number of actions which the administration had taken with regard to running the facility. Parking regulations topped this list and there was widespread dissatisfaction with the way that the parking regulations had been changed, as well as what they had been changed to. Most of the complaints included some statement about the unilateral and arbitrary manner in which this change had been carried out.

A word of caution is needed before any interpretation of the administrative action category is made. It represents a condensed category which includes a range of responses to an open ended question. As such, it focusses on the general thrust or content of the responses related to administrative action but does not reflect a singular response.

It can be concluded from this analysis that the administration can have a tremendous impact on worker morale. This can come directly through action which it initiates or indirectly through the control it has over such things as the establishment of work groups and staff assignments. This is significant since these actions affect a marked change in the attitudes expressed by the staff towards work. Further analysis will focus

on whether this is also related to the actual behaviour of the staff as well. In either case, these changes do not depend on the acquisition of new technology or sophisticated hardware but rest solely on the manner in which work is organized at the Centre. This reflects to a large extent, the actions that the administration takes and the way that the staff responds (i.e., to the existing social relations). These should be easier to change according to the advocates of QWL, than demographic factors based on age, sex, religion or race, etc.

Turning now to an examination of the impact of need satisfaction on morale, we find that a number of the results described above with respect to self reported behaviour items and need satisfaction are mirrored in these findings. The results of a crosstabulation of morale with the various need satisfaction scales is presented in Table 17 below.

The results displayed in Table 17 indicate that there is a low, positive relationship between morale and basic need satisfaction resulting in a Gamma of .1295. Morale was only slightly affected by the workers perceptions of basic need satisfaction, however this did show that morale was lower when basic need satisfaction was lower.

A moderate, positive relationship was found to exist between social need satisfaction and morale. This relationship produced a Gamma of .2884 and the table shows that almost 15% more of the respondents in the high morale category reported high social need satisfaction.

The last part of the table presents the relationship between morale and higher order need satisfaction. In this case there was a strong, positive relationship reported with a Gamma of .5782. The table shows that 31.8% more of the people who reported having high morale also reported high levels of higher order need satisfaction. This is clearly the strongest

TABLE 17: Morale by Basic, Social and Higher Order Need Satisfaction.  
(in percents)

Morale	<u>Basic Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Social Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Higher Order Need Satisfaction</u>	
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
High	52.8	46.3	58.0	43.3	67.0	35.2
Low	47.2	53.7	42.0	56.7	33.0	64.8
	Gamma=.1295		Gamma=.2884		Gamma=.5782	
	Chi Square=.5927 P=.44		Chi Square=3.8557 P=.05		Chi Square=19.4504 P=.001	

relationship reported in the table and demonstrates the importance of the relationship between the satisfaction of higher order needs and people's attitudes towards work.

It can be seen from these results that need satisfaction and higher order need satisfaction in particular, can have a tremendous impact on worker morale. Worker morale was found to increase in each case as the workers were able to satisfy their needs through work. Once again it is significant that both basic and social need satisfaction had less of an impact than did higher order need satisfaction on this relationship. This could be due to the fact that both basic and social needs are taken for granted by these employees since they are perceived so positively by the staff. Higher order need satisfaction however was not perceived this way. It appears that those workers who perceive their higher order needs as being met are also experiencing higher morale levels. This explanation follows directly from our theoretical discussion above since workers should respond more positively as needs are satisfied at work. It would be interesting, however, to examine the same relationship under circumstances

in which either or both the basic and social needs were not perceived so positively as being satisfied by the staff.

Finally, the impact that various organizational factors have on morale was examined. This included the workers perceptions contained in the Authoritarianism, Autonomy and Democratic Supervision Scales. The results of a crosstabulation of these scales and morale is presented in Table 18 below.

The relationship between morale and authoritarianism proved to be very strong and negative producing a Gamma of  $-.8136$  which is very high. This demonstrates that morale is low when high levels of authoritarianism are perceived by the staff. In this case, 79.1% of the respondents in the high authoritarianism category reported having low morale while 72% of those

TABLE 18: Morale by Organizational Factors.  
(in percents)

	<u>Authoritarianism</u>		<u>Autonomy</u>		<u>Democratic Supervision</u>	
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
High	20.9	72.0	61.2	38.6	58.3	41.7
Low	79.1	28.0	38.8	61.4	41.6	58.4
Gamma= $-.8136$		Gamma= $.4292$		Gamma= $.3243$		
Chi Square=49.9461		Chi Square=9.4911		Chi Square=5.0200		
P .001		P .001		P = .02		
N=208						

respondents in the low authoritarianism category report having high morale. This relationship is supported by our discussion above regarding the types of controls which are possible given certain historical, social and economic conditions. Thus, we suggested that what Edwards had described as "simple" control which relied heavily on an authoritarian approach and

included using force and coercion, was least applicable to these types of workers.<sup>1</sup> Their education; their knowledge of the law and their rights; their lack of fear of the economic consequences of being unemployed; all contribute to making this type of control either unworkable or extremely costly to implement with these workers. Perrow's discussion on this topic suggested that the more "unobtrusive" types of controls were more suited to this type of situation and the results of Table 18 clearly show that authoritarianism has a sizeable impact on the morale of these workers.<sup>2</sup> This analysis will be extended below to include the relationship between authoritarianism and worker behaviour.

The relationship between morale and autonomy proved to be less pronounced than that involving authoritarianism, however it was strong and positive. The Gamma in this case was .4292 with approximately 24% more people in the high morale category reporting high autonomy as well. This also reflects the theoretical discussion above since the autonomy items focussed on a person's opportunity to exercise control over work. High morale should be a consequence of high autonomy in this conceptualization.

A moderate, positive relationship was found to exist between morale and democratic supervision and a Gamma of .3243 was obtained. In the table, morale scores were low when democratic supervision scores were also low and vice versa. The difference in cell frequencies was approximately 16% in this case, which suggests some influence but one which is not nearly as strong as that reported for either authoritarianism or autonomy.

The results reported in this section are similar to the ones discussed above when dealing with morale and need satisfaction. The impact in this case, however, was much more pronounced. Morale was shown to vary directly with each of the organizational items and with authoritarianism in

particular. These organizational items represent the perceptions that the residential counsellors have of the nature of the organizational structure. They are not based on technology or some other external factor but on the very nature of the work organization which they experience in their daily working lives. The whole orientation of the QWL approach suggests that these should be accessible to positive changes. The role that control over work plays in underscoring the social relations at work was also pointed out in our discussion of alienation. This was evident in the results presented in this table and it was particularly evident in the case of authoritarianism.

The significance of these findings may be best demonstrated in a consideration of the affects that morale has on the worker behaviour measures. It is to this discussion that we now turn.

Morale was crosstabulated with the measures of worker behaviour described above, including the Cooperation and Confrontation Scales. These results are presented in Table 19 below.

The relationship between morale and cooperation was found to be moderate and positive with a Gamma of .3266. Table 19 shows that high cooperation is related to high morale, thus 73.8% of the respondents in the high cooperation category report having high morale. This drops to 58.8% when the respondents report having low morale. The 25% difference across this category represents a substantial drop and provides a key to interpreting this part of the table.

When the relationship between morale and confrontation was examined, a Gamma of  $-.6212$  was found. This indicates that a strong, negative relationship exists between these two variables. The table shows that there



were higher confrontation scores in the low morale category and that this difference was almost 35%. This represents a large difference and points

TABLE 19: Morale by Worker Behaviour Measures.  
(in percents)

Morale	Cooperation		Confrontation		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
High	73.8	26.2	35.9	64.1	
Low	58.8	41.2	70.6	29.4	

N=208

Gamma = .3266  
Chi Square = 4.4902  
P = .03

Gamma = .6212  
Chi Square = 16.9883  
P .001

out the influence that morale has on confrontation.

Both of the relationships described in Table 19 reflect the ideas which underscore QWL. Cooperation is more likely when people have a positive attitude towards their work and conversely, confrontation is more likely when a positive attitude toward work is absent. This takes on particular significance in the present context, given the impact that higher order need satisfaction, authoritarianism and autonomy were found to have on morale. In each case, these represent factors which reflect the nature of the workplace organization and the control that people exercise over their activity at work. An enhancement of these factors is related to higher morale levels which in turn is related to more cooperation and less confrontation. This supports the job redesign strategies proposed by advocates of QWL and shows how this depends on a reformulation of the existing social relations at work such that the workers are given more control over their lives. This is also the basis for our discussion of alienation.

It must be noted at this point that neither of the measures of worker behaviour were constructed as indicators of the productivity of these workers. The Cooperation items in particular, focussed on the behaviour of workers which exceeded that which was minimally expected of them and in a sense implies that these workers approach work in a very positive way as opposed to either a negative or instrumental one. It may well be that both the quality and the quantity of work performed by these employees is directly related to morale and the factors which affect it. The results of the cooperation scale suggest that this be the case, although this proposition can neither be substantiated nor rejected on the basis of the data presented here. This would entail a detailed examination of the job responsibilities and performance levels of the RC staff and this was beyond the scope of the present research. What is clear from these results however, is that morale does have an important impact on the way that people behave at work.

### iii) Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation.

Job involvement and intrinsic motivation were described above as two types of orientations that people have towards work. In this section, the various factors which affect these orientations are examined in more detail. In addition, the relationship between orientation to work and worker behaviour is outlined.

To begin this task, the job involvement and intrinsic motivation scales were crosstabulated with the various need satisfaction scales described above. Next, the relationship between both job involvement and intrinsic motivation and the scales measuring organizational factors was examined. Finally, the relationship between orientation to work and worker

behaviour was looked at. The results of the crosstabulations of the need satisfaction scales and the orientation to work scales is presented in Tables 20 and 21 below.

TABLES 20: Job Involvement by Basic, Social and Higher Order  
Need Satisfaction. (in percents)

<u>Job Involvement</u>	<u>Basic Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Social Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Higher Order Need Satisfaction</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	58.1	48.2	56.0	52.8	69.4	40.4
Low	41.9	51.8	44.0	47.2	30.6	59.6
N=208						
Gamma = .1962      Gamma = .0638      Gamma = .5400						
Chi Square = 1.5739      Chi Square = .1002      Chi Square = 16.3532						
P = .20      P = .75      P .001						

TABLE 21: Intrinsic Motivation By Basic, Social and Higher Order  
Need Satisfaction. (in percents)

<u>Intrinsic Motivation</u>	<u>Basic Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Social Need Satisfaction</u>		<u>Higher Order Need Satisfaction</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	37.1	38.6	39.0	35.8	52.0	24.8
Low	62.9	61.4	61.0	64.2	48.0	75.2
N=208						
Gamma = .0300      Gamma = .0672      Gamma = .5344						
Chi Square = .0043      Chi Square = .1044      Chi Square = 15.2016						
P = .94      P = .74      P .001						

In Table 20, job involvement is related to basic, social and higher order need satisfaction. The results presented in this table indicate that only a slight positive relationship exists between job involvement and both basic and social need satisfaction. However neither relationship was statistically significant. The Gamma scores obtained here were .1962 and .0638 respectively. In the case of higher order need satisfaction however,

a strong and positive relationship was found. The Gamma here was .5400. and the relationship was statistically significant at the .001 level.

The results suggest that job involvement is not influenced a great deal by either basic or social need satisfaction. It is affected however, by higher order need satisfaction. This is clearly demonstrated in the table as 29% more of the respondents in the high, higher order need satisfaction category also report having high levels of job involvement. Job involvement was lower in all cases when need satisfaction scores were low, but again, this result was most pronounced in the higher order need satisfaction part of the table.

The results in the case of intrinsic motivation were quite similar to those found with job involvement. The relationship between intrinsic motivation and basic need satisfaction was low and negative with a Gamma of  $-.0309$ . The relationship found between intrinsic motivation and social need satisfaction was low and positive producing a Gamma of  $.0672$ . Neither basic nor social need satisfaction appear to have much of an affect on the intrinsic motivation scores. These relationships were not statistically significant.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and higher order need satisfaction presented a different pattern, as the results indicate that a strong positive relationship exists. The Gamma obtained in this case was  $.5344$  and the table shows that intrinsic motivation is especially low when higher order need satisfaction is also low. The percentage difference between scores in these two categories is 27.2% which is quite large. This relationship was statistically significant at the .001 level.

The relationship between both job involvement and intrinsic motivation and higher order need satisfaction was strong and positive. This is

consistent with the discussion of both of these items presented above, in which these orientations to work were described in terms of the importance that work holds for contributing to a person's identity and feelings of self esteem. It is important to point out that both of these orientations were not greatly affected by either basic or social need satisfaction scales.

The strong relationship found between higher order need satisfaction and both job involvement and intrinsic motivation was anticipated by our earlier discussion since both of these orientations toward work are based on the contribution that the work experience makes to self esteem. This was specifically pointed out with respect to intrinsic motivation which was described in terms of the affect that job performance has on self esteem. A similar relationship between the work situation and job involvement was suggested so that in instances where higher order, 'self', needs are being fulfilled, it is not surprising to find people defining work as an important part of their lives or for being motivated to perform their work well. The reverse of this situation, however should also hold, especially with respect to basic and social need satisfaction.

In situations where job involvement and intrinsic motivation is low and work is not seen as offering much in the way of positive measures of self, the most instrumental concerns should emerge. These should be based primarily on the satisfaction of material needs i.e., basic needs in our study, or social needs. This was not the case here, however, since the relationship between these variables was very low. The slight, negative relationship found between intrinsic motivation and basic need satisfaction begins to move in this direction but the percentage differences involved are not significant.

One plausible explanation for these findings is that both basic and social order need satisfaction may be taken for granted by these workers since there is widespread consensus among the staff concerning their satisfaction. Once again, it would be interesting to see what would happen in a situation in which either or both of these needs were not being met. Perhaps then, the relationship which we anticipated would appear and people with low job involvement and low intrinsic motivation would be more concerned with the satisfaction of basic or social needs.

Some support for this position can be garnered from the responses of the RC staff to the following questions concerning basic and social need satisfaction at work. The RC's were asked whether they preferred to work in a place where people talk and joke around or whether they preferred to work alone. They were also asked how things were in this regard, where they worked. The answers given to these questions indicate that 88.3% of those who answered the question preferred a place where people talk and joke around and 90.8% reported that people did talk and joke around at work.

Similarly, the following statement was read to the respondents and they were asked to agree or disagree. The statement was; "If I left this job, I could find a similar or better job." Only 2.9% strongly agreed with this statement and a further 35.3% said that they agreed. The rest of the staff did not respond positively to the statement.

These results suggest that most of the staff members find their work relations to their liking and that they are quite cordial since the people that they work with talk and joke around. Also, over 60% of the staff did not think that they could find a similar or better job. This may indicate that the pay and the benefits received by these workers are seen as being

quite good considering the circumstances. In fact, many of the respondents commented during the interviews that they were paid well at the Centre and that that was one of the things which attracted many people to the job and kept them there. In light of this information therefore, basic and social need satisfaction do not appear to be pressing issues among the staff at the Centre.

The next set of relationships to be examined are those between the organizational factors and both job involvement and intrinsic motivation. These are displayed in Tables 22 and 23 below.

TABLE 22: Job Involvement by Organizational Factors.  
(in percents)

<u>Job Involvement</u>	<u>Authoritarianism</u>		<u>Autonomy</u>		<u>Democratic Supervision</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	40.2	63.9	62.5	45.1	61.2	48.1
Low	59.8	36.1	41.1	54.9	38.8	51.9
N=208						
Gamma = $-.4484$ Chi Square=10.3673 P=.001			Gamma = $.3397$ Chi Square=5.5947 P=.01		Gamma = $.2595$ Chi Square=3.0674 P=.07	

TABLE 23: Intrinsic Motivation by Organizational Factors.  
(in percents)

<u>Intrinsic Motivation</u>	<u>Authoritarianism</u>		<u>Autonomy</u>		<u>Democratic Supervision</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	33.1	40.3	46.2	29.4	46.6	28.8
Low	66.7	59.7	53.8	70.6	53.4	71.2
N=208						
Gamma = $-.1497$ Chi Square=.7750 P=.37			Gamma = $.3457$ Chi Square=5.4440 P=.01		Gamma = $.3656$ Chi Square=6.2120 P=.01	

Table 22 shows that a moderate to strong, negative relationship exists between job involvement and the workers' perceptions of authoritarianism at work. This relationship was statistically significant and produced a Gamma of  $-.4484$ . The table indicates that job involvement decreased sharply as the perception of authoritarianism increased. This is evident in the high job involvement category in which 40.2% of the respondents were in the high authoritarianism cell while 63.9% were in the low authoritarianism cell.

The relationship between job involvement and autonomy proved to be moderate and positive. The results here were in the opposite direction to those in the Authoritarianism section of the table. Thus, job involvement was highest when autonomy was highest and lowest when autonomy was lowest. The Gamma obtained in this case was  $.3397$ .

In the final section of the table, it can be seen that there is a low to moderate, positive relationship between job involvement and democratic supervision. A Gamma of  $.2595$  was found here. Once again, job involvement decreased as democratic supervision decreased and vice versa. This also reflects the trends found in the other sections of the table.

Turning now to Table 23, the relationship between intrinsic motivation and authoritarianism was found to be low and negative. The Gamma in this case was  $-.1497$ . The table shows that intrinsic motivation also highest when authoritarianism was lowest. This is reversed in the low intrinsic motivation category which had the largest number of respondents in the low authoritarianism cell. Intrinsic motivation therefore was high when authoritarianism was low but the observed association was not statistically significant.



The next section of Table 23 focussed on autonomy. The relationship in this case was found to be moderate and positive with a Gamma of .3457. The table shows that intrinsic motivation was high when autonomy was high. The reverse of this, that is that intrinsic motivation was low when autonomy was low was also true.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and democratic supervision was moderate and positive with Gamma of .3656. Once again, the table shows that intrinsic motivation was high when democratic supervision was high and low when democratic supervision was low. This finding is consistent with those in the other sections of the table.

It can be seen from an examination of the results of tables 22 and 23 that both job involvement and intrinsic motivation are related to the organizational factors. While this relationship is not excessively strong in most cases, the results all appear to go in the same direction and in the case of job involvement and authoritarianism it was found to be fairly high. These results are consistent with the discussion of these orientations to work presented above. Both job involvement and intrinsic motivation were defined in terms of the effect of work on self esteem and positive self evaluations. People require the opportunity to acquire self esteem at work and certain types of work organizations allow this while others do not.

It is not surprising to find that there was a strong relationship between job involvement and authoritarianism since we would expect that if a person was involved in their work, their desire to do a good job would be self generated. Authoritarian forms of control are inconsistent with this type of work orientation since they are primarily designed to check the behaviour of recalcitrant workers. In fact, this type of control is the

anathema of those workers with high job involvement since it refutes their positive orientations to work.

When the relationship between autonomy and democratic supervision and both job involvement and intrinsic motivation is examined, the positive effects of work and the performance of work can be seen. The person with high intrinsic motivation scores defines good work performance as contributing to self esteem. This is enhanced when the worker has the opportunity to use skills and abilities and exercise some judgements at work which would be the case if autonomy or democratic supervision were high. Both of these organizational factors are directed at the extent of control that the employees exercise on their jobs. This ties this entire discussion in with our broader concerns over alienation and QWL. High autonomy and high democratic supervision represent the type of work organization in which the most positive results should exist. Their impact on these orientations to work suggest that these may be enhanced if people are given the chance to experience autonomy and to exercise some control over their activity while at work.

Once again, these results point to the importance of the social organization of work. Autonomy and democratic supervision refer specifically to the types of variables which the advocates of QWL point to in their programmes for organizational change and work redesign. The positive effects that these factors have on orientation to work is consistent with their analysis of the situation and is wholly anticipated by them.

The final set of tables which deal with job involvement and intrinsic motivation, focus on the impact that these orientations have on work behaviour. The results of a crosstabulation of these measures with those dealing with worker behaviour are presented in Tables 24 and 25 below.

The relationship between job involvement and cooperation proved to be moderate and positive with a Gamma of .3825. The table suggests that cooperation is much higher when job involvement is high and low when job involvement is low.

A moderate to strong and negative relationship was found to exist

TABLE 24: Job Involvement by Worker Behaviour Measures.  
(in percents)

Job Involvement	Cooperation		Confrontation	
	High	Low	High	Low
High	73.4	25.7	43.4	56.6
Low	56.4	43.6	65.3	34.7
N=208				
Gamma = .3825			Gamma = -.4209	
Chi Square = 6.6096			Chi Square = 9.0859	
P = .01			P = .002	

TABLE 25: Intrinsic Motivation by Worker Behaviour Measures  
(in percents)

Intrinsic Motivation	Cooperation		Confrontation	
	High	Low	High	Low
High	82.1	27.9	50.0	50.0
Low	56.6	43.4	55.4	44.6
N=208				
Gamma = .5563			Gamma = -.1076	
Chi Square = 12.9660			Chi Square = .3722	
P .001			P = .54	

between job involvement and confrontation. In this case the Gamma was  $-.4209$ . Confrontation was found to be highest when job involvement was low and lowest when job involvement was high.

The relationship between job involvement and cooperation can be interpreted as a reflection of what it means to be involved in work. Thus those employees who are highly involved in their jobs would be expected to be cooperative, especially given the interpretation of this factor in the present context, i.e., doing things above and beyond what is minimally required. On the other hand, the relationship between job involvement and confrontation shows that confrontation is highest when people are not involved with their jobs. Theoretically, people low in Job Involvement shouldn't care enough about their work to engage in Confrontation. Conversely, they may care so little that they are not concerned with the possibility of losing their jobs.

This may be explained by the fact that people who care about their work or who define it as an important part of their lives, may be looking for ways to express this at work and may be willing therefore to engage in behaviour which exceeds the minimum required. This extra effort can be seen as a way to enhance the work experience on the part of these workers. This type of behaviour would not be expected from someone who has little self investment in work and who approaches work in an instrumental manner. People who care about work, therefore, or who define it as being important to their self esteem should be more likely to engage in cooperative behaviour when they define the job situation as favourable.

This is an important finding considering our theoretical framework and the focus on alienation and QWL. In our discussion of alienation, work was described as a major activity in people's lives. When work ceases to be

defined as an important facet of life by working people, alienation results, in the sense that these people define their activities at work as meaningless. Work becomes an instrumental activity for these people with respect to need satisfaction. The implication here is that work should be a meaningful pursuit both in the way that it contributes to a positive image of self and as a means of developing skills and powers in the course of the satisfaction of human needs. It should be a way of life rather than a way of making a living!

The results presented in Table 24 show that people who have withdrawn their investments of self from work or who do not see their jobs as important aspects of their lives, may be willing to engage in confrontational behaviour especially if they are not concerned with losing their jobs. Those that define work as important, on the other hand, do in fact act to maximize this through cooperation. This shows two types of responses that people make towards work and demonstrates, to some extent, the nature of the concept of alienation. The job involved person continues to evaluate work positively and acts positively towards the situation. The person who is not job involved may respond with confrontation when they care so little about work that they are not concerned over loss of employment. Alternatively, low job involvement may result in very instrumental responses at work.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and worker behavior reiterates the findings in Table 24 with the exception that intrinsic motivation is more directly related to the value that job performance has for self esteem. This is clearly demonstrated in Table 25 which shows that a strong, positive relationship exists between intrinsic motivation and cooperation. The Gamma reported here .5563. In the table, 25.5% more

people with high motivation appeared in the high cooperation category than in the low one. Cooperation was low when intrinsic motivation was also low.

The relationship between intrinsic motivation and confrontation was found to be very slight and negative with a Gamma of  $-.1076$ . The association was observed not to be statistically significant. While these variables do not appear to be strongly related, the direction of the relationship suggests that confrontation is higher for those workers with low intrinsic motivation. This follows the trend in the rest of this table and that in Table 24 however the differences here were very small.

The findings in Table 25 can be interpreted as another indication of how worker behaviour is affected by this particular orientation to work. People who identify job performance in positive terms with respect to self esteem, should be more willing to do things which go beyond the minimum required by the job. Cooperation should be higher therefore for those workers with high intrinsic motivation and the table indicates that this is in fact the case. The findings with respect to confrontation however warrant a different explanation. While the direction follows that described for job involvement, the weak relationship here suggests that these factors are not strongly related. Intrinsic motivation does not have much of an impact on confrontation. The 10.9% difference in the cell frequencies in the low confrontation category indicates that people with high intrinsic motivation are slightly less likely to engage in this type of behaviour. This may be related to the detrimental impact that confrontation would have on a positive job performance evaluation. Thus high intrinsic motivation is related to high cooperation and the avoidance of

those types of activities at work which could result in negative evaluations.

Workers with low intrinsic motivation may choose an instrumental response in which they avoid confrontation in order to keep a low profile. Alternatively, they may care so little about their jobs or job performance that they are willing to engage in confrontational behaviour.

Worker behaviour therefore is related to both job involvement and intrinsic motivation. Once again the formulations of the advocates of QWL appear to be accurate with respect to the impact of positive orientations to work on worker behaviour. These orientations were described above as being related to the nature of the work organization and need satisfaction. This was especially true for both authoritarianism and high order need satisfaction.

The particular condition that people experience at work influences the way they think about their jobs as well as the way they act at work. This should be important to those people concerned with the design and redesign of work since the factors found to be related to these attitudes and behaviours are those which can be readily altered in work organizations. This reflects both the concerns expressed in terms of alienation and QWL since it focusses once again on the ability which people have to use skills and abilities and to satisfy needs at work. It may be important to examine these results more carefully when searching for forms of work organization which contribute to QWL and which reduce alienation. The next section deals specifically with organizational factors.

iv.) Organizational Factors.

This section of the study deals with the relationship between organizational factors and need satisfaction at work. In addition, the impact that organizational factors have on worker behaviour will be examined. The organizational factors being considered are measured in the Authoritarianism, Autonomy and Democratic Supervision Scales.

When organizational factors were related to basic need satisfaction, a small negative relationship was found to exist in the case of authoritarianism and a small positive one with democratic supervision. The Gamma's obtained here were  $-.1790$  and  $.1405$  respectively. These indicate that basic need satisfaction is not affected very much by these particular organizational factors. These relationships were not statistically significant. In the case of autonomy however, a strong, positive relationship was discovered having a Gamma of  $.4390$ . This relationship was statistically significant at the  $.001$  level. These relationships are presented in Table 26, below. Table 26 shows that 22% more of the people who perceived high levels of autonomy at work also indicated that they had high levels of basic need satisfaction.

The relationship between organizational factors and the satisfaction of social needs is presented in Table 27. The table indicates that a moderate, negative relationship exists between social need satisfaction and authoritarianism. The Gamma obtained here was  $-.2259$  and Table 27 shows that social need satisfaction was low when authoritarianism was high and vice versa, although the differences across the categories were not large. This association was found not to be statistically significant.

A similar result was found when the relationship between social need satisfaction and autonomy was examined except that the relationship in this



case was positive. The Gamma which was obtained here was .3431 and this relationship was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 26: Organizational Factors by Basic Need Satisfaction.  
(in percents)

		Authoritarianism		Autonomy		Democratic Supervision	
		High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Basic Need Satis- faction	High	55.2	63.9	71.2	49.10	63.1	56.3
	Low	44.8	36.1	28.8	51.0	36.9	43.7
		Gamma = $-.1790$ Chi Square=1.2430 P = .26		Gamma = $.4390$ Chi Square=9.6256 P = .001		Gamma = $.1405$ Chi Square=.7264 P = .39	

TABLE 27: Organizational Factors By Social Order Need Satisfaction.  
(in percents)

		Authoritarianism		Autonomy		Democratic Supervision	
		High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Social Need Satis- faction	High	42.4	53.8	57.3	39.6	64.1	32.4
	Low	57.6	46.2	42.7	60.4	35.9	67.6
		Gamma = $-.2259$ Chi Square=2.1543 P = .14		Gamma = $.3431$ Chi Square=5.6917 P = .01		Gamma = $.5771$ Chi Square=19.4056 P .001	

TABLE 28: Organizational Factors By Higher Order Need Satisfaction.  
(in percents)

		Authoritarianism		Autonomy		Democratic Supervision	
		High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Higher Order Need Satis- faction	High	34.5	57.1	57.7	36.3	62.1	32.0
	Low	65.5	42.9	42.3	63.7	37.9	68.0
		Gamma = $.4339$ Chi Square=9.4582 P = .002		Gamma = $.4110$ Chi Square=8.6408 P = .003		Gamma = $.5536$ Chi Square=17.5352 P .001	

A strong positive relationship was discovered when social need satisfaction was related to democratic supervision. The Gamma reported was .5771 and Table 27 shows that 31% more respondents reported having high social need satisfaction when democratic supervision was also high. The reverse of this was also found to be true.

In all three instances therefore, social need satisfaction was influenced by the organizational factors being examined however in the case of authoritarianism, the relationship was not statistically significant. Democratic supervision was observed as having the greatest effect on social need satisfaction. This may be due to the ability of the residence supervisors to promote or inhibit positive group relations. Scheduling has already been mentioned as one way to facilitate group development. Moreover, the mood or tone of the unit or residence may reflect the orientation that the residence supervisor dictates. Thus, cooperation may be encouraged or discouraged, depending on the approach favoured by the supervisor, and this may be reflected in the assignment of particular tasks or in the procedures set out for their accomplishment. In either case, the supervisor appears to have a considerable impact on the degree of social need satisfaction being reported by the Residential Counsellors.

The results of the crosstabulation of organizational factors and higher order need satisfaction are reported in Table 28. The table shows that higher order need satisfaction was strongly related to each of the measures of organizational factors. Each of these will be dealt with in turn.

When the relationship between higher order need satisfaction and authoritarianism was examined, it was found to be strong and negative having a Gamma of  $-.4339$ . Table 28 shows that higher order need satisfac-

tion was low when authoritarianism was high. A 22.6% difference was found to exist across this category. Similarly results were obtained when the relationship between higher order need satisfaction and autonomy was examined. In this case the Gamma was .4110 indicating that the relationship went in a positive direction. Thus, higher order need satisfaction was high when autonomy was high and low when autonomy was low.

The relationship between higher order need satisfaction and democratic supervision was also found to be strong and positive having a Gamma of .5536. A difference of almost 30% exists across the high, higher order need satisfaction category, indicating that democratic supervision has a large impact on this type of need satisfaction.

In general, the relationships between organizational factors and need satisfaction was more pronounced for social and higher order need satisfaction than it was for the satisfaction of basic needs. However, autonomy was shown to have some influence in the case of basic need satisfaction. The impact of democratic supervision on both social and higher order need satisfaction suggests that these workers experience the organizational structure largely as it relates to their interaction with their superiors at work. In this case, the actions of the supervisory staff in encouraging the types of activities described as democratic supervision, represent precisely those activities which allow these workers to use their talents and to be creative. This permits them to bring more to their jobs than simply their physiological abilities. This is the way in which higher order needs were described in our discussion above in terms of both alienation and QWL and the relationships outlined in Tables 26, 27 and 28 fully support the types of responses which this discussion anticipates. Higher order needs should be satisfied more often when people have the opportunity

to exercise some control over their work activity and especially when this consists of using creative skills and talents.

This set of tables outlined the relationships between organizational factors and need satisfaction. The next set focus on the impact that the various organizational factors have on worker behaviour. The crosstabulations of the organizational factors and the cooperation and confrontation scales are displayed in Tables 29 and 30 below.

TABLE 29: Organizational Factors by Cooperation.  
(in percents)

Cooperation	Authoritarianism		Autonomy		Democratic Supervision	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	59.3	72.3	75.0	58.4	77.7	55.3
Low	40.7	27.7	25.0	41.6	22.3	44.7
Gamma = $-.2827$		Gamma = $.3621$		Gamma = $.4765$		
Chi Square=3.2240		Chi Square=5.6310		Chi Square=10.5473		
P = .07		P = .01		P = .001		

TABLE 30: Organizational Factors By Confrontation.  
(in percents)

Confrontation	Authoritarianism		Autonomy		Democratic Supervision	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	73.6	39.5	46.2	60.8	47.6	59.6
Low	26.4	60.5	53.8	39.2	52.4	40.4
Gamma = $.6199$		Gamma = $-.2870$		Gamma = $-.2386$		
Chi Square=22.1218		Chi Square=3.8610		Chi Square=2.5529		
P = .001		P = .05		P = .11		

In Table 29 the relationship between authoritarianism and cooperation was shown to be a moderate and negative one having a Gamma of  $-.2827$ . The table indicates that 13% more workers had low cooperation scores when authoritarianism was high. This relationship, however, was significant only at the .07 level. The relationship between autonomy and cooperation

was also found to be moderately strong however in this case it was statistically significant. The Gamma reported here was .3621. Cooperation was found to be high when autonomy scores were high.

The relationship between cooperation and democratic supervision was the strongest of the three outlined in this table, having a Gamma of .4765 and being statistically significant at the .001 level. The table shows 22.4% more people were in the high cooperation category when autonomy was also high. Autonomy has a clear impact on cooperation in this case.

In Table 30, the organizational factors are related to confrontation. The first part of this table shows that there is a very strong and positive relationship between authoritarianism and confrontation. The Gamma obtained here was .6199. There were 34.1% more respondents in the high confrontation category when authoritarianism was high than when it was low. This difference is quite large, indicating that authoritarianism has a marked impact on this type of behaviour.

When the relationship between confrontation and autonomy was examined it was found to be moderate and negative. The Gamma obtained in this case was -.2873. The table shows that confrontation is higher when autonomy is low with the difference across this category being 14.6%. While this difference is not excessively large, the relationship was statistically significant it does reflect the trend demonstrated throughout the table.

The last part of the table outlines the relationship between confrontation and democratic supervision. In this case, the relationship was also moderate and negative having a Gamma of -.2386. However, it was not statistically significant. The table shows that confrontation was high when democratic supervision was low. The difference here was 12.0% which is not very large although it also reflects the trend evident in the rest

of the table.

The particularly strong, negative relationship presented in Table 30 with respect to the relationship between confrontation and authoritarianism is consistent with our discussion above. This form of control was described as being inappropriate for use with young, highly educated, white collar employees. These workers indicated that they respond hostilely to this approach by the administration and become involved in behaviour which directly challenges the authority of their superiors. The trends presented in the other two parts of this table support these results suggesting that these workers are much less likely to engage in confrontational behaviour when they are given the opportunity to exercise some control over their work. This is exactly what white collar jobs are supposed to have and the responses of these workers show that they are unwilling to accept authoritarian practices at work without opposition. These results also echo our discussion of alienation which described workers behaviour taken as resistance to certain forms of control. The examples of the struggles against "Scientific Management" are a case in point.

v) The Residential Units.

In this section of the report, the differences which exist in the response patterns of the four residential units in the facility will be examined. This will include a consideration of organizational factors, the satisfaction of needs and the attitudes and orientations that the workers in the various residential units have. In our description of the various residential units, we pointed out some of the factors which make working in the various units different from each other. The impact that these differences have on the attitudes and behaviour of the residential staff allows

us a closer examination of the factors responsible for this and aids in our understanding of this interaction. The four residences will be referred to in this section as i) East Unit, ii) West Unit, iii) Nursing Unit, and iv) Special Unit for convenience, although the Nursing Unit includes the Developmental section and the Special Unit encompasses Behaviour Modification according to our description above.

The first three tables presented in this section outline the frequency distributions of the organizational factors across the four residential units. These include authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision. These are presented in Tables 31, 32 and 33 below.

TABLE 31: Frequency Distribution of Authoritarianism in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Authoritarianism	High	54.2	40.4	29.0	47.4
	Low	45.8	59.6	71.0	52.6

TABLE 32: Frequency Distribution of Autonomy in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Autonomy	High	42.4	46.8	55.6	59.5
	Low	57.6	53.2	44.4	40.5

TABLE 33: Frequency Distribution of Democratic Supervision in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Democratic Supervision	High	40.7	63.8	48.4	48.6
	Low	59.3	36.2	51.6	51.4

In Table 31, the frequency distribution of the perception of Authoritarianism by the residential staff in each of the four units is displayed. It is clear from this table that there is a sizeable difference in the perception of authoritarianism by the people working in the various units. Thus, 71% of the staff in the nursing unit and almost 60% of the staff in the West Unit perceive authoritarianism to be low. Only 45.8% of the workers in East Unit and 52.6% in the Special Unit report low authoritarianism. The differences here are quite large and this may be important in interpreting the results of the other tables in this section and in the report in general. This should be most evident when the individual residences are examined in terms of the existence of particular orientations to work and with regard to the types of behaviours that the workers in each of the units participates in. This will be expanded upon later in this section.

The frequency distribution of the perception of Autonomy by the staff in each of the four residential units is presented in Table 32. This distribution suggests that the staff in the Special Unit and in Nursing perceive the most autonomy in their work. East unit reported the lowest levels of autonomy.

Table 33 outlines the frequency distribution of the perceptions of democratic supervision within each of the four residential units. The table indicates that a larger percentage of the staff in West unit perceives high levels of democratic supervision than in any of the other three units. Some of the information acquired in the discussion held with our contacts working at the Centre, may account for the results described in Table 33 as well as those in Tables 31 and 32.



The four Unit Supervisors in the facility, each had a different approach to their jobs. The supervisor in the West Unit, for example, had a reputation of being very democratic but of also being quite demanding of the staff in the unit. This may account for the higher democratic supervision scores reported by the workers in West Unit. On the other hand, the supervisor of East Unit was widely described in the Centre as a disciplinarian and this is reflected in the high scores that the staff members in this unit reported on the authoritarianism measures. In both cases, the organizational factor in question reflects the perceptions of the staff, of their immediate job rather than their appraisals of these factors for the Centre as a whole. However, this may be the result of the ability of the staff in both the Nursing and Special Units to exercise more autonomy in their jobs. These workers would have no reason to define their immediate work situation in negative terms with respect to authoritarianism since they do not experience this at the hands of their immediate supervisors. Similarly, the autonomy they experience at work may be based on the nature of the job itself and not on the particular actions of the immediate unit supervisor. Therefore, these workers could report both high autonomy and moderate democratic supervision scores since their jobs require autonomous action yet the organization, through the supervisor, requires them to yield to certain rules, and procedures.

The overall picture which emerges, based on the results of these three tables, is one which highlights the different character of the four residential units. The Nursing and Special Units have work routines which require more freedom and latitude than those of the other residential units. West unit appears to be strongly influenced by the orientation of

their residence supervisor. East unit experiences a similar influence but in this case, the staff described it in negative terms. The make-up of the client population in East unit may be a contributing factor in the orientation which exists there. Recall that the most difficult clients to deal with are housed in this unit and this could lead to a potentially serious situation if the staff on the unit let matters get out of control. An interesting result of this analysis is the way that the perceptions of the RC staff concerning the organizational factors, affect both their attitudinal and behavioural responses to work. Their perceptions of need satisfaction should also be related to this. The next set of tables deals with the frequency distributions of the need satisfaction measures in each of the four units.

TABLE 34: Frequency Distribution of Basic Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Basic Need Satisfaction				
High	52.5	66.0	58.7	65.8
Low	47.5	34.0	41.3	34.2

TABLE 35: Frequency Distribution of Social Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Social Need Satisfaction				
High	36.2	61.7	46.9	54.1
Low	63.8	38.3	53.1	45.9

TABLE 36: Frequency Distribution of Higher Order Need Satisfaction in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Higher Order Need Satisfaction				
High	47.5	34.0	52.4	55.3
Low	52.5	66.0	47.6	44.7

The distribution of need satisfaction scores among the four residential units presents some interesting findings. In Tables 34, 35 and 36, the responses of the staff in each of the units to the items measuring basic, social and higher order needs are outlined. The tables show that there is little difference in the way that the staff in each of the units perceives basic need satisfaction. In all four cases a consistently high positive response appears. The satisfaction of social needs however reflects some differences between the units. In this case, West unit has a 25.5% higher score than East unit on social need satisfaction. It is also higher than either the Nursing or Special unit however the percentage differences here are 14.6 and 7.6 respectively. This situation is reversed when higher order need satisfaction is examined since the West unit is the one with the lowest scores in the high category of this measure. There is little difference between the other three units in their higher order need satisfaction scores but the order of their ascendancy on the high category shows Special units as highest followed by Nursing and then East.

An explanation of the results shown in these three tables may be based on the particular orientation that these workers have towards their jobs. In the case of the West unit employees in particular, the high basic and social need satisfaction scores coupled with the low scores on higher order need satisfaction suggests that these workers may have an instrumental approach to work. If this is the case, their response to work orientation measures should show that they do not place much value in their work roles in terms of their own self identity and measures of self esteem. Their jobs provide them with material and social benefits but not higher order need satisfaction.

The situation is much different for both the staff in the Nursing and Special units. In these units, basic needs are seen as satisfied and relatively high scores were also reported for both social and higher order need satisfaction. These scores were not significantly higher however than those reported in the other two units. The pattern of response here shows that Special units usually had the highest need satisfaction scores, followed by the Nursing Unit. Both of these units should report positive scores on work orientation and worker behaviour if our analysis is correct.

The results found for East unit with respect to need satisfaction indicate that the workers in this unit perceive the least amount of need satisfaction of all the units. Their corresponding orientations to work and worker behaviour measures should therefore be the most negative or instrumental of the entire group. These comparisons can be made when the frequency distribution of these items are examined and it is to this task that we now turn.

The frequency distributions for job involvement and intrinsic motivation among the four units are presented in Tables 37 and 38 below. The frequency distribution for the morale scores for the residences is given in Table 39

The patterns anticipated above do occur to some extent in the results shown in Tables 37 and 38. The job involvement and intrinsic motivation scores of the staff in West unit suggest that these workers do not place a great deal of value on work or on the self esteem which positive job performance can provide. In both cases, West unit ranks second lowest in terms of positive scores on these measures although the differences between units on the job involvement scores is not large. They do have a very low

TABLE 37: Frequency Distribution for Job Involvement in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Job Involvement	High	42.4	46.8	75.0	47.4
	Low	57.6	53.2	25.0	52.6

TABLE 38: Frequency Distribution for Intrinsic Motivation in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Intrinsic Motivation	High	24.4	29.8	40.6	50.0
	Low	67.8	70.2	59.4	50.0

TABLE 39: Frequency Distribution for Morale in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

		East	West	Nursing	Special
Morale	High	40.7	44.7	62.9	51.4
	Low	59.3	55.3	37.1	48.6

score on intrinsic motivation though, such that only 29.8% of these workers report high intrinsic motivation. In our discussion above, we suggested that since basic and social needs were perceived as fulfilled by this group while higher order needs were not, that work would take on an instrumental orientation. This low intrinsic motivation score shows that self esteem is not tied into job performance for these workers and it may well be that work is a place for them to fulfill material and social needs only.

The workers in East unit report the lowest scores on both job involvement and intrinsic motivation. These were also the workers who ranked last among the units on measures of need satisfaction, highest on authoritarianism and lowest on both autonomy and democratic supervision. In terms

of our theoretical discussion above, these may be the most alienated workers as well as the ones with the poorest QWL. Their score on the morale scale which is presented in Table 39, suggests that they are also the lowest on morale. This score is not significantly lower than those of the workers in the other units however with the exception of those in Nursing. Therefore, some of these workers are satisfied with jobs which they define as having little value. This is not a totally instrumental response either however since these workers were not the highest on the basic need satisfaction measures, suggesting that it is not only material benefits which keeps these people here. Some of these workers do define work in terms of its impact on self esteem but it appears that not many relate positive job performance to this. If our analysis is correct, some of these workers should be the least cooperative and most confrontational workers in the Centre. This will be expanded upon in our discussion of Tables 40 and 41 below.

The results presented in Tables 37, 38 and 39 show that the staff in the Nursing unit is especially involved in their work. Their score on the job involvement measure was 75% in the high job involvement category, which was much higher than scores reported for the other three units. These averaged only approximately 45%. This unit also had 40% of its staff report high intrinsic motivation and while this percentage is not high in absolute terms, the nursing unit staff did rank above both East and West units on this measure. The staff in the Nursing unit also reported the highest positive scores on the measure of morale at the Centre.

Special unit staff were not a great deal higher in their job involvement scores than were either East or West units however, they did post the highest score in the intrinsic motivation category. This was not high in

absolute terms being only 50% in the high category of this measure. The measure of morale in Table 39 indicates that these workers scored higher than East and West Units again but that only 51.4% of the Special unit staff said that morale was high at the Centre. These results suggest that there is a degree of variability in the response pattern of the staff in the Special Unit.

The distribution of organizational factors and need satisfaction scores among the staff members in the four residential units has had an impact on the orientation that these workers have towards work. The next set of tables outlines the distributions on self reported behaviour measures. These are presented in Tables 40 and 41 below.

TABLE 40: Frequency Distribution for Cooperation in the  
Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Cooperation				
High	57.6	76.6	75.0	51.4
Low	42.4	23.4	25.0	48.6

TABLE 41: Frequency Distribution for Confrontation in the  
Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Confrontation				
High	71.2	53.2	34.4	57.9
Low	28.8	46.8	65.6	42.1

The difference found in the cooperation scores between the four residential units was quite large and runs contrary to the findings anticipated above. West unit had the highest score in the high cooperation category of 76.6% followed by 75% in this category by the staff in the Nursing unit. While these strong positive responses were anticipated on the part of the staff in the Nursing unit, it was not seen as a highly probable result for the staff of West Unit since their scores on job involvement and intrinsic motivation were low. The 29.8% score in the positive category of intrinsic motivation, in particular, make these results unusual, given the fact that this measure related positive job performance to self esteem.

One plausible explanation for these results, which can be derived from the data presented, is based on their high score on the measure of democratic supervision. The discussion given concerning this score related information about the personal orientation to work transmitted to the unit by the unit supervisor. It may be that the nature of the work relationships in this unit are affected to a large extent by this individuals' ability to generate and encourage participation and cooperation. There is little support for this behaviour on the basis of the other measures discussed in this section with respect to these workers.

Another unanticipated finding in Table 40 was that the staff in Special unit, reported the lowest positive cooperation scores of all. Since they had been at or near the top on all previous positive measures, we anticipated positive scores on the cooperation items and negative scores on the confrontation ones. This was not the case in either measure since they were also second highest in confrontational behaviour. One plausible



explanation for this is the range that the positive responses fall into. For most items, this was usually around the 50% mark, suggesting that there were many workers in the unit who did not share a common point of view. This variability in response may account for the low cooperation score and high confrontational behaviour.

The results in Tables 40 and 41 which deal with the response of the East unit staff to these questions were the most consistent with our analysis. These workers should have had the highest confrontational behaviour according to their responses on the need satisfaction measures, organizational factors and orientations to work described above. The results show that this was in fact the case as 71.2% of these workers were in the high confrontation category. This unit also had the second lowest positive cooperation scores as well with 57.6% of these workers in the high cooperation category. This amount of cooperation is surprising however considering their low scores on the intrinsic motivation measures.

A better understanding of the responses on these items may be gained from an examination of the frequency distribution of various demographic characteristics of the staff in the four units. The frequency distributions of the age, sex and length of employment in this particular job are presented in Tables 42 and 43 below.

TABLE 42: Frequency Distribution of Age and Sex in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	24 and under	25 to 29	30 and over	Male	Female
East	32.3	33.9	33.8	31.5	68.5
West	34.0	27.7	38.3	11.4	88.6
Nursing	37.5	21.9	40.6	10.7	89.3
Special	44.8	44.7	10.5	15.2	84.5

TABLE 43: Frequency Distribution for Length of Employment at the Centre for the Staff in the Four Residential Units.  
(in percents)

	Less than 5 years	5 to 10 years	10 years or more
East	51.0	28.8	20.2
West	63.8	25.5	10.6
Nursing	61.0	23.4	15.6
Special	81.6	15.8	2.6

The results of Tables 42 and 43 indicate that the staff in East and West units was almost equally distributed across the three age categories. More of the staff in the Nursing unit was 30 and over while 89.5% of the staff in Special unit was under thirty. The distribution of sex among the four units showed that the staff at the Centre was predominantly female with approximately 85% of West, Special and Nursing units employees being women. East Unit, on the other hand, had the highest percentage of men totalling 31.5% of the staff in this unit.

The results in Table 43 also show some interesting patterns since the staff in Special units had the least experience while the staff in East had the most. West Unit and Nursing Unit had similar distributions with each having approximately 65% of its staff working at the Centre for less than five years.

Tables 42 and 43 present some findings which help to explain some of the results discussed above. For example, both West unit and the Nursing Unit have more staff in the over thirty category than the other two units. With the exception of East unit, these two units also have the most experienced staff of residential counsellors. These two factors may be contributing to the high cooperation and low confrontation scores reported here. This may also account for the low intrinsic motivation scores reported by these two units since people at this stage in their careers may

be less concerned with the evaluations they get at work concerning their performance, especially from younger and less experienced co-workers.

The situation in East unit may also be explained partially by these results. To begin with, more staff members in this unit are men, which may account for the higher confrontation scores reported here. Additionally, these workers have the most seniority of all the workers in the residential units. This may account for both their low job involvement scores and low intrinsic motivation scores since these workers may have accepted their work situation for what it is and turned to other areas of life for self identity and self esteem. This explanation would be consistent with our theoretical discussion above. Two other measures may clarify this further. These are the difficulty that these employees perceive in getting promotions at the Centre and the extent to which they desire promotions. Both of these items should reflect the orientations that the RC staff has towards their jobs and perhaps the types of behavioural response they are more likely to engage in. These results are presented in Tables 44 and 45 below.

TABLE 44: Frequency Distribution for, "Difficulty in getting a promotion,"  
Item for the Residential Staff in the Four Residential Units.  
(in percent)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Promotion Very difficult to get promoted	78.0	85.1	73.4	89.2
Not very difficult to get promoted	22.0	14.9	26.6	10.8

TABLE 45: Frequency Distribution for, "How Important is a promotion, to you," Item for the Staff in the Four Residential Units. (in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Promotion important	39.0	44.7	51.6	51.4
Not very important	61.0	55.3	48.4	48.5

In Table 44, a strong consensus on the part of the staff in all four units is obvious. Between 73.4% and 89.2% of the staff indicate that getting a promotion is very difficult. The unit with the lowest score here was the Nursing unit whose staff is somewhat more qualified than the regular RC's. The significance of the lack of upward mobility for the staff is illustrated by the results of Table 45 which shows how many people in each of the units defines getting a promotion as very important.

Table 45 shows that getting a promotion is important for slightly over 50% of the staff in both the Nursing and Special units. West unit has 44.7% of the staff in this category, while East unit has only 39.0% here. The low scores on both job involvement and intrinsic motivation measures may once again be accounted for by the low scores in the West and East units, in terms of their desiring a promotion. This is somewhat problematic however since the entire staff agree's that promotions are very difficult to receive at the Centre. Our informants suggested to us that there was really no place for these employees to go except into management and that the Centre had more supervisors in the residential units than it needed. Therefore, there was no real incentive for these workers to aim for. The only hope, outside of supervision for those that wanted to move up, was a lateral transfer to another area of service. This was often difficult however since these positions required different training and

skills. The feeling gained in the interviews and in our informal conversations with some of the staff members was that people felt locked into their jobs, and in many cases saw little hope of getting out.

One final measure of behaviour is outlined in this section which can be compared to the findings reported above. In this case, rules at the Centre are the focus of attention and the staff was asked how closely the rules were followed where they worked. The results of this item are displayed in Table 46 below.

TABLE 46: Frequency Distribution for How Closely Are Rules Followed, Item for the Staff in the Four Residential Units.  
(in percents)

	East	West	Nursing	Special
Rules followed closely	50.9	63.8	82.9	76.3
Not followed closely	49.1	36.2	17.1	23.7

Table 46 presents the frequency distribution for the item asking how closely rules are followed by the staff. The table suggests that rules are followed very closely in both the Nursing and Special units and less closely in the other two units. A partial explanation for this rests on the work routines followed in each of the four units. Nursing, for example, is involved much more frequently in medical routines including drug dispensing which requires these staff members to follow precise procedures.

Similarly, the staff in the Special Unit deals with sensory impaired individuals who are often being taught to function independently. Routine and regularity is one way of ensuring that this is possible, especially with the visually impaired people who depend on items being located in a particular area or stored in the same place all the time.



No such requirements affect the staff in the other two units and this may account for some of the higher incidence of rule breaking behaviour reported by them.

It is interesting however, to note the rank order of the four units in terms of this item. East unit had the highest score in this category followed by West, Special and Nursing. Again, the age and experience of the staff in East unit may offer some explanation for these results. However, the order of appearance on this "negative" behavioural measure remains consistent with those reported above. East unit reported the highest participation scores in terms of confrontation and lack of cooperation.

#### VI: The Relationship Between Major Variables.

A Multiple Regression analysis was carried out which identified the worker behaviour measures and morale as dependent variables and the need satisfaction, orientation to work and organizational factors as independent variables. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 47 below.

A forward step-wise inclusion procedure was employed in this case in order to determine the explanatory power that the various independent variables contributed to the overall explained variance. The parameters established for inclusion in the equation are set very broadly in order to ensure maximum inclusion which facilitates a comparison of the relative explanatory power contributed by each of these variables to the regression equation. The variables included were the key independent variables in the study.

The R value reported for confrontation in Table 47 was .4320 and .3788 for cooperation. Neither of these values for R is excessively high

considering the number of independent variables included in the equation. In the case of morale, an R value of .6278 was found suggesting that the variables included in the analysis do account for a substantial amount of the variation in the morale scores.

The b values reported in this table are partial regression coefficients and may be used as a measure of the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable with adjustments made for all other independent variables. The other independent variables in this usage are understood to be controlled statistically. The interpretation of b then suggests the unit change in the dependent variables for each unit increase in the independent variable being examined when the effects of all the other independent variables which appear in the equation are controlled statistically.

Table 47 presents some interesting findings with respect to the occurrence of confrontational behaviour. The b values reported indicate that basic need satisfaction has a dampening effect on confrontation such that as basic need satisfaction increases, confrontation decreases. The same is true in the case of job involvement and autonomy although the b reported for basic need satisfaction and job involvement was  $-.58$  and  $-.63$  respectively while it was only  $-.47$  for autonomy.

The opposite effect is found with respect to social need satisfaction which had a b of  $.68$  and was the largest b reported in this section of the table. This was also true of intrinsic motivation which recorded a b of  $.60$ . The rest of the b values reported in this section of the table were much smaller.

These results suggest that confrontation is more likely when people perceive group support for their behaviour which is the case when social



needs are being met. Similarly, the high  $b$  value obtained for intrinsic motivation is consistent with our analysis in the sense that the person who is intrinsically motivated defines work as important to self esteem especially as this is related to performance. The table indicates that confrontation increases by .60 units per unit increase in intrinsic motivation. The composition of the confrontation items was based on the willingness of the worker to challenge their superiors at work. The results obtained here may show that those persons who are concerned with their jobs in this particular way, may be unwilling to accept jobs which do not provide for self esteem or where recognition of performance may not be forthcoming. This is somewhat the opposite of our discussion about the relationship between intrinsic motivation and confrontation above which pointed out that confrontational behaviour was most prevalent in those units with the lowest intrinsic motivation scores. The findings reported in this table show that intrinsic motivation may also be operating in an opposite way to instrumentalism therefore since it is intrinsic motivation which is positively related to confrontation. The intrinsically motivated employee is not the one who responds instrumentally because he/she cares about work.

The interpretation of the Beta values permits an assessment of the relative importance of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The Beta values in this case represent the standardized regression coefficients and their interpretation is that the Beta value represents the number of standard deviation units of change in the dependent variable that would be predicted by changes in one standard deviation unit in the independent variable in question. In Table 47, morale appears to have the largest negative effect on confrontation i.e., reducing the amount of

confrontation, while authoritarianism has the largest positive one.

These results are consistent with our analysis since they point out how morale can reduce confrontation while authoritarianism increases it. In our discussion, workers' attitudes were related to their behaviour by the advocates of QWL while confrontation was referred to in our consideration of control over workers and alienation.

The second part of Table 47 outlines the regression analysis with cooperation being entered into the equation as the dependent variable. The table shows that higher order need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation, job involvement and democratic supervision are most related to cooperation on the basis of the zero order correlations, however none of these relationships are very strong. The b values reported in this section of the table indicate that job involvement and social need satisfaction are most positively associated with positive changes in cooperation while authoritarianism is most strongly associated with negative changes.

The Beta values here point out that higher order need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and democratic supervision would result in the largest unit increase in cooperation for each standard deviation unit of change in these independent variables. While these changes would not be large, the items included here reflect the impact that the satisfaction of self related needs has for the enhancement of positive behaviour by workers. This is precisely what can be inferred from our discussion of alienation and is made explicit by the proponents of QWL.

The final section of this table incorporates morale as the independent variable in the regression equation. The R score reported in this case was the largest of the three indicating that morale is most related to the independent variables under examination. The zero order correlations

reported in this section of the table show that job involvement is most positively related to morale having a correlation of .43, while authoritarianism is most negatively related to morale. The correlation reported in this case was  $-.49$ . The remaining zero order correlates in this section of the table were either low or moderate.

The b values obtained with morale as dependent indicate that social need satisfaction has the largest positive effect on morale while authoritarianism and democratic supervision has the largest negative effect. The b values obtained here were .74 and  $-.40$  and  $-.82$  respectively. It is clearly understandable that social need satisfaction has a strong and positive impact on morale considering the importance of the work groups in the institution's day to day routines. Conversely, the negative response of these people to authoritarianism has emerged a number of times in this study and demonstrates the inappropriateness of this form of control on these workers. The findings with respect to democratic supervision however are much more difficult to understand. Throughout this report, this measure has been identified in positive terms with respect to workers' attitudes and behaviour. In this case, it indicates a large per unit change in morale but this change would go in a negative direction. The only plausible explanation here is that the highly job involved person would be interested in being identified and singled out for his or her work role and this is inhibited by a cooperative, democratic work environment, especially if this is being promoted in this fashion by the supervisor.

The standardized regression coefficients in this section of the table indicate that job involvement has the largest positive effect on morale while authoritarianism has the largest negative effect. Job involvement is followed in order of importance by higher order need satisfaction and

intrinsic motivation. The latter reinforces the importance that work has for people in terms of self identity and self esteem while the former provides the vehicle for this type of expression at work. It is not surprising therefore, to find these three measures appearing in this way. In the case of authoritarianism, its negative impact has been consistent and fully anticipated.

The results presented in Table 47 support our discussions above in a number of ways. The attitudes and behaviours of these workers were shown to be related in ways which is consistent with our theoretical framework and the analysis of the present research site. Authoritarianism in particular reflects the situation which exists at the Centre among this specific group of workers with regard to attitudes and behaviour. This justifies our selection of these workers since they are representative of the new, better educated workers in the service sector of the economy.

A Multiple Regression analysis similar to that presented above was carried out for the need satisfaction measures. The results of this analysis are outlined in Table 48 below.

Table 48 shows that the R scores obtained were low to moderate for basic and social need satisfaction and strong for higher order need satisfaction. These were .2559, .3338 and .4666 respectively. The zero order correlations reported in this table suggest that basic need satisfaction is most closely related to autonomy while social need satisfaction is most closely related to democratic supervision. In the case of higher order need satisfaction, four measures were found to be almost equal in the zero order correlations at the .29 level. These included intrinsic motivation, job involvement, morale and democratic supervision. A  $-.20$  correlation was found here with authoritarianism which was the largest negative score

reported.

The largest Beta value obtained in the portion of the table in which basic need satisfaction scores were displayed was .21 in the autonomy category. For social need this was .28 for democratic supervision while in the case of higher order need satisfaction a b value of .19 was obtained in the democratic supervision category and one of .17 was found with intrinsic motivation.

The b values presented in the table with respect to basic need satisfaction indicate that social need satisfaction would result in the largest positive change here. Higher order need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation morale and authoritarianism resulted in negative b values which ranged from -.44 to -.53, indicating negative change. Social need satisfaction, on the other hand, was most positively affected by basic need satisfaction and autonomy. The measures with the largest negative impact according to these b scores were higher order need satisfaction and job involvement. When higher order need satisfaction was examined, autonomy was found to have the largest positive impact while basic and social need satisfaction and authoritarianism had the largest negative effect.

The results presented in this table, especially those related to the b values reported, demonstrate some interesting findings. Basic need satisfaction for example, appears to be positively related to social need satisfaction but negatively related to higher order need satisfaction. Similar results are reported for social need satisfaction which show that it is positively related to basic need satisfaction but also negatively related to higher order need satisfaction. This pattern has been evident in a number of tables presented above and suggests that basic and social needs differ quite substantially from higher order needs. These three

measures appear to be responsive to different factors as well. The large b value obtained in the autonomy category with respect to higher order need satisfaction and the negative values recorded for basic and social need satisfaction in this case, give an indication of the nature of this pattern. Higher order needs are positively affected by the opportunities that these workers perceive for the expression of skills and abilities at work which reflect their self related needs. Basic and social needs on the other hand are more immediate and in a sense, compensatory. They may be pointing to the lack of desire or perceived opportunity for self needs to be fulfilled on the part of some workers. The only exception here is the .60 b value recorded in the autonomy category of the social need satisfaction section of the table. The rest of the scores follow our analysis including the results obtained in all three parts of this table with respect to job involvement and intrinsic motivation.

It may be that either these workers accept that basic and social needs are being or will be met at work or; that basic and social need satisfaction is more of a concern for workers with instrumental orientations to work as opposed to workers with orientations which seek the satisfaction of higher order needs here. The importance that higher order need satisfaction was found to have on positive the behavioural and attitudinal responses of these workers suggests that alienation and QWL based analysis, such as the one presented here, warrant careful consideration when the nature and form of work are discussed. The proponents of QWL in particular appear to be focussing on the factors in the work environment which contribute to positive attitudes and behaviours at work and which also address the satisfaction of higher order needs. These are also the needs which must be fulfilled through work according to our analysis of alienation.

## CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Conclusion

"On the surface it looks like a fair bargain; do this for that; means employed to a given end - nothing in sum, that any organism in nature does not undergo. This is not creative fashioning of experience in order to attain a given end. Instead, there is a long duration of dead time and dead effort - merely a barter toward the end desired. The individual "puts in time" in order to get a wage. Seen from the point of view of the acting organism, the period of wage-work is a suspension of its own initiatory powers. This is not to be compared to what looks like a similar process in nature...

We began this study with a brief discussion of the tumultuous era of the late sixties and early seventies. At that time, many of the new, young, well educated workers who were entering the economy for the first time, were showing their discontent with work through their behavioural and attitudinal responses to their jobs. So widespread was the problem of work that many government, business and labour leaders began to express grave concerns over the effect of worker unrest on the economy. As a result, a number of initiatives were undertaken to find some sort of resolution to this problem. One such initiative lead to the publication of the Work In America report in early 1972.

The authors of Work In America illustrated the severity of the problem of work in their discussion and offered their assessment of the possible causes of it. For example, they noted the influx of a whole new generation of workers into the labour market who were untouched by the depression, and who had been taught in the nation's schools to value freedom and democracy in their lives. These same young people were woefully unprepared for the authority and discipline they encountered in the large scale, rigid bureaucracies in which they worked. Since they were unafraid of the economic

consequences of being out of work, many demonstrated a less than inspired attitude toward their jobs. This lead many commentators to suggest that the work ethic in America was dead.

A second cause of the problem described in the Work In America report was based on the anachronistic nature of Taylorism and Scientific Management as a form of work place organization. The fragmentation which work suffered under this system was becoming increasingly unacceptable to workers who were unwilling to work under this type of control. The mindless, boring, repetitive jobs which are typical of assembly line work, render calculations of efficiency solely on quantity of output and ignore the social costs incurred in doing this type of work. It was becoming obvious that sabotage, vandalism, absenteeism, labour turn over in addition to more traditional forms of confrontational behaviour such as strikes and grievances had to be factored into the "efficiency of production" equation. The costs of this type of behaviour were becoming more and more a part of doing business. A technological solution to this problem, such as that employed in the construction of General Motor's Lordstown Ohio assembly plant showed that this merely aggravated an already bad situation. This became clear when a series of violent confrontations erupted at this plant shortly after it was opened. The technological solution ignored the social aspects of the workplace organization and the consequences of this proved costly!

The authors of Work In America pointed out one additional cause of the problems at work. They noted the sharp decline in the number of people in the United States who were working for themselves during this period of America history and they posited a gloomy forecast for this type of employment in the future. The essence of this discussion is that fewer and fewer



people in the country would have the opportunity to be their own bosses and work for themselves. The alternatives of this type of work, once so prominent in this country, was working in a large, faceless, heartless bureaucracy in which most people have little or no control over what they do at work. The ramifications of this are quite serious. Some of them are pointed out by the advocates of the quality of working life movement which began to develop during this time. Others are depicted in the concept of alienation. In fact, alienation became the watchword during this era, being applied to a whole range of human experiences and capturing the spirit of the period. People began to recognize that they were strangers to themselves and their own work.

Control over work is both the entrance into this complex topic as well as the corridor linking it to the disparate conceptualization which we employed in our analysis. In *Work In America*, the consequences of Tayloristic methods of workplace organization were clearly spelled out. Jobs which were rigidly controlled, minutely divided and which offered the incumbent little opportunity to use talents and skills were no longer passively accepted. The inherent costs of these types of jobs had to be taken into account. The QWL movement seized on this notion and began to examine alternative methods for organizing production. Unlike Mayo and many of his followers, many of the new QWL advocates were concerned with substantially more than simply enhancing or encouraging good relations with workers and employers. They began to recognize the importance that control over work had.

A number of studies conducted during this time demonstrated the negative impact that mindless, boring jobs had, especially when people exercised little control over their work. The QWL movement extended this

notion by suggesting that the costs of such a system of work organization spread far beyond the workplace and affect society in a number of ways. These 'social costs' include medical expenses, problems with mental health, alcoholism as well as interpersonal problems such as family breakdowns and violence. These people proposed that a better way of organizing production be developed.

Studies during this period also indicated that there were a number of advantages to be gained through the establishment of organizations which encouraged workers to participate in decision making. The Japanese were experiencing tremendous success with industrial relations which were based on cooperation between management and labour rather than confrontation. In addition, according to these theorists, it was patently wasteful to use only the physical power of workers and not their mental and creative power as well. With these types of ideas in mind, the QWL movement began to call for the reorganization of work in a way which would enhance worker control and avoid Tayloristic forms of work organization.

The ideas contained in this conceptualization of the QWL movement especially with respect to the meaning of work in people's lives and the control that they exercise over work, are the key ideas which link this to the concept of alienation employed in this project. Based on the work of Marx, alienation was described above as a structural condition in which people have little or no control over the purpose, process or products of their work. The significance of this rests on the importance attached to work in this conceptual system. For Marx, work represents the means through which a people give meaning to life and make a living, both in the simple physical sense of providing enough to stay alive and in the meta-physical sense of what it means to be human. Human beings therefore,

create and recreate themselves through the free and spontaneous exercise of their human skills and abilities.

People are alienated when they lose control over their activity in this sense, especially as this relates to the work process. In strictly quantitative terms, we spend about one half of our waking hours either at work or preparing for it. Given this situation, alienation means that you do not have control over half of your life and what's more, this time and activity does not exist for you as an opportunity to satisfy human needs, with the exception of the most basic needs for material existence. Work which is organized according to Tayloristic principles in a Capitalist society, maximizes the use of physical power and deliberately enacts the separation of mental and manual labour. Only the most basic of human qualities and skills are utilized in this work process.

The satisfaction of human needs becomes at once the means for eliminating alienation and/or enhancing QWL if these needs are satisfied through the free expression of human powers and abilities. The extent to which this occurs depends upon the organization of work. If this promotes the satisfaction of increasingly higher human needs by affording people the opportunity to use their skills and abilities then alienation will be low since people will have control over their activity at work. QWL will be enhanced under these circumstances as well since people will be able to grow and develop at work and work will become a very positive part of their lives.

The satisfaction of human needs is an explicit part of QWL programmes. Advocates of this approach have drawn on the work of Abraham Maslow who identified a 'hierarchy' of human needs. This hierarchy included the satisfaction of basic needs which revolve around food, shelter and clothing

or the material basis of life, in addition to higher order needs which deal with self esteem and self actualization. This model makes it clear that lower order needs have to be met before higher order ones are addressed. The QWL construct identifies the satisfaction of higher order needs in this manner as an indication of the quality that people actually experience in their work lives.

Alienation and QWL are related in this study precisely on the basis of the extent of need satisfaction which control over work produces. The opportunity which a particular work organization allows for control over work and hence the satisfaction of increasingly higher order needs should demonstrate the nature of both alienation and QWL being experienced by the workers there. This notion underscores much of the present analysis. It neither denies the existence of a Capitalist economy nor the potential impact that the QWL movement can have. Instead it seeks to understand how the relations found at work affect need satisfaction and thus both alienation and QWL. Clearly, some people exercise more control over their work than others do in this society. If this conceptualization is correct, these people should have the opportunity to fulfill more higher order needs through their work and therefore experience a higher quality of working life and 'less' alienation.

One of the proposed solutions to the problem of alienation which emerged during the late 1960's and early 1970's was based on the promise which white collar jobs offered. Unlike the dirty, heavy work in blue collar occupations, white collar jobs were supposed to be ones in which the occupant would be more than an extension of a machine and would be able to exercise some discretion and control at work. The traditional professions represented the models for these white collar jobs and the statistics

gathered on the labour market indicated that an increasingly larger proportion of jobs were being created in the service sector of the economy were comprised mainly of white collar jobs. A great deal of the country's alienation problem would disappear as more and more jobs in the industrial sector would be done by machines while people worked in offices in white collar jobs.

In our discussion above, the reality of many of the new white collar jobs was described. The studies presented in this context indicated that these jobs had little to offer their incumbents in the way of control over their work or the opportunity to satisfy their higher order needs. In fact, many of these jobs began to resemble their blue collar counterparts much more than they did the 'professional' model which they were supposedly fashioned after. The workers selected for study in this project were ones which most represented the qualifications and characteristics of this new white collar segment of the labour market. We were interested in discovering if these workers responded in ways different from or similar to people in more traditional blue collar occupations.

Two sets of factors were considered in conjunction with our conceptualization of need satisfaction. These were the impact that various organizational factors had and the role that orientation to work played in the process of need satisfaction at work. These two sets of factors were seen as being related to both the attitudinal and behavioural responses that people make at work. A series of items designed to measure several aspects of both of these factors were therefore included in this study.

The major components in this study then are alienation and QWL described in terms of need satisfaction through control over work; orientation to work; organizational factors; and measures of workers'

attitudes and self reports about their behaviour at work. Need satisfaction included a consideration of basic, social and higher needs. Orientation to work was described as job involvement and intrinsic motivation. The organizational factors which were included consisted of the workers perceptions of authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision. Attitudinal and self reported behaviour were discussed in terms of workers morale, cooperation and confrontation. The relationships which were found to exist between these variables were described and elaborated upon in our analysis.

The first set of relationships considered in the study involved those which dealt with the satisfaction of needs. A considerable amount of agreement was reported by the Residential Counselling staff with respect to the high degree of satisfaction of both basic and social needs. In the case of higher order needs, much more variability was noted in the responses. This is important in the present context since higher order needs reflect the nature of control over work much more so than do either basic or social need satisfaction. Basic needs refers to pay, security and benefits, factors which are removed from the day to day work routines. Social needs in this case, address the extent of positive interaction and cooperation which goes on between workers on staff at the Centre. While this is based on the organization of work to the extent that work groups are created to accomplish specific tasks, the essence of social need satisfaction may have more to do with the individuals involved than with the work organization itself. Higher order needs, on the other hand, focus on the extent to which skills and abilities are used on the job and the opportunity which the job affords people to grow and develop through this activity. This is based much more directly on the nature of the work

organization since it is this which dictates the degree of control that these workers are able to exercise in the performance of their duties.

The satisfaction of higher order needs was identified in our discussion as a means for maintaining a positive identity and enhancing one's evaluations of self worth. If this type of situation was prevalent, this should have been reflected in the orientations which people had toward work. The two orientations examined in this case included job involvement which addressed the significance which a person attached to work in terms of its overall importance to self identity and self evaluation, and intrinsic motivation, which reflected the importance that a person attached to job performance in terms of its contribution to self esteem.

The relationship between need satisfaction and orientation to work was found to be consistent with our analysis of these factors. Thus, basic and social need satisfaction were found to be only slightly to moderately related to orientation to work. A strong and positive relationship however was found to exist between higher order need satisfaction and both job involvement and intrinsic motivation. This reflects the specific nature of the items included in both our measures of higher order need satisfaction and those in the job involvement and intrinsic motivation scales such that the higher order need variables are in fact the ones which make a contribution to self identity and self esteem.

These findings echoed our discussion of both alienation and QWL since both constructs were based on the necessity to satisfy higher order needs at work. The fact that both job involvement and intrinsic motivation were so strongly related to higher order need satisfaction reinforces these particular concepts since it demonstrates the link between identity, self esteem and work. What does it mean to a person if more than half of their

waking hours are spent in a pursuit which offers no viable source of either identity or self esteem. People can withdraw investments of themselves from situations in which this occurs, however, this is precisely the point; half of a person's life is rendered meaningless through this withdrawal. What kind of 'quality' can exist for people under these circumstances? What does alienation mean if it doesn't address the loss of this large a portion of a person's life for satisfying these intrinsically human needs! Work should be the major arena for doing this. When it is not, QWL suffers and alienation abounds.

The need satisfaction items were crosstabulated with the measures of organizational factors in order to assess the relationship which existed between them. The results of this procedure presented several interesting findings. To begin with, the relationship between authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision and basic need satisfaction was found to be low. This was anticipated by our discussion above since basic need satisfaction was described as not being related to the day-to-day work routines which these organizational factors are based upon.

In the case of social and higher order needs, however, a much stronger relationship was found to exist. This was positive in the case of autonomy and democratic supervision and negative with respect to authoritarianism. The opportunity which work affords people for social and higher order need satisfaction is influenced directly by the type of control which these people are able to exercise at work. All three organizational factors focus on this in one way or another.

The relationship between need satisfaction and the measure of people's orientation to work proved to be quite strong. In the case of morale the relationship ranged from moderate to strong, with higher order need



satisfaction being especially important to morale. Basic need satisfaction had a moderate relationship here and while the one with social need satisfaction was stronger, it was not as strong as that with higher order needs.

Similar results to these were obtained when the relationship between need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation and job involvement was examined. Basic and social need satisfaction were found to be moderately related to job involvement while higher order need satisfaction was found to have a strong relationship here. A strong positive relationship was also found to exist between higher order need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. A slight negative relationship was found in this instance with respect to basic need satisfaction and only a low one when social needs were examined.

These results indicate once again that higher order need satisfaction is much more closely related to the attitudes which people have about the importance of their work experiences for the establishment and maintenance of positive identities and for contributing to positive evaluations of self worth. Basic and social need satisfaction were less related to this process than were higher order needs. When higher order needs are satisfied at work, the likelihood for positive orientations to work is greater than when these needs are not being met. This suggests that the QWL formulation has a great deal to tell us about how people think about work. It may also indicate that there is a clear distinction between the impact of basic and social need satisfaction and the satisfaction of higher order needs on this situation. An instrumental orientation based on pay and benefits etc. for example which does not stress involvement and motivation may rest on a person's ability to satisfy basic needs at work. Being

involved in one's job or having intrinsic motivation may be based according to our discussion above, on exercising control over work activity which is related to the satisfaction of higher order needs. This provides one more source of support for the QWL approach and our analysis of alienation. Higher order need satisfaction is vital for positive orientation toward work!

The culmination of the relationships discussed above was aimed at the impact that these orientations and types of need satisfaction had on a person's behavioural response to work. It was clear that need satisfaction influenced the attitudes of these people. If this relationship continued to hold, it should result in particular types of behavioural responses.

The findings obtained from a crosstabulation of the need satisfaction measures and the workers' self reported behaviour indicated that such a relationship did exist. While basic and social need satisfaction showed only a slight to moderate relationship to the worker behaviour measures, the relationship between worker behaviour and higher order need satisfaction was found to be quite strong. This was true for both negative behavioural expressions described in this report as confrontation as well as positive ones described as cooperation.

Once again, these results lend a great deal of support to the contentions of much of the QWL literature which suggests that people want more than just a decent pay check from their jobs. The relationship between need satisfaction and higher order need satisfaction in particular and worker behaviour also shows that it will take more than simply higher paychecks and better benefits to enhance worker behaviour on the job. This is implied in both the QWL concept and the concept of alienation. People do want more out of their work!

The remaining parts of our analysis explored the relationships between the organizational factors and the measures of workers' orientations to work. These in turn were all related to the behavioural responses of people at work. In most instances, the basic relationships described above with respect to the need satisfaction measures continued to hold. Therefore, a strong relationship was anticipated between orientation to work and worker behaviour. The results obtained showed that morale and job involvement were moderately related to both positive and negative behavioural expressions while intrinsic motivation was related strongly only to the measure of cooperation. This was understandable given the performance component of this concept.

The orientations which people had to work were affected by the organizational factors in much the same way as the need satisfaction measures were. Thus, morale was very strongly and negatively related to authoritarianism while a moderate, positive relationship was found with respect to autonomy and democratic supervision. Similarly, a moderate and positive relationship was found to exist between both job involvement and intrinsic motivation and the measures of autonomy and democratic supervision. Only a slight negative relationship was found to exist between intrinsic motivation and authoritarianism while a strong negative one was found when job involvement was looked at.

The direction and strength of the relationships between organizational factors and orientations to work follow the pattern which our analysis anticipated. People's morale, their involvement with their jobs and their intrinsic motivation should be higher in organizations which minimize strict authoritarian control and which maximize the amount of control that the workers can exercise. These relationships follow directly from those

found with respect to need satisfaction and they also reinforce the position taken both by advocates of QWL and in the concept of alienation.

Finally, the impact of the organizational factors on people's behavioural responses to work was examined. The results here suggested that authoritarianism was very strongly related to confrontational types of responses and moderately related to a lack of cooperation on the part of these workers. A moderate and negative relationship was also reported between confrontation and both autonomy and democratic supervision indicating that confrontation decreases as these two organizational factors increase.

A moderate to strong relationship was found between these factors and workers cooperation scores which coincides with the results reported with the confrontation measures.

The organizational structure can be seen therefore as a key for influencing both the extent of need satisfaction among the workers as well as their attitudinal and behavioural responses to work. The specific items used to measure the organizational factors in this study rested on the social relationships which these people encountered in their jobs. Authoritarianism, autonomy and democratic supervision have one unifying theme; control over work. The strong relationship between these measures and higher order need satisfaction in particular, should be singled out for attention. The satisfaction of higher order needs is the lynch pin which holds much of this analysis together. The QWL movement places a great deal of importance on this and the impact that it has on the rest of a persons' life. If higher order needs are satisfied at work, a person's entire life is affected according to this construct. A similar analysis can be made with respect to the concept of alienation. Work should be a prime area in

a person's life, for the satisfaction of higher order needs. When this occurs and people do exercise control over their work, alienation is minimized. People experience themselves in their work and no separation exists. When this does not occur, the opposite results.

This aspect of our analysis brings us full circle in a sense, since we began by outlining the problems of alienation. In our discussion, this was couched in structural terms reflecting the forms which work organizations have taken within capitalist formations in particular. We argued that control rather than efficiency was the operative concept in describing these work organizations. The costs and consequences of various control practices were outlined and the development of the QWL movement was described. This movement sought better organizational forms as a solution to the problem. The findings of this research provide support for this formulation. The use of the QWL approach and the application of the concept of alienation both pointed to the need for work organizations in which people can have control over their work and jobs which provide them the opportunity to satisfy higher order human needs.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the organizations which we will need in the future will have to be both productive and efficient. The calculation of efficiency and productivity however, must take into account the social dimension of this equation. As the industrial sector of the economy becomes increasingly dominated by robots and computers, the service sector will continue to absorb large numbers of people. Sophisticated technology and specialized hardware offer limited returns in this area where the major component of an organization's operation will increasingly be its people. We will have to expand and develop our use of human resources to use the popular jargon, in order to make our organizations both

productive and efficient. We will have to create organizations which allow people to be all that they can and want to be in order to accomplish this. This task is far too important for us to do otherwise and we will experience severe consequences if we should fail in this endeavor.

This research has pointed to the direction which these changes should take. The impact of organizational factors on higher order need satisfaction as well as on people's attitudes and behaviour at work make this quite clear. Future research should focus on the way that control functions operate in organizations especially those in which people do satisfy higher order needs. Perhaps, the next step would be to carry out research with white collar workers who are higher in the hierarchy than these lower level Residential Counsellors were. The responses of the Nursing Unit staff, for example, on such variables as job involvement and cooperation suggests that this may prove fruitful since power and control over work may operate in a positive way for people in the more powerful positions in an organization. Research involving teachers, social workers, middle level managers and executives would add to our understanding of how the nature of control and the organization of work affect people with various amounts of autonomy.

An important point raised in the present study, demonstrated the impact of basic and social need satisfaction as opposed to higher order need satisfaction on the attitudinal and behavioural responses of workers. In this research, there was widespread consensus among the staff that these needs were in fact being met. In our discussion we suggested that the findings we obtained might have been different if these needs had not been perceived as satisfied. This is an important point since much of the debate concerning workers in undesirable jobs involves a consideration of the amount of money they are paid or the benefits they receive. The very

strong relationship found in the present study between higher order need satisfaction and people's attitudes and behaviour at work calls into question some of the accepted wisdom in this area. Higher order needs may be more important than we have given them credit for and the focus on basic needs may have been over emphasized in the past. This may be especially true in situations where instrumental responses to work are most common. Studies of job satisfaction and the difficulties encountered in interpreting this concept testify to this and indicate that people make choices based on the reality they experience. Certain types of responses are more or less likely then when basic and social needs are satisfied. Instrumentality may be more a reflection of the reality perceived by these workers than it is of what their orientations to work would otherwise be. More research on this issue would help to clarify the situation and help us better understand how people make sense out of their working lives.

Finally, this research has shown that people chose to be cooperative or confrontational in spite of the consequences that their behaviour may have for their employment. People reported being involved in some serious breaches of the rules and regulations of the organization which in many cases could have resulted in their dismissals, even in an economy which was poor and the unemployment rate high. People choose to follow rules. People also choose to avoid, ignore or violate them. The managerial or organizational perspective from which many of the studies in this area are written fail to acknowledge that the people who work in these organizations are more than the recipients of management's actions or its victims. They are, instead, real living, thinking, feeling, acting human beings who have minds of their own and who choose to act. Sometimes, the actions are contrary to the organization's wishes. This presents a much more realistic

picture of the operation of organizations, one which is better able to handle the complexities encountered in analyzing them.

People create themselves and their world through their activity. Through their actions, they can make their organizations better or worse places to live and work. The quality of life that people experience ultimately depends on the nature of the relationships which constitute at once the basis of their organizations and the social structure of their societies.



## APPENDIX: A Interview Schedule

\_\_\_\_\_ : I.D. 1 : CARD \_\_\_\_\_ : Interviewer  
 1, 2, 3 4

M.S.U. QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE SURVEY

TIME STARTED: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME COMPLETED: \_\_\_\_\_ LENGTH OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_. I am working on a survey being done by the Department of Sociology at Michigan State University. The survey is part of a study on the quality of working life and people in many different occupations are being interviewed. You are one of the people who has been selected to be interviewed. The procedure for selecting people is a scientific one designed to produce a representative sample so we really need your co-operation. It will not take much of your time and your answers will be strictly confidential. In fact, your name will not even be put on the answer sheet.

QUESTIONS:

1. First of all, we would like some information about your job and work experience. What is your present job?  
 (GET SPECIFIC JOB TITLE)

- a) \_\_\_\_\_  
 job title
- b) What do you do on the job? What are some of your duties?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- c) How long have you been in that job? (GET YEAR AT WHICH  
 CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT IN THIS JOB BEGAN)
- |                 |                        |                      |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| number of years | 1. less than one year  | 5. 4 to 5 years      |
|                 | 2. one to two years    | 6. 5 to 10 years     |
|                 | 3. two to three years  | 7. 10 to 15 years    |
|                 | 4. three to four years | 8. 15 to 20 years    |
|                 |                        | 9. 20 years and over |

2. Now, can you tell me what job you had immediately before the present one?

- a) \_\_\_\_\_  
 job title
- b) What were your duties on that job?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

c) How long were you on that job?

- |                             |                     |                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| <u>                    </u> | 1. less than 1 year | 5. 4 to 5 years      |
| number of years             | 2. 1 to 2 years     | 6. 5 to 10 years     |
|                             | 3. 2 to 3 years     | 7. 10 to 15 years    |
|                             | 4. 3 to 4 years     | 8. 15 to 20 years    |
|                             |                     | 9. 20 years and over |

3. What was the last year in which you were a full time student?

[CODE NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL]

- |                             |                     |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <u>                    </u> | 1. less than 1 year | 5. 4 to 5 years     |
| actual year                 | 2. 1 to 2 years     | 6. 5 to 10 years    |
|                             | 3. 2 to 3 years     | 7. 10 to 15 years   |
|                             | 4. 3 to 4 years     | 8. 25 to 20 years   |
|                             |                     | 9. 20 years or more |

4. How many full time jobs have you held since leaving school?

                     0 = MD 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3, 4 = 4, 5 = 5,  
6 = 6, 7 = 7, 8 = 8, 9 = 9 or more

5. Now we would like to know how much you agree or disagree with some statements about various aspects of your job. Here is a card with numbered responses from strongly agree to strongly disagree. I will read a statement and you tell me which number on the card represents your response. Please try to think about your responses as though you were giving them to yourself rather than to me or to anyone else. While all of the statements are somewhat similar, each contains something different. Please think about the statements carefully before responding.

- a) My job requires me to be able to handle surprising or unpredictable situations.
- b) My supervisor encourages me to participate in important decisions.
- c) I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.
- d) My supervisor gives responsibility to those he/she supervises.
- e) My job allows me to determine my own work pace.
- f) My supervisor knows his/her job well.
- g) Most of the important decisions on my job are made by the supervisor alone.
- h) I am told what I have to do on my job.
- i) My supervisor encourages those he/she supervises to develop new ways of doing things.
- j) I always know what I should be doing on my job.
- k) I have a lot of say over how work tasks will be divided among myself and my work group.

WE ARE FINISHED WITH THE CARD FOR THE TIME BEING

6. Now can you tell me how many people, including yourself, have the same immediate supervisor?

	0 = MD	4 = 11 to 15	8 = 41 to 50
<u>actual number</u>	1 = 1 to 3	5 = 16 to 20	9 = 50 or more
	2 = 4 to 6	6 = 21 to 30	
	3 = 7 to 10	7 = 31 to 40	

7. How many people see you as their direct supervisor?

	0 = MD	4 = 11 to 15	7 = 31 to 40
<u>actual number</u>	1 = 1 to 3	5 = 16 to 20	8 = 41 to 50
	2 = 4 to 6	6 = 21 to 30	9 = 50 or more
	3 = 7 to 10		

8. Some people say it's not what you know but who you know that counts, especially when it comes to getting a job or a promotion. Can you tell how it is at your place? For example...

- a) If someone is trying to get a job is what you know or who you know more important? \_\_\_\_\_ What = 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Who = 2
- b) If someone is trying to get a promotion, is what you know or who you know more important? \_\_\_\_\_ What = 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Who = 2

- 9a. How do the formal qualifications required to get your job reflect the skills needed to do the job? Can you tell me if you:

- 1) Are overqualified for the job.
- 2) Have about the right qualifications for the job.
- 3) Are underqualified for the job.

- 9b. How much of the time do you use your training and skills to the fullest on your job? (ASK FOR PERCENTAGE)

	0 = MD	5 = 41 - 50
<u>percentage</u>	1 = 1 - 10	6 = 51 - 60
	2 = 11 - 20	7 = 61 - 70
	3 = 21 - 30	8 = 71 - 80
	4 = 31 - 40	9 = 81 - 100

10. The following statements describe how some people respond to their jobs. Here is that card again with numbered responses from strongly agree to strongly disagree. I will read a statement and you tell me which number on the card represents your response. Please think about the statements carefully before responding.

- a) The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
- b) When I do my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and satisfaction.
- c) The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
- d) I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.
- e) I live, eat and breathe my job.
- f) Doing my job well increases my feelings of self esteem.
- g) I am very much involved personally with my job.
- h) Most things in life are more important than work.
- i) I am really a perfectionist about my work.
- j) When I do my job well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.

WE ARE FINISHED WITH THE CARD FOR THE TIME BEING.

11. Now I'd like to ask you about how you are evaluated on your job.  
 a) Can you tell me how many times a year FORMAL evaluations are made of how well you are doing your job?

<u>          </u>	0 = MD	5 = 5
times/year	1 = 1	6 = 6
	2 = 2	7 = 7
	3 = 3	8 = 8
	4 = 4	9 = 9 or more

- b) How often on a typical day are INFORMAL evaluations made of how well you are doing your job?

<u>          </u>	0 = MD	5 = 5
how often	1 = 1	6 = 6
	2 = 2	7 = 7
	3 = 3	8 = 8
	4 = 4	9 = 9 or more

12. Can you tell me what specific criteria are used in evaluating how well you do your job? (PROBE FOR SPECIFIC CRITERIA)

---



---



---

13. Are there others where you work who have more or less the same job as yours?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      b) No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2      IF NO SKIP TO 15  
 IF YES

14. Is it easy or hard to tell whether or not you are doing a better or worse job than they do? That is, is it easy or hard to compare your work and the work of others?

a) Easy \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      b) Hard \_\_\_\_\_ = 2

15. Are there differences in how well people do their jobs or is everyone's performance about the same?

a) Differences \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      b) Same \_\_\_\_\_ = 2 SAME SKIP TO 17.  
 IF DIFFERENCES:

16. Does the evaluation process take these differences into account?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      b) No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2

17. Do you think the supervisor uses the right criteria or the right basis when he/she evaluates your work?

a) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      IF YES SKIP TO 19  
 b) No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2  
 IF NO

18. What criteria or basis should be used?

- 
- b) How hard would it be to get him/her to use the right criteria?  
 Would you say it would be:  
 1 = Very hard to do  
 2 = Hard to do  
 3 = Somewhat hard to do  
 4 = Not very hard to do

19. Sometimes people do things to avoid being evaluated on the job. Have you ever done this?

- 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_  
 IF YES \_\_\_\_\_

- b) How often would you say this happens? 1 = Very often  
 2 = Often  
 3 = Occasionally  
 4 = Not very often at all

c) Can you give me an example?

- d) 

---

In some cases entire groups of people get together to avoid being evaluated on the job. Has this ever happened where you work?

- Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2  
 e. How often would you say this happens?  
 1 = very often      3 = occasionally  
 2 = often      4 = not very often at all

20. Are you required to keep a detailed record of your work activities?

- Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2

21. Does 'favouritism' on the part of the supervisor play a role in the evaluation process where you work?

- Yes \_\_\_\_\_ = 1      No \_\_\_\_\_ = 2

22. What percentage of your work time is spent under the direct supervision of your supervisor?

- |            |           |                |
|------------|-----------|----------------|
| percentage | 1 = 1-10  | 5 = 41-50      |
|            | 2 = 11-20 | 6 = 51-60      |
|            | 3 = 21-30 | 7 = 61-70      |
|            | 4 = 31-40 | 8 = 71-80      |
|            |           | 9 = 81 or more |

23. How much freedom do you have over what you do on your job?

- Would you say that you have:  
 1 = a great deal of freedom  
 2 = some freedom  
 3 = a little freedom  
 4 = no freedom at all

24. When doing your job, do you decide how much time to spend on a particular task:  
 1 = all of the time  
 2 = most of the time  
 3 = some of the time  
 4 = none of the time
25. Taking everything into account, how satisfied are you with your job as it is now? Would you say that you are:  
 1 = Very satisfied                      4 = Somewhat dissatisfied  
 2 = Satisfied                              5 = Dissatisfied  
 3 = Somewhat satisfied              6 = Very dissatisfied  
 Why or why not?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
26. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly interesting?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
27. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly rewarding?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
28. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly difficult?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
29. What one thing is there about your job that makes it particularly undesirable?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
30. In some jobs, people compete with co-workers for promotions, raises and desirable assignments. Thinking about your job, would you say it is?  
 1 = very competitive  
 2 = somewhat competitive  
 3 = not very competitive  
 4 = not competitive at all
31. How would you describe your own behaviour at work? Would you say that you are:  
 1 = very competitive  
 2 = somewhat competitive  
 3 = not very competitive  
 4 = not competitive at all

32. Do you plan to stay in the specific job you have now until you retire?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_ IF YES SKIP TO 35  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
33. What job do you plan to change to?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
34. Why do you want to make this change?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
35. How hard would it be for you to get promoted or to move up where you work? Would it be:  
 1 = very difficult  
 2 = somewhat difficult  
 3 = not very difficult  
 4 = not difficult at all
36. How important is getting a promotion or moving up for you? Would you say it is:  
 1 = very important  
 2 = somewhat important  
 3 = not very important  
 4 = not important at all
37. The following statements describe various aspects of people's jobs. Here is that card again with numbered responses from strongly agree to strongly disagree. I will read a statement and you tell me which number on the card represents your response. Please think about the statements carefully before responding.
- a) People I work with encourage each other and work together.
  - b) communications are good among my co-workers.
  - c) Most of the time I prefer to work alone.
  - d) If I have a problem on the job, I can count on my co-workers for help and support.
  - e) If I should fall behind at work, I can count on my co-workers to cover for me while I get caught up.
  - f) In general, my co-workers and I have a good attitude about working here.
  - g) When I see something wrong at work, I try to figure out how to solve the problem and tell my supervisor about it.
  - h) At work, I am always trying to figure out better ways of doing my job.
  - i) I try to do a good job at work even if no one is around to see it.
  - j) Basically, it doesn't matter how hard you work around here, you get the same pay whether you do a lot of work or a little.
- WE ARE FINISHED WITH THE CARD FOR THE TIME BEING.

38. Compared to the amount of effort you could put into your job if it really turned you on, how much effort do you find yourself putting into your job on a day to day basis? Would you say you put in?

1 = 90% or more	4 = 60 to 70%
2 = 80 to 90%	5 = 50 to 60%
3 = 70 to 80%	6 = less than 50%

39. What percentage of the effort you put into your job is lost because of things on your job over which you have no control?

	0 = MD	
percentage	1 = 1 - 10	5 = 41 - 50
	2 = 11 - 20	6 = 51 - 60
	3 = 21 - 30	7 = 61 - 70
	4 = 31 - 40	9 = 81 - 100

Can you give an example of this?

---



---

40. Have you ever taken a day off from work when you were not really sick but just needed a break?

1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_ IF YES: How often would you say you do this?  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_ (RECORD ACTUAL NUMBER OF TIMES PER YEAR)  
 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5, 6=6, 7=7, 8=8, 9=9 or more.

41. Sometimes workers take longer coffee and lunch breaks than those allowed by management. Have you ever done this?

1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_ IF YES: How often would you say you do this in a typical week?  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_ (RECORD ACTUAL NUMBER)

1 = 1-2	5 = 10-11
2 = 3-4	6 = 12-13
3 = 5-6	7 = 14-15
4 = 7-8	8 = 16-17
4 = 9-10	9 = never

42. Some people like to work in a place where people talk and joke around. Others prefer a place where people work alone. Which type of place do you prefer?

1 = a place where people joke around  
 2 = a place where people work alone

43. Can you tell me how it is at your place?

1 = Do people joke around or  
 2 = Do people work alone?

44. Do people you work with ever get together and have contests or invent little games while at work to help the time go faster?

1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_  
 IF YES: Can you give me an example?

---



---



45. I would like to describe some imaginary situations and ask you what would be most likely to happen in these situations where you work.
- a) You and the people you work with are getting very bored and restless. What do you think would happen?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Your supervisor makes major changes in your job and the jobs of your co-workers without any discussions with the workers beforehand. What do you think would happen?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Your supervisor is very harsh with you for no apparent reason. What do you think you would do?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- d) A problem at work has gone unresolved for a very long time. What do you think would happen?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
46. Most organizations have rules and regulations governing the way people act while at work. In some places, rules are closely followed while in other places rules are largely ignored. Can you tell me how it is where you work? Would you say the rules are:
- |                           |                                 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 = followed very closely | 3 = not followed very closely   |
| 2 = followed closely      | 4 = not followed closely at all |
47. Are there rules where you work that seem to prevent you from doing your job?
- 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- IF YES: Can you give me an example?
- \_\_\_\_\_
48. If a work rule did not make sense to you, would you follow it even if there was no one around to catch you breaking it?
- 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
49. Would you say that you follow the rules on your job:
- 1 = all of the time
- 2 = most of the time
- 3 = some of the time
- 4 = or do you usually ignore the rules
50. Which rules do you break least often?
- \_\_\_\_\_
51. Which rules do you break most often?
- \_\_\_\_\_



This completes the first part of the interview. In the next part, I would like you to record your answers yourself. In the meantime, I will be transferring the answers you gave in the first part. Here is part two. [HAND RESPONDENT PART TWO] Please follow the instructions given at the top of each section.

## PART II:

The following statements describe a variety of job related factors. Please indicate the extent to which each of the statements describes the situation where you work. Do not evaluate the statements in terms of 'good' or 'bad', but read each statement and answer in terms of how well it describes the situation where you work.

## INSTRUCTIONS:

- a) Read each statement carefully.
- b) Think about how well the statement describes the situation where you work.
- c) Select a response from the following:
  - 1. Strongly Agree
  - 2. Agree
  - 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - 4. Disagree
  - 5. Strongly Disagree
- d) Record your answer in the space provided along the left hand margin.
- e) The value of this survey depends on your being frank in your answers. Remember, your answers are strictly confidential.

## ANSWERS

- 1. My job requires that I use a wide range of my abilities.
- 2. What happens around here is really important to me.
- 3. I feel very loyal to this organization
- 4. I used to care about my work more than I do now.
- 5. I often think of quitting.
- 6. My job requires that I keep on learning new things.
- 7. I can influence the decisions that affect my job.
- 8. I have a great deal of freedom to run my own job.
- 9. I don't really like working here. All the rules and regulations make you feel like you're in prison.
- 10. Ultimately, my supervisor has too much control over my job.
- 11. You can give an honest opinion around here without any worry.
- 12. The administration is much too strict in enforcing the rules around here.
- 13. Compared with people doing similar types of work in this community, I am well paid.
- 14. The benefits package in this job is very good.
- 15. Job security for people like me in this organization is very good.
- 16. If I left this job, I could find a similar or better job.
- 17. Working here brings me the respect of my family and neighbours.

18. Around here I am treated as an adult.
19. I used to be more ambitious about my job than I am now.
20. I am proud to tell people where I work.
21. Changes in this organization usually create more problems than they solve.
22. If I could get a good paying job somewhere else, I'd leave this job in a minute.
23. Some major changes are needed before things get better around here.
24. People at the top of this organization are aware of the problems at my level.

### PART III:

The following statements describe a number of things that people sometimes do when they are bored, frustrated or angry. Read each one carefully. Think about how it applies to your job and answer in the space provided.

1. Have you ever worked as fast as you could just to see how much work you could get done? b) If you answered "yes", how often would you say this happens?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
2. Have you ever worked as slowly as possible just to see how little work you could get done?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) If you answered 'yes' how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
3. Have you ever 'deliberately' misplaced a report, memo or piece of equipment because you were angry or frustrated with what was going on at work?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
4. Have you ever turned your back and avoided taking responsibility for things going on at work?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
5. Have you ever walked off the job while on duty without permission?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_

- b) If you answered 'yes' how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
6. Have you ever spent your time daydreaming or doodling while at work when you should have been working?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
7. Have you ever come to work drunk or stoned?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
8. Have you ever gotten drunk or stoned while you were at work?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
9. Have you ever 'borrowed' anything from work for your own personal use?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
10. Have you ever 'deliberately' damaged a piece of equipment or machinery at work?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)
11. Have you ever talked back to your supervisor or other superior?  
1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (how often)

12. Have you ever refused to follow a direct order from your supervisor?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (how often)
13. Have you ever gotten really 'bitchy' or short tempered at work because you were angry or frustrated?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (how often)
14. Have you ever gotten 'bitchy' or short tempered at home because of something happening at work?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (how often)
15. Have you ever yelled or screamed at a supervisor or other employee because you were angry or frustrated at work?  
 1 = Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 = No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) If you answered 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (how often)

#### PART IV:

Place a check mark in the space beside the response which best describes your answer. If the question requires a written answer, use the space provided. Please print your answers clearly.

1. How would you describe the morale where you work? Would you say it is:  
 1) Very high \_\_\_\_\_  
 2) High \_\_\_\_\_  
 3) Neither high or low \_\_\_\_\_  
 4) Low \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Very low \_\_\_\_\_
2. What would you say is the one thing that most affects morale where you work?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

3. How important is the amount of pay you receive in affecting your overall attitude about your job? Would you say it is:
- 1) Very important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) Somewhat important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) Not very important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) Not important at all \_\_\_\_\_
4. Have you ever taken it out on your fellow employees when you were angry or frustrated with something at work?
- 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) No \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) If your answer is 'yes', can you give an example of what you do?  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) If your answer is 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(how often)
5. When you get angry or frustrated at work, does it affect how you act at home?
- 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) No \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) If your answer is 'yes', can you give me an example of what you do?  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) If your answer is 'yes', how often would you say this happens?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(how often)
6. How hard would you say it is for you to have to face coming into work everyday? Would you say it is:
- 1) Very hard \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) Somewhat hard \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) Not very hard \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) Not hard at all \_\_\_\_\_
- Can you explain why you feel this way?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

#### PART V:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| <p>1. Age</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>_____ under 20</td> <td>_____ 40 to 44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ 20 to 24</td> <td>_____ 45 to 49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ 25 to 29</td> <td>_____ 50 to 54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ 30 to 34</td> <td>_____ 55 to 59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ 35 to 39</td> <td>_____ 60 and over</td> </tr> </table> | _____ under 20    | _____ 40 to 44 | _____ 20 to 24 | _____ 45 to 49 | _____ 25 to 29 | _____ 50 to 54 | _____ 30 to 34 | _____ 55 to 59 | _____ 35 to 39 | _____ 60 and over | <p>2. Sex</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>_____ Male</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ Female</td> </tr> </table> | _____ Male | _____ Female | <p>3. Marital Status</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>_____ Single</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ Married</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ Separated</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ Divorced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____ Widowed</td> </tr> </table> | _____ Single | _____ Married | _____ Separated | _____ Divorced | _____ Widowed |
| _____ under 20                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | _____ 40 to 44    |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ 20 to 24                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | _____ 45 to 49    |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ 25 to 29                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | _____ 50 to 54    |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ 30 to 34                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | _____ 55 to 59    |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ 35 to 39                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | _____ 60 and over |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Male                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Female                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Single                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Married                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Separated                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Divorced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
| _____ Widowed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                   |                                                                                                                                |            |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |               |                 |                |               |
4. Have you ever been divorced?  
     \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
     \_\_\_\_\_ No
5. How many dependents do you have?  
     \_\_\_\_\_  
     (number)





- ☐ some college
- ☐ completed college
- ☐ some university
- ☐ completed university

15. Who is the principle wage earner in your household \_\_\_\_\_

16. What is your yearly income?

- |                                           |                                           |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> under 10,000     | <input type="checkbox"/> 30,000 to 34,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10,000 to 14,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 35,000 to 39,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 15,000 to 19,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 40,000 to 44,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 to 24,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> 45,000 to 49,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 25,000 to 29,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 50,000 and over  |

17. What is your religious preference?

- ☐ Protestant
- ☐ Catholic
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None

18. How active are you in this area?

- ☐ Very active
- ☐ Somewhat active
- ☐ Not very active
- ☐ Not active at all

## NOTES

### CHAPTER ONE:

1. Fredrick W. Taylor quoted in Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Common sense For Hard Times." New York, Two Continents Publishing Group, Ltd., 1976:60.
2. James O'Toole, "Work In America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare." Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1972.
3. Theodore Mills, "Human Resources - Why The New Concern?" in the Harvard Business Review, April, p. 120.
4. J. A. Lischeron and Toby Wall, "Employee Participation: An Experimental Field Study." In Human Relations, December, 1975, Pp. 863-884.
5. Theodore Mills, "What Is Quality of Working Life?" Labour Canada, Minister of Supply and Services, 1981, p.12.
6. Robert M. Guest, "Innovative Work Practices." Work in America Institute: Studies In Productivity. New York, Pergamon Press Inc., 1982.
7. Bruce Stokes, "Worker Participation - Productivity and the Quality of Work Life." Worldwatch, Paper No.25, December, 1978, p.5.
8. Business Week, May 11, 1981, Pp. 84-98.
9. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid. For an extensive discussion of the conflict at the Lordstown assembly plant see Stanely Aronowitz, "False Promises." New York, McGraw-Hill Co., 1973.
12. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit., p.19.
13. Theodore Mills, 1981, op. cit., p.7.
14. Bruce Stokes, 1978, op. cit., p.10.
15. Ibid., p.10.
16. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit., p. XVI.
17. Howard Watchel, "Class Consciousness and Stratification in the Labour Process." In Richard Edwards, M. Reich and T.Weisskopf eds., "The Capitalist System." Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1978, p. 284.
18. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit., p. 18.

19. Howard Wachtel, 1978, op. cit., p. 287.
20. James O'Toole 1972, op. cit.
21. See Mills, 1975, op. cit., for a discussion of the mood of the era. This is also discussed by Robert Lauer in his book "Social Problems and the Quality of Life." William C. Brown Publishers. Dubuque, Iowa, 1978.
22. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit., p. 32.
23. Ibid.
24. Stokes, 1978, op. cit., p. 11
25. This is discussed in Robert Blauner's work, "Alienation and Freedom." London, University of Chicago Press, 1964. He compares several types of work organization and their impact on worker alienation in this study.
26. Stokes 1978, op. cit., p. 12.
27. Charles A. Reich, "The Greening of America." Toronto, Ontario, Bantam Books of Canada, Ltd., p. 33.
28. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit.
29. Ibid., p. 18.
30. This type of approach is displayed in a series of documents published by the Ontario Ministry of Labour entitled, "Issues in the Quality of Working Life." They are produced by the Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre which is under the direction of Dr. Hans van Beinum and are aimed at groups which are trying to implement their own QWL programmes.
31. Theodore Mills, 1975, op. cit., p. 121.
32. In this regard a great deal of work was carried out in the mid-sixties at the Tavistock Institute in London. See, for example, F. E. Emery and E. L. Trist, "Socio-Technical Systems," in C.W. Churchman and M. Verhulst, eds., Management Science, Models and Techniques, Vol. 2, Oxford, Pergamon, 1960, Pp. 83-97. Also, F. E. Emery and E. Thorswd, Democracy at Work. Leiden Martinus Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, 1970.
33. David Jenkins, "QWL - Current Trends and Directions." In Issues in the Quality of Working Life, No. 3, December 1981. Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre, Ontario Ministry of Labour, p. 16.
34. Ibid.
35. This reflects the concept of alienation developed by Marx in, "The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1884," in "Writings of the

Young Marx on Philosophy and Society. Lloyd Easton and Kurk H. Guddat eds., New York, Anchor Books, 1976.

36. James Rinehart, "The Tyranny of Work." Don Mills Ontario, Academic Press of Canada, 1975, p. 83.
37. Ibid. See also the Work in America report for a discussion of the failure of the white collar jobs to meet their expectations in terms of non-alienating work.
38. Bertram Silverman and Murray Yanowitch eds., "The Worker in Post Industrial Capitalism." New York, The Free Press, 1974, p. 66.
39. Mills, 1981, op. cit., p. 1.
40. James Rinehart, 1975, op. cit., p. 83.
41. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit., p. 20.
42. Ibid., p. 39.
43. Margaret Levi, "Bureaucratic Insurgency," Lexington Mass., D.C. Heath and Co., 1977.
44. Harry Braverman, Labour and Monopoly Capital." New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974.
45. Bruce Stokes 1978, op. cit., p. 11.
46. This process is discussed at length by Philip Kraft in, "Programmers and Managers, The Routinization of Computer Programming in the United States." New York, Springer-Verlag. See also his work, "The Industrialization of Computer Programming," in Andrew Zimbalist ed., "Case Studies on the Labour Process." New York, Monthly Review Press, pp. 1-17.
47. Barbara Garson, "All the Livelong Day," Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1975.
48. The use of technology for control purposes is discussed by Richard Edwards in, "Contested Terrain." New York, Basic Books Inc., 1979.
49. Garson, 1975, ibid.
50. Charles Perrow, "Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay." Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979, p. 149.
51. Ibid., chapter 4.
52. Ibid., p. 152.
53. The notion of the "fiscal crisis of the state" is developed by James O'Connor and it indicates that the state will find it increasingly difficult to meet the demands which are placed on it. The potential

for conflict is especially high among white collar workers in the public sector of the economy since their jobs are controlled directly by the state and they are likely the ones who will be called on to make the largest sacrifices in times of economic restraint. Recent events in British Columbia involving public sector unions as well as the struggles involving the air traffic controllers are two examples of this type of conflict. For an expanded discussion of this and related issues see his book, "The Fiscal Crisis of the State," New York, St. Martin's Press, 1973.

## NOTES

### CHAPTER TWO.

1. Karl Marx, "The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844," in Lloyd Easton and Kurt H. Guddat eds., "Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society." New York, Anchor Books, 1976.
2. William Faunce, "Problems of an Industrial Society," New York, McGraw-Hill, 1981, p. 131.
3. Karl Marx in "Karl Marx: Early Writings," T. B. Bottomore ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964, p. 124.
4. Erich Fromm, "Marx's Concept of Man," New York, Fredrick Ungar Publishing Company, 1961, p. 106.
5. For a discussion of the philosophy of internal relations see Bertell Ollman, "Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalistic Society," Cambridge, Mass., Cambridge University Press, 1971.
6. Ibid, p. 14.
7. Karl Marx, "Capital. Volume One," in "Marx - Engels Reader," Robert C. Tucker, ed., New York, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968, p. 430.
8. This analysis of Marx's position is presented in James Rinehart, "The Tyranny of Work," Don Mills, Ontario, Academic Press, 1975.
9. Ibid., p. 19.
10. The argument about the use of technology for control rather than for explicitly efficiency reasons is made by the following authors among others; Stephen A. Marglin, "What Do Bosses Do?", The Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1974, Pp. 33-60; Dan Clawson, "Bureaucracy and the Labour Process," New York, Monthly Review Press, 1980; Howard Wachtel, "Class Consciousness and Stratification in the Labour Process," in Richard Edwards, et. al., "The Capitalist System," Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1978, Pp. 283-286.
11. Faunce, 1981, op. cit., p. 134.
12. For a discussion of the uses of alienation see the following authors among others; Joachim Isareal, "Alienation from Marx to Modern Sociology: A Macro-Sociological Analysis," Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1971; Alfred M. Lee, "An Obituary for Alienation," in Social Forces, Vol. 29, Summer, 1972, Pp. 121-127; Richard Schacht, "Alienation," Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970.
13. A discussion of this issue is presented in Archibald, 1976, *ibid.*, in which both aspects of this concept are examined. Seeman's work represents the type of approach most often described as a

psychological one while Rinehart outlines the elements of a structural definition. Seeman's position is outlined in his article. On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, 1959, Pp. 783-791. Rinehart's work, "The Tyranny of Work," was cited above. Archibald's discussion shows how both psychological and structural elements are included in the concept of alienation and he suggests that both can be used in an empirical examination of the concept.

14. See Faunce 1981, op. cit., for a discussion of Seeman's conceptualization of alienation.
15. Robert Blauner, "Alienation and Freedom," London, University of Chicago Press, 1964.
16. Rinehart, 1975, op. cit., presents a critique of psychological conceptualizations of alienation. He suggests that people need not be able to verbalize their alienated mental states in order for alienation to exist. He discusses an incident in Britain in which workers forcibly occupied their factory only one month after they had reported being satisfied with their jobs. This he says demonstrates the necessity to look at people's behavioural responses to work.
17. Iriwin Deutscher, "What We Say, What We Do," Glenville, Illinois, Scott, Foresman, 1973.
18. James Rinehart, 1975, op. cit., p. 18.
19. W. Peter Archibald, 1976, op. cit., Pp. 59-74.
20. Ibid., p. 34.
21. James Rinehart, 1975, op. cit., 17-18.
22. Understanding outbursts of violent behaviour as more than irrational actions is discussed by Laurie Taylor and Paul Walton in, "Industrial Sabotage: Motives and Meanings," in Stanley Cohen, ed., "Images of Deviance," Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1971, Pp. 219-245. This type of behaviour among juveniles is the focus of study in Elliott Leyton's book, "The Myth of Delinquency," Toronto, McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1979. Leyton argues that these seemingly purposeless, nihilistic acts are in reality encoded messages by these people and the task of the social scientist is to learn the codes. People behave in meaningful ways according to Leyton and this type of behaviour should be understood as such.
23. Richard Edwards, 1979, op. cit.
24. A number of excellent historical studies of the labour process have been published in recent years which characterize the intensity of the struggles which have gone on between management and labour. Among these are David Montgomery, "Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labour Struggles," Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979. See also Herbert Gutman, "Work,

Culture and Society in Industrializing America," New York, Vintage Books, 1977.

25. Charles Perrow, *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979.
26. This discussion of Marglin's position can be found in Stewart Clegg and David Dunkerely, *Organization, Class and Control*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., p. 343-344.
27. Stephen A. Marglin, 1974, *op. cit.*
28. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, *Common Sense for Hard Times*, New York, Two Continents Publishing Group, Ltd., 1976, p. 56.
29. Richard Edwards, *Contested Terrain*, New York, Basic Books, 1979, p. 17.
30. H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays In Sociology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1958.
31. Robert J. Antonio, "Domination and Production in Bureaucracy," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 44, No. 6, December 1979, Pp. 845-912.
32. Faunce, 1981, *op. cit.*, chapter 4.
33. Faunce, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
34. For a discussion of the meaning and impact of "domain assumptions", see Gouldner, Alvin W., *"The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology."* New York. Avon Books, 1970.
35. Harry Braverman, *"Labour and Monopoly Capital"*, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974, p. 91.
36. Quoted in Braverman, 1974, *ibid.*, p. 93.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
39. Clawson, 1980, *op. cit.*, p. 265.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
41. Braverman, 1974, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
42. *Op. cit.*, p. 33.
43. Richard Edwards, 1979, *op. cit.*
44. This argument is made explicit in James O'Toole, *"Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education*



- and Welfare," Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1972. This is also a central argument in Rinehart's book, "Tyranny of Work," op. cit.
45. Theodore Mills, "What Is Quality of Working Life?" Labour Canada, Minister of Supply and Service, 1981, p. 7.
  46. The work of Elton Mayo and his associates is described in Nicos Mouzelis, "Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories," Chicago, Illinois, Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.
  47. Perrow, 1979, op. cit., p. 91.
  48. Ibid. p. 98
  49. Ibid., p. 93
  50. One of the first theorists to point out the problems of the Human Relations approach was Harold Sheppard. See, for example, Sheppard, Harold L., "Managerial Sociology", unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 1948. This is also discussed in Sheppard, Harold L., "Approaches to Conflict in American Industrial Sociology." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. V, 1954, Pp. 324-340.
  51. Kerr, C. quoted in Perrow, op. cit., p. 95.
  52. Work in America, op. cit.
  53. Lloyd Zimpel ed., "Man Against Work," William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974, p. 178.
  54. Quoted in Faunce, 1981, op. cit., p. 171.
  55. Thomas Fitzgerald, quoted in Zimple, 1974, op. cit., p. 231.
  56. Edwards, 1979, op. cit., p. 12.
  57. Ibid.
  58. Ernest Mandel, "Marxist Economic Theory. Volume One," New York, Monthly Review Press, 1970. p. 131.
  59. Ibid.
  60. P. K. Edwards and Hugh Scullion, "The Social Organization of Industrial Conflict," Oxford, Basil Blackwell Publisher, Ltd., 1980.
  61. Ibid., p. 5.
  62. Ibid., p. 7.
  63. Steward Clegg and David Dunkerely, "Organization, Class and Control," London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980, p. 513.

64. Edwards, 1979, op. cit., p. 79.
65. The most blatant form of this type of control is slavery and even here, it is extremely expensive and ineffective. Chambliss and Seidman report that over four hundred slave revolts took place in the United States before the Civil War. This paints a picture of active resistance rather than passivity among these people. For a more complete discussion of this see William Chambliss and Robert Seidman, "Law Order and Power," Second Edition, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1982, p. 79.
66. C. Palloix quoted in Clegg and Dunkerely op. cit., p. 512.
67. Ibid., p. 134.
68. Ibid.
69. For a discussion of company unions and their affect see Hugh Beynon, "Working for Ford," Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1974.
70. Quoted in Richard Edwards, Michael Reich and Thomas Weisskopf eds., "The Capitalist System," Second Edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972, p. 269.
71. R. Garlin, quoted in Zimpel, 1974, op. cit., p. 155.
72. Bertram Silverman and Murray Yanowitch eds., "The Worker in Post-Industrial Capitalism," New York, The Free Press, 1974, p. 444.
73. Ibid.
74. This issue is discussed at length in Gerry Hunius, G. David Garson and John Case eds., "Workers' Control," New York, Vintage Books, 1973.
75. In particular, Clegg and Dunkerely discuss the work of Habermas in connection with the ideology which develops from experience with democracy. See Clegg and Dunkerely, 1980, op. cit.
76. David Jenkins, "QWL - Current Trends and Directions," in Issues in the Quality of Working Life, No. 3, December, 1981, Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre, Ontario Ministry of Labour.
77. Ernest Mandel, quoted in Clegg and Dunkerely, op. cit., 522.
78. This argument is made by RInehart, op. cit.
79. Daniel Zwerdling in Zimpel, 1974, op. cit., p. 319.
80. Daniel Zwerdling, "Workplace Democracy," New York, Harper and Row, Publishing Co., 1978, p. 8.
81. Carole Pateman in Hunius et. al., op. cit., p. 469.

82. Paul Blumberg, "Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation," London, Constable and Company, 1969, p. 123.
83. Evidence of this sort of cooperation is visible in a number of areas including "Perspectives on the Quality of Working Life; Proceedings of a Conference Hosted by the Ontario Quality of Working Life Advisory Committee," Toronto, Ontario, Ontario Ministry of Labour, October 15, 1980. Also, this was reported in a number of issues of "QWL Agenda" published by the Lansing Area Joint Labour-Management Committee which showed both labour and management leaders supporting QWL programmes. In particular see the July/August 1983 edition of this publication.
84. William Quchi, "Theory Z". Avon Publishers, New York, 1981.
85. Martin Glaberman discusses the contradiction inherent in the Japanese system and suggests that there is less harmony in this system than is immediately apparent. For example, he points out the relative powerlessness of the Japanese unions comparing them to company unions in Great Britain earlier this century. Also, he discusses the enormous power of the Japanese corporations in terms of their control over the labour market. If a Japanese worker is fired from a job at a large corporation, chances of finding comparable work in another corporation are limited by a form of informal blacklisting which goes on between these companies. Given the paucity of employment opportunities and the excess labour supply, it is not surprising that there is a degree of cooperation. However, Glaberman notes that the militancy of the Japanese workers is increasingly as their standard of living increases. See "Speaking Out," Vol. 2, Summer, 1982, Detroit, Michigan.
86. David Jenkins, 1981, op. cit.
87. Charles A. Reich, "The Greening of America," Toronto, Ontario, Bantam Books, 1970, p. 29.
88. Adam Smith quoted in Stephen A. Marglin, "What Do Bosses Do? The Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1974, p. 37.
89. This point is made by Bruce Stokes, "Worker Participation - Productivity and the Quality of Working Life," Worldwatch, Paper No. 25, December, 1975, p. 35.
90. The QWL material cited in this chapter takes this approach. For example see Jenkins, 1981, op. cit., or Mills, 1981, op. cit.
91. The issue of "compensation" versus "spillover" from work related activities is discussed by both Faunce
92. The distinction between various sectors of the economy including the monopoly sector is made by James O'Connor in "The Fiscal Crisis Of The State," New York, St. Martins Press, 1970.
93. Rinehart discusses this thesis which is most often associated with the work of J.H. Goldthorpe, D. Lockwood, F. Bechofer and J. Platt

entitled "The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure," Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

94. See for example Martin Meisner, "The Long Arm of the Job," in Canada: A Sociological Profile, Second Edition, W. E. Mann ed., Toronto, Copp Clark, Pp. 362-377.
95. Robert H. Lauer, "Social Problems and the Quality of Life," Second Edition, Dubuque, Iowa, Wm. C. Brown Company, 1978. p. 314.
96. Ibid., p. 312.
97. ibid., p. 312.
98. James O'Toole, 1972, op. cit.
99. Lauer, 1978, op. cit., p. 317.
100. For an extensive discussion of problems related to occupational safety and health see Charles E. Reasons, Lois L. Ross and Craig Patterson, "Assault On The Worker," Toronto, Butterworth and Co., 1981.
101. Lauer, 1978, op. cit., p. 317.
102. See Emery, F. E. and E. L. Trist, "Socio-Technical Systems", in C. W. Churchman and M. Verhulst, eds., "Management Science, Models and Techniques." Vol. 2, Oxford. Pergamon Press, 1960, Pp. 83-97. See also Emery F. E. and E. Thorsrud, "Democracy at Work." London. Martinus Nijhoff, Social Sciences Division, 1976.
103. Faunce, 1981, op. cit.
104. Edward Lawler III quoted in , "The Quality of Working Life," Volume One, Louis E. Davis and Albert B. Cherns and Associates eds., New York, The Free Press, 1975, p. 124.
105. Faunce, 1981, op. cit., 107.
106. Smucker, op. cit., p. 292.
107. Bryant, quoted in, "Work In The Canadian Context," Katherine Lundy and Barbara Warne Eds., Toronto, Butterworths and Co., 1981, p. xiii.
108. Richard Schacht, "Alienation," Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., 1970, p. 74.
109. Alan Fox, "Themes and Issues in Modern Sociology. A Sociology of Work in Industry," Jean Floud and John H. Goldthorpe eds., London, Collier-MacMillan Co., 1971, p. 12. Maslow's work and its use by advocates of QWL is also discussed by Lawler, 1975, op. cit.
110. Straus, quoted in, "Work and the Quality of Life," James O'Toole ed., Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1974, p. 47.

111. This is discussed by Faunce, 1981, op. cit., as well as in many of the articles which deal with the QWL approach and its advantages.
112. Theodore Mills, 1981, op. cit., p. 1.
113. A great deal of the QWL literature seems to appeal to altruistic and humanistic concerns which are difficult to reject. The use of "motherhood" issues may be a viable tactic for advocates of this approach given the types of differences and the historical posture of the constituencies that they have to make their appeal to.
114. The concept of the "definition of the situation" was developed by W.I. Thomas and informs much of symbolic interactionist theory. A discussion of this concept and its relation to the larger body of theory from which it developed is presented in, "Symbolic Interaction," Third Edition, Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer eds., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.
115. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Men and Women of the Corporation," New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1977, p. 10.
116. The importance of the notion of choice is presented throughout the work of Chambliss and Seidman op. cit.
117. Taylor and Walton in Cohen, op. cit., p. 219.
118. Clawson, 1980, op. cit., p. 31-37.
119. op. cit., Montgomery and Gutman.
120. For an excellent example of this type of work see Studs Terkel, "Working," New York, Random House, 1972. See also Garson and Brecher and Costello, op. cit.
121. op. cit., Kraft, Garson.
122. Brecher and Costello, 1976, op. cit., p. 59.
123. Chambliss and Seidman, 1982, op. cit.
124. Perrow, 1979, op. cit., p. 154.
125. Gouldner's example is presented in Perrow, 1979, op. cit.
126. See Gilbert Geis, "The Heavy Electrical Equipment Anti-trust Case of 1961," in "White Collar Crime," Gilbert Geis and Robert F. Meier eds., New York, The Free Press, 1977, Pp. 117-132.
127. Seymour Faber, "Working Class Organization," in Our Generation, Vol. 11, No. 3, Pp. 13-27.
128. Daniel Bell, "The End of Ideology," Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1960, p. 224.

129. Donald F. Roy, "Banana Time," in Human Organization, Vol. 18, No. 4, 1960, Pp. 158-165.
130. Bill Watson, "Counter-Planning on the Shop Floor," Boston, Mass., New England Free Press, 1971.
131. Ibid., p. 6.
132. Paul Romanow and Rita Stone, "The American Worker," quoted in Faber, 1976, op. cit.
133. F. J. Rothlisberger and W. F. Dickson, "Management and the Worker," Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1947, cited in H. F. Gardner, "Workers Reaction to the Post Office," published M.A. Thesis, University of Windsor, 1978.
134. Watson, 1971, op. cit. p. 7.
135. Bell, 1960, op. cit., p. 233.
136. Taylor and Walton, in Cohen, op. cit., p. 219.
137. Watson, 1971, op. cit.
138. op. cit., Faber, Roy.
139. op. cit., Faber.
140. Tullio Caputo, "School Organizational Structure and Student Behaviour," unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Windsor, 1978. See also Gardner, op. cit.
141. This is discussed in chapter 4 of Faunce's book, op. cit.
142. Ibid., p. 138.
143. Ibid, p. 161.
144. Ibid., p. 157.
145. Ibid., p. 157.
146. Ibid., p. 139.
147. Thomas M. Lodahl and Mathilde Kejner, "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement," in the Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 49, No. 1, 1965, Pp. 24-33. Also, Edward E. Lawler III and Douglas T. Hall, "Relationship of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction and Intrinsic Motivation," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 54, No.4, 1970, Pp. 313-315.
148. Ibid. Lawler and Hall, Pp. 24-25.
149. Ibid. Lawler and Hall.

150. Ibid. Lodahl and Kejner and Lawler and Hall.
151. M.M. Moch, "Job Involvement, Internal Motivation, and Employees' Integration Into Networks of Work Relations," Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 25, 1980, Pp. 15-31.
152. Ibid. Lawler and Hall, p. 307.

### CHAPTER THREE

1. Blissymbolics is a graphic augmentative communication system used by people who are, for a variety of reasons, unable to communicate verbally. It consists of a set of graphic symbols which have meaning in this system of communication.
2. Seymour Faber, "Working Class Organization," in *Our Generation*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1976, Pp. 13-27.
3. Item 1 in this scale had high loadings on both Factor One and Factor Three. This is understandable given the emphasis placed on good relations with coworkers expressed in Factor One. It's inclusion in this scale, however, rests on its use as a measure of morale. This is reflected in its loading on Factor 3. Factor 3 is difficult to interpret since it shows items with high loadings on a number of dimensions of morale and a person orientation to work. In addition to the high loadings on the item related to group interaction discussed above, high loadings in this factor were also visible on terms which reflect morale through the importance that people attach to work.
4. Michael K. Moch, "Job Involvement, Internal Motivation, and Employees' Integration into Networks of Work Relationships," *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol. 25, 1980, Pp. 15-31.
5. William A. Faunce, "Problems of an Industrial Society," New York, McGraw-Hill.



#### CHAPTER 4.

1. Richard Edwards, "Contested Terrain," New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1979, p. 160.
2. Charles Perrow, "Complex Organizations," Second Edition, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979, p. 160.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antonio, Robert J.  
1979 "Domination and Production in Bureaucracy." American Sociological Review. Vol. 44, No.6. December: 895-912.
- Archibald, Peter W.  
Theories of Alienation. Felix Geyer and David R. Schweitzer eds.
- Archibald, Peter W.  
1978 Social Psychology as Political Economy. Toronto, Ontario: McGraw-Hill, Ryerson Limited.
- Baran, Paul and Paul M. Sweezy  
1966 Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bell, Daniel  
1960 The End of Ideology. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Bernstein, Paul  
1976 Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics. Comparative Administration Research Institute: The Kent State University Press.
- Blauner, Robert  
1964 Alienation and Freedom. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Blumberg, Paul  
1969 Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation. London: Constable and Co.
- Bottomore, T.B. Ed.  
1964 Karl Marx: Early Writings. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Braverman, Harry  
1974 Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brecher, Jeremy & Tim Costello  
1976 Common Sense for Hard Times: The Power of the Powerless to Cope with Everyday Life and Transform Society in the Nineteen Seventies. New York: Two Continents Publishing Group. Ltd.
- Chambliss, William and Robert Seidman  
1982 Law, Order and Power. Second Edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

- Clawson, Dan  
1980      Bureaucracy and the Labor Process: The Transformation of U.S. Industry, 1860-1920. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Clegg, Stewart and David Dunkerley  
1980      Organization, Class and Control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- Cohen, Stanley, Ed.  
1971      Images of Deviance. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.
- Cote, Marcel and Visile Tega  
1980      The Industrial Democracy. Montreal, Que.: Les Editions Agence D'arc, Inc.
- Davis, Louis E. and Albert B. Cherns & Associates  
1975      The Quality of Working Life. Vol. #2 Cases and Commentary. New York: The Free Press.
- Deutscher, Irwin  
1973      What We Say, What We Do. Glenville, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- Dubois, Pierre  
1976      Sabotage in Industry. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Duncan, K.D., M. M. Gruneberg and D. Wallis, Eds.  
1980      Changes in Working Life. Proceedings of an International Conference on Changes in the Nature and Quality of Working Life. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Edwards, P.K. and Hugh Scullion  
1982      The Social Organization of Industrial Conflict: Control and Resistance in The Work Place. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher, Ltd.
- Edwards, Richard  
1979      Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Work Place in the Twentieth Century. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Edwards, Richard C., Michael Reich and Thomas E. Weisskopf  
1972      The Capitalist System: A Radical Analysis of American Society. Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Faunce, William A.  
1981      Problems of an Industrial Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Floud, Jean and John H. Goldthorpe Eds.  
1971      Alanfox, Themes and Issues in Modern Sociology. A Sociology of Work in Industry. London: Collier-MacMillan Co.

- Fromm, Erich  
1961 Marx's Concept of Man. With a Translation from Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts by T.B. Bottomore. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Gardner, H.F.  
1978 Workers Raction to the Post Office. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Windsor.
- Garson, Barbara  
1975 All the Livelong Day. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Gerth, H.H. and C.W. Mills  
1958 From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guest, Robert H.  
1982 "Innovative Work Practices." Work in America Institute Studies in Productivity. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Gutman, Herbert  
1977 Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hackman, Richard J. and Mary Dean Lee  
1979 Redesigning Work: A Strategy for Change. Highlights of the Literature. Work in America Institute Studies in Productivity. Scarsdale, New York: Work in America, Inc.
- Hill, Stephen  
1981 Competition and Control at Work: The New Industrial Sociology. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.
- Hunnius, Gerry, G. David Garson and John Case Eds.  
1973 Workers' Control: A Reader on Labor and Social Change. New York: Vintage Books.
- Isarael, J.  
1971 Alienation from Marx to Modern Sociology: A Malro-Sociological Analysis. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jamieson, Stuart  
1971 Times of Trouble: Labour Unrest and Industrial Conflict in Canada, 1900-66. Ottawa: Information Canada.
- Jenkins, Daivd  
1981 "Current Trends and Directions" Issues in the Quality of Working Life. No.3, December. Ontario Ministry of Labour.
- Johnson, Walter. Ed.  
1975 Working in Canada. Montreal, Que.: Black Rose Books, Ltd.

- Kanter Moss, Rosa Beth  
1977 Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Kanungo, Rabindra, N.  
1982 Work Alienation: An Integrative Approach. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Kraft, Philip  
1979 "The Industrialization of Computer Programming: From Programming to 'Software Production'", in Andrew Zimbalist (ed), Case Studies on the Labour Process. New York: Monthly Review Press. Pp. 1-17.
- Kraft, Philip  
1977 Programmers and Managers, The Routinization of Computer Programming in the United States. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kochan, Thomas A., Daniel J.B. Mitchell and Lee Dyer (Eds.)  
1982 Industrial Relations Research in the 1970's: Review and Appraisal. Industrial Relations Research Association Series.
- Lauer, Robert H.  
1978 Social Problems and the Quality of Life. Second Edition. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Lee, Alfred M.  
1972 "An Obituary for Alienation" in Social Forces Vol. 20, Summer. Pp. 121-127.
- Lichtman, Richard  
1970 An Outline of Marxism. Toronto: Forum House Publishing Company.
- Lischeron, J.A. and T. D. Wall  
Dec. "Employee Participation: An Experimental Field Study."  
1975 Human Relations. Pp. 863-884.
- Lundy, Katherine and Barbara Warne  
1981 Work in the Canadian Context: Continuity Despite Change. Toronto: Butterworths and Co. Canada, Ltd.
- Mandel, Ernest  
1970 Marxist Economic Theory. Vol. 1. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Marglin, Stephen A.  
Summer, "What do Bosses Do? The Origins and Functions of Hierarchy  
1974 Capitalist Production." The Review of Radical Political Economics. Vol. 6, No.2, Pp. 33-60.

- Mars, Gerald  
1982      Cheats At Work: An Anthropology of Work Place Crime.  
London: Unwin Paperbacks.
- Marx, Karl  
1968      Capital. Volume One. In Marx-Engels Reader. Robert C.  
Tucker, Ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc.
- Marx, Karl  
1967      The Economic and Philsophic Manuscripts (1844) Writings of  
The Young Marx on Philosophy and Society. Lloyd D. Easton  
and Kurk H. Guddat. Eds. New York: Anchor Books.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels  
1947      The German Ideology: Part One. C.J. Arthur Ed. New York:  
International Publishers, Co., Inc.
- Meissner, M.  
1971      "The Longarm of the Job: Social Participation and the  
Constraints of Industrial Work", in Canada: A Sociological  
Profile, 2nd Edition, Edited by W.E. Mann. Toronto: Copp  
Clark. Pp. 362-377.
- Meltzer, Loren  
1978      Worker Alienation: Highlights of the Literature. Work in  
America Institute Studies in Productivity. (Scarsdale, New  
York: Work in America, Inc.
- Miller, Richard B. (Ed.)  
1977      Participative Management Quality of Work Life and Job  
Enrichment. Park Ridge, New Jersey: Noyes Data Corpora-  
tion.
- Mills, T.  
April      "Human Resources - Why the New Concern?" Harvard Business  
1975      Review. Pp. 120-134.
- M. M. Moch  
1980      "Job Involvement, Internal Motivation, and Employees Inte-  
gration into Networks of Work Relationships," Organizational  
Behaviour and Human Performance. 25, Pp. 15-31.
- Montgomery, David  
1979      Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of  
Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles. Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press.
- Mouzelis, Nicos P.  
1967      Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern The-  
ories. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co.

- O'Connor, James  
1975 "Productive vs. Unproductive Labor." Politics and Society, Vol. 5, No.3.
- Ollman, Bertell  
1971 Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalistic Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Toole, James Ed.  
1974 Work and the Quality of Life: Resource Papers for Work in America. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- O'Toole, J.  
1972 Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Quchi, William G.  
1981 "Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet The Japanese Challenge." New York: Avon Publishers Inc.
- Parness, Steven  
1978 Productivity and the Quality of Working Life. Highlights of the Literature. Work in America Institute Studies in Productivity. Scarsdale, New York: Work in America Institute, Inc.
- Perrow, Charles  
1979 Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Reasons, Charles E., Lois L. Ross and Craig Paterson  
1981 Assault on the Worker: Occupational Health and Safety in Canada. Toronto: Butterworth and Co., Ltd.
- Reich, Charles A.  
1970 The Greening of America. Toronto, Ont.: Bantam Books of Canada, Ltd.
- Reich, Wilhelm  
1972 Sex-Pol Essays 1929-34. Lee Baxandall (Ed.), Vintage Books.
- Rinehart, James W.  
1975 The Tyranny of Work. Don Mills, Ontario: Academic Press Canada.
- Rinehart, J., Susan Wheller and Seymour Faber  
1976 Our Generation, Vol. 11, No.3, Summer.
- Romanow, Paul and Rita Stone  
Summer The American Worker in Faber, Seymour. Working Class  
1976 Organization. Our Generation, Vol. II, No.3.

- Rosenberg, Michael M., Robert A. Stebbins and Allan Turdwetz  
1982        The Sociology of Deviance. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Rothlisberger, F. J. and William F. Dickson  
1947        Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Cited in Garner, H.F. Workers Reaction to the Post Office. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Windsor.
- Roy, Donald F.  
1960        "Bananatime: Jobs Satisfaction and Informal Interaction" Human Organizations, Vol 18, No.4, Pp. 158-165.
- Schacht, R.  
1970        Alienation. Garden City: New York, Double Day and Company, Inc.
- Seeman, M.  
1959        "On the Meaning of Alienation". American Sociological Review. Vol. 24. Pp. 783-791.
- Silverman, Bertram and Murray Yanowitch (Eds.)  
1974        The Worker in "Post-Industrial" Capitalism: Liberal and Radical Responses. New York: The Free Press.
- Simon, Herbert A  
1976        Administrative Behaviour: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization. Third Edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Smucker, Joseph  
1980        Industrialization in Canada. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd.
- Stokes, Bruce  
Dec.        Worker Participation - Productivity and the Quality of Work  
1978        Life. Worldwatch Paper 25.
- Stone, Katherine  
1974        "The Origins of Job Structures in the Steel Industry." The Review of Radical Political Economics. Vol. 6, No.2. Summer Pp. 61-97.
- Tepperman, Jean  
1976        Not Servants, Not Machines. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Terkel, Studs  
1972        Working. New York: Random House.
- Vanek, Jaroslav (Ed.)  
1975        Self-Management: Economic Liberation of Man. Selected Readings. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.



- Watson, Bill  
1971 "Counter-Planning on the Shop Floor". Boston, Mass.: New England Free Press.
- Watson, Bill  
1971 "Counter-Planning on the Shop Floor". Boston, Mass.: New England Free Press.
- Weber, Max  
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press.
- Wilson, H.B.  
1974 Democracy and the Workplace. Montreal, Que.: Black Rose Books, Ltd.
- Witte, John F.  
1980 Democracy, Authority, and Alienation in Work: Workers' Participation in an American Corporation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zimpel, Lloyd (Ed.)  
1974 Man Against Work. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Zwerdling, Daniel  
1978 Workplace Democracy: A Guide to Workplace Ownership, Participation and Self-Management Experiments in United States and Europe. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.