

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7908834

PRICE, RAYMOND LEON
AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES
OF UNION LEADERS TOWARD APPLICATION OF JOB
ENRICHMENT THEORY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, D.B.A., 1978

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

RAYMOND LEON PRICE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES
OF UNION LEADERS TOWARD APPLICATION OF
JOB ENRICHMENT THEORY

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

By
RAYMOND L. PRICE
Norman, Oklahoma

1978

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES
OF UNION LEADERS TOWARD APPLICATION OF
JOB ENRICHMENT THEORY

APPROVED BY

L. D. Bishop
Chairman

Thomas M. Estes

Robert Stephens

David A. Wren

James A. Constantine

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
PREFACE	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	9
Research Questions	10
Narrative Hypotheses	12
Population of the Study	13
Questionnaire	18
Scope and Limitations	19
Organization of Study	19
II. LITERATURE RESEARCH	21
Motivation: A Cursory Review	21
Job Enrichment: A Beginning	27
Job Enrichment: Conceptualized	32
Job Enrichment: Evaluation	35
Major Conclusions Drawn from the Literature Research	39
III. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	41
Survey Instrument	41
Analysis Procedures	43
Chi Square Analysis	43
Test of Proportions	50
Scales of Questionnaire Parts I and III	51
Narrative Comments	52
Responses to Questionnaires	52

Chapter	Page
IV. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	54
Research Questions	54
Hypotheses Discussion	80
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION	93
Summary	93
Recommendation for Future Job Enrichment Applications	101
Recommendation for Future Studies	102
Conclusion	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104
APPENDICES	
A. Labor Category Distribution	110
B. Questionnaire Package	119

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Methodologies for Evaluating Research Questions	44
2. Methodologies for Evaluating the Narrative Hypotheses	46
3. Chi Square Values for Varying Degrees of Freedom at .05 Probability Level	49
4. Responses of Union Leaders Concerning Whether Firms with Which They Bargain Use Job Enrichment Concepts	55
5. Fundamental Opposition to Job Enrichment by Labor Group	58
6. Frequency of Labor Types by Good Result/Poor Result Responses	61
7. Responses on the Attitude Survey Part III, Questions 1-8 by Public versus Private Sector	64
8. Distribution of Attitude Survey by Whether Respondents Are Bargaining with Firms Using Job Enrichment Techniques	66
9. Distribution of Respondents' View of Job Enrichment Concepts by Whether the Union Leaders Have Dealt with Firms Using Job Enrichment Concepts	67
10. Distribution of Responses to Provisions on Job Enrichment in Current Contracts by Labor Group	69
11. Distribution of Responses to Plans on Future Bargaining Concerning Job Enrichment by Labor Group	71

Table	Page
12. Distribution of the Responses as to Whether the Union Has Sponsored Research by Labor Group	72
13. Distribution of Responses as to Whether the Membership Has Given the Union Leaders a Mandate to Bargain on Job Enrichment	74
14. Distribution of Responses by Labor Group as to Whether They Have Had Formal Training on Job Enrichment Concepts	76
15. Distribution of Whether Union Leaders Feel Their Membership Understands Job Enrichment by Labor Category	77

PREFACE

The by-products of this study have been of enormous benefit to me. The relationship and interaction with union officers represents a high point of my academic career. The knowledge gained about the union structure and specific organizations will be very valuable to my career growth. The insight provided me by local labor presidents was truly helpful in designing and administering this study.

My hope is that this study will be of interest to those in the management field regardless of their primary interests. I also hope that this dissertation will stimulate students and practitioners to study this particular subject for more refinement and further contributions to the common body of knowledge of management thought.

It would be impossible to thank everyone responsible for helping me complete this research work. However, without the constructive critiques, guidance, patience, and support of Dr. L. Doyle Bishop, David Ross Boyd Professor of Management, University of Oklahoma, this project would not have been completed.

I also express my appreciation to the other members of my committee, Dr. Daniel Wren, Dr. James Constantin,

Dr. Dennis Crites, and Dr. J. Kirker Stephens all of the College of Business Administration, University of Oklahoma. Without their sacrifices from their busy schedules this study would not have been possible.

I will be eternally indebted to Dr. Anne Woolf, Professor of Human Relations, University of Oklahoma, for her many hours of technical consultation concerning the problems surrounding the field of labor involved in this study. Also my many thanks to Dr. A. B. Schwarzkopf, Professor of Mathematics, Dr. James Horrell, College of Business, and Dr. Eric Enwall, Professor of Chemistry, all with the University of Oklahoma, Dr. Robert Kane, Veterans Hospital, Oklahoma City, and Dr. Charles Booze, Federal Aviation Administration, Oklahoma City, for their contributions in the field of statistics.

I would certainly be remiss if I did not show my gratitude to Dr. Norris Griffith without whose support this paper simply would not have been completed. Not only did he offer technical support, but also he provided the empathy, concern, and guidance that stimulated me to finish the project.

I also extend my appreciation to Ms. Karen Hayes, Ms. Norma Price, and Ms. Marty Peters for their assistance in the typing, editing, and clerical effort of this study. To all of those who helped, I extend my thanks; however, my very special thanks is given to my wife Norma for her patience, empathy, and contribution during this endeavor.

I take full responsibility for the contents of the manuscript. I alone am responsible for any errors found by the reader.

R.L.P.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The post-World War II years have been marked by technological advances and social upheaval coming at an unprecedented rate. The resulting changes in attitudes and expectations of individuals toward their work have played, and will continue to play, an important role in productivity.

According to recent studies¹ the attitudes and beliefs of today's changing work force may be becoming quite costly in terms of poor performance on the job.

(1) Almost sixty-six per cent of the current work force believe that their employers can give them a ten cent per hour increase immediately without any effect on profits.

(2) Approximately eighty per cent of the workers believe that their employers benefit from increased productivity at the expense of the workers.

(3) The average United States citizen believes that corporate profits are twenty-eight cents on the sales dollar versus an actual four cents for manufacturing and two cents for retail businesses.

Another area of changing attitudes toward work can be seen from the increase in welfare costs from \$6 billion in 1965 to over \$11 billion in 1973. Today there are more

¹Louis E. Tagliaferri, "Understanding and Motivating the Changing Work Force," Training and Development Journal, Vol. 29, No. 6 (June, 1975), pp. 18-22.

people on welfare than during the depression years of the 1930's.²

The changing age of the work force, the changing role of women in the work force, the shorter work week, and the possible changing of retirement ages are all significant factors in the changing make up of the work force and the resulting attitude of the workers.³

The apparent ever-changing worker attitude appeared to indicate the application of job enrichment concepts as a meaningful area of investigation. Library research gave evidence of the diverse views in the literature relating job enrichment theory. Mitchell Fein⁴ in his Motivation for Work criticizes the findings of such authorities in the field as Milton R. Blood, Charles L. Hulin, M. Scott Myers, and Frederick Herzberg as not effectively coping with the motivation of the unskilled worker. In addition, Schoderbek and Reif,⁵ in a poll of 276 companies from the Fortune 500, found that fewer than twenty per cent were using what they termed "job enlargement." However, most of

²Ibid., p. 19.

³Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973), pp. 11-13.

⁴Mitchell Fein, Motivation for Work (Norcross, Georgia: Rand McNally and Company, 1974).

⁵Peter B. Schoderbek and William E. Reif, Job Enlargement: Key to Improved Performance (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1969), p. 58.

these firms were not using any real techniques of job enrichment; rather the firms were simply adding tasks at the same responsibility level or, in other words, horizontal loading.

Job specialization and job design is certainly not a new topic to students of management theory, dating at least back to Adam Smith and his Wealth of Nations in 1776. The approach has generally been that of minimizing cost of training for the employee, while so simplifying the task that high skill could be obtained and consequently production cost per piece is lowered. Only in the last two or three decades has the real impact of monotony to the worker been recognized as a deterrent to the desired productivity and efficiency of the worker as associated with job specialization. As early as 1958 behavioral scientists, while attempting to find an alternate route for achieving worker productivity and based on Frederick Herzberg's⁶ Pittsburg studies, had developed an approach for job design called "job enrichment." Job enrichment as an approach to job design has goals of worker stimulation through intrinsic content in such jobs of responsibility, challenge, and other satisfiers. A part of job enrichment, of course, which is hoped for in the overall results, is that workers enjoying these design characteristics of their work would also be more productive.

⁶M. Scott Myers, "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. 42, No. 1 (January-February, 1964), pp. 73-88.

Purpose of the Study

Some of the diversified viewpoints found in the literature may possibly be attributed to the lack of a composite record of union leaders' attitudes toward job enrichment. Therefore, review of the attitude of union leadership toward the use of this motivation technique appeared necessary in order to establish a base of information.

There will be five main benefactors from this study. They are labor leaders, management in industry and government, academicians, students of management, and workers.

First to be examined are the labor leaders. During preliminary discussions on this study, the labor leaders showed interest for the following reasons:

1. From the study they can obtain a composite viewpoint of their peers for future policy in negotiation and training.
2. Since unions are like any other type of business, the study results will provide competitive information to their hierarchy.
3. The study results will provide a base of experience with application of job enrichment techniques; thus giving the union leader information which he can use to evaluate the impact of implementing job enrichment techniques for his membership.

Union leadership in the United States represents

over 27 million workers, or somewhat over a quarter of the work force. A knowledge of union leaders' attitudes is required in order to evaluate the future of job enrichment as a motivating technique.

The power of the union leader is certainly not a secret to any manager. The attitudes of the leadership of the unions can be seen in politics, labor negotiations, and local community affairs. The attitudes of the leadership of union organizations are a paramount factor in any interaction between the firm and the union. To this writer's knowledge no one before this survey had asked the leaders of unions in the United States their attitudes toward job enrichment. However, as will be seen in Chapter II, there had been speculation by some writers as to the union leaders' attitudes. Also, as is noted in Chapter II, certain union leaders' remarks about the concept of job enrichment had been published. Whether this represented the majority view will be forthcoming with the analysis of the survey results.

The second group of benefactors is industrial and governmental managers. Many writers assume that the theory of job enrichment application is good. There may be serious doubt concerning this issue. Management needs to know and understand labor leaders' thoughts and behavior if it is to be effective at the bargaining table. It is one thing for managers to think they understand their employees,

but to understand their adversary's viewpoint is totally different. Management has no way of getting this information except through research of this nature.

The third benefactor is the academician. This study will provide additional classroom material, fill literature gaps, and allow the classroom teacher to integrate management and union leader attitudes for the student. The teacher will also find knowledge deficiencies from the study, thus discerning where additional training and research programs could be beneficial to union organizations and management.

Fourth, the student of management theory can improve his knowledge level with information obtained in this study. He will have data and information that can stimulate additional studies. He will for the first time be able to begin to understand why labor leaders have in some cases fought application of job enrichment.

Finally, the foremost benefactor may well be the worker. For it is the worker that has been battered from "pillar to post," while his job has been redesigned and reconfigured with new standards, all in the name of job enrichment. Union leadership and industrial management have placed the worker in a difficult position. Students of management theory must start research work to find solutions that will ultimately benefit the worker. This study is a step in that direction.

Therefore, the primary purposes of this study are

the following:

1. To provide academicians and other interested individuals with union leaders' views toward the concept of, use of, and interest in job enrichment techniques as applied to their membership.
2. To gather for the union leaders a common base of information for their use and dissemination.
3. To contribute to the common body of knowledge concerning management theory.
4. To provide those implementing job enrichment techniques a construct within which to work.
5. To determine the level of training that has been or should be provided for union leadership concerning the concept of job enrichment.
6. To ascertain the percentage of unions bargaining with organizations using job enrichment techniques to gain a comprehension of the level of use and attention that union leaders are giving to the concept.
7. To determine whether union leaders want the use and application of job enrichment techniques for their membership and whether there are any conditions associated with the application or use.
8. To discern whether there are diverse viewpoints between the public and private sectors, and whether there are differences within groups in the two sectors concerning the use of job enrichment concepts.

9. To provide information as to the level of knowledge of job enrichment theory within the union structure.
10. To determine whether there has been union-sponsored research in the area of job enrichment.
11. To determine the percentage of unions that now have job enrichment applications existing in their current contracts.
12. To discern union leaders' perceptions of the definition of job enrichment.
13. To discern union leaders' understanding of the term job enrichment.
14. To determine other research areas that need to be studied relating to the concept of job enrichment application.

Foremost is the area of academic surveillance. Many of the writers speak frequently of how well research has shown that enrichment theory is working. Yet on the other hand, as will be shown in Chapter II, certain writers have their doubts. One of the reasons this student suspects that there is doubt as to the benefits of job enrichment concepts is that union leaders may not want job enrichment promulgated in their organizations. Thus, purpose number one is to determine whether they want job enrichment and if so, under what conditions.

Another important aspect is the union leaders' knowledge of job enrichment. When the issue is presented at

the bargaining table by management, do the union leaders know and/or understand the concept? Do those union leaders perceive the concept in the same framework as the negotiating team of management? Specific questions in the survey questionnaire address this issue.

Has the application of job enrichment had a negative impact? If so, how? In what way? Again these questions need answers if management theory is to progress in the area of job enrichment use.

The purpose of this paper is not to clear up all the contradiction in the literature; however, if students can understand union leadership attitudes, then future studies will have a direct data base from which they can begin.

Definition of Terms

In order to insure clarity and continuity of thought, the following definitions are provided for the reader:

1. Horizontal Loading--The adding of tasks to a job wherein the task is on the same level with the job now being performed; e.g., Herzberg on washing dishes versus washing silverware.
2. Hygiene Factors--Those factors expected on the job by the employee, such as pay, working conditions, fringe benefits, and supervisory policy. These factors tend not to satisfy, but rather aid in establishing dissatisfaction if they are not

sufficiently available.

3. Job Enlargement--An increase in the number of tasks a worker is given so that his job can grow and become more interesting but not necessarily including increases in challenge, decision making, or authority.
4. Job Enrichment--A redesign of jobs and tasks with the goal of enriching work by adding to it greater responsibility, challenge, variety, and/or independence.
5. Job Rotation--The movement from one task to another on the same level, such as different locations on an assembly line.
6. Vertical Loading--The addition of tasks to a job that is above the current accepted level of performance providing more responsibility, challenge, variety, and/or independence.

Research Questions

Research questions that are asked by this survey are as follows:

1. What percentage of union leaders has dealt with firms which use job enrichment techniques?
2. Do union leaders want job enrichment techniques applied to the jobs of their membership?
3. Union leaders' preferences notwithstanding, i.e., question number two, are there other factors

influencing a different course of action?

4. According to the survey, which labor categories have jobs to which job enrichment techniques may feasibly be applied?
5. Are there significant differences in attitudes toward job enrichment techniques between the leaders of the public versus private sector unions?
See Appendix A.
6. Are there significant differences in attitudes toward job enrichment concepts between the union leaders who have experiences with firms using job enrichment techniques and those who have no experience with firms using these techniques?
7. Do union leaders agree with the definition of job enrichment as defined in this study?
8. Do any of the unions responding to the survey have provisions relating to job enrichment in their current contracts, or are there any plans for the unions to bargain on this particular issue?
9. Has there been union-sponsored research in the area of application of job enrichment techniques?
10. Do union leaders feel that their membership want job enrichment application to be a bargaining issue?
11. What percentage of union leaders has formal training on the concept of job enrichment?
12. Do union leaders feel that their membership understands

the concept of job enrichment?

13. Have there been cases, in the opinion of union leadership, in which the use of job enrichment techniques produced undesirable results for the union and its membership?
14. Is there a difference in the extent to which job enrichment use has penetrated the various labor groups?

Narrative Hypotheses (Null Form)

In order to reach the objectives of this study and to ascertain answers to the above questions, the following hypotheses have been constructed:

1. There is no significant difference in the knowledge level of job enrichment concepts between those union leaders who bargain with firms using job enrichment techniques and those union leaders who have not had that experience.
2. There is no significant difference in the attitude toward job enrichment concepts between those union leaders who bargain with firms using job enrichment techniques and those union leaders who do not have that experience.
3. Union leadership does not want job enrichment techniques applied to the jobs of their membership.
4. There is no significant difference in the degree to which job enrichment applications have penetrated

- the various labor categories. (See Appendix A.)
5. There is no significant difference in union leaders' attitudes toward job enrichment concepts between the public and private sectors. (See Appendix A.)
 6. Labor leaders do not have a current mandate from their membership to take the issue of job enrichment to the bargaining table.
 7. Labor leaders do not intend to take job enrichment as an issue to the bargaining table.
 8. Formal training has not been given to labor leaders concerning the issue of job enrichment.
 9. There is no significant difference in labor leaders' perception of results expected for application of job enrichment techniques to various labor categories.

Population of the Study

The selected population for this study includes 229 presidents or presiding officials of unions or national associations currently on the records of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Questionnaires were mailed to each.⁷ Appendix A shows a breakdown of the unions into public and private sector groups. Within each sector the groupings are classified as follows:

⁷United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Directory of National Unions and Employee Associations, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976).

A. Public

1. Professional--Those unions representing employees engaged in activities as described by the Taft-Hartley Act that are of a mental nature, requiring exercise of discretion and judgment, where the output cannot be standardized within a given time frame and requiring knowledge in an advanced field of science or technology.⁸
2. State--Those unions/associations solely dedicated to representing state employees. A telephone survey of state associations and unions found that the majority of the membership was of a laborer, clerical, or non-professional nature. Since states have a rather unique problem of representing a heterogenous group, they were classified into a separate group.
3. Other--All other public unions not primarily representing membership in the above categories.

B. Private

1. Craft--Those unions whose membership must have a license, certification or apprenticeship to perform the individual's trade.
2. Production/Manufacturing and Construction--
Those unions whose membership does not fit into

⁸United States Statutes at Large, 80th Congress, 1st Session 1947, Vol. 61, Part 1, Title 29, Paragraph 153, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1948.

craft classification, yet are associated directly to a physical product.

3. Service--All other private sector unions whose membership is not in those shown above.

The above classifications were derived for this research project by interpreting the official name associated with the union and, in some cases, by contacting those union headquarters whose titles were not self-explanatory. The system of coding is discussed later; however, it should be noted that henceforth when the term "labor category" is used, it is one of the above items listed in Appendix A.

This study is limited to the highest union official in each union structure and it is that person who was asked to complete the questionnaire (Appendix B). The main reason for the selection of this level of person was that, in order to answer the research questions, the respondent would need to have knowledge and appreciation of the concept of job enrichment. The rank and file would be more likely not to have the required understanding. During the process of editing the questionnaire packet with a field test, it was found that the outstanding difficulty was with the concept or definition of job enrichment. Use of regular membership sampling would only serve to compound this problem of definition. National negotiation is accomplished or at least heavily influenced by the top level leadership of the union. In order to ensure that the results of this study reflected

the attitude that management would face across the bargaining table, it was determined to use the highest level possible. The membership may well influence the bargaining position, but when the actual bargaining occurs, it is the attitude of top union leadership that impacts management's position.

With only 229 questionnaires, it was possible to obtain viewpoints from all unions currently registered with the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Membership sampling of 27 million workers would require far greater response for representative sampling, which would not be economically feasible for this student. Utilization of this approach allowed the possibility for all unions to respond and curtailed the large expense associated with membership's large rolls.

The incentive to complete the questionnaire package would be greater for the union president than it would be for the union member. The study results that will be discussed later, as well as the long run benefits, can be seen by union top management, whereas these same results may not necessarily be clear to a machine worker on an assembly line.

One of the key research questions concerned the possibility that union leaders may not want job enrichment applied to the work of their membership. As will be discussed in Chapter II, the literature records an instance where the application of job enrichment may have caused the membership to vote the union out of its representation rights.

This kind of data could only be obtained from the union leaders.

Finally, the use of the membership would not serve one of the targets of this dissertation. This student wants to establish as a literary base the need for a reevaluation of the whole operational approach to job enrichment application. In private interviews with local labor leaders and membership personnel, this student discovered that the membership typically felt that their jobs would be redesigned. Consequently, they would be doing more work for the same pay. However, most of the labor leaders interviewed could see the need for job enrichment if implemented properly. For these reasons, the decision was made to use top level union officials.

The population comprised 229 labor leaders in the following groupings:

A. Public:

1. Professional	11
2. State	30
3. Other	<u>24</u>
Sub Total	65

B. Private:

1. Craft	34
2. Production/Manufacturing and Construction	66
3. Service	<u>64</u>
Sub Total	164

The respondents returning the survey instrument will be treated as the sample of the population. There is no feasible way to assure proof of a representative sample. The common method of establishing a normal curve for age, education, years of experience, or years as a union officer was not possible since the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not keep descriptive information on the union leaders.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix B) was divided into four parts: Part I was a tool for determining perception of the job enrichment concept. Part II was intended to collect certain descriptive data. Part III was the actual attitude survey. Part IV consisted of three open-ended questions.

The survey instrument was coded with a number, as shown in Appendix B, in the upper right hand corner. Also, the return envelope was coded immediately below the return address with the corresponding code. Each member of the population received the original form. Forty-five days later those individuals who had not responded received a follow-up package (see Appendix B). Thirty days following the second mailing this writer telephoned each prospective participant who had not responded to the second request.

The instrument was field tested by six local union presidents, a representative of the AFL-CIO, three academicians, and two retired union leaders.

Scope and Limitations

This study was limited to those in a position of union leadership. It was not intended to sample the membership of unions, and it was not designed to compile the viewpoints of managers in government or industry. This study was not intended to ascertain the impact of job enrichment programs except as perceived by union leaders. It was only designed to discern certain data concerning union leaders' knowledge and attitude toward job enrichment programs. As a by-product it also offered this writer the opportunity to gather certain demographic information concerning the current use of job enrichment techniques. Finally, this study was not constructed to clarify all the discrepancies in the literature. For instance, the purpose is not to clarify the dispute discussed in Chapter II where Mitchell Fein criticized Frederick Herzberg's research methodology and findings.

Organization of Study

Chapter I, Introduction, contains a review of the purpose of this study, definition of terms used during the study, a statement of the hypotheses, a discussion of the respondents in the study, and a discussion of the survey instrument.

Chapter II contains a library research on the concept, use, and results of job enrichment techniques. As a lead-in

to the subject matter, this writer also discusses motivation history in order to show how job enrichment concepts integrate into motivation theory. Also this chapter covers job design as an integral force in the use of job enrichment techniques.

Chapter III contains a description of the instrument, scales, statistical tools; and relates the hypotheses and research questions to the methodology as well as to the various research instrument questions.

Chapter IV contains a description of the findings and discussion of the tables associated with the findings. Also, integrated into this chapter is a narrative summary of the open-ended questions.

Chapter V contains the summary of the findings, the conclusions and recommendations gleaned from this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE RESEARCH

Motivation: A Cursory Review

The question of motivation has puzzled man throughout history. Early Greek philosophers explored this question in discussions that would later be part of a concept known as hedonism.¹ In 1789, Bentham, in his book, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, stated that mankind is governed by two sovereign motives, "pain and pleasure."² Thus Bentham viewed self-interest as being the main motive of human conduct. As will be discussed later, this hedonistic approach is still a prominent factor in contemporary literature.

In the early 1800's Robert Owen manifested his belief in concern for the worker. He felt that an entrepreneur should provide the same, if not better, care for

¹Joseph A. Schumpeter, History of Economic Analysis (edited from manuscript by Elizabeth Boody Schumpeter; New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 66.

²Ibid., p. 131.

the worker than one would employ toward his machinery.³ It was almost a century and a half before the establishment of the so-called human relations school; yet, Robert Owen saw the necessity for a positive program of motivation for the work force.

Two other leading theoreticians of the pre-Hawthorne era were Max Weber and Frederick Taylor. Weber, a German sociologist and economist, developed a concept known as the Protestant Ethic.⁴ This concept for the first time gave rise to the idea that ambition to reap profits was not only acceptable to society, but prudent. As stated by Wren⁵ the corollaries developed with this concept: ". . . had a significant impact on the motivations of men leading to a spirit of enterprise."

The following quote from Frederick Taylor synthesizes his attitude toward the concept of motivation.

When a naturally energetic man works for a few days beside a lazy one, the logic of the situation is unanswerable; "Why should I work hard when that lazy fellow gets the same pay that I do and does only half as much work?"⁶

³Daniel A. Wren, The Evolution of Management Thought (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972), p. 66.

⁴Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), pp. 157-173.

⁵Wren, op. cit., p. 27.

⁶Frederick W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1947), p. 31.

Obviously, Taylor was oriented to the "economic man." To him it was natural for man to want to make more money; however, it was unnatural for man to want to work (natural soldiering). The problem, as Taylor viewed it, was to locate the "one best way" to accomplish any given task and to identify a reasonable day's wages for a reasonable day's work.

Taylor had many disciples who helped to propagate his ideas on motivation and "scientific management." However, not all of them agreed completely with Taylor's approach to job design. Henri Lawrence Gantt concurred with Taylor in his concept of money as a motivational force but was not convinced that Taylor's differential piece rate was adequate to obtain cooperation between labor and management.

Gantt devised a piece-rate for the foreman as well as the worker and pushed for a strong harmonious relationship between worker and supervisor.⁷ Gantt was one of the earliest pioneers of the scientific management era to direct major interest to the human being. He pleaded for wide recognition of the human factor in management and recognized that influence on employee behavior was not limited to the financial aspects of employment. Historically, one can begin to see the concepts that would later be promulgated by the Hawthorne studies.

In addition to the pre-Hawthorne contributors

⁷Wren, op. cit., pp. 148-151.

mentioned above, one should also give credit to Lillian Gilbreth for her role in concern for the worker. Her attempts showed how scientific management would promote, not repress, the individual and which continued to foster the growth of motivation theory that is now found in contemporary literature.⁸

The Hawthorne studies, conducted at the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric in Chicago, were designed to investigate the cause and effect relationship between the qualities of the work environment and the productivity and well-being of the worker. The initial experiment conducted by the National Research Council in the mid 1920's had so many varied and inconsistent results that nothing conclusive was found. The Council's study looked at the relationship between illumination and individual efficiency. After a considerable amount of research involving controlled and experimental groups, it was shown that the level of illumination had no significant differential effect between the controlled and experimental groups.

It was at this time that George Penncock, Western Electric's Superintendent of Inspection, asked a group from Harvard University to become involved with the Hawthorne experiment. This group included such notables as Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger, T. North Whitehead, William Dickson, and others from Western Electric and academia. In looking

⁸Ibid., p. 168.

at the increased production which had occurred since the inception of the experiments, Elton Mayo hypothesized that a change in the mental attitude of the group was responsible. This idea launched a new era in management thinking and marked the beginning of the Human Relations Movement.⁹

One can see the bridge beginning to be built between the scientific management era and that of the human relations era through the work of Chester Barnard. Barnard's focus was on motivating the worker by effective management techniques and leadership qualities.¹⁰ Barnard combined research on leadership with studies of the reactions of employees to the leader and was an advocate of correlating the personalities of the worker and manager, as well as considering other factors involving reactions to direction.

The next two decades, roughly 1940-1959, following the contributions from the Hawthorne studies, were filled with follow-up studies, new experiments, and additional books and articles, all resulting from the concept that there just might be more to work than the so-called "hygiene" factors. Students of management now had to work with new terms such as "recognition," "feeling of belonging," "appreciation for a job well done," and that ubiquitous term "satisfaction."

⁹Ibid., pp. 275-299.

¹⁰Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, originally published 1938 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).

In an effort to understand and account for human behavior, many theoreticians looked at the drive, wants, or needs that tend to motivate man. In 1936, A. H. Maslow took this approach to motivation when he developed his famous "hierarchy of needs." According to Maslow's theory, certain needs act as motivational forces for man. He felt that an individual must partially fulfill certain needs before he can become concerned with others, thus placing these needs in a hierarchial arrangement. The hierarchy is, respectively, physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-fulfillment needs.

Physiological needs include physical survival, that requires food, shelter, clothing and other basic drives for self-preservation. When the physiological needs have been reasonably satisfied, the next higher motivational level is the individual's need for safety. The safety needs concern both physical and economic security. Protection against danger, threat, deprivation, and economic insecurity exemplifies this category. The social needs of belonging, giving and receiving love and acceptance are the next set of motivational factors. Following social needs, in the hierarchical arrangement, are the esteem needs, relating to the egotistical needs, self-esteem and reputation. The needs relating to self-esteem include among others such needs as self-respect, self-confidence, autonomy, competence, achievement and knowledge. The reputational needs refer to

such elements as status, recognition, appreciation, and respect. At the summit of the hierarchy are the self-fulfillment needs for realizing one's potentialities, for expression, and for creativity.¹¹

Maslow's hypothesis served as the cornerstone for much of the contemporary writing and current management thought relating to the subject of motivation.

Job Enrichment: A Beginning

One of the outgrowths of the Hawthorne studies was the so-called human relations school of management thought. In 1957 Keith Davis defined human relations as "the integration of people into a work situation in a way that motivates them to work together productively, cooperatively, and with economic, psychological, and social satisfaction."¹² What more could one want as a result of job enrichment programs than Dr. Davis' definition of human relations?

It took Douglas McGregor to shake the foundation of management's post-World War II economic success. He accentuated the point that the traditional concept of rating the performance of employees might be demeaning to the individual worker. His alternative to tradition focused on the concept of including the employee in the process of establishing

¹¹Robert A. Sutermeister, People and Productivity (2nd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960), pp. 83-103.

¹²Keith Davis, Human Relations in Business (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957), p. 4.

standards and objectives, then allowing the employee to rate himself against these pre-established standards.¹³

One can see the change which occurred during the late fifties and through the post-Herzberg era in many ways. Chris Argyris' work exemplified the changed pattern in that his initial works focused on the individual personality as it is integrated into the organization.¹⁴ A decade later after many publications and experiments, his latest major work focused on the fact that job enrichment is one means of circumventing the blocks imposed on the individual's growth by the organizational structure.¹⁵

Likert in his "Motivation Approach to Management Development," published a decade before Herzberg coined the term "enrichment," and following the theme of McGregor, stated, "The aim of reviewing the subordinate's performance is to increase his effectiveness, not to punish him."¹⁶ He essentially duplicated the problem on which McGregor had

¹³Douglas McGregor, "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 35, No. 3 (May-June, 1957), pp. 89-94.

¹⁴Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization: The Conflict between the System and the Individual (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1957).

¹⁵Chris Argyris, Management and Organizational Development (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971).

¹⁶Rensis Likert, "Motivational Approach to Management Development," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 32, No. 4 (July-August, 1959), pp. 75-82.

focused and discussed the ways to motivate employees through performance appraisal techniques.

In 1959, Herzberg reported research findings that suggested that man has two sets of needs: his need as an animal to avoid pain and his need as a human to grow psychologically.¹⁷ It was through the findings of this research that he would later develop his "dual factor" or "motivation-hygiene" theory of motivation.

McGregor's Human Side of Enterprise¹⁸ stressed the behavioral approach that people may want and need work as much as they need recreation and relaxation. He argued for avenues which would allow the employee to be creative and constructive, while also allowing the employee to use his fullest capacity. McGregor's motivation philosophy was derived from his realization that people do not hate work, are capable of making intelligent decisions, and are motivated to achieve objectives in which they have a part in establishing. McGregor, independent of Herzberg, helped to lay the ground work for satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

In 1964 M. Scott Myers,¹⁹ using the results of Herzberg's Texas Instruments studies of the late 1950's,

¹⁷M. Scott Myers, "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. 42, No. 1 (January-February, 1964), pp. 73-88.

¹⁸Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960).

¹⁹Myers, op. cit., pp. 73-88.

described how supervisors can integrate into their repertoire of skills certain key factors Herzberg had titled motivators. Myers pointed out that to gain effective use of motivators, they must be used on a day-to-day basis in the decision-making process. Effective use of the motivators provides reinforcement of leadership skills and can be effected through proper training. Finally, he stated that motivation techniques must be integrated into the management process. As early as 1964 Myers clearly foresaw the coming of enrichment as a motivating technique. During this same time frame, Victor Vroom developed models to measure the predictions of valences of outcomes and forces toward behavior. In his initial tests, Vroom found very little correlation between job satisfaction and job performance.²⁰

In 1966 Herzberg described how the so-called hygiene factors (potential dissatisfiers) affected the individual saying that the individual is not dissatisfied if given the hygiene factors but at the same time is not satisfied or motivated. In other words, one is not necessarily happy with more pay, but he is not unhappy. The individual is at zero level if provided the hygiene factors.

In his motivation-hygiene theory, Herzberg described the hygiene factors as those factors whose absence could lead to dissatisfaction of the worker with his job. The

²⁰Victor H. Vroom, Work and Motivation (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 262.

motivation factors he described are those which potentially could lead to satisfaction or motivation. The motivation factors, or satisfiers, that stand out as strong determiners of job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement, with the last three being of greater importance for lasting change of attitudes.²¹

The hygiene factors, or dissatisfiers, consist of such major factors as company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.²²

The "dissatisfiers," unlike the "satisfiers," consistently produce short term changes in job attitudes and are rarely involved in events that lead to positive job attitude.

Herzberg said the absence of hygiene factors can potentially make a person less dissatisfied, but at the same time, if present, do not necessarily motivate the person. The work cited above was Herzberg's foundation for his classic article of 1968 which coined the term enrichment as discussed in the next section.

Concurrent with Herzberg's studies, Charles Hulin and Milton Blood were involved in research concerning the use of, techniques of implementation for, and worker attitudes toward motivation. Although their general conclusions

²¹Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man (3rd ed.; Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1969), p. 71.

²²Ibid., p. 74.

toward job enlargement were mostly negative,²³ they later encountered positive worker response to job enrichment.²⁴ They concluded that the concepts put forth by the job enlargement theme based on individual differences, worker responses, and cultural backgrounds of the worker could be discounted. In this same study one gets his first hint of the disenchantment of the future when Hulin and Blood found that job size or job level is not necessarily related to job satisfaction.

Job Enrichment: Conceptualized

By 1968 "job enrichment" was beginning to evolve as a meaningful term in management literature.²⁵ Frederick Herzberg labeled job additions which build up job size as being horizontal enlargement, "the adding of nothingness to nothingness." He claimed that meaningful work can only come from what he called job enrichment, a vertical loading of new responsibilities to the job to include such things as:²⁶

²³Milton R. Blood and Charles L. Hulin, "Alienation, Environmental Characteristics, and Worker Responses," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 51, No. 3 (June, 1967), pp. 248-290.

²⁴Charles L. Hulin and Milton R. Blood, "Job Enlargement, Individual Differences, and Worker Responses," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 69, No. 1 (January, 1968), p. 48.

²⁵Frederick Herzberg, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. 46, No. 1 (January-February, 1968), p. 59.

²⁶Ibid., p. 60.

- A. Removing some controls while retaining accountability.
- B. Increasing the accountability of individuals for their own work.
- C. Giving a person a complete natural unit of work (module, division, area, etc.).
- D. Granting additional authority to an employee in his activity; job freedom.
- E. Making periodic reports directly available to the worker himself rather than to the supervisor.
- F. Introducing new and more difficult tasks not previously handled.
- G. Assigning individuals a specific or specialized task enabling them to become experts.

Herzberg firmly believed that the use of the vertical loading would provide job satisfaction leading to higher productivity. Paul, Robertson, and Herzberg found that job enrichment seeks to improve both the task efficiency and human satisfaction by means of building into peoples' jobs greater scope for personal achievement and its recognition, more challenging and responsible work, and more opportunity for individual advancement and growth.²⁷

Lawler, in his studies,²⁸ found that what he called horizontal loading resulted in better quality but not necessarily better productivity. He did not have sufficient

²⁷William J. Paul, Keith B. Robertson, and Frederick Herzberg, "Job Enrichment Pays Off," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 47, No. 2 (March-April, 1969), p. 61.

²⁸Edward E. Lawler, III, "Job Design and Employee Motivation," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Winter, 1969), p. 432.

evidence to prove the impact of vertical loading effects; however, Roche and MacKinnon²⁹ found that meaningful work did correlate with higher motivation.

Patchen, in his work with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), found positive success in motivation through the use of participation, importance of challenge, perception of common goals, and improved self-image.³⁰

Sirota and Greenwood in support of job enrichment stated, "Job autonomy appears in the literature under a number of labels--e.g., 'participative management,' 'consultative management,' 'democratic management'--and is assumed to be a major goal of most employees."³¹

Presented here were just a few of the multitude of writers that were all expounding on the beneficial effects of using enrichment techniques. However, as shown in the next section the early 1970's literature brought strong criticism of job enrichment as it was being applied by government and industry.

²⁹William J. Roche and Neil L. MacKinnon, "Motivating People with Meaningful Work," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 48, No. 3 (May-June, 1970), pp. 97-110.

³⁰Martin Patchen, Participation Achievement and Involvement on the Job (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

³¹David Sirota and J. Michael Greenwood, "Understand Your Overseas Work Force," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 49, No. 1 (January-February, 1971), p. 60.

Job Enrichment: Evaluation

The early research results concerning job enrichment were primarily supportive of the concept; however, as one moves to the present, the literature becomes more critical of the impact of using job enrichment. M. Scott Myers reported an extreme case in which as a result of the introduction of job enrichment, the union's influence diminished to the point that workers no longer wanted the union and voted to eliminate it.³² It was predictable that conflict would surface between the union structure and management concerning the application of job enrichment.

William W. Winpisinger, vice-president of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, referred to job enrichment as "psychic penicillin."³³ He stated, "If you want to enrich the job, enrich the paycheck. The better the wage, the greater the satisfaction."³⁴ He asserted that worker dissatisfaction diminished with age because older workers had accrued more of the kinds of job enrichment that unions had fought for--better wages, shorter hours, vested pensions, a say in their working conditions,

³²M. Scott Myers, "Overcoming Union Opposition to Job Enrichment," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 49, No. 3 (May-June, 1971), p. 47.

³³William Winpisinger, "Job Enrichment--Another Part of the ~~Process~~, ~~Proceedings~~ Proceedings of the Annual Winter Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association (Toronto, Canada, 1972), p. 154.

³⁴Ibid., p. 154.

and promotion on the basis of seniority. He added that this is the kind of job enrichment that unions believe in and that it is the kind for which they will continue to fight. In support of his antagonistic stand against job enrichment, he stated that he had never once carried into negotiations a membership mandate to seek job enrichment.³⁵ He believed that the rank and file want management to leave their jobs alone.

In theory, job enrichment implementation makes performing the job intrinsically satisfying to the union membership which, in turn, motivates the worker to be more productive. It should also lead to lower absenteeism and turnover, less tardiness, and less alienation.

However, some workers may have grown discontented with their unions since unions have tended to emphasize extrinsic rewards in the bargaining processes. There is recent evidence that alienated workers may be less loyal to their unions than non-alienated workers and that workers in jobs with little intrinsic satisfaction are least favorably inclined toward unions regardless of their age.³⁶ Some unions seem to deny that there is a problem with job satisfaction while others have been slow to acknowledge it. From experience, some union officials are suspicious

³⁵Ibid., p. 154.

³⁶Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973), p. 113.

of any changes introduced by management and therefore view job enrichment as yet another scheme to reduce the size of the work force by extracting every ounce of productivity from the worker. In the book Work in America, sponsored by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of the United States Government, studies were cited in support of job enrichment as a motivating technique, although it is somewhat qualified as follows:

However, work redesign is not the only or a sufficient response to the problems we enumerate. For some workers, their jobs can never be made satisfying, but only bearable at best. Other workers may be in relatively satisfying jobs, but after many years on the same job, they may wish to change their careers. Still others, ill-prepared by their education, may want to enlarge their choices through additional education and training.³⁷

However, in that same study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Albert Epstein of the Machinists and Aerospace Workers, said, ". . . if the trade unions have not dealt energetically with this question, it is because they were absorbed with other issues which seem more important to them. . . . There is nothing inherent in the trade union structure which must necessarily prevent it from taking up the question. . . ." ³⁸

Union officials may not support job enrichment because they may thrive on the adversary relationship between the workers and management. If job enrichment

³⁷Ibid., p. xviii.

³⁸Ibid., p. 113.

increases satisfaction and strengthens the relationship between the worker and the company, it stands to reason that the union's influence over the worker may diminish since the worker may need the union to a lesser degree.

A leading adversary of job enrichment application and use was an individual from the academic ranks. Mitchell Fein showed that the previous high rating for the concept of job enrichment may have been somewhat overstated. He was critical of Herzberg's research as is shown by the following:

But were the employees in the studies representative of blue collar employees in factories? The findings of this study were not necessarily relevant wherever people are being managed who are typical of those in the study. Blue and white collar workers have different aspirations and goals from managerial employees--who made up the entire population of this Herzberg study. Workers and managerial employees may react differently under the same circumstances.³⁹

Fein did not believe job enrichment was a viable tool for the unskilled; thus, he believed that any enrichment practices will only broaden the gap between the skilled and unskilled.⁴⁰ Fein believed that job enrichment is profitable for the manager but actually has been detrimental to the individual. He argued:

When management establishes a job enrichment program to involve its employees in job improvements, it violates a basic principle of job evaluation. Employees are encouraged to work at higher skill levels than those for which the job was evaluated. The universal principle followed in relations between management and

³⁹Mitchell Fein, Motivation for Work (Norcross, Georgia: Rand McNally and Company, 1974), p. 14.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 17.

employees is that employees are only required to perform tasks of a skill level commensurate with those listed in the job description. When additional skill requirements are added, the job is always re-evaluated. On what grounds does management violate this principle and accept work of a higher skill level without properly compensating the employee?⁴¹

Scanlan argued that certain hygiene factors influence job satisfaction to a greater degree perhaps than much of the literature has supported.⁴²

H. R. Smith argued that managers tend to resist implementing job enrichment because of its psychological impact of encroachment on their jobs. He stated:

The complication arises because managers exhibit tendencies to preoccupy themselves with trees rather than the forest; . . . As that is often said, it is a continuing problem to get managers to delegate "properly." Psychological, personal security, factors persistently prod bosses to resist letting others do some of the things they will themselves be held responsible for. Significantly, furthermore, that resistance is sometimes carried to the point of jeopardizing the managerial careers of those who most tenaciously exhibit it. Here is eloquent testimony to the operation of the logic of power--even at the expense of other kinds of organization logic.⁴³

Major Conclusions Drawn from the Literature Research

Management and workers probably have different goals, aspirations, and needs. Their outlooks on job enrichment

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁴²Burt K. Scanlan, "Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Productivity," Personnel Journal, Vol. 55, No. 1 (January, 1976), p. 13.

⁴³H. R. Smith, "From Moses to Herzberg: An Exploration of Job De-Enrichment," Academy of Management Proceedings, Thirty-third Annual Meeting (August, 1973), p. 308.

also differ since job enrichment predicts that increased job satisfaction will increase motivation and raise productivity. When workers raise productivity, the company benefits, and in some cases the work force could be reduced by eliminating some of the workers. This reduction makes management look efficient, but the workers may suffer. Therefore, workers may not have incentive to cooperate. Management, of course, does not intend such results, but the system may operate in this manner.

The literature research shows that academicians do not agree on the job enrichment issue. Certainly some union leaders have presented valid arguments (from their viewpoint) against it. Myers stated as early as 1968 that "the informed manager no longer needs to be convinced of the merits of job enrichment . . . the desirability of job enrichment is no longer in question. . . ." ⁴⁴ It was this student's desire to ascertain union leaders' attitudes, conceptual viewpoints, understanding, and ideas relative to the use of job enrichment among their membership, that set the framework for the study discussed in the next chapter.

⁴⁴M. Scott Myers, "Every Employee a Manager," California Management Review, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Spring, 1968), p. 9.

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Survey Instrument

The approach of this study was to use a questionnaire (see Appendix B) as a data collection instrument which was mailed to the 229 international and national public and private sector union presidents or the equivalent offices as earlier described on page 13. The categories of the union leaders were to be stated by them by checking the appropriate item from the following list that was defined on the instrument:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| A. <u>Public</u> | B. <u>Private</u> |
| A-1 Professional | B-1 Craft |
| A-2 State | B-2 Production,
Manufacturing,
and Construction |
| A-3 Other | B-3 Service |

A definition of job enrichment differentiating it from job enlargement was furnished these leaders on the front page of the instrument, as well as a brief reference to the designated parts of the questionnaire. Respondents were promised a copy of the results if desired, by their placement of a check mark on the block so defined on the front page of the survey document. A discussion of the major

parts of the questionnaire follows:

Part I--This part was necessary in order to determine the knowledge level of the respondents. The questions were designed to determine whether the respondent defined job enrichment in the same manner as in this study. In the opening statement of the question, the words "if used properly" were darkened with heavy ink in order to draw attention to that point. The scale approach is discussed later in this chapter.

Part II--This part of the instrument was designed to collect demographic data. Primarily polar type responses were requested, yet certain percentages were also requested as explanatory information. Certain questions in this part will be used in concert with the knowledge level in Part I and with the attitude survey in Part III in order to classify the data into specific groupings.

Part III--This part of the instrument was designed to obtain the attitudes of the union leaders toward the use and application of job enrichment techniques. The questions were worded to avoid the so-called "halo" effect, yet provide the controversial points required to ascertain true attitudes.

Part IV--This part was primarily open-ended questions that allowed the respondent to share additional experiences and thoughts with this writer. Although Question 2 in this part was demographic in nature, and the sub part of Question 2 allowed the respondent to reply to specific conditional acceptance of job enrichment application.

Analysis Procedures

Tables 1 and 2 shown on the following pages are procedural charts that will be followed in Chapter IV during the discussion of the findings. All statistical tests were conducted at the 95 per cent confidence level.

Chi Square Analysis

The following discussion of the chi square analysis approach as it pertains to data of this study is based on Sidney Siegel's¹ test for independence of samples as expressed in response frequencies. This methodology is applicable not only to the scales used in Parts I and III of the survey instrument, but also is used in the analysis of certain demographic data which can be treated as scale response.

As discussed in the previous section, all scale frequencies are treated as having equal weight in determining respective chi square values. Although Siegel's discussion with examples is given for 2 x k arrays, the general equation for chi square which he cites is that for an array of multiple sizes defined as r x k.

The general equation for taking sums to determine experimental chi square values is:

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 104-111.

TABLE 1
METHODOLOGIES FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question	Instrument		Methodology
	Part Numbers	Question Numbers	
1.	II	1.	Responses to this question will be treated on a universal basis of percentages responding "yes," "no," and "do not know." Discussion will follow on the sub parts of the same question.
2.	IV	2.	See Table 2, Item 3.
3.	IV	2.	This will be a subjective treatment of explanations given by those showing conditional acceptance of job enrichment as related to their comments. Also, a proportions test will be used to see if a significant frequency of the respondents replied in any set response pattern.
4.	II	7.	See Table 2, Item 9.
5.	III	1-8.	See Table 2, Item 5.
6.	II III	1. 1-8.	See Table 2, Item 2.
7.	I II	1-6. 1.	See Table 2, Item 1.
8.	II II	3. 4.	Response to this question will be treated on a universal basis of percentages responding "yes" or "no." Discussion will follow on the sub part of this same question.

TABLE 1--Continued

Research Question	Instrument		Methodology
	Part Numbers	Question Numbers	
			Chi square analysis will be applied to determine if there are differences in distribution between the public and private sectors. Also, see Table 2, Item 7.
9.	II	8.	Responses to this question will be treated on a universal basis of percentages responding "yes," "no," or "do not know."
10.	II	2.	See Table 2, Item 6.
11.	II	5.	See Table 2, Item 8.
12.	II	6.	Responses to this question will be treated on a universal basis of percentages responding "yes," "no," and "do not know." Discussion will follow on the sub parts of the same question. The subject of this question is whether or not union leaders feel their membership understands the concept of job enrichment.
13.	IV	1.	Responses to this question will be treated subjectively in terms of written statements in response to this open ended question in the instrument concerning results of job enrichment application.
14.	II	3.	See Table 2, Item 4.

TABLE 2

METHODOLOGIES FOR EVALUATING THE NARRATIVE HYPOTHESES

Narrative Hypotheses	Instrument		Methodology
	Part Numbers	Question Numbers	
1.	I II	1-6. 1.	All respondents as a composite of the unions who answered "yes," "no," or "do not know" in Part II, Question 1 concerning firms with which they bargain which use job enrichment also responded to Part I, Questions 1-6, the knowledge level measure of the instrument. These two response categories yield to a chi square check through the response rate frequencies in an array of 3 rows x 5 columns (from the 5 point scale) for each of the six questions of Part I.
2.	II III	1. 1-8.	All respondents as a composite of the unions who answered "yes," "no," or "do not know" in Part II, Question 1 concerning firms with which they bargain which use job enrichment techniques also responded to Part III, Questions 1-8, the attitude survey. The method here will be identical to that of Hypothesis 1, except that there are eight arrays of 3 rows x 5 columns instead of six arrays.
3.	IV	2.	Three sets of respondents from public sector unions and three sets from the private sector gave "yes," "no," or "conditional" answers regarding fundamental opposition to job enrichment concepts. Thus chi square checks will be performed pitting three sets of respondents of each sector versus said responses to form 3 x 3 arrays. Since the public and private sector sets can then be

TABLE 2--Continued

Narrative Hypotheses	Instrument		Methodology
	Part Numbers	Question Numbers	
			summed as like respondents, an overall chi square test of array size 2 x 3 will be performed. In addition, a test of proportions will be used to reject or accept the null hypothesis. This test will be processed against the frequency of those answering "yes" in order to determine if the frequency of "yes" answers is significant.
4.	II	3.	A similar chi square is arranged as that described for Hypothesis 3, except that there will be only "yes" and "no" response frequencies; therefore, the array sizes are 3 x 2 for each of the public and private sets of respondents and 2 x 2 for their respective composites. The subject to be evaluated will be whether respondents have provisions in current contracts on job enrichment.
5.	III	1-8.	All unions of the two sectors responding to the attitude questions of Part III, Items 1-8 allow composite arrays of public versus private sector response frequencies versus the five point scale so that there will be a 2 x 5 array in each of the eight cases subject to a chi square test.
6.	II	2.	The treatment here will be similar to Hypothesis 4 in terms of array size, responses, and respondent categories. The subject is whether there is a membership mandate for bargaining on job enrichment.

TABLE 2--Continued

Narrative Hypotheses	Instrument		Methodology
	Part Numbers	Question Numbers	
7.	II	4.	The chi square test here will be identical with that for Hypothesis 3 except that the responses are "yes," "no," and "undecided" on the subject of whether union leaders intend to make an issue of job enrichment during the bargaining process.
8.	II	5.	The chi square test here will be identical with that for Hypothesis 4 but the subject is that of whether union leaders have received formal training on the subject of job enrichment.
9.	II	7.	The subject for this hypothesis will be to determine if union leaders would expect "good" or "poor" results if applied to each of the six labor categories whether public or private sector. It will be subject to a chi square test with each of the labor categories paired with one of the others to form 2 x 2 arrays when response frequencies of "good" and "poor" are tabulated for the categories.

$$x^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

Where: O_{ij} = observed number of cases categorized in the i th row of the j th column.

E_{ij} = number of cases expected under H_0 to be categorized in the i th row and the j th column.

$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k$ directs one to sum over all (r) rows and all (k) columns.

The hypotheses and research questions dealt with herein are when tested by chi square procedures treated as null statements which will either be rejected or not rejected on the basis of whether computed chi square values respectively exceed or are less than those found in Table 3.

TABLE 3

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR VARYING DEGREES OF FREEDOM AT .05 PROBABILITY LEVEL²

Degrees of Freedom	1	2	3	4	5	8	10
x^2	3.84	5.99	7.82	9.49	11.07	15.51	18.31

In situations wherein there is assurance of data having come from the same basic population, respective response frequencies will be added from their sub-categories to form composite values of frequencies which will then be subjected to chi square analysis. This cannot be done

²Ibid., p. 249.

unless there is strong similarity of population from which the responses are obtained, such as organizations from the public versus the private sector. In other cases such combinations are not appropriate since chi square variates are assumed to be independent of each other when coming from differing populations; e.g., one would not be proper in combining response frequencies from sub-categories of the blue collar workers and white collar workers in order to analyze a difference with some such third or other category.

In all cases the rejection of a null statement is based upon the value of the computed chi square having exceeded an expected or acceptable probability level of .05 such as that shown in Table 3. Degrees of freedom with arrays $r \times k$ are computed by taking the product of $(r-1)(k-1)$.

Test of Proportions

When it was desired to test whether the proportion of a given response was .5 a parametric test was used in order to reject or accept the null hypothesis. Based on a binomial distribution, the test used can be shown in the following formula:

$$z = \frac{x - np}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$$

Where: x = the frequency of responses in that particular parameter.

n = the number of observations in the sample.

p = assumed to be .5.

z = the computed value of the test which serves as the indices for acceptance or rejection.

The variable p was given the value of .5 because under a random distribution, one could normally expect the respondents to be equally divided between the "yes" answer and the other response. At the 95 per cent confidence level the "Z" value must be between -1.96 and +1.96 in order to accept the null hypothesis.³

Scales of Questionnaire
Parts I and III

The scales used in Parts I and III of this study all involve five points entitled Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Indifferent (I), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). In designing Parts I and III of the instrument this writer subjectively chose to have a structure of an odd number of possible responses across the scale in order to have a point of neutrality at the center. Five points were chosen rather than three, seven, or greater because human beings need more refined judgments than those demanded by a three point scale, and that the same people would have difficulty in distinguishing levels of agreement or disagreement beyond two choices each. Neither does this writer believe it appropriate nor feasible to

³William C. Merrill and Karl A. Fox, Introduction to Economic Statistics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 298-300.

assign weights to points on this scale; thus, the applicability of a method of analysis using chi square techniques. Kerlinger refers to such weighting equality as that applying to summated scales. The preceding discussion on scales is a summary of Kerlinger's statements in the cited reference.⁴

Narrative Comments

The narrative responses to the open-ended questions will be summarized by certain types of statements and listed and discussed in Chapter IV in concert with the statistical analysis. Since anonymity was promised during the survey, there will be no quotes identified by name, with certain quotes restated or edited appropriately. The summaries will be integrated as applicable to discussion of research questions and narrative hypotheses.

Responses to Questionnaire

The data shown below identifies the responses by sector group:

Public	
Professional	8
State	19
Other	<u>16</u>
Sub Total	43

⁴Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 484-485.

Private:

Craft	15
Production/Manufacturing and Construction	28
Service	<u>29</u>
Sub Total	<u>72</u>
Overall Total	115

This represents 50 per cent of the survey instruments mailed to the potential respondents. The formula shown below can be used to ascertain the accuracy level one can expect with a given sample size:⁵

$$\sigma_p = \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N-1}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{PQ}{n}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\frac{229-115}{228}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(.5)(.5)}{115}}$$

Where: N = Population size

 n = Sample size

σ_p = Standard error of the proportion

 P and Q = the estimated proportions of the sample size.

Therefore, 95 per cent of the time ($\pm 2\sigma_p$) one can expect that the proportions obtained from a sample of this size would be within 6.6 per cent of the population value. In analyzing the non responses characteristics, this writer finds no major areas that would alter the results if the total group had responded.

The various forms of data responses are now taken up in their appropriate detail and for analysis in Chapter IV, Findings and Analysis.

⁵William G. Cochran, Sampling Techniques (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963), pp. 74-75.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The procedure of this chapter will be, first, to apply the methodologies outlined in Tables 1 and 2 as related to research questions and narrative hypotheses with appropriate discussion and interpretation. Second, open-ended question responses will be taken up as it may be desirable over and above their contribution to evaluations of data associated with Tables 1 and 2.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

The research question is: "What percentage of union leaders has dealt with firms which use job enrichment techniques?"

Table 4 reflects the proportion of union leaders who deal with firms which use job enrichment techniques. From the 115 total responses, 25 responded "yes" to Part II, question 1. The percentages shown in sub-parts of the question range from one per cent to 100 per cent. From these data it is estimated that the unions are aware of approximately

TABLE 4

RESPONSES OF UNION LEADERS CONCERNING WHETHER FIRMS
WITH WHICH THEY BARGAIN USE JOB ENRICHMENT CONCEPTS

Type Group	Number of Yes Responses	Per Cent of Firms Using Job Enrichment Techniques	Per Cent of Job Enrichment Programs Which Union Leaders Supported	Per Cent of Membership Represented by Yes Response
Public-Professional	1	30	0	.0055
Public-State	1	100	100	.045
Public-Other	6	01	100	1.858
		05	100	
		20	100	
		50	100	
		100	100	
		100	100	
Private-Craft	3	*	Not Applicable	.157
		10	100	
		10	100	
Private-Production Manufacturing and Construction	10	*	Not Applicable	.232
		*	Not Applicable	
		01	100	
		01	100	
		04	0	
		05	100	
		10	100	
		10	80	
		25	50	
		100	100	
Private-Service	4	05	100	10.06
		20	100	
		30	100	
		50	100	

*By contractual agreement the union cannot disclose this information.

690,000 members working for firms employing job enrichment techniques. It is also noted that the unions, in general, support the programs in existence. Of the 25 responses of "yes," only four of the responses report that they did not completely support existing programs. However, contrasted with the fact that the respondents to this query represent over 14 million members, there are relatively very few union leaders that admit/know that job enrichment is used in firms with which they bargain. The narrative comments, like the percentages received, are, on the whole, dichotomous with a few being completely negative and a few being extremely complimentary of the programs for the organizations with which they bargain. One of the more unusual factors is the fact that the response from the public-professional group indicates that 30 per cent of the organizations with which the respondent bargains uses job enrichment techniques, yet none of those organizations has his support. As will be discussed later, the private sector generates the strongest support for job enrichment concepts, and the trends from this question begin to support this tendency.

Research Question 2

The research question is: "Do union leaders want job enrichment techniques applied to the jobs of their memberships?"

The data obtained from part IV, question 2 completed by the respondents are checked by the chi square test in

connection with Hypothesis 3 in the succeeding part of this chapter. It does appear, from the tabulation in Table 5 that there is a very strong tendency that both the public and private sectors are fundamentally opposed to job enrichment concepts. The percentage tabulation shown in Table 5 also suggests that the public sector is stronger in its opposition than is the private sector. The public sector responses show 79 per cent to be fundamentally opposed and the public-other group register 88 per cent that are fundamentally opposed to the use of job enrichment techniques.

The reasons why the public sector is stronger in its opposition will be discussed under Hypothesis 3 and the data concerning conditional acceptance of job enrichment concepts will be discussed in the next section. Overall, 70 per cent of the respondents indicate they are fundamentally opposed to job enrichment concepts. This extremely negative view should be cause for concern to the government and industrial managers.

Research Question 3

This research question is: "Union leaders' preferences notwithstanding, i.e., question 2, are there other factors influencing a different course of action?"

The narrative comments associated with the "conditional" response in part IV, question 2 of the survey instrument are classified into four distinct categories shown below:

TABLE 5

FUNDAMENTAL OPPOSITION TO JOB ENRICHMENT BY LABOR GROUP

Labor Group	Respondents Fundamentally Opposed		Respondents Not Fundamentally Opposed		Respondents Suggesting Conditional Acceptance	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Public-Professional	6	75	0	0	2	25
Public-State	14	74	4	21	1	5
Public-Other	<u>14</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Public Total	34	79	6	14	3	7
Private-Craft	9	60	3	20	3	20
Private-Production, Manufacturing, Construction	16	57	8	29	4	14
Private-Service	<u>21</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>
Private Total	46	64	17	24	9	12
Overall Total	80	70	23	20	12	10

1. Only through collective bargaining.
2. Only if management understood issue.
3. Only when it can be clearly demonstrated that implementation of this concept would not be either work redesign or speed-up.
4. Only with additional compensation.

Through the use of the proportions test, it is found that the proportion of "yes" respondents is significantly different from .5. The "Z" values are summarized below:

<u>Labor Group</u>	<u>Z Value</u>
Public Sector	3.81
Private Sector	2.36
Total of Both	4.19

One of the main reasons that the public sector is stronger in their opposition than the private sector may be the concept of "position management." This concept stated briefly implies concentration of the highest level duties in as few positions as possible. Another reason is that supervisors in the public sector may tend to see the use of job enrichment as a threat to their security, thereby programming any application for failure. A third reason for stronger public sector opposition can be attributed to the lack of knowledge discussed later in this section under research questions 7 and 11. Several of the respondents in the public sector commented that Executive Order 11491 prohibits them from bargaining on the concept which, of course, is not true. What they are saying is that they are prohibited from

bargaining on the issues of "hygiene" factors which is not job enrichment. Answers to the research question indicate that there is strong opposition to the use of job enrichment for the respondents' membership and that there is stronger opposition in the public sector than that of the private sector.

Research Question 4

The research question is: "According to the survey, which labor categories have jobs in which job enrichment techniques may feasibly be applied?"

Table 6 is a frequency table of the responses by expected good and poor results by type labor category. The table clearly defines laborer as being an area where the respondents would not expect good results. This result illustrates the concept that there are some tasks which simply cannot be enriched. However, classifying the responses as to whether or not the respondent bargained with firms using job enrichment techniques, 24 per cent of the responses appear in the "good results expected" versus the 34 per cent calculated from Table 6. The "yes" and "don't know" responses from the experience question shown above indicate more tendency toward the "good results expected" response, indicating possibly that experience with the issue may provide impetus toward greater understanding toward use of enrichment applications.

Table 6 indicates a 50/50 ratio for the craft/operator

TABLE 6
FREQUENCY OF LABOR TYPES BY GOOD RESULT/
POOR RESULT RESPONSES

Type Labor Category	Frequency of Respondents' Expectations of	
	Good Results	Poor Results
Laborer	36	70
Craft Operator	55	55
Technician	71	36
Clerical	77	30
Sales	69	34
Professional	93	15

area. The "yes," "no," and "don't know" answers to part II, question 1 of the survey instrument do not show any significant differences in the responses of "poor" and "good" to the craft/operator area of employment. This result could be expected though since many of the craft unions display tendencies toward misunderstanding of the term which will be discussed in detail later.

Application of the chi square test to the data shown below, which is grouped into the so-called "white collar" and "blue collar" groups indicate significant differences in the distribution.

	Response Good Results	Expected Poor Results
White Collar Workers	239	79
Blue Collar Workers	162	161

Laborers, craft/operators, and technicians were grouped as blue collar workers; whereas, professional, clerical, and sales groups were classified as white collar workers. The chi square value computed on the above 2 x 2 array with one degree of freedom was 42.77. In other words, there is a significant difference in the two groups. It appears from these data that the so-called white collar groups are viewed by union leaders as having better results when job enrichment techniques are applied than the blue collar workers. Removing the responses for the technician area from the blue collar workers, one finds they fit the same general configuration of the white collar workers. This could be expected since

the technicians for the electronics, computer, and aerospace industries are considered as professional-type people requiring a high level of training and responsibility.

Research Question 5

The research question is: "Are there significant differences in attitudes toward job enrichment techniques between the leadership of the public versus the private sectors?"

The data shown in Table 7 obtained from the respondents are checked by a chi square variance test in connection with Hypothesis 5 and are discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter. The majority of responses appear in the "strongly agree" or "agree" columns; however, variances in the frequency distribution do clearly stand out for the attitude item concerning who benefits from job enrichment application. Both the public and private sectors show tendencies toward disagreement with the statement that management benefits more than the worker. The private sector respondents also tend to believe that their membership will not favor the application and use of job enrichment.

Research Question 6

The research question is: "Are there significant differences in attitudes toward job enrichment concepts between the union leaders who have experience with firms using job enrichment techniques and those who have no

TABLE 7

RESPONSES ON THE ATTITUDE SURVEY, PART III, QUESTIONS 1-8 BY PUBLIC
VERSUS PRIVATE SECTOR

Item Paraphrased	Sector	SA	A	I	D	SD	χ^2	Total
Job Enrichment Concepts Benefit Membership	Public	18	19	4	2	0	10.84*	43
	Private	16	27	20	5	4		72
Management Understands Theory and Application of Job Enrichment	Public	13	21	8	1	0	1.09	43
	Private	23	31	14	3	1		72
Job Enrichment Should Be a Bargaining Issue	Public	11	21	5	2	4	10.30*	43
	Private	27	19	15	9	2		72
Benefits of Job Enrichment Have Been Overstated in Publications	Public	7	7	19	10	0	7.58	43
	Private	20	16	23	11	2		72
Job Enrichment Benefits Management Rather than Workers	Public	7	7	8	20	1	3.33	43
	Private	19	13	16	22	2		72
Membership Would Favor Application of Job Enrichment	Public	10	19	8	5	1	12.50*	43
	Private	5	21	29	15	2		72
Real Motive of Management in Implementing Job Enrichment--More Work/Same Pay	Public	7	19	12	5	0	8.06	43
	Private	21	21	12	16	2		72
Use of Job Enrichment Instills Pride in Work and Product	Public	11	23	5	3	1	4.43	43
	Private	12	32	18	7	3		72

Degree of freedom for all 2 x 5 arrays above was calculated at 4.

*Distributions showing significant differences.

experience with firms using these techniques?"

The data shown in Table 8 obtained from the respondents are checked by a chi square test in connection with Hypothesis 2 and are discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter.

Research Question 7

The research question is: "Do union leaders agree with the definition of job enrichment as defined in this study?"

The data (shown in Table 9) obtained from respondents are checked by chi square method in connection with Hypothesis 1 discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter. It does appear from the data, for the most part, that the respondents agree with the definition. Shown below are the item numbers on the knowledge survey with the percentage of respondents in the strongly agree and agree responses:

Item	Per Cent of Responses Above Indifferent
1	64
2	74
3	78
4	77
5	66
6	48

Item 6, which deals with the concept that the use of job enrichment could reduce close supervision, is agreed with 48 per cent of the time. Almost one among five responses is in disagreement with this statement and it brings up the old point that most union leaders feel their membership may be oversupervised.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDE SURVEY BY WHETHER RESPONDENTS ARE BARGAINING WITH FIRMS
USING JOB ENRICHMENT TECHNIQUES

Item Paraphrased	Response on Part II Question 1	SA	A	I	D	SD	TOT	x ² Value on Yes/No Array	x ² Value on 3 x 5 Array
Job Enrichment Concepts Bene- fit Membership	Yes	12	9	2	1	1	25	6.63 df=4	12.32 df=8
	No	17	23	18	5	1	64		
	Don't Know	5	14	4	1	2	26		
Management Understands Theory and Application of Job Enrichment	Yes	4	17	2	1	1	25	9.40 df=4	18.78* df=8
	No	26	26	10	2	0	64		
	Don't Know	6	9	10	1	0	26		
Job Enrichment Should Be a Bargaining Issue	Yes	8	12	2	3	0	25	2.59 df=4	21.63* df=8
	No	26	19	9	8	2	64		
	Don't Know	4	9	9	0	4	26		
Benefits of Job Enrichment Have Been Overstated in Publications	Yes	6	2	4	11	2	25	18.69* df=4	26.93* df=8
	No	16	16	24	8	0	64		
	Don't Know	5	5	14	2	0	26		
Job Enrichment Benefits Management Rather Than Workers	Yes	5	5	3	10	2	25	6.78 df=4	7.56 df=8
	No	17	9	14	24	0	64		
	Don't Know	5	6	6	8	1	26		
Membership Would Favor Application of Job Enrichment	Yes	7	8	5	4	1	25	6.01 df=4	8.74 df=8
	No	6	25	21	11	1	64		
	Don't Know	3	7	11	5	0	26		
Real Motive of Management in Implementing Job Enrichment-- More Work/Same Pay	Yes	5	8	5	6	1	25	1.26 df=4	2.04 df=8
	No	17	22	13	11	1	64		
	Don't Know	5	10	6	4	1	26		
Use of Job Enrichment Instills Pride in Work and Product	Yes	7	12	3	2	1	25	1.89 df=4	6.29 df=8
	No	14	27	16	5	2	64		
	Don't Know	3	16	4	3	0	26		

*At .05 probability these distributions are significantly different.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' VIEW OF JOB ENRICHMENT CONCEPTS BY WHETHER
THE UNION LEADERS HAVE DEALT WITH FIRMS USING JOB ENRICHMENT CONCEPTS

Item Paraphrased	Response on Part II Question 1	SA	A	I	D	SD	TOT	x ² Value on Yes/No Array	x ² Value on 3 x 5 Array
Responsible for Providing Promotion Opportunities	Yes	10	10	3	1	1	25	6.43 df=4	13.21 df=8
	No	11	29	13	9	2	64		
	Don't Know	3	11	10	2	0	26		
Recognizes Individual Achievement	Yes	9	12	2	1	1	25	7.07 df=4	14.86 df=8
	No	12	34	9	9	0	64		
	Don't Know	3	15	7	0	1	26		
Makes Work More Challenging	Yes	8	12	3	2	0	25	1.67 df=4	3.52 df=8
	No	15	34	11	3	1	64		
	Don't Know	5	16	3	1	1	26		
Provides More Responsibility to Worker	Yes	10	11	2	2	0	25	2.77 df=4	4.84 df=8
	No	15	33	10	6	0	64		
	Don't Know	5	15	5	1	0	26		
Creates Better Communication Channels	Yes	9	10	4	2	0	25	1.89 df=4	8.48 df=8
	No	16	24	14	10	0	64		
	Don't Know	5	12	7	1	1	26		
Decreases Close Supervision	Yes	4	12	4	4	1	25	4.50 df=4	6.32 df=8
	No	9	19	22	13	1	64		
	Don't Know	3	8	8	5	2	26		

Research Question 8

The research question is: "Do any of the unions responding to the survey have provisions relating to job enrichment in their current contracts, or are there any plans for the unions to bargain on this particular issue?"

The data shown in Table 10 are the result of the respondents replying to part II, question 3 which asked if the union had current contracts with provisions relating to job enrichment. This data will be discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter in the discussion on Hypothesis 7. Seventeen per cent replied that they did have job enrichment concepts in their current contracts. A chi square test was applied within the public and private sectors, as well as between the sectors, to see whether the replies were within the same distribution. There are no significant differences on any of the tests.

Also, for part II, question 3, there was requested in the case of a "yes" response a percentage of contracts containing clauses that concern job enrichment concepts. The percentage data on the responses varies from 2 per cent to 100 per cent. For instance, the private craft unions reports for the three responses 20, 40 and 100 per cent of their contracts containing clauses that pertain to job enrichment concepts. However, it appears from other comments on these survey instruments that these clauses may in fact be speaking to such things as hygiene factors rather than to

TABLE 10
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PROVISIONS ON JOB
 ENRICHMENT IN CURRENT CONTRACTS
 BY LABOR GROUP

Labor Group	Respondents Having Provisions in Current Contracts	Respondents Not Having Provisions in Current Contracts
Public-Professional	2	6
Public-State	1	17
Public-Other	3	13
Sub-Total	6	36
Private-Craft	3	12
Private-Production, Manu- facturing, Construction	7	20
Private-Service	3	26
Sub-Total	13	58
Over-All Total	19	94

job enrichment concepts.

Eighty two per cent of the unions basically do not now have current contracts where job enrichment concepts have been included as part of the contract.

The second part of this research question deals with whether or not there are any plans to bargain on this issue. Table 11 is a distribution of the responses for the question of future plans to bargain by labor group. Only 22 per cent of the responses indicate that they have plans to bargain on the issue in the future. However, 23 per cent did respond in an undecided state indicating perhaps, that they are thinking about the issue and its impact on their membership. A chi square test applied within the public and private sectors as well as between the sectors ascertains if the replies are within the same distribution. There are no significant differences on any of the statistical tests. In summary, the unions in general do not intend to bargain on this issue.

Research Question 9

The research question is: "Has there been any union-sponsored research in the area of application of job enrichment techniques?"

The data in Table 12, received as responses from the participants in the survey, show that 76 per cent of the respondents indicate that their union has not conducted research on this issue. Twelve per cent do not know whether the union has sponsored research on this subject. With only

TABLE 11
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PLANS ON FUTURE BARGAINING
 CONCERNING JOB ENRICHMENT BY LABOR GROUP

Labor Group	Respondents with Plans to Bargain on the Issue	Respondents Not Currently Planning to Bargain on the Issue	Undecided
Public-Professional	3	3	2
Public-State	6	9	4
Public-Other	4	7	5
Sub-Total	13	19	11
Private-Craft	3	10	2
Private-Production Manufacturing Construction	3	18	7
Private-Service	6	16	7
Sub-Total	12	44	16
Over-All Total	25	63	27

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONSES AS TO WHETHER THE
UNION HAS SPONSORED RESEARCH BY LABOR GROUP

Labor Group	Responses Where Union Has Sponsored Research	Responses Where Union Has Not Sponsored Research	Responses Where Union Leader Did Not Know
Public-Professional	0	6	2
Public-State	2	15	2
Public-Other	2	13	1
Sub-Total	4	34	5
Private-Craft	2	10	3
Private-Production Manufacturing Construction	4	19	5
Private-Service	4	24	1
Sub-Total	10	53	9
Over-All Total	14	87	14

12 per cent showing a positive response that unions have in fact conducted research on this matter, it seems likely that ignorance may be a partial explanation for the negative attitudes which are apparent.

Research Question 10

The research question is: "Do union leaders feel that their membership want job enrichment application to be a bargaining issue?"

The data obtained from the respondents to this survey are checked by a proportions and chi square tests in connection with Hypothesis 6 and discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter. It does appear from the data shown in Table 13 that the answer to the question above is a positive "no." Eighty-three per cent indicate "no," while two respondents did not complete that portion of the form, and only 18 respondents of 113 indicate "yes" to the question. This should not surprise the reader, especially in light of the other problems that the rank and file must contend with right now. As one respondent noted, "If you want to enrich our jobs, enrich the money we get." The mass membership may simply not be interested in this concept.

Research Question 11

The research question is: "What percentage of union leaders have formal training on the concept of job enrichment?"

TABLE 13
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES AS TO WHETHER THE MEMBERSHIP
 HAS GIVEN THE UNION LEADERS A MANDATE TO
 BARGAIN ON JOB ENRICHMENT

Labor Group	Responding "Yes"	Responding "No"
Public-Professional	3	5
Public-State	4	15
Public-Other	2	14
Sub-Total	9	34
Private-Craft	2	13
Private-Production Manufacturing Construction	4	22
Private-Service	3	26
Sub-Total	9	61
Over-All Total	18	95

The data in Table 14 obtained from respondents were checked by proportions and chi square tests in connection with Hypothesis 8, discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter. It does appear from the data shown in Table 14 that very little training on the subject matter has been given to union leaders. There were five narrative comments relating to this item. Two of those comments state that management should have better training on the subject, while the other three narrative comments indicate that training on this subject has been very helpful to the union negotiators.

Research Question 12

The research question is: "Do union leaders feel that their membership understands the concept of job enrichment?"

The tabular data in Table 15 show strong trends toward the fact that union leaders do not feel that their membership understands the term. The high level of "don't know" responses is reinforcement that the union leaders may not be in touch with their membership on this issue. Only 18 per cent of the respondents feel their membership understands the term. The percentage reported for the "yes" responses represents less than 10 per cent of the membership represented by this sample. The most appalling item uncovered in this response is that 30 per cent of the respondents do not know whether their membership does or does not understand the term under study.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY LABOR GROUP AS TO WHETHER
THEY HAVE HAD FORMAL TRAINING
ON JOB ENRICHMENT CONCEPTS

Labor Group	Responding "Yes"	Responding "No"
Public-Professional	1	7
Public-State	5	14
Public-Other	1	15
Sub-Total	7	36
Private-Craft	2	13
Private-Production Manufacturing Construction	3	23
Private-Service	2	27
Sub-Total	7	63
Over-All Total	14	99

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER UNION LEADERS FEEL THEIR
MEMBERSHIP UNDERSTANDS JOB ENRICHMENT
BY LABOR CATEGORY

Labor Groups	Feel Membership Understands	Do Not Feel Membership Understands	Don't Know
Public-Professional	2	4	2
Public-State	3	15	1
Public-Other	4	3	9
Sub-Total	9	22	12
Private-Craft	3	6	6
Private-Production Manufacturing Construction	6	15	7
Private-Service	3	16	10
Sub-Total	12	37	23
Over-All Total	21	59	35

Research Question 13

The research question is: "Have there been cases, in the opinion of union leadership, in which the use of job enrichment techniques has produced undesirable results for the union and its membership?"

This question was researched by use of a narrative question (part IV, question 1) on the instrument which read: "Do you know of any cases where job enrichment either has/has not produced desirable results from the standpoint of the union and its membership? If so, please describe." From the public sector there are five replies where the use of job enrichment have produced good results. All of these are from the federal sector and have to do with the use of upward mobility (UPMO). The concept of UPMO is where the Civil Service Commission is waiving specialized skill requirements and allowing the agency through assessment or testing to select people in dead-end positions for other career fields. The agency is then responsible for training the individual for those specialized skills. The public sector respondents that show where it has been used and has produced undesirable results are not very specific. However, the comments primarily center around redesigning work standards. One public official states "All we got from enrichment was a cup of coffee from the commander and new standards by which to work."

The private sector replies were extremely limited

but comments are as follows:

- (1) "We got good results at first then when management didn't follow-up with their promises, it all fell apart."
- (2) "First line supervisors do not understand."
- (3) "Management intervened, did not understand the concept."
- (4) "We have employees on certain management committees as part of our job enrichment program, seems to be working out well."

With the very limited responses on this item, it is difficult to make any over-all judgment. However, it appears that the comments can be summarized to the point: If management truly understands the issue and follows up properly, the concept could produce desirable results.

Research Question 14

The research question is: "Is there a difference in the extent to which job enrichment use has penetrated the various labor groups?"

The data in Table 10 obtained from the respondents are checked by proportions and chi square tests in connection with Hypothesis 4 and discussed in the succeeding part of this chapter. It does appear from the tabular listing in Table 10 that the extent of use in the various labor groups is similar. As discussed earlier, it is rather startling to find that only 17 per cent of the respondents had in their current contracts provisions relating to job enrichment.

Hypotheses DiscussionHypothesis 1

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "There is no significant difference in the knowledge of job enrichment concepts between those union leaders who bargain with firms using job enrichment techniques and those union leaders who have not had that experience."

A chi square test was applied to the data in Table 9. There are no significant differences in the knowledge level of those having experience bargaining with firms using job enrichment techniques and those not having that experience. The chi square test was applied to a 2 x 5 array of the "yes/no" responses versus the scale portion of the survey, and then the "don't know" string was added to form a 3 x 5 array for the same statistical test. No significant differences are found in either group by item number.

As addressed earlier, union leaders do not view job enrichment as a way to relieve close supervision. Several of the respondents circled the words on the survey instrument: "If used properly." A few comments indicate that the primary problem was that it had not been used properly. It had, according to those particular respondents, been used as a "redesign/speed-up device." In summary, the null hypothesis is not rejected; all three groups have the same level of knowledge concerning the issue of job enrichment.

Hypothesis 2

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "There is no significant difference in the attitude toward job enrichment concepts between those union leaders who bargain with firms using job enrichment techniques and those union leaders who do not have that experience."

Significant differences in distribution is found in items 2, 3, and 4 when the data are processed by the 3 x 5 array as shown in Table 8.

Item 2 concerned the fact that the respondent feels that firms with which he bargains understand job enrichment theory and application. One would expect that, if the union leader had not bargained with firms using the concept, his attitude might well be different from the union leader who had the experience. This is not the case. There is no difference in the "yes/no" array; however, when the "don't know" data string is added to the array, the chi square on the 3 x 5 array indicates significant differences. This is very likely due to the fact that those individuals responding "no" understand enough of the concept to know how the firm's management would feel. The individuals responding "don't know," on the other hand, very likely do not understand the concept, thus their answers are not consistent with the other two groups.

Item 3 concerned whether or not the concept of job enrichment should be a bargaining issue. Once again, we

see the "yes/no" array with no significant differences; however, as soon as the "don't know" string is added to the array, the chi square test shows significant differences. Again, this is very likely due to the lack of knowledge on the "don't know" group which may have placed their responses in a different distribution from those who understand the concept.

Item 4 concerned the fact that publications may, in part, have overstated the benefits of job enrichment. The "yes" and "no" strings are not distributed in the same manner (see Table 8). Those who have had experience with the issue tend to disagree with the survey item, whereas those without experience tend to be indifferent. Forty-two per cent of the non-"yes" group responded in the indifferent category, probably indicating they simply do not have sufficient knowledge with which to answer intelligently.

The remainder of the survey indicates no differences as shown in Table 8. Thus, in this case the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Hypothesis 3

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "Union leadership does not want job enrichment techniques applied to their membership."

As discussed in research questions 2 and 3, there are definite tendencies that would appear to accept the null hypothesis. A chi square test is applied to the data in

Table 5 as follows:

1. A 3 x 3 array of the public sector groups by the three response possibilities. The chi square value computed is 6.98 where the degrees of freedom are four. There are no significant differences found in the way the responses are answered within the public sector groups.
2. A 3 x 3 array of the private sector groups by the three response possibilities. The chi square value computed is 2.51 with four degrees of freedom. There are no significant differences found in the way the responses are answered within the private sector groups.
3. A 2 x 3 array of the two sectors (public and private) totals by the three response possibilities. The chi square value computed is 6.98 where the degrees of freedom are two. There are significant differences found in the way the responses are answered between the public and private sectors.
4. As described in research question 3, a proportions test is administered to each sector and to the totals of the two sectors. The "Z" values shown on page 59 of this chapter indicate that union leadership does not want job enrichment techniques applied to their membership's jobs.

Therefore, it appears there is validity for the

acceptance of the null hypothesis. Reasons behind the fundamental opposition may be as follows:

1. Union leaders may visualize the process as being anti union.
2. Job enrichment by definition strives for a satisfied employee. Union leaders may not want an employee to be satisfied.
3. Union leaders may not visualize the process as being beneficial to their position in the union.
4. Union leaders may have associated with the usual first line supervisor opposition, in turn, generating the feeling that the process may tend to decrease the need for the union.

Hypothesis 4

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "There is no significant difference in the degree to which job enrichment applications have penetrated the various labor categories."

The following values are computed from the data in Table 10 application of chi square:

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>x²</u>
1. Public groups x Question response	2.13
2. Private groups x Question response	2.30
3. Public/Private Sub-Totals x Question response	.30

At the 95 per cent confidence level with degrees of freedom of two for items 1 and 2 above, the rejection value would be

any value above 5.99; therefore, the values above do not indicate rejection of the null hypothesis. At the 95 per cent confidence level with degree of freedom of one for item 3 above, the rejection value would be any value above 3.84; therefore, the value of .30 does not indicate rejection of the null hypothesis.

Also the writer applied a proportions test on the sub-total frequencies to determine if there is significance in the negative response ratio. This test indicates that a significant difference does exist; thus, in summary, there is no significant difference in the degree to which job enrichment applications have penetrated the various labor categories.

Hypothesis 5

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "There is no significant difference in union leaders' attitudes toward job enrichment concepts between the public and private sectors."

This hypothesis will be discussed by item number of the attitude survey with reference to Table 7, page 64, shown earlier in this chapter.

Item 1--This question implied that the use of the concepts would benefit the union leader's membership. There are tendencies toward "agree" and "strongly agree" in the public sector with 42 per cent of the respondents indicating

"strongly agree" and 44 per cent of the respondents indicating "agree." On the contrary the private sector responded with 22 per cent "strongly agree," 38 per cent "agree" and 28 per cent "indifferent." The above variance in distribution was supported by the chi square value computed from the 2 x 5 array shown in Table 7.

Item 2--This question implied that firms or agencies with which the union leaders bargain do not understand the theory and proper application of job enrichment. The chi square test applied to this question and shown in Table 7 shows no significant difference in the distribution of responses from the private versus the public sectors. Approximately one-third of the respondents in both sectors strongly agree that most managements with which they deal do not understand job enrichment concepts. Over 40 per cent of each sector agree with the statement while 19 per cent for both sectors are indifferent.

Item 3--This question concerned whether or not job enrichment should be a bargaining issue. The chi square test found the distribution of responses between the public and private sector to be significantly different. The difference is in the frequency of responses for the "indifferent" aspect of the question, as well as the reversed distribution in the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses. Although the distributions of responses are different, there are still strong tendencies to feel that the issue of job enrichment

should be a bargaining issue. The strength of the private sector asserts itself by the 38 per cent of the private sector respondents indicating they strongly agree that it should be a bargaining issue. The striking part of this survey is that one would normally assume any labor leader would not think that the concept should be a bargaining issue; yet from Table 7, although small in number, there are 17 responses that are in disagreement or strongly disagree with the statement.

Item 4--This statement implied that past publications had overstated the benefits claimed for the concept of job enrichment. Although the chi square test show no major deviations in the distribution between the sectors (see Table 7), there is a strong tendency in both sectors for indifference. Thirty-seven per cent of the responses are indifferent. Because of other data, this writer attributes the indifference equivalent to that of non-awareness. It is strongly suspected that a large majority of the indifferent responses are simply responses of those without sufficient knowledge to answer intelligently.

Item 5--This question searched to see if union leaders felt management benefited more than the worker from the use of job enrichment concepts. In line with the other questions one would have suspected strong disagreement on this item, and from Table 7 one can see that there is an obvious shift to disagreeing with the survey item. The chi

square analysis of this array indicates no significant difference between the public and private sectors indicating that the distribution of each group is somewhat similar.

Item 6--This attitude survey item concerned whether or not the membership of the union leaders involved in this survey felt their membership would favor the application of job enrichment techniques. The chi square value shown in Table 7 indicates a difference in the two distributions. The difference lies primarily in the fact that the public unions are in much stronger agreement with the concept than the private sector. Forty per cent of the responses from the private sector are indifferent and 21 per cent are in disagreement with the attitude statement. This disagreement may exist because the private sector may view the concept as anti-union.

Item 7--This item was designed to see whether union leaders felt that the motive of management using job enrichment techniques might be more output for the same pay. Although not significantly different in the distribution of responses, the private sector shows 65 per cent of the responses in the SA, A, and I categories. Contrasted with 88 per cent of the public sector in the same category, it appears that union leaders in this country do believe that management may well have ulterior motives when they attempt to implement job enrichment programs.

Item 8--This survey item was designed to see whether

union leaders feel that the use of job enrichment would instill pride in the individual's work. There is a strong tendency of agreement in their responses with 68 per cent of the responses appearing in the "strongly agree" and "agree" columns. The chi square value computed on the 2 x 5 array indicates no difference in the distribution between the public and private sectors.

Theoretically, the responses should have been at opposite ends of the continuum for questions 5 through 8. Not getting this type response simply reinforces the point that basically the union leaders do not understand the issue. Although some small differences are found in the distribution of responses for the various items in the attitude survey, basically from a composite viewpoint there is no fundamental or significant difference in union leaders' attitudes toward job enrichment concepts between the public and private sectors.

Hypothesis 6

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "Labor leaders do not have a current mandate from their membership to take the issue of job enrichment to the bargaining table."

A test of proportions is applied to the public and private sector totals in Table 13, with the values shown below:

Public	Z = 3.81
Private	Z = 6.36

The values above are not within the range of -1.96 to +1.96 indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, by this test and through observation, unions do not have a mandate from their membership to take the issue to the bargaining table.

A chi square test is also applied within and between the sectors to see if there are significant differences in the various labor groups' responses. None of these tests support any significant differences in the distributions.

Hypothesis 7

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "Labor leaders do not intend to take job enrichment as an issue to the bargaining table."

The following chi square values are computed from the data in Table 11:

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>χ^2</u>
1. Public sector groups x Question responses	.77
2. Private sector groups x Question responses	1.94
3. Public versus Private sectors x Question responses	3.81

With reference to Table 3, none of the above show significant deviations in the distribution.

A proportion test applied to the summary of each sector found that the labor groups as a composite do not have any plans to bargain on the issue of job enrichment.

Hypothesis 8

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "Formal training has not been given to labor leaders concerning the issue of job enrichment."

With reference to Table 14, a chi square test is administered to the public versus private sectors as well as within groups. There is no deviation from the distribution by any of the elements.

A proportion test is administered to the positive responses. The values of Z indicate that formal training concerning job enrichment has not been given to labor leaders.

Many comments indicate that perhaps training would not change the bargaining opposition they receive from management and that, in fact, training should be given to supervisors on what the issue truly means.

Hypothesis 9

Stated in null form the hypothesis is: "There is no significant difference in the labor leaders perception of results expected for application of job enrichment techniques to various labor categories."

With reference to Table 6 each labor category is compared to each of the other categories in a 2 x 2 array. The chi square test is applied with the results shown below:

<u>Category Comparison</u>	<u>x² Value</u>	<u>Degree of Freedom</u>
Laborer-Professional	60.76	1
Laborer-Clerical	30.87	1
Laborer-Sales	22.79	1
Laborer-Craft/Operator	5.69	1
Laborer-Technical	22.35	1
Clerical-Professional	6.50	1
Clerical-Sales	.61*	1
Clerical-Craft/Operator	10.98	1
Clerical-Technical	.78*	1
Professional-Sales	10.81	1
Professional-Craft/Operator	32.59	1
Professional-Technical	.78*	1
Sales-Craft/Operator	6.31	1
Sales-Technical	.0095*	1
Craft/Operator-Technical	5.95	1

The asterisks shown in the table above indicate the labor types that are perceived by the union leaders to be areas where one can expect good results with the application of job enrichment concepts.

Certainly, this is logical since workers involved in clerical, technical, professional, and sales work tend to have more freedom and flexibility in their tasks which provide viable opportunities to implement job enrichment techniques. There is enough significant differences in the various labor categories to indicate that the null hypothesis should be rejected.

The summary of the findings in this chapter will be presented in Chapter V, Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The tabular data shown below is a synthesis of the hypotheses for this study as to their rejection/non rejection:

<u>Hypothesis Number</u>	<u>Results</u>
H ₀ 1	Not Rejected
H ₀ 2	Not Rejected
H ₀ 3	Not Rejected
H ₀ 4	Not Rejected
H ₀ 5	Not Rejected
H ₀ 6	Not Rejected
H ₀ 7	Not Rejected
H ₀ 8	Not Rejected
H ₀ 9	Rejected

In the summary each hypothesis will be discussed with its respective research question and a short summary will follow for those research questions for which there was no hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1 was designed to discern differences in a knowledge level between unions bargaining with firms using

job enrichment techniques and those bargaining with firms not using the concept. The associated research question No. 7 was designed to see whether the respondents have the same general understanding of job enrichment as this writer. The results from the statistical test applied to this null hypothesis indicate that the null hypothesis should not be rejected and that there is no difference in response whether or not the union leader has experience bargaining with firms using job enrichment techniques.

The research question is quite a different matter. The highest level of agreement is on the item concerning challenging work of which 78 per cent are recorded above the indifferent level. But, when it comes to the item of decreasing close supervision, only 48 per cent of the respondents agree or strongly agree. This strongly indicates that the respondents do not agree with the generally accepted definition of the concept. Further reinforcement of this matter is gleaned from the open-ended questions. Eight comments indicate that such things as fringes, supervisory policy, compensation and working conditions should be included in the various programs. This confusion of definition of the subject matter may well be the major part of the problem with job enrichment programs. Training, more progressive literature, and seminars concerning the subject matter may tend to alleviate the confusion.

Hypothesis 2 was designed to ascertain differences in

attitudes between those who bargain with firms using job enrichment techniques and those who do not. The associated research question No. 6 is simply a restatement of the hypothesis in question form.

The data analysis shows that there are no significant differences in the attitude of those respondents that have bargaining experience with firms using job enrichment techniques and those that do not have that experience. An interesting by-product of this survey is the way the respondents answered the questions. Theoretically, there should be tendencies toward agreement with questions 1, 3, 6, and 8; and the opposite for questions 2, 4, 5, and 7. Referencing Table 8, one can see disagreement tendencies on the item that benefits of job enrichment go to management rather than the worker; however, items 2, 4, and 7 have agreement tendencies. The results of this survey show that most union leaders feel:

1. Job enrichment if used properly would benefit the membership.
2. Most firms with which they bargain do not understand the theory and application of the concept.
3. Job enrichment should be a bargaining issue.
4. The use of job enrichment benefits the worker more than management.
5. Indifference toward whether or not publications have overstated the results of job enrichment application.

6. Split between agreement and indifference as to whether or not their membership would favor the application of job enrichment to their jobs.
7. Lack of agreement as to the real motive of management when they implement job enrichment programs. There was agreement, indifference, and disagreement in generally equal proportions.
8. The use of job enrichment instills a sense of pride in the worker's product.

From the analysis of the above, it does not appear that the union leaders are an immovable force in the way of progress for programs of this nature.

Hypothesis 3 concerned whether or not the respondents want job enrichment techniques applied to their membership. Research question 2 is the above hypothesis stated in question form. Also, applicable to this hypothesis is research question 3, which is concerned with what other factors/conditions are influencing acceptance of job enrichment applications.

The research information gives strong evidence that union leadership does not want job enrichment techniques applied to their membership. The other factors that influence alternate courses of action are found in the comments associated with conditional acceptance of the concept. These conditions are summarized on page 59. This result implies that union leaders want a high degree of control over matters

that affect the fate of their rank and file membership. When a term such as job enrichment is used as widely as this term has been, it is no wonder that it brings out frustration, skepticism, and distrust among those that must bargain for their membership.

Hypothesis 4 and its respective research question 14 deal with whether or not there are differences in the degree to which job enrichment applications have penetrated the various labor categories. The analysis of the data finds that there are no significant differences in the penetration of the labor categories by job enrichment applications. Neither public nor private union leaders have many current contracts containing job enrichment techniques, and from other data collected by this survey it appears that they do not want the concept. With no more experience or knowledge than there seems to be, this writer feels it may be premature to make any judgments as to whether or not the application and use of job enrichment techniques would have poor or good results.

Hypothesis 5 and its respective research question 5 address the issue of attitude differences between the union leaders of the public and private sectors. Through the analysis of the responses, it is found that there are no significant differences in attitudes toward the subject matter between the private and public sectors. A summary of the attitudes of labor leaders is discussed in the summary

of Hypothesis 2 earlier in this chapter. One should not be surprised that there are no differences in attitude between the public and private sectors. After all, most of the labor leaders, whether public or private, receive their direction and guidance from the AFL-CIO.

Hypothesis 6 and its corresponding research question 10 address the question of whether or not union membership want union leaders to take the issue of job enrichment to the bargaining table. This hypothesis and question results indicate that union leaders do not have a mandate from their membership to bargain on this concept. Almost 83 per cent of the respondents answered "no" to this issue. This writer feels this is a matter of level of importance. In other words, at this time economic problems are simply taking precedence in the minds of the membership. It could be, too, that the union leaders do not know what/how their membership feels, but with most of the union leaders up for periodic re-election that is not likely.

Hypothesis 7 and its related research question concern the issue of whether or not there are plans for the union leaders to bargain on this issue and whether or not there are provisions concerning job enrichment in current contracts.

Analysis of the data finds very few current labor contracts with job enrichment provisions in them. The information obtained from the respondents also indicate that

labor leaders do not intend to take job enrichment as an issue to the bargaining table. The labor leaders with whom this writer had personal conversations indicate they had more pressing problems. Comments turned in with the data indicate many union leaders feel that this issue takes a back seat to the "hygiene" factors. In short, the union leaders do not see a need for bargaining; yet if a firm proposes such a program, the union leaders will usually be the first individuals to want to bargain on the issue.

Hypothesis 8 and the associated research question 11 address the issue of whether or not union leaders have received formal training on the subject of job enrichment. The statistical results indicate that formal training has not been given to union leaders. There are several open-ended comments on this subject such as follows:

1. "Training should be given to management so the concept won't be used as a speed-up device."
2. "Training helped me to understand what management was doing to us."
3. "Training won't help until management changes its attitude."

Comments such as the above enforce the attitude survey and indicate that maybe authorities in this field are worried about the wrong faction. Perhaps the need to enlighten management is more pressing than trying to train the union leaders.

Hypothesis 9 and the corresponding research question 4 were designed to test for differences in labor leaders

as to the areas where the application of job enrichment could be most appropriately implemented by what type of result. It is found through the statistical tests that there is a significant difference as to task areas where the union leaders feel successful application of job enrichment can be implemented. According to the responses, implementation of job enrichment programs for blue collar workers would give poor results; whereas, the responses indicate good results for white collar workers. Union leaders by their responses actually classify technician in the same result areas as the white collar worker.

These results can only be tied to the concept that union leaders see no freedom, flexibility or challenge to the laborer and craft/operator areas. This proved interesting when this student separated the laborer-type union leaders responses and found that most of the union leaders in that group feel there would be good results if job enrichment were implemented for the laborer. The apparent discrepancy between this statement and the results of the study can be attributed to the lack of knowledge of the respondents. Through comments and personal contacts, the writer finds that the laborer type union leader views the hygiene factors as job enrichment.

Research question 1 was designed to query the respondents as to the percentage of union leaders that had experience bargaining with firms that use job enrichment

techniques. Only 22 per cent of the respondents bargain with firms using job enrichment applications.

Research question 9 searched for union-sponsored research in the area of job enrichment. Twelve per cent of the respondents report being aware of union-sponsored research concerning the concept.

Research question 12 was designed to see if the union leaders feel their membership understand the concept. Thirty per cent of the respondents do not know, and 18 per cent feel their membership understand the concept of job enrichment.

Research question 13 was designed to document cases, if any, where job enrichment application has/has not had detrimental effects on the union or membership. Several very general cases are summarized on page 78 of Chapter IV. However, in summary the number of cases either way have not been sufficient to substantiate positive judgment.

Recommendation for Future Job Enrichment Applications

If there is one thing this writer has learned to accept during this study it is that management, if they want successful job enrichment programs, must have union support. To get this support management must strive for excellence in the following areas:

1. Union leaders should be consulted and used to help sell the program to the rank and file.
2. Union leaders must be convinced that the program is

not a device for greater production at the same pay.

3. Management must follow-up to insure that positive results are a product of the program.
4. Management should take a careful look at the way performance is evaluated and insure that the performance rating system is not in contrast with their job enrichment program.

On the other hand, union leaders should strive to insure that they are not so biased toward an idea of management concerning job enrichment programs that they tend to suppress these types of programs for their membership. Each union leader should ascertain the desires of membership concerning the issue. Union leaders should, as a responsibility to their membership, become thoroughly acquainted with the subject matter and explore its possibilities for his/her membership.

Recommendation for Future Studies

If this study is replicated, the writer recommends changing the survey instrument part II, questions 1, 3 and 6 to record numbers of locals and members involved rather than percentages. This will give a better impact since the percentages can be misleading.

This writer recommends that a study be accomplished contrasting the performance evaluation systems with job enrichment programs. It may be found that jobs are redesigned under the guise of job enrichment applications.

This writer recommends that if funded properly an institution or governmental agency should replicate this study with the membership rather than union leaders.

Finally, a replication of this study using managers in the "Fortune 500" would close the knowledge gap concerning this issue.

Conclusion

There seems to be very little difference, if any, between the public and private sectors of union leaders concerning attitude, knowledge, or action. Management and academia, and union leaders may well be on polar extremes as to their attitude, knowledge, understanding, and expectation of job enrichment application. Union leaders are not impressed with the flowery rhetoric surrounding this term in the literature. During personal discussions with certain union leaders, this writer found that concern for other pressing employee problems such as inflation, unemployment, and pending legislation that affects the take home pay of the rank and file took heavy precedence over job enrichment concerns. The union leaders simply do not see this concept as a priority item. As one union official told this student, "How can we be concerned with things like challenge when our membership cannot pay their bills?"

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andolsek, L. J. "Productivity and the Public Sector." Vital Speeches of the Day, XXXX, No. 7 (January 15, 1974).
- Argyris, Chris. Management and Organizational Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- _____. Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between the System and the Individual. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1957.
- _____. "Personality and Organization Theory Revisited." Administrative Science Quarterly 18, No. 2 (June, 1973).
- _____. "We Must Make Work Worthwhile." Life, May 5, 1967.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Originally published 1938. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Blood, Milton R., and Hulin, Charles L. "Alienation, Environmental Characteristics, and Worker Responses." Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 No. 3 (June, 1967).
- Bowin, Robert Bruce. "Attitude Change Toward a Theory of Managerial Motivation." Academy of Management Journal, 16, No. 4 (December, 1973).
- Carrell, Michael R., and Elbert, Norbert F. "Some Personal and Organizational Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Postal Clerks." Academy of Management Journal, 17, No. 2 (June, 1974).
- Cochran, William G. Sampling Techniques. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.
- Corson, John J. "A Neglected Element of Political Leadership." Personnel Administration (May-June, 1971).

- David, Keith. Human Relations in Business. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.
- Dermer, Jerry. "The Interrelationship of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation." Academy of Management Journal, 18, No. 1 (March, 1975).
- Dichter, Ernest. Motivating Human Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Dimock, Marshall Edward, and Dimock, Gladys Ogden. Public Administration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Downey, H. Kirk; Hellriegel, Don; and Slocum, John W., Jr. "Congruence Between Individual Needs, Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction and Performance." Academy of Management Journal, 18, No. 1 (March, 1975).
- Fein, Mitchell. "Job Enrichment: A Re-evaluation." Sloan Management Review (Winter, 1974).
- _____. Motivation for Work. Norcross, Georgia: Rand McNally and Company, 1974.
- Fitzgerald, Thomas H. "Why Motivation Theory Doesn't Work." Harvard Business Review, 49, No. 4 (July-August, 1971).
- Gemmile, Gary R., and Heisler, W. J. "Machiavellianism as a Factor in Managerial Job Strain, Job Satisfaction, and Upward Mobility." Academy of Management Journal, 15, No. 1 (March, 1972).
- Guilford, Joan S., and Gray, David E. Motivation and Management. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- Hackman, J. Richard, and Lawler, Edward E., III. "Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics." Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, No. 3 (1971).
- Heneman, Herbert G., III. "An Empirical Investigation of Expectancy Theory Predictions of Job Performance." Academy of Management Proceedings of Thirty-First Annual Meeting (August, 1971).
- Herzberg, Frederick. "Job Enrichment Pays Off." Harvard Business Review, 47, No. 2 (March-April, 1969).
- _____. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, 46, No. 1 (January-February, 1968).

- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. 3rd ed. Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1969.
- House, Robert J., and Wigdor, Lawrence A. "Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory, Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism." Personnel Psychology, 20 (Winter, 1967).
- Hulin, Charles L., and Blood, Milton R. "Job Enlargement, Individual Differences, and Worker Responses." Psychological Bulletin, 69, No. 1 (January, 1968).
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Lawler, Edward E., III. "For a More Effective Organization-- March the Job to the Man." Organizational Dynamics (Summer, 1974).
- _____. "Job Design and Employee Motivation." Personnel Psychology, 22, No. 4 (Winter, 1969).
- _____. "A Correlation-Causal Analysis of the Relationship between Expectancy Attitudes and Job Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, No. 6 (December, 1968).
- Likert, Rensis. "Motivational Approach to Management Development." Harvard Business Review, 32, No. 4 (July-August, 1959).
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- _____. "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal." Harvard Business Review, 35, No. 3 (May-June, 1957).
- Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." Psychological Review, 50 (1943).
- Merrill, William C., and Fox, Karl A. Introduction to Economic Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Mills, Ted. "Human Resources--Why the New Concern?" Harvard Business Review, 53, No. 1 (March-April, 1975).
- Morse, John J., and Lorsch, Jay W. "Beyond Theory Y." Harvard Business Review, 48, No. 3 (May-June, 1970).

- Myers, M. Scott. "Every Employee a Manager." California Management Review, 10, No. 3 (Spring, 1968).
- _____. "Overcoming Union Opposition to Job Enrichment." Harvard Business Review, 49, No. 3 (May-June, 1971).
- _____. "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?" Harvard Business Review, 42, No. 1 (January-February, 1964).
- Ondrack, D. A. "Defense Mechanisms and the Herzberg Theory: An Alternate Test." Academy of Management Journal, 17, No. 1 (March, 1974).
- Patchen, Martin. Participation Achievement and Involvement On the Job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Paul, William J.; Robertson, Keith B.; and Herzberg, Frederick. "Job Enrichment Pays Off." Harvard Business Review, 47, No. 2 (March-April, 1969).
- Peterfreund, Stanley. "What Do YOU Expect from a Job?" Management Review (June, 1975).
- Reber, Ralph W., and Terry, Gloria E. Behavioral Insight for Supervision. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Work In America. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.
- Roche, William J., and MacKinnon, Neil L. "Motivating People with Meaningful Work." Harvard Business Review, 48, No. 3 (May-June, 1970).
- Roethlisberger, F. J. Management and Morale. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickson, William J. Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Scanlan, Burt K. "Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Productivity." Personnel Journal, 55, No. 1 (January, 1976).
- Schoderbek, Peter S., and Reif, William E. Job Enlargement: Key to Improved Performance. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1969.

- Schumpeter, Joseph A. History of Economic Analysis. Edited from manuscript by Elizabeth Boody Schumpeter. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Scott, William G., and Mitchell, Terena R. Organizational Theory: A Structural and Behavior Analysis. Homewood, Illinois: Richard E. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1972.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Sirota, David, and Greenwood, J. Michael. "Understand Your Overseas Work Force." Harvard Business Review, 49, No. 1 (January-February, 1971).
- Smith, H. R. "From Moses to Herzberg: An Exploration of Job De-Enrichment." Academy of Management Proceedings. Thirty-Third Annual Meeting (August, 1973).
- Sutermeister, Robert A. People and Productivity. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Tagliaferri, Louis E. "Understanding and Motivating the Changing Work Force." Training and Development Journal, 29, No. 6 (June, 1975).
- Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1947.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1975. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Directory of National Unions and Employee Associations, 1973. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.
- U.S. Statutes at Large, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947, Vol. 61, pt. 1, Title 29, Paragraph 153. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948.
- Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Weaver, Charles N. "Correlates of Job Satisfaction: Some Evidence from the National Surveys." Academy of Management Journal, 17, No. 2 (June, 1974).

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Wimpisinger, William. "Job Enrichment--Another Part of the Forest." Proceedings of the Annual Winter Meeting. Industrial Relations Research Association, Toronto, Canada, 1972.

Wren, Daniel A. The Evolution of Management Thought. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972.

APPENDIX A

LABOR CATEGORY DISTRIBUTION

APPENDIX A

LABOR CATEGORY DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC - PROFESSIONAL

1. Education Association; National
2. National Labor Relations Board Professional Association
3. Nurses' Association; American
4. Overseas Education Association, Inc.
5. Patent Office Professional Association
6. Quarantine Inspectors National Association; Federal Plant
7. School Administrators; American Federation of
8. Teachers; American Federation of
9. Trademark Society, Inc.
10. University Professors, American Association of
11. Veterinarians; National Association of Federal

APPENDIX A (Continued)

PUBLIC - STATE ASSOCIATIONS

1. Alabama State Employees Association
2. Alaska Public Employees Association
3. Arizona Public Employees Association
4. California State Employees Association
5. Civil Service Employees Association, Inc.
6. Colorado Association of Public Employees
7. Connecticut Employees Union
8. Connecticut State Employees Association
9. Idaho Public Employees Association
10. Illinois State Employees Association
11. Indiana State Employees Association
12. Kentucky Career Employees Association
13. Maine State Employees Association
14. Maryland Classified Employees Association, Inc.
15. Massachusetts State Employees Association
16. Michigan State Employees Association
17. Montana Public Employees Association
18. Nebraska Association of Public Employees
19. Nevada Employees Association, State of
20. New Hampshire State Employees Association
21. New Jersey State Employees Association
22. North Carolina State Employees Association
23. North Carolina State Government Employees Association
24. Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, Inc.
25. Oregon State Employees Association
26. Utah Public Employees Association
27. Vermont State Employees Association, Inc.
28. Washington Public Employees Association
29. West Virginia Public Employees Association
30. Wyoming State Employees Association

APPENDIX A (Continued)

PUBLIC - OTHERS

1. Aeronautical Examiners; National Association of
2. Air Traffic Specialist, Inc.; National Association of
3. ASCS County Office Employees; National Association
4. Classified School Employees; American Association of
5. Federal Employees; National Federation of
6. Fire Fighters; International Association of
7. Government Employees; American Federation of
8. Government Employees; National Association of
9. Government Inspectors; National Association of
10. Letter Carriers of the United States of America;
National Association of
11. National Labor Relations Board Union
12. Planners, Estimators, and Progressmen; National
Association of
13. Police; Fraternal Order of
14. Postal and Federal Employees; National Alliance of
15. Postal Supervisors; National Association of
16. Postal Workers Union; America
17. Postmasters of the United States; National League of
18. Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization
19. Rural Letter Carriers' Association; National
20. State, County and Municipal Employees; American
Federation of
21. Technicians Association Civilian
22. Transit Union; Amalgamated
23. Treasury Employees Union, National

APPENDIX A (Continued)

PRIVATE - CRAFT

1. Airline Pilots Association; International
2. Barbers, Beauticians, and Allied Industries, International Association
3. Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; International Brotherhood of
4. Bricklayers, and Allied Craftsmen; International Union of
5. Carpenters and Joiners of America; United Brotherhood of
6. Cooper's International Union of North America
7. Die Sinkers Conference; International
8. Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of
9. Flight Engineers' International Association
10. Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada
11. Granite Cutters' International Association of America; The
12. Horseshoers of the United States and Canada; International Union of Journeymen
13. Inland Boatman's Union of the Pacific
14. Lathers; International Union of Wood, Wire and Metal
15. Licensed Officers' Organization; Great Lakes
16. Licensed Practical Nurses; National Federation of
17. Locomotive Engineers; Brotherhood of
18. Machine Printers and Engravers Association of the United States
19. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; National
20. Masters, Mates and Pilots; International Organization of
21. Operating Engineers; International Union of
22. Painters and Allied Trades of the United States and Canada; International Brotherhood of
23. Physicians National Housestaff Association
24. Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association of the United States and Canada; Operative
25. Plate Printers', Die Stampers' and Engravers' Union of North America; International
26. Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada; United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the
27. Railroad Signalmen; Brotherhood of
28. Railroad Yardmasters of America
29. Roofers, Damp and Waterproof Workers Association; United Slate, Tile and Composition
30. Technical Engineers; International Federation of Professional and
31. Tile, Marble and Terrazzo Finishers and Shopmen; International Union of
32. Tool Craftsmen; International Association of
33. Typographical Union; International
34. Umpires Association; Major League

APPENDIX A (Continued)

PRIVATE - PRODUCTION, MANUFACTURING, AND CONSTRUCTION

1. Allied Workers International Union
2. Aluminum Workers International Union
3. Asbestos Workers; International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and
4. Atlantic Independent Union
5. Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; International Union
6. Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America
7. Bakery Employees Union; Independent
8. Brick and Clay Workers of America; The United
9. Cement Lime and Gypsum Workers International Union; United
10. Chemical Workers Union; International
11. Christian Labor Association of the United States of America
12. Clothing and Textile Workers Union; Amalgamated
13. Communications Workers of America
14. Distillery, Rectifying, Wine and Allied Worker's International Union of America
15. Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; United
16. Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; International Union of
17. Elevator Constructors; International Union of
18. Farm Workers of America; United
19. Firemen and Oilers; International Brotherhood of
20. Furniture Workers of America; United
21. Garment Workers of America; United
22. Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America; United
23. Glass Workers' Union of North America; American Flint
24. Grain Millers; American Federation of
25. Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union; United
26. Industrial Trade Unions; National Organization of
27. Industrial Workers of America; International Union Allied
28. Industrial Workers Union; National
29. International Union of Petroleum and Industrial Workers
30. Iron Workers; International Association of Bridge and Structural
31. Jewelry Workers' Union; International
32. Laborers' International Union of North America
33. Lace Operatives of America; Amalgamated
34. Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; International
35. Leather Goods, Plastic and Novelty Workers Union; International
36. Leather Workers International Union of America
37. Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Association of
38. Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; Industrial Union of

APPENDIX A (Continued)

39. Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America; Amalgamated
40. Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Allied Workers International
41. Mine Workers of America, United
42. Molder's and Allied Workers' Union; International
43. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Worker's International Union
44. Packinghouse and Industrial Workers; National Brotherhood of
45. Paperworkers International Union; United
46. Pattern Makers' League of North America
47. Pottery and Allied Workers; International Brotherhood of
48. Printing and Graphic Communications Union; International
49. Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada; Brotherhood
50. Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, United
51. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association
52. Shoe and Allied Craftsmen; Brotherhood of
53. Shoe Workers' of America; United
54. Shoe Workers' Union; Boot and
55. Southern Labor Union
56. Steelworkers of America; United
57. Stove Furnace and Allied Appliance Workers' International Union of North America
58. Textile Foremen's Guild, Inc.
59. Textile Workers of America; United
60. Tobacco Workers International Union
61. Toys, Playthings, Novelties and Allied Products of the United States and Canada; International Union of Dolls
62. Trades and Crafts National Construction Union; Associated
63. Upholsterers' International Union of North America
64. Watch Workers Union; American
65. Western Pulp and Paper Workers; Association of
66. Wood Workers of America; International

APPENDIX A (Continued)

PRIVATE - SERVICE

1. Actors and Artistes of America
2. Actors Equity Association
3. Aeronautical Production Controllers; National Association of
4. Air Line Dispatchers Association
5. Air Line Employees Association
6. American Federation of Television of Radio Artists
7. American Guild of Musical Artists
8. American Guild of Variety Artists
9. Association of Flight Attendants
10. Baseball Players Association; Major League
11. Basketball Players Association; National
12. Broadcast Employees and Technicians; National Association of
13. Directors, Guild of America, Inc.
14. Distributive Workers of America
15. Football League Players Association; National
16. Graphic Arts International Union
17. Guards Union of America; International
18. Hebrews Actors Union
19. Hockey League Players' Association; National
20. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union
21. Insurance Workers International Union
22. Italian Actors Union
23. Laundry and Dry Cleaning International Union
24. Laundry, Dry Cleaning and Dye House Workers International Union
25. Longshoremen's Association; International
26. Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; International
27. Mailers Union; International
28. Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of
29. Marine Cooks and Stewards' Union
30. Maritime Union of America; National
31. Mechanics Educational Society of America
32. Musicians; American Federation of
33. Newspaper and Mail Deliverers' Union of New York and Vicinity
34. Newspaper Guild; The
35. Office and Professional Employees International Union
36. Operations Analysis Association; National
37. Pacific Coast Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers Association
38. Plant Guard Workers of America; International Union, United
39. Protection Employees; Independent Union of Plant
40. Radio Association; America

APPENDIX A (Continued)

41. Railway and Airline Supervisors Association; The American
42. Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; Brotherhood of
43. Retail Clerks International Association
44. Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union
45. Retail Workers Union; United
46. Sailors' Union of the Pacific
47. Seafarers' International Union of North America
48. Screen Actors Guild
49. Screen Extras Guild
50. Service Employees' International Union
51. Siderographers; International Association of
52. Sleeping Car Porters; Brotherhood of
53. Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America; International Brotherhood of
54. Telecommunications International Union
55. Telegraph Workers; United
56. Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada; International Alliance of
57. Train Dispatchers Association; American
58. Transport Workers Union of America
59. Transportation Union; United
60. Utility Workers of New England, Inc.; Brotherhood of
61. Utility Workers Union of America
62. Watchmen's Association; Independent
63. Western States Service Station Employees Union
64. Writers Guild of America, East, Inc.
65. Writers Guild of America, West, Inc.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE

1419 Spruce Drive
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
November 19, 1976

Dear

Because of your leadership position within the union structure, you have been selected to assist in a study concerning the concept of job enrichment.* As a professional labor representative you will be interested in the results of this study since its purpose is to discover the attitudes of labor leaders toward the use and application of job enrichment.

This subject is the topic of my doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma. A literature review revealed very little information concerning union leaders' attitudes toward the concept. Your help is needed in order to establish accuracy of the data.

Will you please complete the questionnaire packet which I have enclosed concerning the subject under study? There is a stamped, return-addressed envelope enclosed for your convenience. If a member of your staff completes the form for you, please review it to insure that it accurately reflects your opinions in the job enrichment area before mailing it.

I assure you that your identity will not be used or disclosed in any manner. I will be happy to share the results of this study with you, and if you want a copy of the results, please check the box identified for this purpose on the questionnaire.

Please let me thank you in advance for your interest and participation as an authority in this study.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND L. PRICE

Attachment

*See instructions paragraph 2 for definitions.

INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Please complete the entire form by checking the appropriate blocks on Part I, II, and III. Part II has certain questions which ask for percentages that are very important to the outcome of this study. Comments on Part IV will be extremely helpful during the analysis phase of this study.

Job enrichment in this study is defined as a redesign of jobs and tasks with the goal of enriching work by adding to it greater responsibility, challenge, variety and/or independence. This involves an extension of job tasks backward into the planning function and forward into the control function. This does not include job enlargement or in other words the expansion of the number of same level tasks.

The unions chosen for this study have been divided into groups for analysis purposes. The groups and a short definition are shown below:

Public

Professional — Those unions representing employees engaged in activities as described by the Taft-Hartley Act that are of a mental nature, requiring exercise of discretion and judgment, where the output cannot be standardized within a given time frame and requiring knowledge in an advanced field of science or technology.

State — Those unions/associations solely dedicated to representing state employees.

Other — All other public unions not primarily representing membership in the above.

Private

Craft — Those unions where the member must have a license, certification or apprenticeship to perform their trade.

Production/Manufacturing and Construction — Those unions where the membership does not fit in craft classification yet are associated directly to a physical product.

Service — All other private sector unions whereby the membership is not in those shown above.

Using the above definition of groups, please check the box below which coincides with the majority of your membership.

Public Professional

Public State

Public Other

Private Craft

Private Production/Manufacturing/Construction

Private Service

Check here if you would like a copy of the results of this study mailed to you.

--

122
QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

In the matrix shown below, check the block which represents your judgment regarding the statements concerning the concept of job enrichment:

I believe that job enrichment, if used properly, could:

1. Be directly responsible for providing promotion opportunities for our membership.
2. Assist management in recognizing the individual achievement of our membership.
3. Make the work more challenging for the individual member.
4. Provide more responsibility to the individual member.
5. Create better communication channels between the employee and his supervisors.
6. Decrease the close supervision by management of our membership.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Be directly responsible for providing promotion opportunities for our membership.					
2. Assist management in recognizing the individual achievement of our membership.					
3. Make the work more challenging for the individual member.					
4. Provide more responsibility to the individual member.					
5. Create better communication channels between the employee and his supervisors.					
6. Decrease the close supervision by management of our membership.					

Part II

1. Do any of the firms with which you bargain use job enrichment concepts?

Yes _____ No _____ Do Not Know _____

If your answer is yes, please estimate the percentage of firms using job enrichment techniques. _____

If your answer to question number one above is yes, also please indicate the percentage of firms that had your support of their enrichment program. _____

2. Have you ever received a mandate from your membership to go to the bargaining table with the issue of promoting the adoption of a job enrichment program?

Yes _____ No _____

3. Do any of your current contracts have provisions relating to job enrichment?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer is yes, please estimate the percentage of contracts containing those current provisions. _____

4. Do you have any current plans to bargain on the issue of job enrichment?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

5. Have you had formal training on the concept of job enrichment?

Yes _____ No _____

6. Do you believe that your membership understands the term job enrichment as defined in this packet?

Yes _____ No _____ Do Not Know _____

If your answer is yes, please estimate the percentage of the membership that does. _____

7. With reference to the definition of job enrichment as shown on the instruction sheet for this package, what results could be expected with the application of job enrichment concepts to the following type workers.

	Good Results	Poor Results
Laborer		
Professional		
Clerical		
Sales		
Craft/Operator		
Technician		

8. To your knowledge has there been union-sponsored research applied to the application of job enrichment for your membership?

Yes _____ No _____ Do Not Know _____

Part III

On the following survey, as the leader of the union, check the block best expressing your attitude:

1. I feel that job enrichment concepts if used properly would benefit our membership.
2. I feel that most firms with which I bargain do not fully understand the theory and proper application of job enrichment.
3. I think that job enrichment should be a bargaining issue.
4. I believe that the benefits claimed for job enrichment in publications have been overstated.
5. I feel that the use of job enrichment benefits management rather than the worker.
6. I believe that the majority of our membership would favor the application of job enrichment to their jobs.
7. I believe the real motive of management for implementing job enrichment programs is to get more output for the same pay.
8. I believe the use of job enrichment instills a sense of pride in the individual's work and product.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I feel that job enrichment concepts if used properly would benefit our membership.					
2. I feel that most firms with which I bargain do not fully understand the theory and proper application of job enrichment.					
3. I think that job enrichment should be a bargaining issue.					
4. I believe that the benefits claimed for job enrichment in publications have been overstated.					
5. I feel that the use of job enrichment benefits management rather than the worker.					
6. I believe that the majority of our membership would favor the application of job enrichment to their jobs.					
7. I believe the real motive of management for implementing job enrichment programs is to get more output for the same pay.					
8. I believe the use of job enrichment instills a sense of pride in the individual's work and product.					

Part IV

For the following questions, please answer with brief statements:

1. Do you know of any cases where job enrichment either has/has not produced desirable results from the standpoint of the union and its membership? If so, please describe:

Part IV (Continued)

2. Are you fundamentally opposed to job enrichment concepts?

Yes_____ No_____ Conditional_____

If your answer is conditional, under what conditions would you favor the application of job enrichment techniques?

3. Please feel free to provide any further comments concerning the use and application of job enrichment that you may have encountered in your experience:

1419 Spruce
Norman, OK 73069

Dear Mr. :

On November 19, 1976, I mailed a questionnaire packet to your office. The purpose of that survey instrument was to gather data in order to establish union leaders' attitudes toward the application of job enrichment concepts. You were selected to assist in this study because of your knowledge and leadership position with the union structure.

In the event that for one reason or another, you did not receive the initial package, I am enclosing another one for your attention. If you completed the first form, simply destroy this package.

The return of the questionnaire is vital to the completion of my doctorate degree; therefore, I would deeply appreciate your taking the time from your busy schedule to complete and return the form to me.

Once again let me reiterate that your identity will not be discussed in any manner. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please check the appropriate box on the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this study as an authority in the labor field.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND L. PRICE

Enclosure