



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Dundon, Tony

Employment relations in non-union organisations : a study of the patterns of relationship modification in the absence of a trade union

### Original Citation

Dundon, Tony (1999) Employment relations in non-union organisations : a study of the patterns of relationship modification in the absence of a trade union. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/4844/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

**EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS IN  
NON-UNION ORGANISATIONS**

**A STUDY OF THE PATTERNS OF RELATIONSHIP  
MODIFICATION IN THE ABSENCE OF A TRADE UNION**

BY

**TONY DUNDON**

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
at Huddersfield University Business School

**Vol. II**

**APPENDICES**

**VOL. II**  
**APPENDICES**

**SUMMARY CONTENTS**

<b>DETAILED CONTENTS &amp; INDEX</b>		<b>v -ix</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX ONE</b>	<b>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND SPECIFICATION</b>	<b>1</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX TWO</b>	<b>MEASURING FRAMEWORK FOR THE FIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP: ALL COMPANIES</b>	<b>49</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX THREE</b>	<b>FACTOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURE &amp; RESULTS</b>	<b>104</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX W8</b>	<b>RESULTS AND STATISTICAL TESTS FOR WATER CO.</b>	<b>122</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX C9</b>	<b>RESULTS AND STATISTICAL TESTS FOR CHEM CO.</b>	<b>137</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX M10</b>	<b>RESULTS AND STATISTICAL TESTS FOR MERCHANT CO.</b>	<b>160</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX D11</b>	<b>RESULTS AND STATISTICAL TESTS FOR DELIVERY CO.</b>	<b>175</b>
<hr/>		
<b>APPENDIX 12</b>	<b>INTEGRATION OF RESULTS: ALL COMPANIES</b>	<b>194</b>
<hr/>		

## APPENDICES DETAILED CONTENTS & INDEX

### APPENDIX ONE

<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 1</i>	<i>POSTAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE</i>	1
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 2</i>	<i>COMPANY QUESTIONNAIRE</i>	15
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 3</i>	<i>COMPANY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE</i>	26
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 4</i>	<i>EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE</i>	30
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 5</i>	<i>EMPLOYEE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE</i>	40
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 6</i>	<i>DATA SPECIFICATION AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION</i>	43
<i>APPENDIX ONE: PART 7</i>	<i>PROFILE OF POSTAL SURVEY RESPONDENTS</i>	47

### APPENDIX TWO

<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1</i>	<i>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR REGULATORY APPROACHES</i>	49
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1.1</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF REGULATORY APPROACHES: WATER CO.</i>	52
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1.2</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF REGULATORY APPROACHES: CHEM CO.</i>	54
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1.3</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF REGULATORY APPROACHES: DELIVERY CO.</i>	55
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1.4</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF REGULATORY APPROACHES: MERCHANT CO.</i>	60
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 1.5</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF REGULATORY APPROACHES: ALL CASES</i>	62
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2</i>	<i>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR DIMENSION HR STRATEGY</i>	63
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2.1</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF HR STRATEGY: WATER CO.</i>	65
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2.2</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF HR STRATEGY: CHEM CO.</i>	67
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2.3</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF HR STRATEGY: DELIVERY CO.</i>	69
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2.4</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF HR STRATEGY: MERCHANT CO.</i>	71
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 2.5</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF HR STRATEGY: ALL CASES</i>	73
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3</i>	<i>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR DIMENSION TRUST</i>	74
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3.1</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF TRUST: WATER CO.</i>	76
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3.2</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF TRUST: CHEM CO.</i>	78
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3.3</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF TRUST: DELIVERY CO.</i>	80
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3.4</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF TRUST: MERCHANT CO.</i>	82
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 3.5</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF TRUST: ALL CASES</i>	84
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4</i>	<i>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR DIMENSION FORMALISATION</i>	85
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.1</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF FORMALISATION: WATER CO.</i>	87
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.1A</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FORMALISATION: WATER CO.</i>	89
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.2</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF FORMALISATION: CHEM CO.</i>	90
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.2A</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FORMALISATION: CHEM CO.</i>	92
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.3</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF FORMALISATION: DELIVERY CO.</i>	93
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.3A</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FORMALISATION: DELIVERY CO.</i>	94
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.4</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF FORMALISATION: MERCHANT CO.</i>	95
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.4A</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FORMALISATION: MERCHANT CO.</i>	96
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 4.5</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF FORMALISATION: ALL CASES</i>	97
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5</i>	<i>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR DIMENSION DISCRETENESS</i>	98
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.1</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF DISCRETENESS: WATER CO.</i>	99
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.2</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF DISCRETENESS: CHEM CO.</i>	100
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.3</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF DISCRETENESS: DELIVERY CO.</i>	101
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.4</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF DISCRETENESS: MERCHANT CO.</i>	102
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.5</i>	<i>DATA MEASURES OF 'ATTITUDINAL' &amp; 'BEHAVIOURAL' THEM &amp; US'</i>	103
<i>APPENDIX 2: TABLE 5.6</i>	<i>SUMMATION OF DISCRETENESS: ALL CASES</i>	103

**APPENDIX THREE**  
**FACTOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURE & RESULTS**

<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	104
<i>OUTLINE OF FACTOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURE</i>	105
<i>TABLE A3.1: SUMMARY STATISTICS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS</i>	106
<i>TABLE A3.2: FACTOR LOADINGS (VARIMAX ROTATED)</i>	106
<i>INTERPRETATION OF FACTORS</i>	108
<i>FACTOR SCALES &amp; MEASUREMENTS</i>	111
<i>TABLE A3.3: POSITIVE/NEGATIVE FACTOR ATTITUDES</i>	112
<i>INTERPRETATION OF FACTOR MEASUREMENTS</i>	113
<i>SUMMARY OF FACTOR ANALYSIS</i>	115
<i>TABLE A3.4: CORRELATION MATRIX OF FACTORS</i>	117

**APPENDIX W8**  
**WATER CO.**

<i>BIOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF WATER CO. WORKFORCE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	122
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; STANDARD DEV: RESPONSES ABOUT TRADE UNIONS</i>	123
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; STANDARD DEV: RESPONSES ABOUT CO. &amp; MANAGEMENT</i>	123
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; STANDARD DEV: RESPONSES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES</i>	124
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; STANDARD DEV: RESPONSES ABOUT VOICE &amp; SATISFACTION</i>	124
<i>APPENDIX W8.1 COMPUTATION OF VARIABLE SUB-SCALES USED (FOR ALL COMPANIES)</i>	125
<i>APPENDIX W8.1 SUB-SCALES USED FOR EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	125
<i>APPENDIX W8.1A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	126
<i>APPENDIX W8.1B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	126
<i>APPENDIX W8.1C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY SUB-SCALES</i>	126
<i>APPENDIX W8.2 SUB-SCALES USED FOR CLIMATE</i>	127
<i>APPENDIX W8.2A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: CLIMATE</i>	127
<i>APPENDIX W8.2B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: CLIMATE</i>	128
<i>APPENDIX W8.2C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: CLIMATIC SUB-SCALES</i>	128
<i>APPENDIX W8.3 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT</i>	129
<i>APPENDIX W8.3A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	129
<i>APPENDIX W8.3B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	130
<i>APPENDIX W8.3C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT SUB-SCALES</i>	130
<i>APPENDIX W8.4 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD TRADE UNIONS</i>	131
<i>APPENDIX W8.4A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	131
<i>APPENDIX W8.4B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	131
<i>APPENDIX W8.4C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNION SUB-SCALES</i>	131
<i>APPENDIX W8.5 SUB-SCALES USED FOR WORK SATISFACTION/EXPERIENCES</i>	132
<i>APPENDIX W8.5A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	132
<i>APPENDIX W8.5B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	133
<i>APPENDIX W8.5C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO WORK SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES</i>	133
<i>APPENDIX W8.6 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD COMPANY</i>	134
<i>APPENDIX W8.6A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	134
<i>APPENDIX W8.6B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	134
<i>APPENDIX W8.6C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY SUB-SCALES</i>	134
<i>APPENDIX W8.7 DESCRIPTIVE TABULATION OF RELATIONSHIP INFLUENCES FOR WATER CO.</i>	135

**APPENDIX C9**  
**CHEM CO.**

<i>BIOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF CHEM CO. WORKFORCE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	137
<i>BIOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF CHEM CO. WORKFORCE: BY SITE / DIVISION</i>	140
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT TRADE UNIONS: BY OCCUPATION</i>	142
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT CO. &amp; MANAGEMENT: BY OCCUPATION</i>	143
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES BY OCCUPATION</i>	144
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT VOICE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	145
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT TRADE UNIONS: BY SITE/DIVISION</i>	146
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT CO. &amp; MANAGEMENT: BY SITE/DIVISION</i>	146
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES: BY SITE/DIVISION</i>	147
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT VOICE: BY SITE/DIVISION</i>	147
<i>APPENDIX C9.1 SUB-SCALES USED FOR EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY (SEE ALSO APX W8.1)</i>	148
<i>APPENDIX C9.1A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	148
<i>APPENDIX C9.1B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	149
<i>APPENDIX C9.1C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY SUB-SCALES</i>	149
<i>APPENDIX C9.2 SUB-SCALES USED FOR CLIMATE (SEE ALSO APX W8.2)</i>	150
<i>APPENDIX C9.2A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: CLIMATE</i>	150
<i>APPENDIX C9.2B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: CLIMATE</i>	150
<i>APPENDIX C9.2C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: CLIMATIC SUB-SCALES</i>	152
<i>APPENDIX C9.3 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT (SEE APX W8.3)</i>	153
<i>APPENDIX C9.3A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	153
<i>APPENDIX C9.3B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	153
<i>APPENDIX C9.3C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT SUB-SCALES</i>	154
<i>APPENDIX C9.4 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD TRADE UNIONS (SEE APX W8.4)</i>	155
<i>APPENDIX C9.4A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	155
<i>APPENDIX C9.4B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	155
<i>APPENDIX C9.4C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNION SUB-SCALES</i>	155
<i>APPENDIX C9.5 SUB-SCALES USED FOR WORK SATISFACTION/EXPERIENCES (SEE APX W8.5)</i>	156
<i>APPENDIX C9.5A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	156
<i>APPENDIX C9.5B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	156
<i>APPENDIX C9.5C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO WORK SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES</i>	157
<i>APPENDIX C9.6 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD COMPANY (SEE ALSO APX W8.6)</i>	158
<i>APPENDIX C9.6A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	158
<i>APPENDIX C9.6B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	158
<i>APPENDIX C9.6C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY SUB-SCALES</i>	158
<i>APPENDIX C9.7 DESCRIPTIVE TABULATION OF RELATIONSHIP INFLUENCES FOR CHEM CO.</i>	159

<b>APPENDIX M10</b>
<b>MERCHANT CO.</b>

<i>BIOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF MERCHANT CO. WORKFORCE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	160
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT TRADE UNIONS: BY OCCUPATION</i>	162
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT CO. &amp; MANAGEMENT: BY OCCUPATION</i>	162
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES BY OCCUPATION</i>	163
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT VOICE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	163
<i>APPENDIX M10.1 SUB-SCALES USED FOR EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY (SEE ALSO APX W8.1)</i>	164
<i>APPENDIX M10.1A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	164
<i>APPENDIX M10.1B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	165
<i>APPENDIX M10.1C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY SUB-SCALES</i>	165
<i>APPENDIX M10.2 SUB-SCALES USED FOR CLIMATE (SEE ALSO APX W8.2)</i>	166
<i>APPENDIX M10.2A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: CLIMATE</i>	166
<i>APPENDIX M10.2B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: CLIMATE</i>	166
<i>APPENDIX M10.2C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: CLIMATIC SUB-SCALES</i>	167
<i>APPENDIX M10.3 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT (SEE APX W8.3)</i>	168
<i>APPENDIX M10.3A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	168
<i>APPENDIX M10.3B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	168
<i>APPENDIX M10.3C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT SUB-SCALES</i>	169
<i>APPENDIX M10.4 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD TRADE UNIONS (SEE APX W8.4)</i>	170
<i>APPENDIX M10.4A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	170
<i>APPENDIX M10.4B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	170
<i>APPENDIX M10.4C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNION SUB-SCALES</i>	170
<i>APPENDIX M10.5 SUB-SCALES USED FOR WORK SATISFACTION/EXPERIENCES (SEE APX W8.5)</i>	171
<i>APPENDIX M10.5A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	171
<i>APPENDIX M10.5B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	171
<i>APPENDIX M10.5C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO WORK SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES</i>	172
<i>APPENDIX M10.6 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD COMPANY (SEE APX W8.6)</i>	173
<i>APPENDIX M10.6A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	173
<i>APPENDIX M10.6B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	173
<i>APPENDIX M10.6C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY SUB-SCALES</i>	173
<i>APPENDIX M10.7 DESCRIPTIVE TABULATION OF RELATIONSHIP INFLUENCES FOR MERCHANT CO.</i>	174

**APPENDIX D11  
DELIVERY CO.**

<i>BIOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF DELIVERY CO. WORKFORCE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	175
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT TRADE UNIONS: BY OCCUPATION</i>	178
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT CO. &amp; MANAGEMENT: BY OCCUPATION</i>	179
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT WORK PRACTICES BY OCCUPATION</i>	180
<i>MEAN SCORES &amp; ST.D: RESPONSES ABOUT VOICE: BY OCCUPATION</i>	181
<i>APPENDIX D11.1 SUB-SCALES USED FOR EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY (SEE ALSO APX W8.1)</i>	182
<i>APPENDIX D11.1A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	182
<i>APPENDIX D11.1B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY</i>	183
<i>APPENDIX D11.1C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE VOICE UTILITY SUB-SCALES</i>	183
<i>APPENDIX D11.2 SUB-SCALES USED FOR CLIMATE (SEE ALSO APX W8.2)</i>	184
<i>APPENDIX D11.2A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: CLIMATE</i>	184
<i>APPENDIX D11.2B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: CLIMATE</i>	184
<i>APPENDIX D11.2C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: CLIMATIC SUB-SCALES</i>	185
<i>APPENDIX D11.3 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT (SEE APX W8.3)</i>	186
<i>APPENDIX D11.3A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	186
<i>APPENDIX D11.3B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT</i>	186
<i>APPENDIX D11.3C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO MANAGEMENT SUB-SCALES</i>	187
<i>APPENDIX D11.4 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD TRADE UNIONS (SEE APX W8.4)</i>	188
<i>APPENDIX D11.4A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	188
<i>APPENDIX D11.4B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO UNIONS</i>	188
<i>APPENDIX D11.4C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNION SUB-SCALES</i>	188
<i>APPENDIX D11.5 SUB-SCALES USED FOR WORK SATISFACTION/EXPERIENCES (SEE APX W8.5)</i>	189
<i>APPENDIX D11.5A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	189
<i>APPENDIX D11.5B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO WORK</i>	189
<i>APPENDIX D11.5C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO WORK SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES</i>	190
<i>APPENDIX D11.6 SUB-SCALES USED FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD COMPANY (SEE APX W8.6)</i>	191
<i>APPENDIX D11.6A MEAN SCORES &amp; POSITIVE/NEGATIVE DEVIATIONS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	191
<i>APPENDIX D11.6B TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE SIGNIFICANCE: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY</i>	191
<i>APPENDIX D11.6C CORRELATION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDES TO COMPANY SUB-SCALES</i>	191
<i>APPENDIX D11.7 DESCRIPTIVE TABULATION OF RELATIONSHIP INFLUENCES FOR DELIVERY CO.</i>	192

**APPENDIX 12  
INTEGRATION OF RESULTS**

<i>TABLE 12A SUMMARY TABULATION OF MAIN INFLUENCES ON DIMENSION REGULATION</i>	194
<i>TABLE 12B SUMMARY TABULATION OF MAIN INFLUENCES ON DIMENSION HR STRATEGY</i>	197
<i>TABLE 12C SUMMARY TABULATION OF MAIN INFLUENCES ON DIMENSION TRUST</i>	200
<i>TABLE 12D SUMMARY TABULATION OF MAIN INFLUENCES ON DIMENSION FORMALISATION</i>	203
<i>TABLE 12E SUMMARY TABULATION OF MAIN INFLUENCES ON DIMENSION DISCRETENESS</i>	206
<i>TABLE 12F COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES SCALES: ALL COMPANIES</i>	209



**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 1**

**Postal Survey Questionnaire**



**THE MANAGEMENT OF  
HUMAN RESOURCES IN THE 1990s**

This is a confidential questionnaire to find information on the human resource and personnel arrangements in your company. The information will be treated in the strictest confidence.

Whilst it is recognised that the management of human resources will vary between occupational groups in your company, and thus no single answer is likely to cover every employee group, it would be helpful if you could direct your answers to the most typical employee where no specific occupational category is mentioned.

Could you please respond to each question by either writing your answer in the space provided, or by ticking the appropriate box. Please feel free to add any additional comments you may think are necessary.

Could you please ensure that all the pages remain intact.

When you have completed the questionnaire can you please return it in the pre-paid envelope provided, addressed to Tony Dundon, School of Business, University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield, HD1 3DH.

We hope you find this survey interesting and that we may contribute to the understanding of the management of human resources in today's business environment through your support.

***Your participation in this study is very important to the success of the research project.***

***May I thank you for your time and co-operation.***

1. Can you please identify your company's main trading sector?

For Office Use Only 001
----------------------------

- Service Sector
- Manufacturing Sector

2. Can you please say in which industry does your company operate?

**a) Manufacturing**

- Metals & Mineral Products
- Chemicals & Manufactured Fibres
- Metal Goods
- Mechanical Engineering
- Electrical & Instrumental Engineering
- Vehicles & Transport Equipment
- Food, Drink & Tobacco
- Textiles
- Leather, Footwear & Clothing
- Timber & Furniture
- Paper & Printing
- Rubber & Plastics
- Other Manufacturing
- (please describe)*

**b) Services**

- Energy & Water
- Construction
- Wholesale Distribution
- Retail Distribution
- Hotels & Catering
- Transport
- Post & Telecommunications
- Banking, Finance & insurance
- Business Services
- Educational
- Medical Services
- Other Services
- (please describe)*

3. Is the establishment you work in part of a larger organisation or multinational company ?

- Yes  No

4. If you answered yes to question 3, what is the trading name and country of residence for your parent organisation or company's head office (e.g. IBM, USA).

5. Can you please give the year when your company started trading?

6. Approximately, can you please give the total number of employees who are employed at this or the main plant/site for the company ?

.....

7. Approximately, please list the number of employees who fall into the following:

	Male	Female
Chief Executives	_____	_____
Senior Managers	_____	_____
Personnel Managers	_____	_____
Line/Operations Managers	_____	_____
Supervisors	_____	_____
Technical/Professional	_____	_____
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	_____	_____
Sales	_____	_____
Skilled and Semi-skilled	_____	_____
Unskilled	_____	_____
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	_____	_____

.....

8. Approximately, please list the number of employees that have the following job arrangements in your company:

	Male	Female
Full-time working	_____	_____
Flexible working hours	_____	_____
Shift attendance	_____	_____
Part-time working	_____	_____
Job share	_____	_____
Temporary employees	_____	_____
Agency staff	_____	_____
Regularly work overtime	_____	_____

9. Does your company recognise a trade union for all or some or all of the following categories of employees?

Managerial	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Unskilled	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]

.....

10. If appropriate, can you please say whether your parent company or group recognise a trade union?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

11. If no, can you please say whether your company has ever been asked to recognise a trade union?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

12. If you have answered yes to question 11, can you please say which union requested recognition and the approximate date when the request was made (e.g., month and year)

	Union	Date	Recognised	
Managerial	_____	_____	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	_____	_____	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)	_____	_____	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Unskilled	_____	_____	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Any Other (please describe)	_____	_____	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

13. If your company does recognise a trade union, can you please say whether the trade union is recognised for some or all of the following: (please tick as many as may be necessary)

Negotiate pay and terms & conditions	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Consult over pay and terms & conditions	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Company pension	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Health & safety arrangements	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Disciplinary matters	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Grievance representation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
To pass on information to employees	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

14. Has your company ever de-recognised a trade union?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. If yes, can you briefly describe the circumstances of de-recognition.

.....  
 .....  
 .....

16. Does your company recognise an in-house staff or employee association for all or some of the following categories of employees?

Managerial	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Unskilled	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Any Other (please describe)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

17. Can you please say whether the parent organisation or group recognise an in-house staff

association?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

18. If yes, can you please say whether the staff or employee association is recognised for some or all of the following: *(please tick as many as may be necessary)*

Negotiate pay and terms & conditions	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Consult over pay and terms & conditions	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Company pension	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Health & safety arrangements	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Disciplinary matters	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Grievance representation	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
To pass on information to employees	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]

19. Can you please say whether your company is a member/use the services of an Employer Association for any personnel/employee relation matters?

Member	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Use Services	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]

20. Does your company have its own personnel or human resources department?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

21. If you answered yes to question 20, can you please say how many people are employed within the personnel or human resources department?

Managerial	_____
Clerical/Admin	_____
Professional	_____
Any Other <i>(please describe)</i>	_____

22. If you have answered yes to question 20, can you please say how many people in your company's personnel department have formal personnel-related qualifications ? *(e.g. IPD)*

Managerial	_____
Clerical/Admin	_____
Professional	_____
Any Other <i>(please describe)</i>	_____

23. Is there a senior manager/director within your company with sole responsibility for personnel-related matters?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

***If you answered no to question 23, please go to question 27.***

24. If you answered yes to question 23, is the same senior manager/director a member of the

company's board of directors?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

25. Does the senior manager/director dealing with personnel-related matters have any other responsibilities?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

26. Would you describe the role of personnel in your company as an 'advice/support' function to other line managers?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

27. Can you please say whether your company has ever introduced a total quality management programme ?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

28. If yes, can you briefly describe what is involved in your company's TQM programme?

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

29. Does your company have a formal 'mission statement' ?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

**If possible, could you please enclose a copy of your company's mission statement with this questionnaire**

30. Are any of the following methods of employee involvement encouraged within your company? *(please tick those which are actively encouraged or discouraged)*

Encouraged [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]      Discouraged

- a) Profit share [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- b) Briefing groups [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- c) Collective bargaining [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- d) Works councils [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- e) Quality circles [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- f) Suggestion schemes [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- g) Any Other *(please describe)* [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

31. How frequently are the following methods of communication to employees used within your company: *(please tick the most common)*

Frequently  Infrequently

- Access to junior managers by individual employee
- Access to middle managers by individual employee
- Team, Group, or Department briefing of employees
- Employee handbook
- Notice Boards
- Company newsletters
- Employee surveys/ballots
- Any Other *(please describe)*

32. Does your company have any arrangements to encourage employees to communicate to each other over job related matters?

Yes  No

33. Does your company have a formal disciplinary procedure or policy?

Yes  No

*If you have answered no to question 33, please go to question 37.*

34. If you answered yes to question 33, can you please identify which of the following arrangements exist within your disciplinary procedure: *(please tick as many as necessary)*

- Verbal (informal) warning Yes  No
- Verbal (formal) warning Yes  No
- Written warning Yes  No
- Final written warning Yes  No
- Corrective action *(e.g., sanctions, demotion etc.)* Yes  No
- Dismissal Yes  No
- Any Other *(please describe)* Yes  No

35. Are disciplinary decisions made by supervisors within your company?

Yes  No

36. How would you view your company's approach to handling disciplinary matters?

Tendency to be handled informally  Tendency to be handled formally   
*(e.g., before formal procedures are used)* *(e.g., only within formal procedures)*



If possible, could you please enclose a copy of your company's discipline procedure with this questionnaire?

37. Does your company have a formal grievance procedure?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

*If you have answered no to question 38, please go to question 41.*

38. If you answered yes to question 37, can you please identify which of the following arrangements/stages exist within your grievance procedure? (tick as many as necessary)

Informally raising a complaint	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Formally raising a complaint	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Stage 1 - formal hearing	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Stage 2 - formal hearing	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Stage 3 - formal hearing	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Stage 4 - formal hearing	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Any Other (please describe)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

39. Are grievance decisions made by supervisors within your company?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

40. How would you view your company's approach to handling grievance matters?

Tendency to be handled informally (e.g., before formal procedures are used)	_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	Tendency to be handled formally (e.g., used only within formal procedures)
--	---------------------	---

If possible, could you please enclose a copy of your company's grievance procedure with this questionnaire?

41. Does your company provide training for employees?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

*If you have answered no to question 41, please go to question 47.*

42. How formally structured is the training for the following categories of employee.

Very Formal/Structured	_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	Very Informal/ Un-Structured
Managerial	_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	

Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unskilled	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>

43. How job related is the training for each of the following employee categories.

	Very job-related	<input type="checkbox"/>	Little job relation
Managerial		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Clerical/Admin (white collar)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Unskilled		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )		<input type="checkbox"/>	

44. Would you say the majority of training is conducted on-the-job for the typical employee?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

45. How many different training programmes are available for each of the following categories of employee?

	Many	<input type="checkbox"/>	Few
Managerial		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Clerical/Admin (white collar)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Unskilled		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )		<input type="checkbox"/>	

46. On average, how many hours training does each of the following employee receive each year?

	None	11-20hrs	21-40hrs	41-60hrs	61-80hrs	81+hrs
Managerial	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Skilled/Semi-skilled (manual)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Unskilled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

47. Does your company have a formal job evaluation scheme for any of the follow categories of employee?

Managerial	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Skilled and Semi-skilled (manual)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Unskilled	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]

48. Does your company carry out individual performance appraisal for any of the following employees?

Managerial	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Clerical/Admin (white collar)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Skilled/Semi-skilled (manual)	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Unskilled	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]
Any Other ( <i>please describe</i> )	Yes	[ ]	No	[ ]

*If you have answered no to all parts of question 48, please go to question 52.*

49. If you answered yes to any part of question 48, what would say are the main objectives of the appraisal? (*please tick no more than 3 responses - indicating a priority order if you wish*)

- a) Company competitiveness [ ]
- b) Assessment of past performance [ ]
- c) Assessment of future development [ ]
- d) Assessment for training needs [ ]
- e) Assessment for annual pay review [ ]
- f) Promotion decisions [ ]
- g) Any Other (*please describe*) [ ]

50. On average, how often is the typical employee appraised?

- Yearly [ ]
- Half yearly [ ]
- Quarterly [ ]
- Monthly [ ]

51. Who carries out the appraisal for the typical employee?

- Immediate manager/supervisor [ ]
- More senior manager [ ]
- Personnel manager [ ]
- Any Other (*please describe*) [ ]

52. Which of the following methods does your company use to advertise job vacancies?

- Internal notice board [ ]
- Word of mouth [ ]
- Private employment agencies [ ]
- Job centres [ ]
- Local newspapers [ ]
- National newspapers [ ]
- Any Other (*please describe*) [ ]

53. Can you please indicate which of the following are commonly used in selecting new employees? *(please tick no more than 3 responses - indicating a priority order if you wish)*

- Individual interview [ ]
- Panel selection board [ ]
- Informal chat [ ]
- Medical examination [ ]
- Personality tests [ ]
- Agency staff (no interview) [ ]
- Agency staff (interview by your company) [ ]
- Recruit from prior knowledge [ ]
- Recommended by another employee [ ]
- Any other *(please describe)* [ ]

54. Are any of the following categories of employee encouraged/allowed to carry out more than one occupation task? *(sometimes referred to as multi-skilling or flexible workforce)*

- |                                    |         |        |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Managerial                         | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| Clerical/Admin (white collar)      | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| Skilled/ Semi-skilled (manual)     | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| Technical/Professional             | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| Unskilled                          | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| Any Other <i>(please describe)</i> | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |

55. If you answered yes to any part of question 54, can you please explain the circumstance/reasons for a multi-skilled/flexible workforce?

.....

.....

.....

.....

56. Can you please say whether you company review the pay for 'all' employees 'together' ? *(i.e. collectively)*

- Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

57. If you have answered yes to question 56, can you briefly describe whether the collective process involves employees consultation/negotiation about the pay review?

.....

.....

.....

.....

58. If you have answered no to question 56, does your company review the pay of each individual employee separately?

- Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

59. Does your company operate a performance pay system for employees additional to the annual pay review?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

60. How would you rate the pay in your company to other companies in the same geographical area?

Higher [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Lower

61. In your opinion, how do you think the average employee's wage in your company compares to the pay in similar companies within the same industry?

Better [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Worse

62. Does your company provide 'paid' holiday leave to the typical employee?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

63. Does your company have a formal policy of employing all employees on the same/similar terms and conditions? *(sometimes this is referred to as single status or harmonisation)*

Yes [ ] No [ ]

64. Can you please indicate whether your company provides any of the following non-pay benefits for the typical employee?

Sick pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Maternity pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Paternity pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Holiday pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Contributory pension scheme	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Employee share option scheme	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Company car	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Subsidies (e.g., meals, clothing, free parking)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Sports facilities at the workplace	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Child care at the workplace	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Medical treatment (e.g. BUPA)	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Any Other <i>(please describe)</i>	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

65. Can you please indicate which of the following type of payment system is used in your company for the following categories of employees:

<i>(a) Managerial</i>	Negotiated		Not Negotiated	
	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Performance related pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on qualification	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on age	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to job evaluation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to appraisal	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Individual incentive award	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Cost of living increase	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Payment-By-Results	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Profit share	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

<i>(b) Technical/Professional</i>	Negotiated		Not Negotiated	
	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Performance related pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on qualification	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on age	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to job evaluation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to appraisal	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Individual incentive award	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Cost of living increase	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Payment-By-Results	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Profit share	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

<i>(c) Clerical/Admin (white collar)</i>	Negotiated		Not Negotiated	
	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Performance related pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on qualification	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on age	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to job evaluation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to appraisal	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Individual incentive award	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Cost of living increase	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Payment-By-Results	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Profit share	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

<i>(d) Skilled/Semi-skilled (manual)</i>	Negotiated		Not Negotiated	
	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Performance related pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on qualification	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on age	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to job evaluation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to appraisal	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Individual incentive award	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Cost of living increase	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Payment-By-Results	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Profit share	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

<i>(e) Unskilled</i>	Negotiated		Not Negotiated	
	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Performance related pay	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on qualification	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay based on age	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to job evaluation	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Pay related to appraisal	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Individual incentive award	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Cost of living increase	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Payment-By-Results	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]
Profit share	Yes [ ]	No [ ]	Yes [ ]	No [ ]

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.**

**Please return in the envelope provided, to:**

**Tony Dundon  
School of Business  
University of Huddersfield  
Queensgate  
Huddersfield  
HD1 3DH**

If possible, please remember to send copies of your company's  
discipline and grievance procedure  
and any mission statement

**- Thank You -**

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 2**

**Company Questionnaire for each Organisation Studied**





**THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES WITHOUT TRADE UNIONS**

**COMPANY QUESTIONNAIRE**

*for*

**'Name of Company'**

This questionnaire is strictly confidential and information disclosed will only be used for the purposes of the research project. You are guaranteed complete confidentiality and anonymity.

Whilst it is recognised that the management of employees will vary between occupations, and thus no single answer is likely to cover every employee group in your company, it would be helpful if you could direct your answers to the most typical employee where no specific occupational category is mentioned.

Could you please respond to each question by either writing your answer in the space provided, or by ticking the appropriate box.

Please feel free to add any additional comments you may think are necessary.

When you have completed the questionnaire, can you please return it to me at (or I'll collect it at the next visit):

<p><b>Tony Dundon School of Business University of Huddersfield Queensgate Huddersfield HD1 3DH</b></p>
---

*We hope you find this survey interesting and that we may contribute to the understanding of the management of human resources in today's business environment through your support.*

***Your participation in this study is very important to the success of the research project.  
May I thank you for your time and co-operation.***

**This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain background information about your company: the services/products you provide; market characteristics; type of working arrangements; and employment policies etc.**

**Your co-operation would be greatly appreciated in answering these questions.**

1. Can you please identify your company's main trading sector?
  - a) Service Sector
  - b) Manufacturing Sector
  
2. Can you briefly describe the product/service of your company's main business/trading activity?  
 .....
  
3. Can you please state the year when your company started trading?  
 .....
  
4. Is your company part of a larger organisation or multinational group?  

Yes                       No
  
5. If you answered yes to question 4, what is the trading name and country of residence for your parent organisation or group's head office (e.g. IBM, USA).  
 .....  
 .....
  
6. Approximately, can you please say what the total number of employees is for your company?  
 .....
  
7. Can you please indicate what the average contractual working week is (*without any overtime*) for the typical full time employee?
  - a) Less than 30 hours
  - b) Between 30 and 35 hours
  - c) Between 35 and 40 hours
  - d) Above 40 hours
  - e) Any Other (*please specify*)
 .....  
 .....

8. Can you please say what the average monthly salary is for the typical full time employee (e.g. excluding supervisors and management)?

- a) Less than £300 per month [ ]
- b) Between £301-500 per month [ ]
- c) Between £502-700 per month [ ]
- d) Between £701-1000 per month [ ]
- e) Between £1001-1500 per month [ ]
- f) Between £1501-1700 per month [ ]
- g) Between £1701-2000 per month [ ]
- h) Above £2001 per month [ ]

.....  
 .....

9. Can you please indicate whether the typical employee (e.g. non-management grades) in your company receives any of the following fringe benefits?

- |  |         |        |
|--|---------|--------|
| a) Paid sick leave                           | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| b) Paid holiday leave                        | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| c) Contributory pension to all employees     | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| d) Maternity leave                           | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| e) Paternity leave                           | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| f) Medical assistance to all employees       | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| g) Subsidised meals                          | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| h) Free car parking                          | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| l) Profit sharing available to all employees | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| j) Company discounts                         | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| k) Company car                               | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |
| l) Any Other (please specify)                | Yes [ ] | No [ ] |

.....  
 .....



15. Has a \*trade union / \*staff association (\* please delete as appropriate) ever formally requested recognition from your company to represent employees?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. If you have answered yes, can you please indicate which \*trade union / \* staff association (\*please delete as appropriate) requested recognition and the approximate date?

Recognition requested from ..... Approximate date .....

Very Important Not Important

17. The following is a list of possible <u>advantages</u> of employing a workforce where there is no direct trade union role. Can you please indicate whether any of the following is regarded as an <u>advantage</u> to your company.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a) Lower wage costs because of no union bargaining							
b) Fewer fringe benefits without union							
c) Employee flexibility without union							
d) Lower labour turnover							
e) Lower absenteeism							
f) More committed employees							
g) Greater employee satisfaction							
h) Greater managerial freedom to introduce change							
i) Smoother/quicker change to working practices							
j) Improved productivity							
k) Direct employee communications							
l) Any Other (please describe)							

.....  
 .....

Very Relevant Irrelevant

18. The following is a list of possible <u>disadvantages</u> of employing a workforce where there is no direct trade union role. Can you please indicate whether any of the following is regarded as a <u>disadvantage</u> to your company	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a) Higher wage costs to remain union free							
b) More fringe benefits to remain union free							
c) Higher labour turnover							
d) Higher absenteeism							
e) Less committed employees							
f) Objections from employees							
g) Unsatisfied employees							
h) Objections from supervisors							
i) Difficult to introduce changes to working practices							
j) More difficult employee communications because of no union							
k) Less employee involvement & participation in company matters							
l) Any Other (please describe)							

.....  
 .....

19. Can you please say, to what extent does your company emphasise its non-union status to prospective employees as part of its recruitment strategy?

Strongly Emphasised

Not Emphasised at all

[ | | | | | | | ]

20. Does your company seek to establish whether prospective employees are trade union members as part of its selection / recruitment strategy?

Definitely Seeks to establish

Never Seeks to establish

[ | | | | | | | ]

21. Can you please say whether your company is an associate member of any relevant employer, trade or business association?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

22. If you have answered yes, can you please indicate which association and an approximate date of membership?

Name of Employer Association..... Approximate date.....

23. If yes, can you please indicate the services your company use from the employer association	Yes	No
a) New product/service information		
b) Technological information		
c) Management training services		
d) General Personnel/Human Resource Advice		
e) Direct involvement in Personnel/Human Resource Policies		
f) Consultancy services		
g) Any Other (please specify)		

.....  
 .....

24. If you have answered yes to any part of questions 21-23, can you please say whether your company is an active member of the employer or trade association (being active means taking part in the decisions and policies of the Association)?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**Section 3 of the questionnaire is interested in the Human Resource policies, communications and methods used to involve employees within your company.**

25. Would you say that your company's personnel/human resource policies are closely integrated with the overall business plan for the company?

Strongly Integrated           Not Integrated at all

26. If you have answered yes, can you briefly describe how this integration is achieved?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

27. Does your company have its own personnel/human resource department?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

28. If yes, is your personnel/human resource department mainly used as a 'specialist' support and advice function?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

29. Does your company have a Personnel Director or Senior Manager responsible only for personnel/human resource matters for your company?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

30. If yes, does the Personnel Director or Senior Manager have a seat on the company's Board of Directors?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

31. In your company, are the majority of personnel managers/HR staff specially qualified (e.g. IPD)?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

32. Can you please tick the appropriate box if any of the following practices are currently relevant in your company, indicating the year of relevance by placing your tick in either column (1), (2), or (3) ?

Human Resource Management Practice	Column 1 Introduced before 1992	Column 2 Introduced after 1992	Column 3 Never introduced
a) Company Mission Statements			
b) Team-working			
c) Team-briefings which meet often ( <i>i.e. monthly</i> )			
d) Quality Circles which meet often ( <i>i.e. monthly</i> )			
e) Individual Employee Communications			
f) Employee Communication Policy			
g) Employee Suggestion Schemes			
h) Works or Employee Councils			
i) Employee Appraisals ( <i>objective setting</i> )			
j) Appraisals to Determine Pay ( <i>i.e. PRP</i> )			
k) Selection Testing for New Recruits			
l) Encourage Promotion from Within			
m) Employee Job Security Policy ( <i>e.g. no compulsory redundancies</i> )			
n) Harmonised Terms & Conditions			
o) Flexible Job Descriptions ( <i>e.g. multi-skilled employees</i> )			
p) Employee Training/Skills Programmes			
q) Use of Temporary Staff			
r) Any Other ( <i>please specify</i> )			

.....  
 .....

Very Important                      Not Important

33. Out of the following, what would you say are most important employee relations issues dealt with in order to manage employees effectively in your company (*please tick as many as necessary*)?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a) Employee Discipline to Influence behaviour at Work							
b) Employee Grievance Resolution							
c) Introducing Change to Working Practices							
d) Health & Safety Concerns							
e) Employee Job Security							
f) Low Employee Morale							
g) Setting Pay Rates							
h) Hours of Work							
i) Reducing Absenteeism							
j) Labour Turnover							
k) Employee Opposition ( <i>could be expression of concern/unhappy with changes</i> )							
l) Industrial Action Resolution							



	Very Important				Not Important		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Can you please say what are the most important factors when deciding a pay rise for employees ( <i>please tick as many as necessary</i> )?							
a) Internal financial/budget constraints							
b) External commercial reasons ( <i>i.e. keeping costs/prices low</i> )							
c) Labour shortages ( <i>i.e. retaining existing staff</i> )							
d) Desire to agree with employees/their representatives							
e) Based on merit/performance of individual employee							
f) Cost of living generally ( <i>i.e. employee pay keeps up with inflation</i> )							
g) To pay the same as in other similar companies							

35. When introducing change to employment matters (*including new pay rates etc.*), does your company consult with employees about a proposed change?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

36. If you have answered yes, can you please briefly describe the method of consultation?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

37. Can you please say whether your company has had to reduce the size of its workforce at any time in the last 5 years?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

38. If you have answered yes to question 37, can you please say which of the following methods were used?

- a) Natural Wastage (*i.e. retirements*)
- b) Voluntary Severance
- c) Compulsory Redundancy
- d) Any Other (please specify)

.....

39. If your company has experienced compulsory redundancies, can you please indicate the method of selection?

- a) Based on individual performance
- b) Attendance
- c) Lack of multi-skills
- d) Length of service (*i.e. last-in-first-out*)
- e) Any Other (*please describe*)

.....

40. Does your company have a formal disciplinary procedure?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

41. Does your company have a formal grievance procedure?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

42. Can you please say whether disciplinary and grievance matters are usually handled formally or informally in your company?

Tendency to be  
handled Formally

Tendency to be  
handled Informally

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

43. Can you please say how your company formally communicates information to employees?

- a) Direct to individual employee from supervisor
- b) Appraisal system used to communicate change to employee
- c) Via employee representatives (*i.e. joint consultation*)
- e) Via team-briefings from supervisor
- f) By company notice boards
- g) Written memos
- h) Any other method (*please specify*)

44. Can you please indicate the frequency of communications between supervisor and employee?

- a) Monthly
- b) Quarterly
- c) Half-yearly
- d) Yearly
- e) Any Other (*please specify*)

**This is the final part of the questionnaire, and is interested in factors which have helped shape or change the market for your company's service/product in the last few years.**

**A list of statements have been used rather than specific questions for you to agree or disagree with in relation to your company. Please tick the statement closest to your own situation.**

Definitely Agree                      Definitely Disagree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. There have been an increasing number of competing companies offering the same or similar service/product during last 5 years?								
46. My company has had to adapt to new technology in a big way to introduce new services/products on the market?								
47. The non-union status of my company has been an advantage to make changes as a result of market factors/demands?								
48. Employment legislation introduced during the last 10-15 years has assisted my company introduce necessary change without union influence?								
49. My company concentrates on providing a unique service/product in the market place?								
50. My company has had to increase its responsiveness and/or delivery of services/products to retain existing customers?								

**Please use this space if you would like to add any additional comments  
Please feel free to continue on a separate sheet if necessary.**

*May I thank you once again for time and co-operation.*

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 3**

**Company/Senior Manager Interview Schedule**

**Non-union Employee Relations - Ph.D. Research  
(Tony Dundon - School of Business, University of Huddersfield)**

<p><b>Interview Schedule: Company Personnel Manager/ Most Senior Manager for Company (e.g. Chief Executive)</b></p> <p>Name of Organisation:.....</p> <p>Name of Respondent:.....</p> <p>Position/Title of Respondent:..</p> <p>Place of Interview:...</p> <p>Date of Interview:.....</p> <p>Telephone Number:.....</p>
---

**Points to cover at beginning of Interview:**

- About the Interview
  - ⇒ expected time, about 1 to 2 hours;
  - ⇒ THERE are roughly 20 question areas:  
from each main question a number of secondary questions  
may arise as we go on;
  - ⇒ open/semi-structured approach, **emphasise seeking their  
experiences** of issues and how dealt with;
  - ⇒ check use of tape recorder with respondent;
- Reassurance about confidentiality/anonymity;
- Emphasise the value of their contribution to the research project;
- Thank respondent for their time and interest;

*The aim of interview with Senior Personnel Manager is to capture reasons and motives for non-unionism, how satisfied they are with that type of employment relationship, and why it works for them.*

**Ask if any questions or queries from respondent before interview starts:**

No	Question & Topic	Initial Comments/Reactions
1.	Can you tell me about Co. - <i>What Co. does?</i> - <i>How came into existence?</i> - <i>Any union members</i>	
2.	Could you briefly tell me about your job/role in company; - <i>what you do;</i> - <i>how long worked here;</i> - <i>worked anywhere else in similar job/dealt with unions;</i> - <i>why different here</i> - <i>who responsible to</i> - <i>sit on board - explain role</i>	
3.	Can you explain how communications between mangnt & staff are dealt with? - <i>how is it done</i> - <i>prefer formal or informal</i> - <i>group or individual basis (any staff committee);</i> - <i>last 1 or 2 issues which had to be communicated to staff;</i> - <i>how satisfied are you with that - why?</i>	
4.	What would be the process of changing or modifying employment conditions? (PAY) - <i>who involved in decisions;</i> - <i>what levels (staff committee)</i> - <i>how staff views be considered</i> - <i>are they considered</i>	
5.	Can you tell me about the reaction of employees when change is introduced ? - <i>any resentment, what form;</i> - <i>ever felt need to respond to employee reactions or anger</i>	
6.	Can you tell me about, say, the last 1 or 2 main employee relations issues in Co. ? - <i>How came about;</i> - <i>How dealt with;</i> - <i>Aim to modify behaviour;</i>	
7.	Do you think staff are satisfied with the way they are dealt with in Co. ? - <i>why?</i> - <i>ever "we never get told anything" staff comments</i>	

8.	<p>What sort of authority do line mangrs have for employee matters. How important is this; (devolved or centralised)  <u>Strategicness!!!</u>  <i>- can they discipline/dismiss?</i>  <i>- recruit employees;</i>  <i>- from personnel point of view, any difficulties with this;</i>  <i>- what training do line mangrs have in dealing with people issues</i></p>	
9.	<p>Can you tell me about discipline and grievances in Co. ?  <i>- are these handled formally or informally</i>  <i>- by whom - at what level;</i>  <i>- can employees be represented;</i>  <u>Have copy of policies</u></p>	
10.	<p>How important is it to have a committed workforce:  <i>- any examples of how achieved;</i>  <i>- behaviour and commitment a management aim;</i>  <i>- is this easier with no TU;</i></p>	
11.	<p>What sort of responsibility would the typical employee have?  <i>- with regard to their work;</i>  <i>- allowed to use own initiative</i>  <i>- how far use initiative;</i>  <i>- how strict supervision</i></p>	
12.	<p>What would you say are the main advantages of a non-union workforce: managerial freedom, smooth change to work practices  <i>- what is it that makes these important 'because' of no union voice;</i>  <i>- what about gov't laws etc.</i></p>	
13.	<p>Is there a clear policy of linking employee matters to the overall objectives of company ?  <u>Strategicness (lack of)!!</u>  <i>- made any easier given absence of trade union - why?</i></p>	

14.	As an overall goal/objective, how important is it to remain non-union? - any <i>policies to ensure this</i>	
15.	How would you describe the style of management in Co. . - <i>your own and of line managers</i> - <i>is there any preferred way of doing things</i>	
16.	What would be the response by either yourself, or the senior team in Co, if employees did join a trade union which then wanted to start negotiating about pay.	
17.	Has a trade union ever sought recognition from Co. ? - <i>How was that dealt with;</i> - <i>What was reaction by staff;</i>	
18.	If there was one particular thing/issue you could change with a magic wand now, what would it be? - <i>why;</i> - <i>without magic wand, any problems with that;</i>	
19.	Anything else you would like to add or comment about.	

Thank respondent for their time and co-operation.

**NB: Remind them if any issues/points thought about later - OK to get in touch**



**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 4**

**Employee Questionnaire**

## EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE

**'Name of Company'**

This questionnaire is strictly confidential and information disclosed will only be used for the purposes of the research project. There is no way anyone can identify you from the answers you give. In completing this questionnaire you are guaranteed complete confidentiality and anonymity.

The aim is to obtain views and opinions concerning your work, the management of your company and how you feel about your job.

Please respond to each question by either writing your answers in the space provided, or by ticking the opinion nearest to your own view.

*It is not absolutely necessary to complete the whole questionnaire in one go. Each section can be completed separately, but please try to do all of one section at a time.*

Please feel free to add any additional comments you may think are necessary at the end of the questionnaire.

**Remember, the questionnaire is anonymous, please DO NOT put your name on it.**

When you have completed the questionnaire can you please return it in the envelope provided, to ...

Tony Dundon School of Business University of Huddersfield Queensgate Huddersfield HD1 3DH
--

*Your participation in this study is very important to the success of the research project.*

*May I thank you for your time and co-operation.*

**This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain background information to compare different groups of employees in other companies.**

**Your co-operation would be greatly appreciated in answering these questions.**

1. Can you please identify whether you are.. ?

- a) Male  1  
b) Female  2

2. Can you please indicate your age group?

- a) 16-20  1  
b) 21-30  2  
c) 31-40  3  
d) 41-50  4  
e) 51-60  5  
f) Over 60  6

3. Would you describe yourself as ?

- a) White European  1  
b) White British  2  
c) Black European  3  
d) Black British  4  
e) Afro-Caribbean  5  
f) Asian  6  
g) Other (*please describe*)  7

4. Are you? (*please tick only one box*)

- a) Married  1  
b) Living with Partner  2  
c) Single  3  
d) Divorced  4  
e) Widowed  5

5. Can you please identify your highest level of formal education?  
 (please tick only one box)

- a) No formal qualification  1
- b) CSE/O' Level  2
- c) GCSE/A Level  3
- d) NVQ/GNVQ  4
- e) Degree or equivalent  5
- f) Higher degree or equivalent  6
- g) Technical or Apprenticeship qualification  7

6. Can you please identify your current occupation from the following?  
 (please tick only one box)

- a) Professional  1
  - b) Technical  2
  - c) Managerial  3
  - d) Clerical/Admin.  4
  - e) Sales  5
  - f) Skilled  6
  - g) Semi-skilled  7
  - h) Unskilled  8
  - I) Other (please specify)  9
- .....

7. How long have you worked for your company?

- a) Less than 1 year  1
- b) Between 1 and 3 years  2
- c) Between 4 and 7 years  3
- d) Between 8 and 10 years  4
- e) Over 10 years  5

8. Do you have any of the following work arrangements in your present job?  
 (please tick as many as necessary)

- a) Full-time working
- b) Flexible working hours
- c) Shift attendance
- d) Part-time working
- e) Job share
- f) Temporary/Contract employee
- g) Regularly work overtime

9. Which of the following category identifies your current monthly salary before tax?

- a) Less than £300 per month  1
- b) Between £301-500 per month  2
- c) Between £502-700 per month  3
- d) Between £701-1000 per month  4
- e) Between £1001-1500 per month  5
- f) Between £1501-1700 per month  6
- g) Between £1701-2000 per month  7
- h) Above £2001 per month  8

10. Can you please indicate whether you receive any of the following fringe benefits?  
(please tick as many as necessary)

- a) Paid sick leave
  - b) Paid holiday leave
  - c) Contributory pension
  - d) Maternity leave
  - e) Paternity leave
  - f) Private medical assistance
  - g) Subsidised meals
  - h) Free car parking
  - I) Profit sharing
  - j) Company discounts
  - k) Company car
  - l) Any Other (please specify)
- .....

11. Can you please indicate your contractual working week from the following?

- a) Less than 30 hours  1
  - b) Between 30 and 35 hours  2
  - c) Between 35 and 40 hours  3
  - d) Above 40 hours  4
  - e) Any Other (please specify)  5
- .....

12. How often do you work overtime? (please tick only one box)

- a) Regularly (i.e. more than twice a week)  1
- b) Often (i.e. about once a week)  2
- c) Sometimes (i.e. once or twice a month)  3
- d) Hardly ever (i.e. a few times a year)  4
- c) Never (i.e. you cannot or there is no overtime)  5

13.If you work overtime, are you paid?

1                      2  
Yes [ ]              No [ ]

14.If you do work overtime, which of the following best describes your situation?  
(please tick only one box)?

- a) Mainly to increase my wages       1
- b) Mainly to help the company out     2
- c) Mainly to assist work colleagues  3

**Section 2 of the questionnaire is interested in your views and opinions about representation at work - either from a trade union or other employee group.**

**Remember, no one can tell who has answered what, so please free to add any additional comments you think are important.**

**Thank you for your co-operation.**

15. Are you a trade union member at this present moment in time?

1                      2  
 Yes [ ]              No [ ]

16. If you have answered yes to question 15, do you know if any of the following services are available through the trade union?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
	1	2	3
a) To negotiate pay & conditions with your company	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) To talk to management on your behalf	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) To represent you if faced with discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Help you with a complaint or grievance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Offer free legal advice ( <i>work and non-work related</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Offer financial services ( <i>loans, mortgages etc.</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. If you are not a trade union member at the present time, have you ever been a union member?

1                      2  
 Yes [ ]              No [ ]

18. Were you asked about union membership when interviewed for your present job?

1                      2  
 Yes [ ]              No [ ]

19. Are you a member of a staff or employee association at the present moment in time?

1                      2  
 Yes [ ]              No [ ]

20. If you have answered yes to question 19, do know if any of the following benefits are available through the staff/employee association?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
	1	2	3
a) To negotiate pay & conditions with your company	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) To talk to management on your behalf	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) To represent you if faced with discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Help you with a complaint or grievance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Offer free legal advice ( <i>work and non-work related</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Offer financial services ( <i>loans, mortgages etc.</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Definitely	Definitely			No			
	Agree	Opinion		Disagree			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. Do you agree that trade unions are generally a good thing for workers?							
22. Do you agree your pay and conditions could be improved if there was a trade union in your company?							
23. Do you think a trade union would create unnecessary rules about your job if one were present in your company?							
24. Would you agree there are real benefits in having the views of all employees represented to management?							
25. On the whole, I think a trade union would make my job more secure in my company?							

Definitely	Definitely			No			
	Agree	Opinion		Disagree			

26. When the words "trade unions" are mentioned, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a) Bunch of political lefties							
b) Trouble-makers							
c) Unions are a necessary evil							
d) Unions can be beneficial to employees							
e) Unions can be beneficial to management							
f) Unions provide necessary protection							
g) On the whole, unions are sensible							





Very Often    Sometimes    Never

40. In your job, how often do you do any of the following ?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a) Inform supervisors that you can do your job well							
b) Make sure you work hard for the company							
c) Suggest to supervisors improvements in the way your job is done							
41. How often is the appraisal system used to speak to management about your wages/conditions (e.g. pay, overtime, working hours etc)?							
42. When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, how often do you think your views are taken into account by management?							
43. How often do you feel that you have accomplished something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?							
44. If you work especially hard, are your efforts likely to be rewarded and recognised by management?							
45. How often do management enforce company rules (i.e. disciplining employees)							
46. How often do management communicate, to you, changes at work?							

47. How secure do you think your job is for the next five years?

Very Secure                  Fairly Secure                  Very Insecure

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[    |    |    |    |    |    |    ]

48. Generally speaking, over the last 2 or 3 years, have you had more or less freedom to decide how to carry out your work tasks independent of supervisor's instruction?

Considerably More                  About the Same                  Considerably Less

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[    |    |    |    |    |    |    ]

49. Do you find your job repetitive and routine?

Very Repetitive Very Varied

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[ | | | | | | | ]

50. Generally speaking, would you say your pay and conditions are better or worse than those for other companies close to where you work/live?

Considerably Better About the Same Considerably Worse

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[ | | | | | | | ]

51. Does the amount of pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs and living expenses?

More Than All My Needs Most of My Needs Only Few of My Needs

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[ | | | | | | | ]

52. Would you say that the majority of employees you work with are committed to the company?

Definitely Committed No Real Opinion Definitely Not Committed

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

[ | | | | | | | ]

**Please continue on the attached sheet if you would like to add any additional comments about your work, the company, trade unions or the style of management etc.**

***May I thank you once again for time and co-operation.***

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 5**

**Employee Interview Schedule**

**Non-union Employee Relations - Ph.D. Research  
(Tony Dundon - School of Business, University of Huddersfield)**

<b>Interview Schedule: Employees</b>	
Name of Organisation:....	
Position/Title of Respondent:.....	
Place of Interview:..	
Date of Interview:..	

**Points to cover at beginning of Interview:**

- About the Interview
  - ⇒ Expected time, about 20-30 min;
  - ⇒ Checklist of general areas to talk about
    - **but more interested in your experiences & examples**
  - ⇒ May also be some subsidiary questions as interview progresses;
  - ⇒ Questions are interested in **your** experiences and views;
  - ⇒ There are no right or wrong answers;
  - ⇒ check use of tape recorder;
- Reassurance about confidentiality/anonymity;
- **Management do NOT have access to any individual responses;**
- Emphasise the value of their contribution to the research project;
- Thank respondent for their time and effort;

**Ask if any questions or queries from respondent before interview starts:**

No	Question & Topic	Initial Comments/Reactions
1.	Can you please tell me about the job you do here?: - <i>what it is you do; - how long worked here? Any OT ?</i>	
2.	Do you find your work interesting, challenging? - <i>what sort of <u>responsibilities</u> do you have - is that satisfactory - why ?</i>	
3.	Can you give me your experiences of how employees and managers communicate to each other? - <i>regular staff meetings;</i> - <i>supervisor direct to you;</i> - <i>is that adequate/satisfactory;</i> - <i>could it be better;</i>	
4.	Can you tell me about discipline in this company? - <i>is there a need for it;</i> - <i>who does it ?</i> - <i>what about you personally;</i>	
5.	Can you explain how you are supervised? - <i>proximity of supervisor;</i> - <i>frequency supervisor tells people to do things;</i> - <i>constantly on your back - strict,</i> - <i>more or less easy going,</i> - <i>very relaxed, hardly ever has to push people to work;</i>	
6.	Do you trust management? - <i>why, examples;</i>	
7.	Would you say management take-on views of employees about changes in work? - <i>how its done ?</i> - <i>who does what ?</i> - <i>any examples;</i>	
8.	Can you tell me about your supervisor? - <i>do they stick-up for staff to senior managers;</i> - <i>how friendly are relations with supervisors;</i> - <i>encourage their staff to get-on in company;</i> - <i>no more than implement orders from above;</i>	

9.	Can you tell me about rules in this company? - <i>who enforces them, how often;</i> - <i>what do you think about that;</i>	
10.	Would you say the way management treat you is easy-going or strict? - <i>why, explain that, examples?</i> - <i>experiences of how concerns handled?</i>	
11.	How do employees react when management tell them changes? - <i>their mood; what they say;</i>	
12.	Do you or your work mates ever talk of wanting to work elsewhere? - <i>for better pay;</i> - <i>to be treated better;</i>	
13.	What do you think would be the reaction of management if a trade union represented your views to the company (e.g. pay); - <i>what do you think about TU</i>	
14.	Do you have any experiences of trade unions? - <i>current/former member?</i>	
15.	Do you have any ideas where you think things could be improved between managers and workers? - <i>What 'one' issue would you tackle if you could change roles with top management?</i>	

**Anything else you want to add**

- **about management**
- **unions**
- **how you feel your treated etc. etc.**

**Thanks for your time and comments.**

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 6**

**Summary Data Specification Methods**



**Data Specification and Sources of Information**

Taking the basis of prior empirical work and associated issues discussed in chapters one to three, the specification and sources of data to address the focal and subsidiary questions are summarised below.

Factor	Data Type <sup>a</sup>	Data Required	Source	Method <sup>b</sup>
<b>Five Dimensions can be used to characterise, explain and operationalise what the employment relationship is in each non-unionised organisation</b>				
<i>Regulation</i>	F	Existence of rules to regulate employment relations	Management	Q
	F	The range of structural regulation by rules in each organisation through a content analysis of documentation/rules	Management	D
<i>HR Strategy</i>	P	Frequency/representativeness of regulatory/communication mechanisms from both parties	Management & Employees	Q & I
	P	Perceptions of managerial unilateralism/joint regulatory approaches from both parties	Management & Employees	Q, & I
	F	Existence of personnel/ senior managers at board level decision-making	Management	Q & I
	F	Mission/vision statements of each organisation which place a high-low priority on employees as an organisational asset (or not)	Literature	D
	P	Management perceptions of extent to which employee relations are central (or not) to business objectives	Management	Q
	P	Senior managerial perceptions of extent and range of influence over employee relations approaches for each organisation	Management	Q & I
<i>Trust</i>	F	Extent to which management seek to establish non-union status of prospective employees, seeking cost-benefit advantage (or not) over employee exchange.	Management	Q
	F	Extent to which management seek to modify employee behaviour through control devices, seeking cost-benefit advantage (or not) over employee exchange	Management	Q
	P	Perceptions of managerial freedom and control as a cost-benefit advantage (or not) over employees because of a union absence.	Management & Employees	Q & I
	P	Perceptions from both parties about the task freedom/subordination as an indicator of 'institutionalised' trust (or mis-trust).	Management & Employees	Q & I

a: P = Perceptual; F = Factual Information; b: Q = Questionnaire; I = Interview; D = Document/Policy Review

Factor	Data Type a	Data Required	Source	Method b
<b>Dimension of Employment Relationship (continued)</b>				
<i>Formalisation</i>	F	Extent to which rules are highly formalised in each organisation through documentation	Management	Q & D
	P	Actor interpretations of whether rules are circumvented as indicator of informal features within employment relationship	Management & Employees	Q & I
<i>Discreteness</i>	P	Actor interpretations of preferences for formal or informal approaches.	Management & Employees	Q & I
	P	The existence (or not) of them & us as a characteristic feature of the relationship by employee support for managerial values/goal, as indication of 'out-group' identification	Employees	Q
	P	The existence (or not) of them & us as a characteristic feature of the relationship by employee support for trade unions within non-union firms, as indication of 'inter-group/collective' identify.	Employees	Q
<b>External Environment: A group of influences which can have a bearing on the relationship and how it is modified, which exist outside the organisational context.</b>				
<i>Government Policies</i>	P	Extent to which management believe government policies act as 'advantage' or 'hindrance' in maintaining non-union relationship	Management	Q & I
<i>Legislation</i>	P	As above for employment legislation.	Management	Q & I
	F	Type of technical occupations in each organisation.	Management	Q & I
<i>Technology</i>	F	Range of multi-skilled occupations through technology transfers	Management & Employees	Q & I
	P	Use of technology as main criteria for product/service efficiency.	Management & Employees	Q & I
	P	Use of technology in controlling/substituting labour.	Management & Employees	Q, I & O
<i>Markets (product)</i>	F	Market trading position of each company, geographic relevance	Management & Literature	Q, I & D
	P	Actor interpretations of easy of entry of competitors for market pressure on firm	Management	Q & I
<i>Markets (labour)</i>	F	Labour turnover, geographic relevance	Management & Literature	Q, I & D
	P	Easy-difficulty in recruiting/retaining employees for labour market pressure on firm	Management	Q & I

a: P = Perceptual; F = Factual Information

b: Q = Questionnaire; I = Interview; D = Document/Policy Review

Factor	Data Type a	Data Required	Source	Method b
<b>Structural Environment: A group of influences which can have a bearing on the relationship and how it is modified, which exist within the organisational context, but not necessarily within the immediate work milieu.</b>				
<i>Ownership/Nationality</i>	F	Ownership of each company vis-à-vis: single manager-owner; part of larger organisation; nationality of main ownership (UK or non-UK)	Management & Literature	Q, I & D
	P	Where non-UK owned, extent to which foreign country/head office exert influence on employee relations	Management	Q & I
<i>Size</i>	F	Size of organisation by number of total employees.	Management	Q
	F	Size of work unit studied if different from whole company	Management	Q & I
<b>Personnel Factors: A group of influences which can have a bearing on the relationship and how it is modified, which exist within immediate work milieu.</b>				
<i>Management Style</i>	F	Scope of individual-collective styles by range of polices and their integration.	Management	Q & D
	P	Depth of above style and integration, by examining custom and practice as variation in policy approach.	Management & Employees	Q, I & O
<i>Non-Union Voice</i>	F	Existence, scope of voice mechanisms in each organisation	Management & Literature	Q, I & D
	P	Satisfaction and utility of voice mechanisms from recipients (i.e. employees).	Employees	Q, I & O
<b>Actor Factors: A group of influences which can have a bearing on what relationship is, and how it is modified, which are located within the immediate work milieu. These seek to explore differences both among and between the parties to the relationship in each non-unionised organisation.</b>				
<i>Biographic</i>	F	Main variables to explore difference between employees within each organisation by: length of service; age; gender; educational attainment; salary; former union experience; current union membership in non-union firm	Employees	Q & I
	F	Differences between employees within each organisation by occupational/grade status (e.g. manual-white collar)	Employees	Q
<i>Attitudinal</i>	P	Covering a sample of employees in non-union organisation to assess their attitudes to: trade unions; management; company and work itself.	Employees	Q & I
	P	Attitudes of management toward trade unions and employees	Management	Q & I

a: P = Perceptual; F = Factual Information; b: Q = Questionnaire; I = Interview; D = Document/Policy Review

Data Specification

Factor	Data Type a	Data Required	Source	Method b
<b>Climatic Factors: Present within the organisational context which can also be evident both within and outside the immediate work milieu. As such climate is tapping a short-lived 'atmosphere or feeling' present during the periods of investigation in each organisation.</b>				
<i>Issue-Centred</i>	F	Mechanism for handling problems/grievance in the workplace.	Employees	Q & I
	P	Employee perception of problems handled by management and (dis)satisfaction thereof, salience of issues evident during time of investigation.	Employees	Q & I
<i>Inter-Personal</i>	F	Extent of friendly, close relations between employees and supervisors to raise/express complaint.	Management & Employees	Q, I & O
	P	Employee (dis)satisfaction with friendly/non-friendly relations with superior, and salience of relations between actors during time of investigation.	Employees	Q, I & O

a: P = Perceptual; F = Factual Information

b: Q = Questionnaire; I = Interview; D = Document/Policy Review

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Part 7**

**Profile of Postal Survey Respondents**

**Profile of Postal Survey Respondents**

Company Type	Sector	Size	Ownership	Date Established	Union Recognised	Staff Assoc. Recognised	Main Trading Activity
Electronic	Manufacturing	600	UK	1974	Yes	No	Electrical instruments/systems
Construction	Manufacturing	400	UK	1961	Yes	No	House Building
Printing	Manufacturing	800	UK	1978	Yes	No	Printing and paper Recycling
Electrical	Manufacturing	1000	UK	1964	Yes	No	Electrical components for cars
Chemicals	Manufacturing	650	USA	1966	Yes	No	Chemical fibres
Transport	Manufacturing	800	UK	1936	Yes	No	Maker of vehicle equipment
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	3400	USA	1956	Yes	No	Maker of soft drinks
Metals	Manufacturing	800	UK	1988	Yes	No	Steel & electrical consumer products
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	600	UK	1978	Yes	No	Make pre-packed frozen foods
Metals	Manufacturing	1000	UK	1968	Yes	No	Copper pipes
Vehicle/Transport	Manufacturing	600	USA	1970	Yes	No	Vehicle Upholstery
Transport	Services	1100	UK	1975	Yes	No	Coach driving/delivery
Transport	Services	2600	UK	1958	Yes	No	Motor (HGV) Engineers
Educational	Services	700	UK	1962	Yes	No	Tourism & Leisure
Transport	Services	950	UK	1988	Yes	No	Public transport (buses)
Retail	Services	3000	UK	1955	Yes	No	Clothing, Sport & Leisure
Retail	Services	4000	UK	1968	Yes	No	Supermarket/Sales
Retail	Services	1200	UK	1984	Yes	No	Storage & distribution
Banking & Finance	Services	1000	UK	1930	Yes	Yes	Insurance & Investments
Metals	Manufacturing	650	UK (51%) USA (49%)	1982	Yes (manual)	Yes (clerical)	Copper tubing for construction industry
<b>Non-Unionised, but Staff Association-Recognised</b>							
Construction	Services	600	UK	1957	No	Yes	Energy insulators
Food & Drink	Services	900	USA	1988	No	Yes	Contact catering supplies
Banking & Finance	Services	8000	UK	1954	No	Yes	High St. building society

**Profile of Postal Survey Respondents (Cont'd)**

Non-Unionised and Non-Staff Association-Recognised (i.e. no employee intermediary)						
Distribution	Services	1000	USA	1935	No	Air Freight
Retail	Services	700	UK	1981	No	Packaging food products
Food & Drink	Services	160	USA/Canadian	1989	No	Bottled mineral water
Property	Services	600	UK	1978	No	Property consultants, surveyors and estate agents
Telecommunications	Services	900	France & Singapore	1988	No	Cable television & communications
Construction/Retail	Services	3400	UK	1936	No	Builders merchants
Chemicals	Services	250	UK	1972	No	Process intermediate ingredients for soaps & disinfectants
Cleaning	Services	400	UK	1991	No	Contact office cleaning
Metals	Manufacturing	1800	UK	1984	No	Components for Offshote industry
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	330	UK	1978	No	Confectionery - sweets
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	300	UK	1971	No	Confectionery - ice cream
Pharmaceutical	Manufacturing	600	UK	1985	No	Pharmaceutical products for exports
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	500	UK	1968	No	Maker of soft drinks
Food & Drink	Manufacturing	550	USA	1977	No	Edible oils
Metals	Manufacturing	650	Canadian	1972	No	Steels - for construction industry and recycle car metals

NB: Mean size for all non-union organisations is 809 employees

NB: Excluding the largest single employer (3400 employees), the mean size is reduced to 560.

(N = 38)

## **APPENDIX TWO**

### **Data Measures And Collection Instruments**

#### **The Five Dimensions of the Employment Relationship**



**APPENDIX TWO**  
**Part 1**

**TABLE 1: COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR REGULATION**

**Table 1.1: Data Measures of Regulation: Water Co.**

**Table 1.2: Data Measures of Regulation: Chem Co.**

**Table 1.3: Data Measures of Regulation: Delivery Co.**

**Table 1.4: Data Measures of Regulation: Merchant Co.**

**Table 1.5: Summary Index for Regulation: All Companies**

**Table 1:** Data collection instruments for the Dimension 'Regulatory Approaches'

Method	How Management Communicate	Measure	Extent of Communication	Measure
<b>Management Edict</b> is made up of four indicators: (1) How mgmnt communicate (A+B); (2) Extent of communication (Cx D); (3) How relationship is modified (Ex F); (4) Employee perception of workplace tension (G), derived from factor 5, appendix 3.	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q35 'Consult with employees?'  <b>B</b> Company Questionnaire, Q36 'Describe method of consulting?' - no methods - one method only - two methods only described - three methods described - more than three methods described - consult and seek employee input/views	No = 0; Yes = 1   = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5 =	<b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q43 a, f, g 'How company communicate change to employees': -) no method of communicating/explaining change g) communication limited to written memo/instruction to employee f) written memo published via notice boards a) communicate change via supervisors -) combination of different approaches above  <b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q44 'Frequency of communications with employees' - yearly - half-yearly - quarterly - monthly - more than once a month	= 0 = 1 = 2 = 3 = 4  = 0 - 16
	<b>A + B</b>  <b>How Management Modify</b> <b>E</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4. 'Explain process of modifying conditions' - no method of asking staff views - inform/ask occasionally, but no clear consultation - consult managers only - consult staff - staff involved in decisions <b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 8. 'Explain line/supervisory management authority': - unilateral authority (e.g. to hire & fire) - authority to discipline but not dismiss - control/determine own staff resource budget - line managers must consult personnel specialist - no authority to make & modify/personnel regulated  <b>E x F</b>	= 0 - 6   = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3 = 4  = 0 - 16	<b>C x D</b>  <b>Workplace Tension</b> <b>G</b> * Employee Questionnaire, Q28, 37, 30, 31 (Factor 4) 'Employee perception of workplace tension/conflict': Combined mean score.  High score is sign of less edict / lower the score greater extent of tension as sign of edict. Deviations above the mid-point 12 are positive (e.g. less edict).	= 0 - 24   = 0 - 24
<b>Combined Scale</b>	i.e. sigma of (A+B) + (C x D) + (E x F) + G		<b>G</b>	= 0 - 24 = 0 - 62

\* Employee questions are derived from factor analysis, appendix 3, mean values are 0 - 6 for consistency and comparison.

Table 1 Cont'd: Collection instruments for Regulation

Method	Context	Measure	Depth	Measure
<b>Works Council</b> <i>is assessed through 4 indicators:</i> (1) <i>Existence and range of issues covered by WC (A+B);</i> (2) <i>Depth of representation on WC (C+D);</i> (3) <i>The purpose of WC (E+F+G);</i> (4) <i>Frequency of WC meetings (H).</i>	<b>Existence &amp; Issue Range</b> <b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32 h: h) existence of employee works council <b>B</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'range of issues covered by works council' - none specified - issues/agenda determined by management (e.g. presentations only) - procedural issues specified (e.g. rules for employee conduct) - substantive issues specified (e.g. pay/conditions)	No = 0; Yes = 1 = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3	<b>Representativeness of WC</b> <b>C</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4: Election of council representatives where relevant <b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'election/appointment of council representatives' - management select employee representatives - workforce elect one staff representative to works council - grades/sites elect their respective staff representative to works council - works council meetings conducted in company time - equal number of management-employee WC members	No = 0; Yes = 1 = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3 = 4
	<b>Purpose of WC</b> <b>E</b> Company Documentation: Formal constitution/rules for works council <b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'constitution/rules of conduct of works council' - no formal rules/constitution exists - information forum (management to employees) - consultative (seeks employee views) - decision-making (employees involved in council outcomes) <b>G</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'Explanation for existence of works council': - plant management critical, un-supportive of WC - decision for WC pushed from company HQ - plant management highly supportive of WC - plant management initiated idea for WC/ <b>E + F + G</b>	No = 0; Yes = 1 = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3 = 0 = 1 = 2 = 3	<b>Frequency of WC Meetings</b> <b>H</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'frequency of works council meetings' - exists on paper, but hardly ever meets - WC meetings are infrequent, generally <i>ad hoc</i> / when necessary - yearly - quarterly - monthly	= 0 - 4 = 0 - 7
<b>Combined Scale</b>	<b>A + B</b> <b>E + F + G</b> i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D) + (E + F + G) + (H)		<b>C + D</b> <b>H</b>	= 0 - 5 = 0 - 4 = 0 - 20



**Table 1.1: Data 'measures' of Regulation: Water Co.**

Method	How Management Communicate	Measure	Extent of Communication	Measure
Management Edict	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q35 'Consult with employees?' NO</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Questionnaire, Q36 'Describe method of consulting?' - Discuss occasionally with supervisors, do not consult employees.</p>	= 0	<p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q43 a, f, g 'How company communicate change to employees': On balance, combination of low level techniques to communicate. Reliance on written instruction from the Chief Executive, occasionally put up on notice boards or left for supervisors in inform. Chief Executive occasionally holds staff-wide meetings, but extremely <i>ad hoc</i> in infrequent.</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q44 'Frequency of communications with employees' - Quarterly</p>	= 2
	<p><b>A + B</b></p> <p><u>How Management Modify</u></p> <p><b>E</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4. 'Explain process of modifying conditions' <b>High reliance on supervisors passing on decisions.</b> <b>For example: "decisions taken outside communications with staff .. supervisors do inform"</b></p> <p><b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 8. 'Explain line/supervisory management authority': Unilateral line management authority. For example: "supervisors can, and do, make all day to day decisions for their area, including discipline and dismissal"</p>	= 0		<p><b>C x D</b></p> <p><u>Workplace Tension</u></p> <p><b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q28, 37, 30, 31 (Factor 4) 'Employee perception of workplace tension/conflict': Combined mean score. <b>Mean Score 11.73 Negative deviation, -0.27</b></p> <p>High score is sign of less edict / lower the score greater extent of tension as sign of edict. Deviations above the mid-point 12 are positive (e.g. less edict).</p>
Combined Scale	<b>E x F</b>	= 0	<b>G</b>	= 12
	i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C x D) + (E x F) + G			= 16

**Table 1:1 Cont'd: Regulation (Water Co.)**

Method	Measure	Measure	Measure	
<b>Works Council</b>	<b>Existence &amp; Issue Range</b> A Company Questionnaire, Q32 h: h) existence of employee works council B Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'range of issues covered by works council' A + B	= 0	<b>Representativeness of WC</b> C Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4: Election of council representatives where relevant D Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'election/appointment of council representatives' C + D	= 0
	<b>Purpose of WC</b> E Company Documentation: Formal constitution/rules for works council F Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'constitution/rules of conduct of works council' G Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'Explanation for existence of works council': E + F + G	= 0	<b>Frequency of WC Meetings</b> H Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'frequency of works council meetings' H	= 0
	i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D) + (E + F + G) + H			
	= 0			
	<b>Combined Scale</b>			= 0
<b>Workplace Meetings</b>	<b>Existence of, and rules for, meetings</b> A Company Questionnaire, Q32 c, d, r: c) team meetings - YES d) quality circles - NO r) other workplace meeting/forum - YES, product awareness briefings for sales reps. Chief Executive also holds, occasionally, staff-wide meetings B Company Documentation/Handbook: 'Policy/rules for workplace meetings': - non specified A x B	= 1 = 0 = 1 = 0	<b>Climate of Communication</b> C Employee Questionnaire, Q40a, 40c, Q41 'Labelled climatic communication: from factor 5, appendix 3'. - Mean score 10.80. <u>Positive deviation</u> . + 1.80 Means re-coded (0=6; 6=0) so high score is reflection of greater perception of opportunities for dialogue/communication with management (e.g. more joint approach). Deviations above mid-point 9 are positive attitudes	= 11 (rounded)
	i.e. sigma of (A x B) + C			
	= 0			
	<b>Combined Scale</b>			= 11
	= 11			

**Overall, combined score for Water Co. is 27 out of possible score of 100; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Managerial Edict = 16;**

**Works Councils = 0;**

**Workplace Meetings = 11;**

**I = 27/112 x 100 = 24**

**Table 1.2: Data 'measures' of Regulation: Chem Co.**

Method	How Management Communicate	Measure	Extent of Communication	Measure
Management Edict	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q35 'Consult with employees?' - YES</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Questionnaire, Q36 'Describe method of consulting?' - Three methods described: works committee; team meetings and discussion groups.</p>	= 1	<p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q43 a, f, g 'How company communicate change to employees': In the main, a combination of low and high communication techniques, such as: written memos, through supervisors, notice boards, individual memos, meetings.</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q44 'Frequency of communications with employees' "At least weekly"</p>	= 3
	<p><b>A + B</b></p> <p><b>How Management Modify</b></p> <p><b>E</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4. 'Explain process of modifying conditions' Consult staff, but within management's pre-determined agenda. For example: "meetings are with staff reps - a rudimentary form of negotiation. In the main, I (Operations Director) go and convince people of my ideas, get them in groups to explain and it, consult yes, but this isn't a bargain"</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 8. 'Explain line/supervisory management authority': Authority is determined by hierarchy, and mixed between running own budget and seeking advice. For example: "Yes, certainly, hire and fire, discipline .. What you'd call a supervisor is graded here. Higher their grade they can do literally everything .. they know to seek my advice"</p>	= 4		<p><b>C x D</b></p> <p><b>Workplace Tension</b></p> <p><b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q28, 37, 30, 31 (Factor 4) 'Employee perception of workplace tension/conflict': Combined mean score.</p> <p><b>Mean Score 11.30 Negative deviation, - 0.70</b></p> <p>High score is sign of less edict / lower the score greater extent of tension as sign of edict. Deviations above the mid-point 12 are positive (e.g. less edict).</p>
Combined Scale	<b>E x F</b>		<b>G</b>	= 11
	i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C x D) + (E x F) + G			= 33

Table 1:2 Cont'd: Regulation (Chem Co.)

Method	Context	Measure	Depth	Measure
Works Council	<b>Existence &amp; Issue Range</b>		<b>Representativeness of WC</b>	
	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32 h: h) existence of employee works council - YES</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 4/Documentation 'range of issues covered by works council' Mainly procedural issues and managerial determined agenda.: safety is extremely prominent, little on pay or conditions. Overall, management 'inform' committee on major items such as pay, with less substantive issues talked-about rather than decided.</p> <p><b>A + B</b></p>	= 1  = 2  = 3	<p><b>C</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 4: Election of council representatives where relevant - YES</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'election/appointment of council representatives' Complex and governed by managerial control which means, in practice, employee reps are always a minority. Thus while staff elect their own rep from each grade and site, management also insist that particular people are also members of committee. For example: "we have to make sure certain people are included - technicians, health &amp; safety people"</p> <p><b>C + D</b></p>	= 1  = 2  = 3
Works Council	<b>Purpose of WC</b>		<b>Frequency of WC Meetings</b>	
	<p><b>E</b> Company Documentation: Formal constitution/rules for works council - none exist</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 4/Documentation 'constitution/rules of conduct of works council' - none exists. WC described by management as "informative only, for us to listen ... prefer to deal and persuade direct" than via WC.</p> <p><b>G</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'Explanation for existence of works council': Management did initiate WC, but highly critical of utility, citing lack of employee interest to sit on WC as staff reps. "they are not prepared to put effort in and turn up". This may be because WC meetings are outside company time.</p> <p><b>E + F + G</b></p>	= 0  = 1  = 1	<p><b>H</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'frequency of works council meetings' Intended to be quarterly, but has lapsed and hasn't met for over 1 year at time of study.</p> <p><b>H</b></p>	= 0  = 1  = 2
Combined Scale	i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D) + (E + F + G) + H			
				= 8



**Table 1.2 Cont'd: Regulation (Chem Co.)**

Workplace Meetings	Existence of, and rules for, meetings		Climate of Communication	
<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32 c. d. e.:</p> <p>c) team meetings - YES  d) quality circles - NO  r) other workplace meeting/forum - YES  daily shift and safety review meetings.</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Documentation/Handbook:</p> <p>'Policy/rules for workplace meetings':  - Policy on team meetings - YES, which outline purpose of for line managers and a way staff can raise issues of concern. But no reference to frequency or procedures of meeting itself.</p>	<p>= 1  = 0  = 1</p> <p>= 2</p>	<p>= 1  = 0  = 1</p> <p>= 2</p>	<p><b>C</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q40a, 40c, Q41</p> <p>'Labelled climatic communication from factor 5, appendix 3':</p> <p>- Mean score 9.57. <u>Negative deviation, +0.23.</u></p> <p>Means re-coded (0=6; 6=0) so high score is reflection of greater perception of opportunities to meet/communicate with management (e.g. more joint approach). Deviations above mid-point 9 are positive attitudes</p>	<p>= 9.5  (rounded)</p>
<b>Combined Scale</b>	<p><b>A x B</b></p> <p>= 4</p>		<p><b>C</b></p>	<p>= 9.5  = 13.5</p>
<p>i.e. sigma of (A x B) + C</p>				

**Overall, combined score for Chem Co. 54.5; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Managerial Edict = 33;**  
**Works Councils = 8;**  
**Workplace Meetings = 13.5;**

$$I = 54.5/112 \times 100 = 48.6$$

**Table 1.3: Data 'measures' of Regulation: Delivery Co**

Method	How Management Communicate	Measure	Extent of Communication	Measure	
Management Edict	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q35 'Consult with employees?' - YES</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Questionnaire, Q36 'Describe method of consulting?'</p> <p>Three methods described: staff surveys, questionnaires, focus groups to discuss issues. But emphasised consultation would not cover pay &amp; benefits</p>	= 1	<p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q43 a, f, g 'How company communicate change to employees?'</p> <p>Combination of low and high communication techniques: supervisor direct to employees, team meetings, written memos, videos, staff newsletter, managerial road-show.</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q44 'Frequency of communications with employees' Usually "weekly".</p>	= 4	
	<p><b>A + B</b></p> <p><b>How Management Modify</b></p> <p><b>E</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4. 'Explain process of modifying conditions'</p> <p>Consult staff widely, but limited to less substantive terms and conditions. For example: "we consult widely .. staff reps, brief managers in stations, allow staff to cost their own ideas before taken on board .. road show of senior managers travelling country ... its all interactive, but its also controlled from the top, otherwise there's no real focus or structure"</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 8. 'Explain line/supervisory management authority':</p> <p>In the main, regulated through management systems. On balance, more recent moves at devolved management systems. For example: "station managers run the station with personnel on hand for advice, but its personnel who issue the main guides, such as general pay award bands. ... We wouldn't expect a station manager to dismiss someone without us being an integral part of the interview stages"</p>	= 3		<p><b>C x D</b></p> <p>Workplace Tension</p> <p><b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q28, 37, 30, 31 (Factor 4) 'Employee perception of workplace tension/conflict'.</p> <p>Mean Score 12.55. Positive deviation, + 0.55</p> <p>High score is sign of less edict / lower the score greater extent of tension as sign of edict. Deviations above the mid-point 12 are positive (e.g. less edict).</p>	= 16
Combined Scale	<b>E x F</b> i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C x D) + (E x F) + G		<b>G</b>	= 9	= 12.5
					= 41.5

Table 1:3 Cont'd: Regulation (Delivery Co)

Method	Context	Measure	Depth	Measure
Works Council	<u>Existence &amp; Issue Range</u>		<u>Representativeness of WC</u>	
	<u>A</u> Company Questionnaire, Q32 h: h) existence of employee works council - YES	= 1	<u>C</u> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4: Election of council representatives where relevant - YES	= 1
	<u>B</u> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'range of issues covered by works council' No issue-remit specified, and highly regulated by management. WC is more of a presentational forum by senior managers, where employee reps can then ask questions.	= 1	<u>D</u> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'election/appointment of council representatives' Election is for one UK rep to European WC, and all election arrangements conducted by personnel department in UK.	= 1
	<u>A + B</u>	= 2	<u>C + D</u>	= 2
	<u>Purpose of WC</u>		<u>Frequency of WC Meetings</u>	
	<u>E</u> Company Documentation: Formal constitution/rules for works council - none exists	= 0	<u>H</u> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'frequency of works council meetings' Yearly. Personnel manager did also comment that "its all new to us, we've only just set up the process to link with other operations across Europe"	= 1
<u>F</u> Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'constitution/rules of conduct of works council' exists, but only as a statement saying that WC is multi-national in nature., UK operations fall under European WC.	= 0			
<u>G</u> Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'Explanation for existence of works council': Decision pushed from outside UK. to fall into line with EU Directives applicable to other European operations. Indeed, actual meetings are held outside UK., which seems to have been 'tagged-on' to given developments in other parts of Europe.	= 0			
<u>E + F + G</u>	= 0	<u>H</u>	= 1	
<b>Combined Scale</b>	<b>i.e. sigma of (A+B) + (C+D) + (E+F+G) + H</b>			= 5

**Table 1.3 Cont'd: Regulation (Delivery Co)**

<b>Workplace Meetings</b>	<u>Existence of, and rules for, meetings</u>		<u>Climate of Communication</u>	
<p><b>A</b> <u>Company Questionnaire, Q32 c, d, f:</u>                      c) team meetings - YES                      d) quality circles - YES                      r) other workplace meeting/forum - YES, works council, discussion groups, road-show of senior managers.</p> <p><b>B</b> <u>Company Documentation/Handbook:</u>                      'Policy/rules for workplace meetings':                      Only policy/rules is for team meetings, which outline line manager role to hold them, but no guidelines or intended frequency specified.. On balance, rules specify 'purpose' but little else.</p>	<p>= 1                      = 1                      = 1</p> <p>= 2</p>	<p>= 6</p>	<p><b>C</b> <u>Employee Questionnaire, Q40a, 40c, Q41</u>                      'Labelled climatic communication from factor 5, appendix 3'.                      - Mean score 8.82. <u>Negative deviation</u>, -0.18                      Means re-coded (0=6; 6=0) so high score is reflection of greater perception of opportunities for dialogue/communication with management (e.g. more joint approach). Deviations above mid-point 9 are positive attitudes</p>	<p>= 9                      (rounded)</p>
<b>Combined Scale</b>		<p>= 6                      i.e. sigma of (A x B) + C</p>	<p><b>C</b></p>	<p>= 9                      = 15</p>

**Overall, combined score for Delivery Co. 61.5; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

- Managerial Edict = 41.5;**
- Works Councils = 5;**
- Workplace Meetings = 15;**

$$I = 61.5/112 \times 100 = 55$$

**Table 1.4: Data 'measures' of Regulation: Merchant Co.**

Method	Measure	Measure	Measure	
<b>Management Edict</b>	<p><b>How Management Communicate</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q35 'Consult with employees?' - NO</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Questionnaire, Q36 'Describe method of consulting?' None described. Occasionally seek management views, but not employees.</p> <p><b>A + B</b></p>	= 0	<p><b>Extent of Communication</b></p> <p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q43 a, f, g 'How company communicate change to employees': Combination of communication techniques: direct via supervisors, team meetings, written memos, notice board memoranda, news-sheets</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q44 'Frequency of communications with employees' Monthly</p>	= 3
	<p><b>How Management Modify</b></p> <p><b>E</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 4. 'Explain process of modifying conditions' No method of employee consultation., but reliance on supervisory views. For example: "We don't give people much choice .. its implemented in here through the board, personnel and line manager teams"</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 8. 'Explain line/supervisory management authority': Authority should be discipline but not dismiss, control own budget, but problems with this means difference in practice. For example: line managers 'are suppose to get advice from personnel but many don't ... we have a lot of tribunals to deal with"</p> <p><b>E x F</b></p>	= 1	<p><b>C x D</b></p> <p><b>Workplace Tension</b></p> <p><b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q28, 37, 30, 31 (Factor 4) 'Employee perception of workplace tension/conflict'. Combined mean score</p> <p><b>Mean Score 12.55. Positive deviation, + 0.55</b></p> <p>High score is sign of less edict / lower the score greater extent of tension as sign of edict. Deviations above the mid-point 12 are positive (e.g. less edict).</p>	= 12.5 (rounded)
<b>Combined Scale</b>		= 1	<b>G</b>	= 12.5
		i.e. sigma of (A + B) + C x D) + (E x F) + G		= 22.5

**Table 1:4 Cont'd: Regulation (Merchant Co)**

Method	Context	Measure	Depth	Measure
<b>Works Council</b>	<b>Existence &amp; Issue Range</b> A. Company Questionnaire, Q32 h: h) existence of employee works council B. Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'range of issues covered by works council'	= 0 = 0 = 0	<b>Representativeness of WC</b> C. Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4: Election of council representatives where relevant D. Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'election/appointment of council representatives'	= 0 = 0 = 0
	<b>Purpose of WC</b> E. Company Documentation: Formal constitution/rules for works council F. Company Interview Schedule, items 3 & 4/Documentation: 'constitution/rules of conduct of works council' G. Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation: 'Explanation for existence of works council'	= 0 = 0 = 0	<b>Frequency of WC Meetings</b> H. Company Interview Schedule, item 4/Documentation 'frequency of works council meetings'	= 0
	<b>E + F + G</b>	= 0	<b>H</b>	= 0
	<b>i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D) + (E + F + G) + H</b>	= 0		= 0
<b>Workplace Meetings</b>	<b>Existence of, and rules for, meetings</b> A. Company Questionnaire, Q32 c, d, r: c) team meetings - YES d) quality circles - NO r) other workplace meeting/forum - NO B. Company Documentation/Handbook: 'Policy/rules for workplace meetings': Policy for team meetings, purpose outlined as information method to staff, and also allow staff to express ideas.	= 1 = 0 = 0 = 2	<b>Climate of Communication</b> C. Employee Questionnaire, Q40a, 40c, Q41 'Labelled climatic communication from factor 5, appendix 3': - Mean score 13.02 Positive deviation, + 4.02 Means re-coded (0=6; 6=0) so high score is reflection of greater perception of opportunities for dialogue/communication with management (e.g. more joint approach). Deviations above mid-point 9 are positive attitudes	= 13 (rounded)
<b>Combined Scale</b>	<b>A x B</b>	= 2	<b>C</b>	= 13
	<b>i.e. sigma of (A x B) + C</b>			= 15

**Overall, combined score for Merchant Co. is 37.5; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Managerial Edict = 22.5;**

**Works Councils = 0;**

**Workplace Meetings = 15;**

$$I = 37.5/112 \times 100 = 33.4$$

**Table 1.5: Data 'measures' for 'Regulatory Approaches' - All Organisations**

Method/Approach	Index Score			Comments	
	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Delivery Merchant		
Managerial Edict	16	33	41.5	22.5	Higher the score, less managerial edict, which would indicate less of a unilateral and greater potential for joint approaches.
Works Committee	0	8	5	0	Higher the score, greater the extent of a works council as a potential regulatory mechanism, implying more of a joint than unilateral approach.
Workplace Meetings	11	13.5	15	15	Higher the score, greater the existence of workplace meetings as a regulatory tool, symbolic of joint rather than unilateral approaches.
Actual Score (a)	27	54.5	61.5	37.5	
Maximum Score (m) x 100	112	112	112	112	
Weighted Index	24	48.6	55	33.4	
Rank Order	4	2	1	3	

**APPENDIX TWO**  
**Part 2**

**TABLE 2: COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR HR STRATEGY**

---

**Table 2.1: Data Measures of HR Strategy: Water Co.**

**Table 2.2: Data Measures of HR Strategy: Chem Co.**

**Table 2.3: Data Measures of HR Strategy: Delivery Co.**

**Table 2.4: Data Measures of HR Strategy: Merchant Co.**

**Table 2.5: Summary Index of HR Strategy: All Companies**



**Table 2:** Data 'collection' instruments for the Dimension HR Strategy.

Method	Existence and Content of MVS	Measure	Integration of HR Practices	Measure
<p><b>Strategic Vision:</b> is made up from two combined indicators; (1) The existence and content of mission/vision statements (MVS) (A+B); and (2) the integration of HR practices to company objectives (C x D).</p>	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32 a: Existence of company mission/vision statements</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Documentation: Mission statements which view employees as part of business objective' - no mission statement or no employee link to business plan in statement - low order/ranking for employee role in mission statement - moderate priority for employee role in achieving business objective - high order/ranking of employee to business objectives</p>	<p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p> <p>= 0 = 1 = 2 = 3</p> <p>= 0 - 4</p>	<p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q25: Extent HR integrated into business plan for company: - from no integration whatsoever to extremely integrated</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 13: 'Explain how employees are integrated to business objective' - no clear processes explain - at least one process or method explained - 2 processes explained - 3 or more processes explained</p>	<p>= 0 - 6</p> <p>= 0 = 1 = 2 = 3</p> <p>= 0 - 18</p> <p>= 0 - 22</p>
	<p><b>A + B</b></p> <p>(A + B) + (C x D)</p>		<p><b>C x D</b></p>	
<p><b>Personnel Function</b> is first assessed by the existence or not of personnel in each company (E+F+G); and secondly, to determine the depth of personnel role where relevant (H+I+J).</p>	<p><b>E</b> Company Questionnaire, Q27: 'Existence of separate personnel/HR department':</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Questionnaire, Q29: 'Personnel/HR manager responsible <u>only</u> for employee relations matters':</p> <p><b>G</b> Company Questionnaire, Q30: 'Personnel/HR manager/director on company board':</p>	<p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p> <p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p> <p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p>	<p><b>H</b> Company Questionnaire, Q28: 'Function of personnel department is to offer 'support' and 'advice' to managers</p> <p><b>I</b> Company Questionnaire, Q31: 'Personnel managers who are specially trained (e.g. IPD)</p> <p><b>J</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 2: 'Explain job in company - role on board if relevant': - no role/not relevant - report, advice role offered to board - facilitator, persuade other board members - full decision-making role on board (e.g. voting)</p>	<p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p> <p>No = 0; Yes = 1</p> <p>= 0 = 1 = 2 = 3</p>
	<p><b>(E + F + G)</b></p> <p>(E + F + G) + (H + I + J)</p>		<p><b>(H + I + J)</b></p>	

\* The 7 point Likert-type scale is re-coded from 1 - 7, to 0 - 6 for consistency and comparison.

**Table 2 Cont'd - HR Strategy**

**Overall, combined scale for HR Strategy is 0 - 30 determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Strategic Vision = 0 - 22**

**Personnel Function = 0 - 8**

**Where 0 = reactive/minimalist HR Strategy and 30 = proactive/maximalist HR Strategy toward the management of employees**

**Each score is then converted into an index as before (I). The actual score 'a' divided by the maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100 to obtain an overall score out of 100. Thus  $I = a/m \times 100$ .**

**Table 2.1:** Data 'measures' of HR Strategy: Water Co.

Method	Existence and Content of MVS	Measure	Integration of HR Practices	Measure
<i>Strategic Vision</i>	A. Company Questionnaire, Q32 a: Existence of company mission/vision statements	= 0	C. Company Questionnaire, Q25: Extent HR integrated into business plan for company: - from no integration whatsoever (0) to extremely integrated (6)  D. Company Interview Schedule, item 13: 'Explain how employees are integrated to business objective' Only one method explained, which is extremely <i>ad hoc</i> . Generally, other than Chief Executive occasionally doing a 'state-of-the-nation' speech, there is no integration. For example, "occasionally, I'll visit each depot and hold a meeting with everyone - give them as much news as I can"	= 2
	B. Company Documentation: 'Mission statements which view employees as part of business objective'	= 0		= 0
	A + B	= 0	C x D	= 0
	(A + B) + (C x D)	= 0		= 0
<i>Personnel Function</i>	<b>Personnel Existence</b>		<b>Personnel Role</b>	
	E. Company Questionnaire, Q27: 'Existence of separate personnel/HR department': No	= 0	H. Company Questionnaire, Q28: 'Function of personnel department is to offer 'support' and 'advice' to managers:	= 0
	F. Company Questionnaire, Q29: 'Personnel/HR manager responsible <u>only</u> for employee relations matters': No	= 0	I. Company Questionnaire, Q31: 'Personnel managers who are specially trained (e.g. IPD): N/A	= 0
	G. Company Questionnaire, Q30: 'Personnel/HR manager/director on company board': No	= 0	J. Company Interview Schedule, item 2: 'Explain job in company - role on board if relevant': No personnel manager, however the Chief Executive has a role on board, which is advisory and reporting. There are no decision-making powers, the board consists of 5 people - owner, senior accountant (both based in USA) and the Chief Executive for each country's operations (USA, UK & Canada)	= 1
	(E + F + G)	= 0	(H + I + J)	= 1
	i.e. sigma of (E + F + G) + (H + I + J)	= 1		= 1

\* Question 26 from the company questionnaire is a 7 point Likert-type scale, where 0 = no integration and 6 = extremely integrated.

**Table 2:1 Cont'd: HR Strategy (Water Co.)**

**For HR Strategy, Water Co. score 1 out of 30, the sum of the following factor measures**

**Strategic Vision = 0**

**Personnel Function = 1**

**The weighted index (I) is thus:  $a/m \times 100$**

$$\frac{1}{30} \times 100 = 3.3$$

**Table 2.2:** Data 'measures' of HR Strategy: Chem Co.

Method	Existence and Content of MVS	Measure	Integration of HR Practices	Measure
<i>Strategic Vision</i>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32.a: Existence of company mission/vision statements - Yes	= 1	<b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q25: Extent HR integrated into business plan for company: - from no integration whatsoever (0) to extremely integrated (6)	= 4
	<b>B</b> Company Documentation: 'Mission statements which view employees as part of business objective' No link between employees and objectives. Mission statement is peppered with statements company is "fight years ahead in technology ... chemistry processes" and keen on the "environment". No employee role outlined in MVS.	= 0	<b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 13: 'Explain how employees are integrated to business objective' Emphasis is placed on employee self-development combined with training, but no clear policy goals or integration with company objectives. For example, "I encourage staff a lot .. the idea of self development ... taking responsibility. We support our staff an awful lot but demand a lot in return .. we're running things like new modern apprenticeships and investors in people".	= 1
	<b>A + B</b>	= 1	<b>C x D</b>	= 4
	<b>(A + B) + (C x D)</b>			= 5
<b>Method</b>		<b>Measure</b>		<b>Measure</b>
<i>Personnel Function</i>	<b>Personnel Existence</b>		<b>Personnel Role</b>	
	<b>E</b> Company Questionnaire, Q27: 'Existence of separate personnel/HR department': No	= 0	<b>H</b> Company Questionnaire, Q28: 'Function of personnel department is to offer 'support' and 'advice' to managers	= 0
	<b>F</b> Company Questionnaire, Q29: 'Personnel/HR manager responsible <u>only</u> for employee relations matters': No	= 0	<b>I</b> Company Questionnaire, Q31: 'Personnel managers who are specially trained (e.g. IPD) No	= 0
	<b>G</b> Company Questionnaire, Q30: 'Personnel/HR manager/director on company board': No	= 0	<b>J</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 2: 'Explain job in company - role on board if relevant': No personnel manager, but Operations Director has responsibility for personnel-related issues, with a facilitating/persuading role on board. For example, "I run the business basically .. I don't like personnel departments at all, I think they are an abdication of responsibility .. The board will agree to my plans and ideas once they understand them .. they employ me to get it right, to get the right people".	= 2
	<b>(E + F + G)</b>	= 0	<b>(H + I + J)</b>	= 2
	<b>i.e. sigma of (E + F + G) + (H + I + J)</b>			= 2

\* Question 26 from the company questionnaire is a 7 point Likert-type scale, where 0 = no integration and 6 = extremely integrated.

**Table 2.2 Cont'd: HR Strategy (Chem Co.)**

**For HR Strategy, Chem Co. score 7, the sum of the following factor measures**

**Strategic Vision = 5**  
**Personnel Function = 2**

**The weighted index (I) is thus:  $a/m \times 100$**

$$\frac{7}{30} \times 100 = 23.3$$

**Table 2.3: Data 'measures' of HR Strategy: Delivery Co**

Method	Existence and Content of MVS	Measure	Integration of HR Practices	Measure
<i>Strategic Vision</i>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32.a: Existence of company mission/vision statements - Yes	= 1	<b>C</b> * Company Questionnaire, Q25: Extent HR integrated into business plan for company: - from no integration whatsoever (0) to extremely integrated (6)	= 6
	<b>B</b> Company Documentation: 'Mission statements which view employees as part of business objective' Out of an 8 item MVS, prescriptive employee values and desired attributes rank in the first three, the remained are customer and commercial statements. On balance, a moderate employee role defined in mission statements.	= 2	<b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 13: 'Explain how employees are integrated to business objective' Two principle measures explained in some detail - communications and training linked to market factors. For example, "we assess our managers on how well they treat staff", and secondly, "we hold confidential focus groups to feed info into staff .. and back to the senior team ... Because of the speed of our market for our service delivery .. we train heavily for that"	= 2
	<b>A + B</b>	= 3	<b>C x D</b>	= 12
	<b>(A + B) + (C x D)</b>	<b>Measure</b>		<b>Measure</b>
				<b>= 15</b>
<i>Personnel Function</i>	<b>Personnel Existence</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Personnel Role</b>	<b>Measure</b>
	<b>E</b> Company Questionnaire, Q27: 'Existence of separate personnel/HR department' : - Yes	= 1	<b>H</b> Company Questionnaire, Q28: 'Function of personnel department is to offer 'support' and 'advice' to managers	= 1
	<b>F</b> Company Questionnaire, Q29: 'Personnel/HR manager responsible only for employee relations matters': - Yes	= 1	<b>I</b> Company Questionnaire, Q31: 'Personnel managers who are specially trained (e.g. IPD)	= 1
	<b>G</b> Company Questionnaire, Q30: 'Personnel/HR manager/director on company board' Yes	= 1	<b>J</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 2: 'Explain job in company - role on board if relevant': A presentational rather than decision-making role was explained with regard to board activities.: "I can't vote if that's what your after, but I do have an equal status to my senior contemporaries"	= 2
	<b>(E + F + G)</b>	= 3	<b>(H + I + J)</b>	= 4
	<b>i.e. sigma of (E + F + G) + (H + I + J)</b>	<b>Measure</b>		<b>Measure</b>
				<b>= 7</b>

\* Question 26 from the company questionnaire is a 7 point Likert-type scale, where 0 = no integration and 6 = extremely integrated.

**Table 2.3 Cont'd: HR Strategy (Delivery Co)**

For **HR Strategy**, Delivery Co. score 22, the sum of the following factor measures

Strategic Vision = 15  
Personnel Function = 7

The weighted index (I) is thus:  $a/m \times 100$

$$\frac{22}{30} \times 100 = 73.3$$



**Table 2.4:** Data 'measures' of HR Strategy: Merchant Co.

Method	Existence and Content of MVS	Measure	Integration of HR Practices	Measure	
<i>Strategic Vision</i>	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire, Q32 a: Existence of company mission/vision statements - Yes</p> <p><b>B</b> Company Documentation: 'Mission statements which view employees as part of business objective' Two MVS exist in tandem. One is a 3 point employee statement, with all 3 points referring to the development of employees to meet company plans. the second is a Customer care Pledge, which contains another 8 items (such as efficient deliveries etc.) that all employees are required to achieve. On balance, a moderate link on paper between MVS and employee role in organisation.</p>	= 1	<p><b>C</b> Company Questionnaire, Q25: Extent HR integrated into business plan for company: - from no integration whatsoever (0) to extremely integrated (6)</p> <p><b>D</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 13: 'Explain how employees are integrated to business objective' Two methods explained. One is matching employees to business/ market changes. For example: "we offer training depending on how the business is moving .. we need people with specific skills; if its 'light-stuff' down south and 'heavy-stuff' up north". The second explanation is much more punitive and less strategic: "we also correct performance usually before having to go down the discipline route .. it's there for managers to use"</p>	= 1	
	<p><b>A + B</b></p>	= 2		<p><b>C x D</b></p>	= 2
<i>Personnel Function</i>	<p><b>E</b> Company Questionnaire, Q27: 'Existence of separate personnel/HR department': Yes</p> <p><b>F</b> Company Questionnaire, Q29: 'Personnel/HR manager responsible only for employee relations matters': Yes</p> <p><b>G</b> Company Questionnaire, Q30: 'Personnel/HR manager/director on company board' No</p>	= 1	<p><b>Personnel Role</b>  <b>H</b> Company Questionnaire, Q28: 'Function of personnel department is to offer 'support' and 'advice' to managers - Yes</p> <p><b>I</b> Company Questionnaire, Q31: 'Personnel managers who are specially trained (e.g. IPD) - Yes</p> <p><b>J</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 2: 'Explain job in company - role on board if relevant': No role on board for personnel manager. Reports to Chief Executive who has seat on board with personnel-related responsibility. The personnel manager did comment that the Chief Executive has little time or sympathy for a personnel department, although the author did not have the opportunity to meet the Chief Executive. But it was clear the role of personnel within top decision-making structures is absent.</p>	= 1	
	<p><b>(E + F + G)</b></p>	= 1		<p><b>(H + I + J)</b></p>	= 1
	<p><b>(E + F + G) + (H + I + J)</b></p>	= 0		= 0	
	<p><b>i.e. sigma of (E + F + G) + (H + I + J)</b></p>	= 2		= 2	
				= 4	

\* Question 26 from the company questionnaire is a 7 point Likert-type scale, where 0 = no integration and 6 = extremely integrated.

**Table 2.4 Cont'd (Merchant Co.)**

**For HR Strategy, Merchant Co. score 9, the sum of the following factor measures**

**Strategic Vision = 5**  
**Personnel Function = 4**

**The weighted index (I) is thus:  $a/m \times 100$**

$$\frac{9}{30} \times 100 = 30$$

**Table 2:5** Data 'measures' for HR Strategy: All Companies

Method/Approach	Index Score					Comments
	Water	Chem	Delivery	Merchant		
Strategic Vision	0	5	15	5		Higher the score, greater the extent of a strategic vision toward the relationship.
Personnel Function	1	2	7	4		Higher the score, greater the existence of a more strategic personnel function in managing the relationship.
Actual Score (a)	1	7	22	9		
Divided by max. (m)	30	30	30	30		
x 100	3.3	23.3	73.3	30.0		
Rank Order for HR Strategy	4	3	1	2		

## **APPENDIX TWO**

### **Part 3**

#### **TABLE 3: COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR TRUST**

**Table 3.1: Data Measures of Trust: Water Co.**

**Table 3.2: Data Measures of Trust: Chem Co.**

**Table 3.3: Data Measures of Trust: Delivery Co.**

**Table 3.4: Data Measures of Trust: Merchant Co.**

**Table 3.5: Summary Index for Trust: All Companies**

**Table 3** Data collection instruments for the Dimension Trust:

Method	Union Checking Devices	Measure	Focus/Issues of Managerial Control	Measure
<b>Institutional Trust</b> <i>is derived from the sum of 2 indicators:</i> (1) <i>Management checking about union status of employee as indication of low trust (A+B);</i> (2) <i>The focus/extent of control measures used to manage employees (C).</i>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire Q19: 'Company emphasises non-union status to prospective employees' 0 = Emphasised (low trust); 6 = Not Emphasised (high trust)  <b>B</b> Company Questionnaire Q20: 'Company seeks to establish if prospective employees are union members' 0 = Always seek (low trust); 6 = Never seek (high trust)	= 0 - 6  = 0 - 6 (0 - 12)	<b>C</b> Company Questionnaire Q33: a, e, h, i, j: 'Focus of issues to control/manage employees': a) discipline to modify behaviour e) employee job security/insecurity h) working hours i) absenteeism j) labour turnover  0 = Always used (low trust); 6 = Never Used (high trust)	= 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 (0 - 30)
	<b>A + B + C</b>			
<b>Work Design</b> <i>is based on view of limiting employee work/task freedom will beget mis-trust, using 2 indicators:</i> (1) <i>Extent management perceive non-union status as an advantage to make/modify relationship (D);</i> (2) <i>Employee perceptions of work/task-related control (E), using factor 3, appendix 3.</i>	<b>D</b> Company Questionnaire Q17, a, b, c, h, i: 'advantages to control work design from non-union status': a) lower wages with no union bargaining b) lower fringe benefits from union absence c) greater employee flexibility without union h) management freedom to implement decisions without union i) quicker change to working practice without unions  0 = Advantage (low trust); 6 = Not Advantage (high trust)	= 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 = 0 - 6 (0 - 30)	<b>E</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q39, a, b, c, d, e, g, (Factor 3) 'Perceptions of supervisor control over work-related practices': Based on factor 3, labelled supervisory control of work design, appendix 3.  6 statements make-up factor 3: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 18; High Trust = 36. Deviations above 18 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less supervisory control.	= 0 - 36
	<b>D + E</b>			
<b>Empowered Trust</b> <i>elements for possible empowered trust/mis-trust are taken from both parties (F + G). For employees this is based on factor 8, appendix 3.</i>	<b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 11: 'Extent to which employees are empowered as measure of trust': - employees can use own initiative completely in work decisions - use own initiative, but within clear parameters - limited discretion for employees to use own initiative - require constant supervision with little empowerment - supervisor's main role is bureaucratic control of employee output	= 4 = 3 = 2 = 1 = 0	<b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire, Q37 and Q45: (Factor 8) 'Based on factor 8, appendix 3, labelled subordination.  2 statements make-up factor 8: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 6; High Trust = 12. Deviations above 6 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less subordination of employees.	= 0 - 12
	<b>F + G</b>			

\* Employee questions are derived from the factor analysis in appendix 3.

**Table 3 Cont'd: Data collection instruments for Trust**

**Overall, combined scale for Trust is 0 - 124; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Institutional Trust = 0 - 42;  
Work Design = 0 - 66;  
Empowered Trust = 0 - 16;**

**The scale is then weighted as an index out of 100 (I), where I = actual score 'a' divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100.**

**Thus 0 = low/miss-trust and 100 = high trust**

**Table 3:1 Data measures of Trust: Water Co.**

Method	Measure	Measure	Measure
<b>Institutional Trust</b>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire Q19: 'Company emphasises non-union status to prospective employees'	= 6	<b>Focus/Issues of Managerial Control</b> <b>C</b> Company Questionnaire Q33: a, e, h, i, j: 'Focus of issues to control/manage employees': a) discipline to modify behaviour e) employee job security/insecurity h) working hours i) absenteeism j) labour turnover
	<b>B</b> Company Questionnaire Q20: 'Company seeks to establish if prospective employees are union members'	= 5	
	<b>A + B</b>	= 11	
<b>Work Design</b>	<b>Non-Union Managerial Advantages</b> <b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q17, a, b, c, h, i: 'advantages to control work design from non-union status': a) lower wages with no union bargaining b) lower fringe benefits from union absence c) greater employee flexibility without union h) management freedom to implement decisions without union i) quicker change to working practice without unions	<b>A + B + C</b>	<b>Supervisory Control</b> <b>E</b> # Employee Questionnaire, Q39, a, b, c, d, e, g, (Factor 3) 'Perceptions of supervisor control over work-related practices': Based on factor 3, appendix 3. Mean score 9.2 <u>Negative deviation - 8.80</u> 6 statements make-up factor 3: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 18; High Trust = 36. Deviations above 18 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less supervisory control.
	<b>D</b>	= 14	
	<b>D + E</b>	= 23	
<b>Empowered Trust</b>	<b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 11: 'Extent to which employees are empowered as measure of trust': Constant supervision, little if any empowerment. For example: "It goes in this kind of format, first is distribution and then sales, then processing and then the admin. and finance staff, and if you work down that list the supervision gets more relaxed I suppose ... it's knowing who to keep an eye on, and distribution and sales are top of that list"	<b>F + G</b>	<b>Subordination</b> <b>G</b> # Employee Questionnaire, Q37 and Q45: (Factor 8) 'Based on factor 8, appendix 3, labelled subordination. Mean score 4.0. <u>Negative deviation - 2.0</u> 2 statements make-up factor 8: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 6; High Trust = 12. Deviations above 6 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less subordination of employees.
			= 4 (rounded)
			= 5

\* Employee questions are derived from the factor analysis in appendix 3.

**Table 3.1 Cont'd (Water Co.: Trust)**

**Overall, combined score for Water Co. is 46, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Institutional Trust = 18;  
Work Design = 23;  
Empowered Trust = 5;**

**The scale is weighted as an index out of 100 (I), where  $I = \text{actual score 'a'}$  divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100.**

**0 = low trust and 100 = high trust**

$$I = \frac{46}{124} \times 100 = 37$$



**Table 3:2 Data measures of Trust: Chem Co.**

Method	Measure	Measure	Measure
<b>Institutional Trust</b>	<b>Union Checking Devices</b>		
	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire Q19: 'Company emphasises non-union status to prospective employees'	= 6	<b>Focus/Issues of Managerial Control</b>
	<b>B</b> Company Questionnaire Q20: 'Company seeks to establish if prospective employees are union members'	= 6	<b>C</b> Company Questionnaire Q33: a, e, h, i, j: 'Focus of issues to control/manage employees': a) discipline to modify behaviour e) employee job security/insecurity h) working hours i) absenteeism j) labour turnover
	<b>A + B</b>	= 12	<b>C</b>
	<b>A + B + C</b>	= 34	
<b>Work Design</b>	<b>Non-Union Managerial Advantages</b>		
	<b>D</b> Company Questionnaire Q17: a, b, c, h, i, j: 'advantages to control work design from non-union status': a) lower wages with no union bargaining b) lower fringe benefits from union absence c) greater employee flexibility without union h) management freedom to implement decisions without union i) quicker change to working practice without unions	= 6 = 5 = 5 = 5 = 6	<b>Supervisory Control</b>
		= 27	<b>E</b> Employee Questionnaire Q39: a, b, c, d, e, g: (Factor 3) 'Perceptions of supervisor control over work-related practices': Based on factor 3, appendix 3. Mean score 14.2. <u>Negative deviation, - 3.8</u>  6 statements make-up factor 3: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 18; High Trust = 36. Deviations above 18 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less supervisory control.
	<b>D</b>	= 14	<b>E</b>
	<b>D + E</b>	= 41	
<b>Empowered Trust</b>	<b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 11: 'Extent to which employees are empowered as measure of trust': Differentiation by occupation, but on balance, limited employee empowerment. Technical employees have greater degree of freedom in their tasks, however process operatives are subject to more bureaucratic supervision on process line. Overall, limited discretion for empowerment..	= 2	<b>Subordination</b>
			<b>G</b> Employee Questionnaire Q37 and Q45: (Factor 8) 'Based on factor 8, appendix 3, labelled subordination. Mean score 6.5 <u>Positive deviation, + 0.5</u>  2 statements make-up factor 8: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 6; High Trust = 12. Deviations above 6 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less subordination of employees.
		<b>F + G</b>	= 8.5

\* Employee questions are derived from the factor analysis in appendix 3.

**Table 3.2 Cont'd (Chem Co. Trust)**

**Overall, combined score for Chem Co. is 83.5, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Institutional Trust = 34;  
Work Design = 41;  
Empowered Trust = 8.5;**

**The scale is weighted as an index out of 100 (I), where I = actual score 'a' divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100.**

**0 = low trust and 100 = high trust**

**I =**

$$\frac{83.5}{124} \times 100 = 67.3$$

**Table 3:3**

**Data measures of Trust: Delivery Co.**

Method		Measure	Measure	Measure	
<b>Institutional Trust</b>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire Q19: 'Company emphasises non-union status to prospective employees'		= 6	<b>Focus/Issues of Managerial Control</b> <b>C</b> Company Questionnaire Q33: a, e, h, i, j: 'Focus of issues to control/manage employees': a) discipline to modify behaviour e) employee job security/insecurity h) working hours i) absenteeism j) labour turnover	
	<b>B</b> Company Questionnaire Q20: 'Company seeks to establish if prospective employees are union members'		= 6		
	<b>A + B</b>		= 12	<b>C</b>	
		<b>A + B + C</b>			
<b>Work Design</b>	<b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q17, a, b, c, h, i: 'advantages to control work design from non-union status': a) lower wages with no union bargaining b) lower fringe benefits from union absence c) greater employee flexibility without union h) management freedom to implement decisions without union i) quicker change to working practice without unions		= 6 = 6 = 6 = 5 = 1	<b>Supervisory Control</b> <b>E</b> * Employee Questionnaire, Q39, a, b, c, d, e, g, (Factor 3) 'Perceptions of supervisor control over work-related practices': Based on factor 3, appendix 3. Mean score 23.7 Positive deviation, + 5.7 6 statements make-up factor 3: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 18; High Trust = 36. Deviations above 18 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less supervisory control.	
			= 24		
		<b>D</b>			= 24
		<b>D + E</b>			= 48
<b>Empowered Trust</b>	<b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 11: 'Extent to which employees are empowered as measure of trust': There is a degree of discretion for employees which indicates empowerment, but limited in many ways and by occupation. For senior personnel manager, "we tend to play on humour a bit as one way to encourage staff, light heartedness, and people do things off their own bat in that situation. But we need to survive, and that often means pushing deadlines to stay ahead in this game, which I'm afraid doesn't allow the luxury of freedom we'd perhaps like our people to have .. what I'm sure they'd like to have as well"		= 2	<b>Subordination</b> <b>G</b> # Employee Questionnaire, Q37 and Q45: (Factor 8) 'Based on factor 8, appendix 3, labelled subordination. Mean score 5.6 Negative deviation, - 0.6 2 statements make-up factor 8: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 6; High Trust = 12. Deviations above 6 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less subordination of employees.	
		<b>F + G</b>			= 8

\* Employee questions are derived from the factor analysis in appendix 3.

**Table 3.3 Cont'd: Trust (Delivery Co.)**

**Overall, combined score for Delivery Co. is 85, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Institutional Trust = 29;  
Work Design = 48;  
Empowered Trust = 8;**

**The scale is weighted as an index out of 100 (I), where I = actual score 'a' divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100.**

**0 = low trust and 100 = high trust**

**Index =**

$$\frac{85}{124} \times 100 = 68.5$$

**Table 3.4** Data measures of Trust: Merchant Co.

Method	Measure	Measure	Measure
<b>Institutional Trust</b>	<b>A</b> Company Questionnaire Q19: 'Company emphasises non-union status to prospective employees'	= 2	<b>Focus/Issues of Managerial Control</b> C Company Questionnaire Q33: a, e, h, i, j 'Focus of issues to control/manage employees': a) discipline to modify behaviour e) employee job security/insecurity h) working hours i) absenteeism j) labour turnover
	<b>B</b> Company Questionnaire Q20: 'Company seeks to establish if prospective employees are union members'	= 6	
	<b>A + B</b>	= 8	<b>C</b>
	<b>A + B + C</b>		= 17
<b>Work Design</b>	<b>Non-Union Managerial Advantages</b>		<b>Supervisory Control</b> E # Employee Questionnaire, Q39, a, b, c, d, e, g, (Factor 3) 'Perceptions of supervisor control over work-related practices': Based on factor 3, appendix 3. Mean score 16.3 Negative deviation, - 1.7 6 statements make-up factor 3: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 18; High Trust = 36. Deviations above 18 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less supervisory control.
	<b>D</b> Company Questionnaire, Q17, a, b, c, h, i, j: 'advantages to control work design from non-union status': a) lower wages with no union bargaining b) lower fringe benefits from union absence c) greater employee flexibility without union h) management freedom to implement decisions without union i) quicker change to working practice without unions	= 4 = 3 = 3 = 2 = 2	
	<b>D</b>	= 14	<b>E</b>
	<b>D + E</b>		= 30
<b>Empowered Trust</b>	<b>F</b> Company Interview Schedule, item 11: 'Extent to which employees are empowered as measure of trust': High degree of constant supervision, however the intensity of supervision is determined by line managers themselves rather than as an overall company objective. This is problematic for personnel given a lack of co-ordination on whether employees work in an empowered way or not. For example: "There is a lot of closed off issues here... in many ways we're a pretty old-fashioned company... young ones come in with the enthusiasm and fresh ideas, but the older ones don't wanna know, they don't even try if I'm honest. That tends to mean there's not much freedom about the place... In the 20 years I've been here we've always carried the message that the rules are important and should be used... its amazing how many people we've dismissed on trust and confidence... we have a hell of a lot of tribunals to deal with these days"	= 1	<b>Subordination</b> G # Employee Questionnaire, Q37 and Q45: (Factor 8) 'Based on factor 8, appendix 3, labelled subordination. Mean score 6.4 Negative deviation, - 0.4 2 statements make-up factor 8: Low Trust = 0; Medium Trust = 6; High Trust = 12. Deviations above 6 are positive and below negative. Higher score is sign of less subordination of employees
		<b>F + G</b>	

\* Employee questions are derived from the factor analysis in appendix 3.

**Table 3.4 Cont'd: Trust (Merchant Co.)**

**Overall, combined score for Merchant Co. is 54, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Institutional Trust = 17;  
Work Design = 30;  
Empowered Trust = 7;**

**The scale is weighted as an index out of 100 (I), where I = actual score 'a' divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100.**

**0 = low trust and 100 = high trust**

**Index:**

$$\frac{54}{124} \times 100 = 43.5$$

**Table 3.5** Data measures for 'Trust' - All Companies

Method	Index Score				Comments
	Water	Chem	Delivery	Merchant	
<b>Institutional Trust</b>	18	34	29	17	Lower the score, greater the institutionalisation of mis-trust in relationship. High score = high trust
<b>Work Design</b>	23	41	48	30	Higher the score, fewer methods used to control work design, indicating higher trust to perform tasks
<b>Empowered Trust</b>	5	8.5	8	7	High score indicates low perception of subordination/greater view of empowerment as sign of high trust.
<b>Actual Score (a)</b>	46	83.5	85	54	
<b>Maximum Score (m) (x 100)</b>	124	124	124	124	
<b>Index</b>	37	67.3	68.5	43.5	
<b>Rank Order</b>	4	2	1	3	

## **APPENDIX TWO**

### **Part 4**

#### **TABLE 4: COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR FORMALITY**

**Table 4.1: Data Measures of Formalisation: Water Co.**

**Table 4.2: Data Measures of Formalisation: Chem Co.**

**Table 4.3: Data Measures of Formalisation: Delivery Co.**

**Table 4.4: Data Measures of Formalisation: Merchant Co.**

**Table 4.5: Summary Index Formalisation: All Companies**





**Table 4 Cont'd: Formalisation**

**Overall, combined scale for Formality is 0 - 49; determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Formalisation/Depth of Rules = 0 - 28**  
**Formality of Approach = 0 - 21**

**Where 0 = informality within relationship and 100 = extreme formality as approach to make and modify**

**As with other measures, the scores are weighted into an index (I) out of 100 for consistency and comparison as follows.**

**$I = a/m \times 100$ , where 'a' is the actual score and 'm' the maximum possible score.**

**Table 4.1:** Data measures of Formalisation: Water Co.

Method	Formalisation of Rules/Policies	Measure	Depth of Rule/Policy Formality	Measure
Formality	<p><b>A: Company Questionnaire &amp; Documentation</b></p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - NO                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - YES                      Q40: Discipline Policy - YES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - YES                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - YES                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - NO                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - NO</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 0                      = 0                      (= 4)</p>	<p><b>B: Company Documentation</b> (see also table 4:1a, report of content analysis) Content analysis on each of A where evident. (Scoring framework 0 - 3)</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - N/A                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - WEAK, FEW DETAILS                      Q40: Discipline Policy - BARE MINIMUM                      Q41: Grievance Policy - FEW DETAILS, ONLY A STATEMENT                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - BELOW H&amp;S LEGAL DUTIES                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - N/A                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - N/A. RELIANCE ON INFORMAL NETWORKS</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 2                      = 0                      = 0                      = 0                      = 0                      (= 3)</p>
	<p><b>C: Formality of Approach (Employer)</b></p> <p>Company Questionnaire, Q 42:                      'Extent discipline/grievance handled formally/informally':                      (where 0 = informality and 6 = formality)</p> <p>Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 9:                      'Explanation about communications/changing rules and discipline as a formal/informal approach':                      Preference is for less formal, but not always possible. Chief Executive talked about inter-departmental communications as main problem area, especially across different locations. This gave rise to strong reliance on supervisory management passing-on information. The approach is extremely 'autocratic': often harsh, crude methods. For example: "we tend to impose and implement ... our discipline standards and changes". Further, workers coming up to 2 years service are often dismissed because of ensuing employment protection.</p>	<p>A + B                      = 4                      = 2</p>	<p><b>D: Formality of Approach (Employee)</b></p> <p>*Employee Questionnaire, Q32 and 33: (Factor 7) - Informality  <b>Mean Score 2.12 . Positive deviation, + 3.88</b></p> <p>Low scores indicate informality (face-to-face relations) and high scores formality.</p> <p>0 = Informal; 6 = Medium; 12 = Formality</p>	<p>= 7                      = 2                      (= rounded)</p>
	<p><b>C + D</b>                      (= sigma of (A + B) + (C + D))</p>			<p>= 8                      = 15</p>

\* Employee questions are derived from factor analysis, appendix 3.

**Table 4:1 Cont'd: Formalisation (Water Co.)**

**For Formalisation Water Co. score is 15, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

**Formalisation/Depth of Rules = 7**  
**Formality of Approach = 8**

**I = 15/49 x 100 = 30.6**

**Thus I =**  
**a/m x 100**

**Table 4:1a - Summary Report of Content Analysis on Rules & Policies: Formalisation - Water Co.**

Scoring Framework	Type and Policy Range							Recruitment & Selection
	Job Security	Training Policy	Discipline	Grievance	Health & Safety	Equal Opp's		
None Exists (0)	N/A			Only reference is employees "raise a grievance with their manager".	Only mention is to 'employee duties' under HASAWA 1974, no mention of 'employers duties' or other legal requirements, such as risk assessments or other EC Directives	Discipline code states that 'sexual harassment is a disciplinary offence (note: not dismissal or gross misconduct), but no equal opportunities policy or statement.	No formal or written policy. Explanations are there is a strong reliance on informal networks, employee recommending friends and family, or adverts in trade press (e.g. The Grocer) when specialist or sales reps are required.	
Weak/Few Rules (1)		No formal or structured training, other than basic 'induction' for new staff. Sanitation Engineers are briefed about technological developments (e.g. to water coolers).						
Minimum/Little Guidance (falls short of legal standards) (2)			Discipline code is outlined in handbook (which is 4 page document). the right of an appeal is stated, but no procedures explaining appeal process. A work colleague can accompany a fellow employee. The Chief Executive's decision is final.					
High detail of rules/policy (consistent/above legal standards) (3)								

**Table 4.2: Data measures of Formalisation: Chem Co.**

Method Formality	Formalisation of Rules/Policies	Measure	Depth of Rule/Policy Formality	Measure
	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire &amp; Documentation</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - NO                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - YES                      Q40: Discipline Policy - YES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - YES                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - YES                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - NO                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - YES</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 0                      = 1                      (= 5)</p>	<p><b>B</b> Company Documentation (see also table 4.2a, summary report of content analysis) Content analysis on each of A where evident. (Scoring framework 0 - 3)</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - N/A                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - HIGH LEVEL OF TRAINING                      Q40: Discipline Policy - BARE MIN - BELOW ACAS CODES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - BARE MIN - BELOW ACAS CODES                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - HIGH DETAIL/COVERAGE                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - NONE EXISTENT                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - NO FORMAL POLICY, BUT SOPHISTICATED NETWORKS (e.g. UNIVERSITIES)</p>	<p>= 0                      = 3                      = 2                      = 2                      = 3                      = 0                      = 1                      (= 10)</p>
	<p><b>C: Formality of Approach (Employer)</b></p> <p>Company Questionnaire, Q.42:                      'Extent discipline/grievance handled formally/informally'.                      (where 0 = informal and 6 highly formal)</p> <p>Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 9:                      'Explanation about communications and changing rules as a formal/informal approach':                      'Tendency is to communicate/seek change formally, but not always possible. Operations Director spends a great deal of time 'on the shop floor' persuading people of ideas and new working methods in less than formal manner. Discipline also tends to be less formal, with reliance on 'memory' of management rather than detailed records. One employee interviewed was on a 'final warning' (also confirmed by manager), but no records were kept of this (according to manager)</p>	<p>= 6                      = 2</p>	<p><b>D: Formality of Approach (Employee)</b></p> <p>* Employee Questionnaire, Q32 and 33: (Factor 7) - Informality                      Mean Score 4.00. Positive deviation, + 2.00                      Low scores indicate informality (face-to-face relations) and high scores formality.                      0 = Informal; 6 = Medium; 12 = Formality</p>	<p>= 4</p>
	<b>A + B</b>			<p>= 15</p>
	<b>C + D</b>			<p>= 10</p>
	<b>i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D)</b>			<p>= 25</p>

\* Employee questions are derived from factor analysis, appendix 3.

**Table 4.2 Cont'd: Formalisation (Chem Co.)**

**For Formalisation Chem Co. score is 25, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Formalisation/Depth of Rules} &= 15 \\ \text{Formality of Approach} &= 10 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Thus } I = \frac{a}{m} \times 100$$

$$I = \frac{25}{49} \times 100 = 51$$

**Table 4:2a - Summary Report of Content Analysis on Rules & Policies: Formalisation (Chem Co.)**

Scoring Framework	Type and Policy Range						Recruitment & Selection
	Job Security	Training Policy	Discipline	Grievance	Health & Safety	Equal Opp's	
None Exists (0)	N/A					N/A	
Weak/Few Rules (1)							No formal policy, links with higher education (York University) for new recruits of a technical nature. Outside technical/chemist jobs, main method is adverts and operations director selects from interview. Tendency is also to 'promote from within', but nothing documented about the latter.
Minimum/Little Guidance (falls short of legal standards) (2)			Discipline code exists, but last updated in 1981. Levels are explained, with appeals, but does not say with whom. There is right of representation, must be by existing employee.	Similar to discipline with 3 stages outlined: team leader, manager, then op's director. Representation is allowed, again by existing employee.			
High detail of rules/policy (consistent/above legal standards) (3)		High training, especially H&S. Company also sponsor/pay fees/time-off for post-graduate training and modern apprenticeships (work-related) and non-work related education/courses. Supportive of Investors in People with emphasis on training.			Highly detailed, as may be expected at chemical plant. Employees undergo safety and first aid training. Both 'employer/employee duties' outlined from H&S Act, as are various EC Directives: e.g. risk assessments, manual handling, COSHH.		



**Table 4.3: Data measures of Formalisation: Delivery Co.**

Method	Formalisation of Rules/Policies	Measure	Depth of Rule/Policy Formality	Measure
Formality	<p><b>A</b> Company Questionnaire &amp; Documentation</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - NO                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - YES                      Q40: Discipline Policy - YES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - YES                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - YES                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - YES                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - YES</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      (= 6)</p>	<p><b>B</b> Company Documentation (see also table 4.3a, content analysis content analysis on each of A where evident. (Scoring frame 0-3)</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - N/A                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - EXIST, BUT WEAK                      Q40: Discipline Policy - MIN, BELOW ACAS                      Q41: Grievance Policy - MIN, BELOW ACAS                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - BELOW LEGAL STANDARD                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - EXISTS BUT WEAK                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - VARIOUS APPROACHES, BUT LITTLE POLICY DETAIL</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 2                      = 2                      = 2                      = 1                      = 2                      (= 10)</p>
	<p><b>C: Formality of Approach (Employer)</b></p> <p>Company Questionnaire, Q42:                      "Extent discipline/grievance handled formally/informally".                      (where 0 = informal and 6 = highly formal)</p> <p>Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 9:                      "Explanation about communications and changing rules as a formal/informal approach":                      Preference is for less formal "atmosphere", but backed by well-documented policies and procedures overall.                      Guidance exists on team meetings and implementation of new methods at line manager level. For example, personnel manager stated: "we get a little concerned that what we're doing is a bit too formal - counter to the culture at (Delivery Co.) .. probably semi-formal briefings". Regarding discipline approaches: "we have counselling rather than hearings and allow representation"</p>	<p>= 3                      = 1</p>	<p><b>D: Formality of Approach (Employee)</b></p> <p>* Employee Questionnaire, Q32 and 33: (Factor 7) - Informality</p> <p>Mean Score 2.42. Positive deviation, + 3.58</p> <p>Low scores indicate informality (face-to-face relations) and high scores formality.</p> <p>0 = Informal; 6 = Medium; 12 = Formality</p>	<p>= 16                      = 2.5 (rounded)</p>
A + B				
C + D				
i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D)				

For Formalisation Delivery Co. score 22.5, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:  
 Formalisation/Depth of Rules = 16  
 Formality of Approach = 6.5  
 Thus 22.5 / 49 x 100 = 45.9

\* Employee questions are derived from factor analysis, appendix 3.

**Table 4:3a - Summary Report of Content Analysis on Rules & Policies: Formalisation (Delivery Co.)**

Scoring Framework	Type and Policy Range						Recruitment & Selection
	Job Security	Training Policy	Discipline	Grievance	Health & Safety	Equal Opp's	
None Exists (0)	N/A						
Weak/Few Rules (1)		Statement exists in staff handbook, but no other policy. Training is mostly in-house, related to company matters (e.g. using e-mail or new delivery services). Who is trained is often up to station managers.				Statement exists in staff handbook, nothing else, that sexual/race harassment is disciplinary (note: not dismissal/gross misconduct offence).	
Minimum/Little Guidance (falls short of legal standards) (2)			Stated aims are as a "corrective not a punishment", but few stages explained beyond immediate manager. representation and appeals allowed, internally, but again no specific guidelines, stages.	Similar to discipline code with stages but few explanations. More detail is given, however, with time limits between stages, but line managers decision is final.	General reference to both 'employer and employee duties' under H&S Act, but nothing on EC Directives: risk assessments, manual handling (perhaps surprising given delivery of parcels).		Policy statements outline recruitment of 'quality staff', but at station level employees often recruited by nomination from existing employees. Use of adverts, external agencies are used, but mainly for head office staff. Interview is main method, with preference for promotion from within.
High detail of rules/policy (consistent/above legal standards) (3)							

**Table 4.4:** Data measures of Formalisation: Merchant Co.

Method	Formalisation of Rules/Policies	Measure	Depth of Rule/Policy Formality	Measure
Formality	<p><b>A. Company Questionnaire &amp; Documentation</b></p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - NO                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - YES                      Q40: Discipline Policy - YES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - YES                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - YES                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - YES                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - YES</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      = 1                      (= 6)</p>	<p><b>B. Company Documentation</b> (see also table 4.4a, summary report of content analysis) Content analysis on each of A where evident. (Scoring framework 0 - 3)</p> <p>Q32m: Employee Job Security Policy - N/A                      Q32p: Employee Training Policy - EXISTS, BUT FEW AIMS/GUIDELINES                      Q40: Discipline Policy - HIGH DETAIL - CONSISTENT WITH ACAS CODES                      Q41: Grievance Policy - MINIMUM - LESS THAN ACAS RECOMMEND                      Doc: Health &amp; Safety Policy - EXISTS, BUT BELOW LEGAL MIN                      Doc: Equal Opportunities Policy - VERY WEAK - ONLY A STATEMENT                      Doc: Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy - LITTLE DETAIL, MIXED METHODS                      IN PRACTICE WHICH REALLY ON WORD OF MOUTH</p>	<p>= 0                      = 1                      = 3                      = 2                      = 2                      = 0                      = 1                      (= 9)</p>
	<p><b>C: Formality of Approach (Employer)</b></p> <p>Company Questionnaire, Q 42:                      'Extent discipline/grievance handled formally/informally'.                      (where 0 = informal and 6 = high informality)</p> <p>Company Interview Schedule, items 3 &amp; 9:                      'Explanation about communications and changing rules as a formal/informal approach':                      Tendency and preference is to implement change by the book, but line managers vary in approach. High formality on the surface, not in practice. For example: 'we don't solicit views ... its implemented in here'. However, supervisors often determine own way of doing things, even contrary to personnel rules.</p>	<p>= 4                      = 2</p>	<p><b>D: Formality of Approach (Employee)</b></p> <p>* Employee Questionnaire, Q32 and 33: (Factor 7) - Informality                      Mean Score 3.59. Positive deviation, + 2.41                      Low scores indicate informality (face-to-face relations) and high scores formality.                      0 = Informal; 6 = Medium; 12 = Formality</p>	<p>= 3.5                      (= rounded)</p>
		<b>A + B</b>		<b>15</b>
		<b>C + D</b>		<b>9.5</b>
		<b>i.e. sigma of (A + B) + (C + D)</b>		<b>24.5</b>

For Formalisation Merchant Co. score is 24.5, determined as the sum of the following factor measures:  
 Formalisation/Depth of Rules = 15  
 Formality of Approach = 9.5  
 Thus I =  $I = 24.5 / 49 \times 100 = 47$   
 $a/m \times 100$

\* Employee questions are derived from factor analysis, appendix 3.

**Table 4:4a - Summary Report of Content Analysis on Rules & Policies: Formalisation (Merchant Co.)**

		Type and Policy Range					
Scoring Framework	Job Security	Training Policy	Discipline	Grievance	Health & Safety	Equal Opp's	Recruitment & Selection
None Exists (0)	N/A					A statement exists in staff handbook, about sex harassment, but nothing on race or potential discipline.	
Weak/Few Rules (1)		Mainly on-the-job. No explanation of who can be trained nor in what, just that training exists. Also explained that little training takes place, reliance on people with existing qualification and skills					Written policy is to recruit 'high calibre staff', but nothing about how to do this. Reliance on informal methods for employees to recommend prospective employees. Selection is interview, at time without personnel involvement.
Minimum/ Little Guidance (falls short of legal standards) (2)				How to process grievance is explained, at what levels, but time limits and representation absent. Falls short of ACAS recommendations.	Minimum outline of H&S policy and procedures. 'Employee duties' stated, but not 'employer duties' under H&S Act, no reference to EC Regulations; risk assessments etc.		
High detail of rules/policy (consistent/ above legal standards) (3)			Detailed coverage for discipline, explains offences and categories (e.g. misconduct and gross misconduct), with stages and levels outlined, together with appeals at personnel manager level, rights of representation by fellow works, and time limits between discipline and appeal. very compatible to codes and models by ACAS.				

**Table 4:5** Data measures for Formalisation - All Companies

Method	Index Score			Comments
	Water Co	Chem Co	Delivery Co	
Formalisation/Depth of Rules and Polices	7	15	16	Higher the score, greater the existence and depth of formal/written rules, procedures and policies dealing with the relationship.
Formality of Approach	8	10	6.5	Higher the score, greater the extent to which the parties approach /perceive the relationship as more formal.
Actual Score (a)	15	25	22.5	24.5
Divided by max. (m) x 100	49	49	49	49
Index	30.6	51	45.9	50
Rank Order	4	1	3	2

**APPENDIX TWO**  
**Part 5**

**TABLE 5: COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR DISCRETENESS**

**Table 5.1: Data Measures of Discreteness: Water Co.**

**Table 5.2: Data Measures of Discreteness: Chem Co.**

**Table 5.3: Data Measures of Discreteness: Delivery Co.**

**Table 5.4: Data Measures of Discreteness: Merchant Co.**

**Table 5.5: Summary Index of Discreteness: All Companies**

**Table 5:** Data Measures for the Dimension Discreteness

Q	Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+ / -)	Q	Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+ / -)
44	If you work especially hard, are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?			26	Out of the following, do you agree or disagree that:		
42	When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, how often do you think your views are taken into account by management?			26f	trade unions 'provide necessary protection' (R)		
50	Generally speaking, would you say your pay and conditions are better or worse than those for other companies close to where you work/live?			26d	trade unions 'can be beneficial to employees' (R)		
34	Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions in this company			26g	trade unions 'are, on the whole, sensible' (R)		
52	Would you say that the majority of employees you work with are committed to company			24	Would you agree that there are real benefits in having the views of all employees represented to management?		
36	I believe management that the company's most valued asset is people working here?			21	Trade unions are generally a good thing for workers? (R)		
46	How often do management communicate, to you, changes at work			25	On the whole, I think a trade union would make my job more secure in my company?		
51	Does the amount of pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/living expenses?			22	Do you agree your pay and conditions could be improved if there was a trade union in your company?		
<b>Score for Attitudinal Discreteness</b>		<b>0 - 48</b>		<b>Score for Behavioral Discreteness</b>		<b>0 - 42</b>	
<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>0-100</b>		<b>Weighted Index (s/m x 100)</b>		<b>0-100</b>	

Higher the score on each scale indicates 'them & us' within the relationship. Low attitudinal scores show support for out-group identification (management), thus a high mean is disagreement with managerial objectives. For behavioural discreteness, high score is support for inter-collective group identity (unions), thus high score is sign of behavioural them and us in relationship. The summation of discreteness can be obtained by adding each scale, divided by 2 for overall index. (shown in table 5.6). (R)= Re-coded questions for consistency of index measures, so all high scores indicate them & us along each separate dimension.

All mean scores have been amended from 1 - 7, to 0 to 6 for consistency and comparison. For each separate statement/question the mid-point is 3. For attitudinal discreteness, with 8 statements, the scale is 0 - 48, and for behavioural them & us, with 7 statements, the scale is 0 - 42. Deviations represent the extent of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes from the mid-score.

For comparison the measures of attitudinal and behavioural discreteness are taken separately, each given a weighted index out of 100 as follows:  
 Actual score 'a' divided by maximum score 'm', multiplied by 100 (i.e.  $I = a/m \times 100$ ).

**Table 5.1: Data measures of Discreteness: Water Co.**

Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness		Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness			
Q	Mean	Deviation (+/-)	Q	Mean	Deviation (+/-)
44	3.2	- 0.2	26	5.0	+ 2.0
42	4.1	- 1.1	26f	5.2	+ 2.2
50	4.0	- 1.0	26d	2.1	- 0.9
34	4.7	- 1.7	26g	5.5	+ 2.5
52	4.1	- 1.1	24	5.2	+ 2.2
36	3.7	- 0.7	25	4.5	+ 1.5
46	2.5	+ 0.5	22	2.6	- 0.4
51	4.6	- 1.6			
<b>Score for Attitudinal Discreteness</b>			<b>Score for Behavioural Discreteness</b>		
30.05		(n = 57)	30.10		(n = 16)
<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>62.5</b>	<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>71.6</b>

(R) = Re-coded questions for consistency (e.g. inverse deviation scales for behavioural items & us, in order to create summation scale for overall discreteness)

For each separate statement the mid point is 3. Deviations represent the extent of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes from the mid-score. For comparison the measures of attitudinal and behavioural discreteness are taken separately, each given a weighted index (I) out of 100, as follows:  
 Attitudinal Discreteness Index = 30, divided by maximum score, 48, x 100 = 62.5  
 Behavioural Discreteness Index = 30.1, divided by maximum score, 42, x 100 = 71.6

**I = Attitudinal Discreteness = 62.5 (Negative support for out-group, Deviation of - 12.5)**  
**Behavioural Discreteness = 71.6 (Positive support for collective inter-group, Deviation of + 21.6)**



**Table 5.2: Data measures of Discreteness: Chem Co.**

Q	Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+/-)	Q	Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+/-)
44	If you work especially hard, are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	5.3	- 2.3	26	Out of the following, do you agree or disagree that:	4.8	+ 1.8
42	When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, how often do you think your views are taken into account by management?	5.3	- 2.3	26f	trade unions 'provide necessary protection' (R)		
50	Generally speaking, would you say your pay and conditions are better or worse than those for other companies close to where you work/live?	5.2	- 2.2	26d	trade unions 'can be beneficial to employees' (R)	5.2	+ 2.2
34	Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions in this company	5.5	- 2.5	26g	trade unions 'are, on the whole, sensible' (R)	4.9	+ 1.9
52	Would you say that the majority of employees you work with are committed to company	5.1	- 2.1	24	Would you agree that there are real benefits in having the views of all employees represented to management?	5.2	+ 2.2
36	I believe management that the company's most valued asset is people working here?	4.5	- 1.5	21	Trade unions are generally a good thing for workers? (R)	5.1	+ 2.1
46	How often do management communicate, to you, changes at work	3.8	- 0.8	25	On the whole, I think a trade union would make my job more secure in my company?	4.2	+ 1.2
51	Does the amount of pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/living expenses?	5.2	- 2.2	22	Do you agree your pay and conditions could be improved if there was a trade union in your company?	5.0	+ 2.0
<b>Score for Attitudinal Discreteness</b>		<b>40.0</b>		<b>Score for Behavioural Discreteness</b>		<b>34.4</b>	
		(n = 59)				(n = 67)	
<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>83.3</b>	<b>- 33.3</b>	<b>Weighted Index (s/m x 100)</b>		<b>81.9</b>	<b>+ 31.9</b>

(R) = Re-coded questions for consistency (e.g. inverse deviation scales for behavioural them & us, in order to create summation scale for overall discreteness)

For each separate statement the mid point is 3. Deviations represent the extent of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes from the mid-score. For comparison the measures of attitudinal and behavioural discreteness are taken separately, each given a weighted index (I) out of 100, as follows:  
 Attitudinal Discreteness Index = 40, divided by maximum score, 48, x 100.  
 Behavioural Discreteness Index = 34.4, divided by maximum score, 42, x 100.

**I = Attitudinal Discreteness = 83.3 (Negative support for out-group, Deviation of - 33.3)**  
**Behavioural Discreteness = 81.9 (Positive support for collective inter-group, Deviation of + 31.9)**

**Table 5.3:** Data measures of Discreteness: Delivery Co

Q	Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+/-)	Q	Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness	Mean	Deviation (+/-)
44	If you work especially hard, are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	3.5	- 0.5	26	Out of the following, do you agree or disagree that:	3.9	+ 0.9
42	When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, how often do you think your views are taken into account by management?	4.1	- 1.1	26f	trade unions 'provide necessary protection' (R)	4.4	+ 1.4
50	Generally speaking, would you say your pay and conditions are better or worse than those for other companies close to where you work/live?	3.0	0.0	26d	trade unions 'can be beneficial to employees' (R)	3.6	+ 0.6
34	Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions in this company	3.7	- 0.7	26g	trade unions 'are, on the whole, sensible' (R)	4.8	+ 1.8
52	Would you say that the majority of employees you work with are committed to company	3.3	- 0.3	24	Would you agree that there are real benefits in having the views of all employees represented to management?	3.8	+ 0.8
36	I believe management that the company's most valued asset is people working here?	2.8	+ 0.2	21	Trade unions are generally a good thing for workers? (R)	2.9	- 0.1
46	How often do management communicate, to you, changes at work	2.7	+ 0.3	25	On the whole, I think a trade union would make my job more secure in my company?	3.3	+ 0.3
51	Does the amount of pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/living expenses?	4.2	- 1.2	22	Do you agree your pay and conditions could be improved if there was a trade union in your company?		
<b>Score for Attitudinal Discreteness</b>		<b>27.3</b>		<b>Score for Behavioural Discreteness</b>		<b>26.7</b>	
		(n = 103)				(n = 103)	
<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>56.8</b>	<b>- 6.8</b>	<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		<b>63.5</b>	<b>+ 13.5</b>

(R) = Re-coded questions for consistency (e.g. inverse deviation scales for behavioural them & us, in order to create summation scale for overall discreteness)

For each separate statement the mid point is 3. Deviations represent the extent of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes from the mid-score. For comparison the measures of attitudinal and behavioural discreteness are taken separately, each given a weighted index (I) out of 100, as follows:  
 Attitudinal Discreteness Index = 27.3, divided by maximum score, 48, x 100.  
 Behavioural Discreteness Index = 26.7, divided by maximum score, 42, x 100.

**I = Attitudinal Discreteness = 56.8 (Negative support for out-group, Deviation of - 6.8)**  
**Behavioural Discreteness = 63.5 (Positive support for collective inter-group, Deviation of + 13.5)**

**Table 5.4:** Data measures of Discreteness: Merchant Co.

Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness			Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness		
Q	Mean	Deviation (+/-)	Q	Mean	Deviation (+/-)
44	5.2	- 2.2	26	4.3	+ 1.3
42	5.8	- 2.8	26f	5.1	+ 2.1
50	5.1	- 2.1	26d	4.2	+ 1.2
34	5.5	- 2.5	24	5.2	+ 2.2
52	4.5	- 1.5	21	4.4	+ 1.4
36	5.1	- 2.1	25	3.4	+ 0.4
46	4.4	- 1.4	22	3.8	+ 0.8
51	4.6	- 1.6			
<b>Score for Attitudinal Discreteness</b>			<b>Score for Behavioural Discreteness</b>		
40.2 (n 37)			30.4 (n = 39)		
<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>			<b>Weighted Index (a/m x 100)</b>		
83.7			72.3		

(R) = Re-coded questions for consistency (e.g. inverse deviation scales for behavioural them & us, in order to create summation scale for overall discreteness)

For each separate statement the mid point is 3. Deviations represent the extent of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes from the mid-score. For comparison the measures of attitudinal and behavioural discreteness are taken separately, each given a weighted index (I) out of 100, as follows:  
 Attitudinal Discreteness Index = 40.2, divided by maximum score, 48, x 100.  
 Behavioural Discreteness Index = 30.4, divided by maximum score, 42, x 100.

**I = Attitudinal Discreteness = 83.7 (Negative support for out-group, Deviation of - 33.7)**  
**Behavioural Discreteness = 72.3 (Positive support for collective inter-group, Deviation of + 22.3)**

**Table 5:5** Data measures of Attitudinal and Behavioural Discreteness - All Companies

Company	Attitudinal Discreteness	Deviation	Rank Order <sup>a</sup>	Behavioural Discreteness	Deviation	Rank Order <sup>a</sup>
Delivery Co.	57	- 7	1	63	+ 13	1
Water Co.	62	- 12	2	71	+ 21	2
Chem Co.	83	- 33	3	82	+ 32	4
Merchant Co.	84	- 34	4	72	+ 22	3

Figures have been rounded for simplicity. Higher score reflects 'them & us' within the relationship.

a: Rank order from least to highest extent of 'them & us'

**Table 5:6** Summation of both Attitudinal and Behavioural Discreteness - All Companies

Company	Overall Discreteness Index	Deviation	Rank Order <sup>a</sup>
Delivery Co.	60	+ 10	1
Water Co.	66	+ 16	2
Merchant Co.	78	+ 28	3
Chem Co.	82	+ 32	4

Figures have been rounded for simplicity. Each separate index from table 5.5 is added and divided by 2 for overall index score. Those above (+) 50 show extent/summation of 'them & us' within the employment relationship.

a: Rank order from least to highest extent of 'them & us'

## **APPENDIX THREE**

### **Factor Analysis Procedure and Results**

## APPENDIX THREE

### FACTOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURE AND RESULTS

#### INTRODUCTION

This appendix reports the results and method of a factor analysis carried out on a range of statements in the employee survey questionnaire. Because some firms studied are too small to generate a reliable factor analysis on their own, all separate company data files have been merged in SPSS to obtain a large enough population, thereby producing a combined sample of 276 non-union employees. The rationale for factor analysis is:

1. To strengthen the validity of the questionnaire data by assessing what values and attitudes are actually measurable. That is to say factor analysis was used to obtain some *construct* validity to the data.
2. From 1 above, this could then identify key sources of influence on the dimensions of the relationship discussed in chapters two and three.
3. Subsequently, respondents in each separate organisation can be assessed using the same data collection instruments, as revealed by the factor patterns themselves.
4. Finally, factor loadings were subsequently tested for their reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient is used to add a further degree of validity.

In total 46 questions were included in the factor analysis. These represented all the questions which contained attitudinal-type statements. Of the 46 questions input, 9 did not fall into any factor<sup>1</sup>. All factor loadings below 0.5 were excluded using the default procedure in SPSS. This enabled a much easier interpretation of the tabulated printout and discarded loading which were less significant (Kinnear & Gray, 1994). All factors were subsequently rotated

---

<sup>1</sup> In the employee questionnaire, these are: Q23, 26a, 26b, 27, 29, 35, 38, 39f, 47.

using the most robust method (Varimax) to obtain a tighter fit to the factor structures (Kinnear & Gray, 1994; Norusis, 1994).

Following an outline of the factor analysis procedures and tests for reassurance, each factor is listed in rank order allied to a brief discussion of factor labelling. Finally, a scale for each factor is created and explained, which shows the range of attitudinal responses to those statements posed.

#### OUTLINE OF FACTOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

The first stage of factor analysis produced the correlation matrix (Table A3:4). The points of interest are that the determinant statistic ought to be  $> 0.00001$ , which means it can be assumed the coefficients do not suffer from multicollinearity or singularity. Secondly, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy should be  $> 0.5$ , together with a significant Bartlett Test of Sphericity, which would produce an 'identity matrix'<sup>2</sup>. As can be seen, the preliminary stages to factor analysis are reassuring for validity purposes. From the correlation matrix (Table A3.4), the results are:

Determinant of Correlation Matrix	=	.0000000
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	=	.74465
Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 3963.1652, Significance	=	.00000

The second stage is the extraction of principle factors. Here, 11 factors were extracted with an eigenvalue greater than 1, as seen in Table A3.1. These account for 69% of the variance among all variables (e.g. statement questions) used in the factor analysis. The final stage is the rotation of extracted factors. These are shown in Table A3:2 ranked by their respective loading. The rank by loading value rather than question number allows an easier interpretation to the underlying attitudes and values ascribed to each factor (Child, 1970).

---

<sup>2</sup> An 'identity matrix' has all the diagonal elements in the matrix = 1, and off-diagonal elements = 0. See Kinnear & Grey, p222 for more elaborate explanations of the procedure.

**Table A3.1: Summary Statistics of Factor Analysis (Eigenvalue)**

Factor	Communality	Eigenvalue	% of Var	Cum %
1	.75619	10.23	22.3	22.3
2	.70226	4.18	9.1	31.4
3	.58726	3.59	7.8	39.2
4	.68989	2.84	6.2	45.4
5	.65648	1.99	4.3	49.7
6	.75174	1.95	4.2	53.9
7	.77237	1.62	3.5	57.5
8	.71014	1.55	3.4	60.9
9	.70896	1.38	3.0	63.9
10	.76525	1.26	2.8	66.6
11	.77018	1.04	2.4	69.0

Following the factor analysis procedure and examinations for reassurance, the reliability of each factor was tested using Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient. These results are also shown under each factor in Table A3:2. For almost all variables/factors, the reliability coefficients are highly significant. Briefly, the closer to 1, the more reliable are the factor statements. The areas of concern are the low reliability coefficients for factors 5, 6 and 9 and therefore caution is necessary when interpreting their reliability.

**Table A3:2 Factors and Loadings (Varimax Rotated)**

All Employee Attitudinal Questions - All Companies Merged		
Q	Factor 1: Eigenvalue = 10.23	Loading
44	If you work especially hard, are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	.78059
42	When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, how often do you think your views are taken into account by management?	.77585
50	Generally speaking, would you say your pay and conditions are better or worse than those for other companies close to where you work/live?	.74403
34	Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions in this company	.71299
52	Would you say that the majority of employees you work with are committed to company	.66840
36	I believe management that the company's most valued asset is people working here?	.65929
51	Does the amount of pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/living expenses?	.62749
46	How often do management communicate, to you, changes at work	.59555
<i>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.8731 (N = 255)</i>		
Q	Factor 2: Eigenvalue = 4.18	Loading
26f	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'provide necessary protection'	.82236
26d	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'can be beneficial to employees'	.74582
24	Would you agree there are real benefits having views of all employees represented to management	.70209
26g	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'are, on the whole, sensible'	.69155
21	Do you agree that trade unions are generally a good thing for workers?	.68244
25	On the whole, I think a trade union would make my job more secure in my company?	.64486
22	Do you agree your pay/conditions could be improved if a trade union were in your company?	.61562
<i>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.8761 (N = 216)</i>		



Table A3:2 (cont'd)

Q	Factor 3: Eigenvalue = 3.59	Loading
	Over the last 2 or 3 years, has your supervisor had more or less control over :	
39a	'pace of output'	.79934
39d	'allocation of work'	.77314
39b	'product/service quality'	.75165
39e	'how your work tasks are performed'	.71982
39c	'discipline of employees'	.66078
39g	'when and what to communicate to employees'	.50690
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.8415 (N = 236)</b>		
Q	Factor 4: Eigenvalue = 2.84	Loading
28	If I were to question management decisions I would be labelled a trouble-maker? (R)	.71168
37	In the main, it takes a strong minded individual to stand up to management	.65808
30	There seems to be a great deal of tension between employees & supervisors in my company (R)	.65597
31	If I were offered a similar job on the same pay & conditions, I would leave this company (R)	.59928
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.6973 (N = 265)</b>		
Q	Factor 5: Eigenvalue = 1.99	Loading
40a	In your job, how often do you 'inform supervisors that you can do your job well'	.69073
40c	In your job, how often do you 'suggest to supervisors improvements in the way your job is done'	.62827
41	How often is the appraisal system used to speak to management about your wages/conditions (e.g. pay, overtime, working hours etc.)?	.60046
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.4186 (N = 265)</b>		
Q	Factor 6: Eigenvalue = 1.95	Loading
40b	In your job, how often do you 'make sure you work hard for the company'	.71385
26e	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'can be beneficial to management'	.72656
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.3825 (N = 207)</b>		
Q	Factor 7: Eigenvalue = 1.62	Loading
32	On the whole, I get on very well with the management in my company?	.65401
33	I am willing to put in a great deal of extra effort to help my company be successful?	.55926
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.6711 (N = 272)</b>		
Q	Factor 8: Eigenvalue = 1.55	Loading
37	In the main, it takes a strong-minded individual to stand up to management? (R).	.71479
45	How often do management enforce company rules? (i.e. discipline)	.65380
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.6406 (N = 266)</b>		
Q	Factor 9: Eigenvalue = 1.38	Loading
49	Do you find your job repetitive and routine (R) (from very repetitive/routine to very varied)	.62826
43	How often do you feel that you have accomplished something worthwhile/stimulating in your job?	.58075
<b>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient = 0.4723 (N = 266)</b>		
Q	Factor 10: Eigenvalue = 1.26	Loading
48	Generally speaking, over the last 2 or 3 years, have you had more or less freedom to decide how to carry out your work tasks independent of supervisor's instruction	.71100
Q	Factor 11: Eigenvalue = 1.04	Loading
26c	Do you agree or disagree trade unions are 'a necessary evil' (R)	.84704
<b>All Rotated (Varimax) factors account for 70% of variance</b>		

(R) = Questions posed negatively to avoid agreement bias, and re-coded for consistency.

### INTERPRETATION OF FACTORS

**FACTOR 1:** There are 8 items, from which many indicate an orientation toward the values of the organisation and/or management. For instance:

*'efforts rewarded/recognised by management' (Q44)*

*'involved with management in making decisions' (Q34)*

*'employee views taken into account by management' (Q42)*

*'employees committed to the company' (Q52)*

*'management communications' (Q46)*

Factor 1 may be interpreted as a form of 'attitudinal discreteness'. That is, the variables (statements) in factor one can be an indication of the extent of out-group identification.

It should be noted, however, that factor analysis is not suggesting either agreement or disagreement to the statements, but reporting a common pattern or thematic response. Thus the actual answer scores may well be a combination of both positive and negative responses. For the present, however, we can identify these cluster of variables as representing a potential measure of attitudinal discreteness.

**FACTOR 2:** There are 7 items, all of which are trade union orientated. These are comparable to the twin-dimensions of discreteness discussed in chapter two, that of behavioural them & us. In other words, factor 2 can be an indication of the extent of 'inter/collective-group' identification.

In addition, within factor 2 there are further subtleties, which serve to emphasise a common problem in attitudinal scales, between *absolute* and *relative* attitudes. On their own, value statements which are loaded by the common theme of trade unionism does not inform about the detail of where or

in what direction trade union values are coming from. In this regard, factor two was further explored to assess the *relativity* of attitudes. From this two sub-scales, 'ideological' and 'instrumental' union values, emerged. Statements which have an ideological implication included those ranked highest, such as:

*'unions provide necessary protection' (Q26f)*

*'union can be beneficial to employees' (Q26d)*

*'benefits having the views of all employees represented to management' (Q24)*

*'unions are, on the whole, sensible' (Q26g)*

*'union are generally a good thing for workers' (Q21)*

For instrumental values, which place the (presumed) role of unions within the immediate work context rank lowest, such as:

*'a union would make my job more secure' (Q25)*

*'pay and conditions would be improved if a union were present' (Q22)*

Thus from factor 2 it may be noted there are potentially further complexities about inter-group identity, which can vary by both ideological and/or instrumental orientations toward attitudinal objects. A scale and reliability test is conducted later in this appendix.

**FACTOR 3:** Six items are loaded here, all concerned with supervisory control of work design and work performance. Using Fox's (1974) social exchange rationale about job enlargement and task freedom, this factor can be a measure of trust (or more precisely the climate of trust). That is, employees may (may not) trust management because the nature of work itself suggests to employees that management do not trust them. As such, this factor can be a proxy of attitudes to management.

**FACTOR 4:** Four items are loaded, which all contain a strong element of workplace conflict/tension, and can provide a further indication about attitudes toward management, such as:

*'questioning management means being labelled a trouble-maker' (Q28)*

*'it takes a strong minded individual to stand up to management' (Q37)*

*'a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors' (Q30).*

*'if offered another job on same pay/conditions, would leave company' (Q31)*

**FACTOR 5:** The ranking is reduced somewhat at this stage, with 3 items loaded. These contain statements such as:

*'inform supervisor do job well' (Q40a)*

*'suggest improvements to work' (Q40c)*

*'use appraisal to speak about wages and conditions' (Q41)*

Factor 5 can be used to assess the opportunities for employees to engage in dialogue with management. This can provide indicators of voice utility.

**FACTOR 6:** Two items are loaded, for which it is extremely difficult to ascribe a particular thematic label. The two statements, 'work hard for company' and 'unions can be beneficial to management' would not appear to have any obvious link. The reliability coefficient is also reduced for factor six (0.3825).

**FACTOR 7:** Again reduced to only two statements with a loading above 0.5. These may suggest that personal relations are linked to effort. That is to say, 'getting-on well with your manager' may prompt employees to 'put in extra effort to help the company be more successful'. Interestingly, research into smaller organisations which, while recognising that any notion of industrial relations harmony can be misleading, does stress that social relations are much more personal and face-to-face in smaller companies (Scase & Goffee, 1987;

Scase, 1988; Goss, 1991; Rainnie, 1989; Scott *et al*, 1989; Richie, 1993). In this regard, factor 7 provides some indication of possible informal relations between employees and their immediate manager. In part, this can be used to determine the influence of inter-personal climate.

**FACTOR 8:** There are two factor items here; 'it takes a strong-minded individual to stand-up to management' (Q37) and the 'enforcement of rules' (Q45). These suggest some clues about attitudes to management.

**FACTOR 9:** Two items refer to the perception of work as being 'routine or varied' allied to 'feelings of accomplishment'. This can provide some measure of work attachment, as distinct from an orientation to either the employing organisation or management. It should be noted, however, that the reliability coefficient is less significant here (0.4723).

**FACTOR 10:** One statement about freedom to carry out work tasks.

**FACTOR 11:** One statement as to whether trade unions are a 'necessary evil'

### SUMMARY

The use of a factor analysis was used to obtain some *construct* validity to the data (Bryman & Crammer, 1994; Kinnear & Gray, 1994). The aim of the exercise is to confirm as far as practicable, that a number of variables are tapping what they purport to measure. That is to say while we can create some *face* validity to clusters of variables, factor analysis was used to add *construct* validity.

### FACTOR SCALES & MEASUREMENTS

From the above factor analysis procedures, the summation of all mean values for each statement which make up a factor are used to create a scale showing the extent of positive and negative attitudes from all non-union employees. The scores were subsequently weighted out of 100 for consistency and

comparison. The mid-point for all factor scales is 57. An indication of positive (+) and negative (-) attitudes is measured by the extent of agreement/disagreement to the statements posed in each factor. Some have been re-coded for consistency (R), so that both 'tastes' and 'judgements' toward an 'object' are measured in the same direction (i.e. the most positive responses range from 1, to the most negative, 7).

**Table A3:3 - Positive/Negative Factors Attitudes**

Factor Theme/Label	Score out of 100	Deviation (+ / -)	Positive/Negative
Factor 1: Attitudinal Discreteness 8 statements = 56 x 1.8	60	- 3	Negative
Factor 2: Behavioural Discreteness 7 statements = 49 x 2.05	38	+ 19	Positive
Factor 2a: Ideological Union Orientation 5 statements = 35 x 2.85	34	+ 23	Positive
Factor 2b: Instrumental Union Orientation 2 statements = 14 x 7.2	47	+ 10	Positive
Factor 3: Work/Supervisory Control 6 statements = 42 x 2.4	44	+ 13	Positive
Factor 4: Conflict/Workplace Tension 4 statements = 28 x 3.6	62	- 5	Negative
Factor 5: Dialogue / Communication 3 statements = 21 x 4.8	61	- 4	Negative
Factor 7: Informality/Face-to-Face Relations 2 statements = 14 x 7.2	35	+ 22	Positive
Factor 8: Subordination 2 statements = 14 x 7.2	55	+ 2	Positive
Factor 9: Work Orientation/Attachment 2 statements = 14 x 7.2	48	+ 9	Positive

*NB: Factors 6, 10 and 11 did not represent any obvious theme or label.*

*Above 57 (mid-point) is negative attitude to statements posed; below 57, positive attitude.*

The weighting method is to multiply the maximum possible mean score to obtain 100. For example, factor 1 is made up of 8 separate statements using a seven-point Likert-type scale, giving a range of 8 (positive) to 56 (negative). To compute the weighted scale for 'attitudinal discreteness' (factor 1), the maximum mean score is multiplied by 1.8 to equal 100 (rounded). The same process is conducted on all other factors and although the numerical calculations differ depending upon the range of statements that make up each

factor, the mathematical properties remain the same, creating a scale range up to 100 (the mid-point is always 57 on the weighted index scale).

#### INTERPRETATION OF FACTOR MEASURES

**FACTOR 1:** As suggested earlier, the thematic interpretation was attitudinal 'them & us' between the parties, with statements reflecting a degree of out-group identification. As can be seen in Table A3:3, the overall score is 60, which is in the negative direction by 3 points from the mid-range. In other words, employees negatively identify with the out-group, suggesting a measure of attitudinal 'them & us'.

**FACTOR 2:** It was suggested that the trade union focus of this factor could imply another indicator of 'them & us' attitudes within the relationship, and the label 'behavioural discreteness' was used as a form of 'inter/collective-group identity', which may exist alongside or in contradiction of out-group identity. The evidence here implies that there is another aspect of them & us within the relationship and a score of 38 suggests that employees have a positive collective group identity.

It was also suggested earlier that within factor 2 itself, there are additional subtleties which can reflect tastes or judgements of ideological and/or instrumental attitudes toward trade unions among non-union employees. In Table A3:3 these are examined under the headings factor 2a and 2b respectively. Cronbach's Reliability coefficient was also significant for these, 0.8601 for factor 2a (ideological) and 0.7162 for factor 2b (instrumental).

For both the ideological and instrumental union identity there is a positive attitude. However, the latter is significantly less positive than for the former, at +23 and +10 positive deviation points respectively. This tends to suggest that while non-union employees are (perhaps surprisingly) extremely supportive of unions in general, such an attitude is not transparent to the same degree when

related to their immediate work context. Indeed, employees are less than half as supportive of unions instrumentally than they are ideologically. In other words, employees may identify with unions as an alternative group to that of management on a general level, but when related to notions of personal efficacy, or perceptions of rectifying an injustice or grievance at their workplace, the message is less clear and therefore explanations must be found from deeper analysis through case study comparisons.

**FACTOR 3:** The evidence here is supportive (i.e. responses in agreement), by 13 deviation points, of a high degree of supervisory control over work design and related tasks. In relating this to the analysis of both Fox (1974), as a situation likely to lead to a low-trust relationship and Nicholson's (1979) definition of issue-centred climate, then factor three is potentially a significant variable. It informs us, overall rather than company-specific, that employees in non-union organisations experience tight control of their work tasks, which could mean they reciprocate low trust with low trust.

**FACTOR 4:** This factor asked about workplace conflict and tension. Overall, this is not a view supported by all non-union employees, as they disagreed this existed by 5 points on the combined scale.

**FACTOR 5:** The theme identified here was voice utility. On the whole, employees disagree there are adequate opportunities to engage with management and a negative attitude (by 4 points) is expressed.

**FACTOR 6:** No obvious factor label/theme.

**FACTOR 7:** The suggested theme for factor seven was that of possible informality as an indicator inter-personal climate at workplace level. Overall, employees are strongly supportive of an informal and/or friendly climate (by 22 points) on the computed scale.



**FACTOR 8:** The issue of subordination was suggested here and this provides some indication of attitudes to management. Overall, this suggests that employees are party to a subordinate role to management (by 2 points) on the computed scale. Thus while face-to-face relations may be one possible route for employees to satisfy their needs and wants, as implied with factor 7 above, the evidence from factor 8 suggests there are other complexities to be explained.

**FACTOR 9:** This implied some attachment to work itself, that is, as something separate from satisfaction with management, the company or trade unions. Overall, Table A3:3 suggests employees are in agreement (by 9 points) that they are attached to their work.

**FACTORS 10 & 11:** No obvious factor label/theme.

#### SUMMARY OF FACTOR ANALYSIS/INTERPRETATIONS

From the above a number of summary points can be made:

1. The factor analysis has added legitimacy to the notion of *construct* validity, offering reassurance and reliability about factors and variables.
2. The factor scores enable a comparison between the issues and themes raised. This was done by providing a weighted score so that all factors are measured on a scale of 0-100, with a mid-point of 57.
3. The factor scores provides evidence about positive (agreement) and negative (disagreement) attitudes among non-union employees, reflecting elements of 'taste' and 'judgement' in relation to 'object' (trade unions, management, workplace tension, informality, climate and voice). This is what Child (1970) suggests is the importance of *relative* attitudes.

4. A fuller explanation as to why such patterns have emerged is not available from factor analysis. This is the subject of case study analysis.
  
5. It should also be noted that the factor themes need to be viewed with a holistic approach. That is to say, where employees suggest there is a high degree of supervisory control (factor 3), that does not mean there are no benefits to the relationship, such as an attachment to work itself (factor 9). This provides support for the proposition that the relationship is one of social rather than pure economic exchange. As such it is likely to be the subject of contradictory and dynamic social processes.

Table A3.4: Correlation Matrix from Factor Analysis

	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26A	Q26B	Q26C	Q26D	Q26E	Q26F	Q26G	Q27	Q28
Q21	1.00000													
Q22	.56656	1.00000												
Q23	.43083	.47561	1.00000											
Q24	.40346	.33949	.16919	1.00000										
Q25	.64800	.65471	.46194	.29289	1.00000									
Q26A	.50435	.36091	.42355	.27131	.37204	1.00000								
Q26B	.51203	.31739	.29292	.28842	.29415	.71325	1.00000							
Q26C	.09272	.07741	.07161	.10461	.04183	.11785	.30405	1.00000						
Q26D	.60988	.48810	.31015	.47960	.49583	.40709	.34476	.00216	1.00000					
Q26E	.20760	.26673	.03891	.20613	.07248	.25823	.21157	.06960	.33114	1.00000				
Q26F	.73737	.52726	.43532	.43245	.65106	.48511	.44359	.04459	.72468	.23755	1.00000			
Q26G	.66358	.60622	.42852	.42071	.60690	.40511	.42589	.23801	.59794	.35557	.71678	1.00000		
Q27	-.11919	-.06641	-.15538	-.07573	-.16350	-.16550	-.17881	.03340	-.09273	.14737	-.09506	-.04725	1.00000	
Q28	-.16047	-.18737	-.13596	.00159	-.21751	.08549	.03426	.04526	-.11258	.09332	-.15991	-.20055	.18536	1.00000
Q29	-.21209	-.27935	-.31075	-.06547	-.25233	-.02751	-.01071	-.12515	-.20641	.01645	-.26889	-.24750	.29256	.23408
Q30	-.12364	-.13504	-.11689	.01928	-.17842	.13947	.12711	.23843	-.05984	.11593	-.03522	-.01681	.13022	.47312
Q31	-.27776	-.38057	-.29868	-.11678	-.36983	-.04293	-.02833	.03704	-.26218	.04307	-.29129	-.30779	.31568	.34980
Q32	-.16365	-.20654	-.14742	-.04621	-.16556	-.17648	-.08264	.18331	-.19042	-.03644	-.09759	-.07654	.32625	.14521
Q33	-.21890	-.21008	-.23502	-.12510	-.24810	-.20345	-.12698	.15172	-.19373	.08260	-.21601	-.13242	.37755	.06279
Q34	-.22114	-.24380	-.27463	-.17301	-.26955	-.12762	-.15011	.04259	-.19266	.12267	-.14426	-.09264	.46094	.20556
Q35	-.03926	.00119	-.11481	.02283	-.15046	.07288	-.00526	-.02038	.03700	.31034	-.03023	.04871	.31697	.28082
Q36	-.24933	-.15996	-.21167	-.04980	-.33194	-.03655	-.01759	.01110	-.15419	.23325	-.17267	-.10172	.45426	.22942
Q37	-.14752	-.24233	-.17244	-.17093	-.15330	.04095	-.05174	-.10236	-.15413	-.12740	-.09514	-.22558	.02111	.18587

Table A3.4 (Cont'd)

	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26A	Q26B	Q26C	Q26D	Q26E	Q26F	Q26G	Q27	Q28
Q38	-.21084	-.15878	-.20967	-.10561	-.15973	-.27077	-.21102	.02803	-.02398	.00257	-.15557	-.03311	.18290	-.02889
Q39A	-.09612	-.03951	-.09097	.02146	-.07779	-.02500	.00713	-.05518	-.04280	-.09812	-.11961	-.10604	.12088	.10701
Q39B	-.17682	-.09880	-.17524	.00280	-.12185	-.03807	-.05939	.00521	-.04666	.00923	-.13144	-.13663	.21075	.22705
Q39C	-.04349	-.12518	-.03345	-.09122	-.09172	-.07162	-.07470	-.15328	.01315	-.14140	-.06691	-.14125	.04597	.13839
Q39D	-.06750	-.05974	-.02827	-.04727	.04858	-.11389	-.12936	-.00425	.03078	-.27686	.02186	-.04989	.03142	-.00201
Q39E	-.20143	-.15915	-.20989	-.03322	-.07149	-.23067	-.18619	.00845	-.03866	-.17529	-.11912	-.10883	.04559	.01341
Q39F	-.09681	-.08043	-.05303	.00222	-.06214	-.06027	-.06773	-.02308	.09313	.08150	.02650	-.08561	.08646	.16608
Q39G	-.18250	-.18713	-.14114	-.09956	-.21530	-.08619	-.02993	-.01436	-.11241	-.06648	-.13023	-.23343	.20246	.21799
Q40A	-.15260	.01174	-.06364	.00630	-.19485	-.04133	-.04315	-.04170	-.11740	-.01879	-.11277	-.13873	.26773	.10718
Q40B	-.17202	-.05203	-.13994	-.00821	-.15764	-.08431	-.05998	.14558	.00820	.38759	-.10222	-.03518	.22079	.07591
Q40C	-.13432	-.04597	-.12405	.04961	-.18322	-.02370	.05314	.06049	-.10995	.14399	-.14708	-.06286	.25580	.06043
Q41	-.11245	.06980	.02028	-.02991	-.02021	-.14920	-.19628	.00267	-.03876	-.04616	-.05750	-.03422	.20362	-.06671
Q42	-.24447	-.21622	-.27398	-.21567	-.29842	-.15951	-.15539	.01030	-.22375	-.01814	-.22791	-.14958	.31516	.22510
Q43	-.24742	-.14686	-.15845	-.15608	-.32598	-.19192	-.17027	.04106	-.05538	.07169	-.11951	-.09184	.38329	.13580
Q44	-.26286	-.28989	-.31926	-.12016	-.33416	-.17505	-.17343	-.02472	-.23548	.03953	-.22025	-.17716	.34911	.26525
Q45	.12842	.03907	.06740	.05223	.06378	-.01309	.00079	-.03893	.08374	.12651	.04769	.04289	.03044	.03348
Q46	-.05763	-.17676	-.09919	-.11245	-.20103	-.05833	.00042	-.06640	-.08411	-.05360	-.06035	-.10866	.21103	.19985
Q47	-.21699	-.23398	-.24946	-.10232	-.30272	-.15618	-.18044	-.10370	-.22591	.01213	-.19832	-.18536	.51534	.09823
Q48	-.18548	-.15156	-.27397	.09319	-.22421	-.15142	-.16864	.01072	-.13186	-.00227	-.15016	-.15968	.14280	.23076
Q49	-.14703	-.16151	-.09685	-.20110	-.18607	-.06602	-.04099	.05686	-.15141	.02256	-.11725	-.06467	.13088	.26338
Q50	-.28397	-.34761	-.36451	-.14392	-.30423	-.15690	-.07603	-.00777	-.20126	.13701	-.22026	-.16639	.29118	.14850
Q51	-.22631	-.30265	-.36054	-.16470	-.26200	-.16678	-.08344	.00381	-.22871	.07850	-.25423	-.13920	.24061	.14516
Q52	-.29624	-.25769	-.31811	-.16659	-.36113	-.03508	-.11974	.01354	-.21756	.08867	-.24481	-.21079	.35339	.17707

Table A3.4 (Cont'd)

	Q29	Q30	Q31	Q32	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37	Q38	Q39A	Q39B	Q39C	Q39D
Q29	1.00000													
Q30	.27049	1.00000												
Q31	.36536	.33516	1.00000											
Q32	.26203	.21584	.36666	1.00000										
Q33	.29674	.15129	.29225	.53033	1.00000									
Q34	.48332	.38126	.32613	.39374	.44667	1.00000								
Q35	.25690	.30103	.36545	.19047	.23501	.42016	1.00000							
Q36	.38136	.36754	.37294	.28331	.41151	.68210	.47239	1.00000						
Q37	.18059	.27762	.34868	.19123	.09092	.17751	.10271	.07263	1.00000					
Q38	.15285	.06747	.04843	-.05127	.12775	.25364	.11310	.21943	-.14233	1.00000				
Q39A	.23874	.03947	.14620	.02424	.17043	.13469	.19323	.18052	.12874	.03675	1.00000			
Q39B	.25422	.07311	.13769	.06911	.11480	.23039	.24727	.26179	.07157	.09142	.68774	1.00000		
Q39C	.05425	.05844	.16242	.04025	.17932	.11751	.14912	.06518	.16469	.02943	.42687	.33871	1.00000	
Q39D	.00869	-.04009	.01639	.07953	.04128	.07594	.02462	-.04503	.09471	.07480	.42245	.36084	.52565	1.00000
Q39E	.15219	-.01214	.06976	.02748	.18602	.16436	.05606	.07347	.04820	.27866	.53319	.48036	.47357	.62130
Q39F	.14521	.06922	.00386	-.01609	.09886	.11547	.09405	.19662	-.06573	.14864	.37228	.46287	.27598	.14079
Q39G	.33835	.26897	.23719	.16984	.19820	.33681	.25450	.24016	.18243	.10350	.37738	.46334	.38729	.37046
Q40A	.32939	.08548	.05795	.11902	.20583	.20387	.25638	.27729	-.10933	.17927	.25008	.18777	.06569	.02439
Q40B	.09941	.07038	.14828	.16541	.40129	.23652	.36194	.36297	-.06541	.12607	.14739	.15140	.03626	-.08959
Q40C	.35338	.02683	.11630	.14761	.25084	.21040	.16746	.31870	-.19881	.16472	.18992	.18911	.02044	-.04953
Q41	.04706	-.13976	-.09733	.08970	.17176	.13165	.00304	.14451	-.22058	.09544	.06576	.04271	-.12762	-.01992
Q42	.40150	.23218	.26868	.31868	.35427	.58052	.35733	.48906	.03509	.14954	.09232	.17326	-.01475	.03090

Table A3.4 (Cont'd)

	Q29	Q30	Q31	Q32	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37	Q38	Q39A	Q39B	Q39C	Q39D
Q43	.18126	.09579	.20812	.14396	.30689	.38427	.32665	.43330	.04694	.28815	.20509	.26229	.21280	.04492
Q44	.50362	.34513	.42295	.44904	.46072	.65646	.40531	.64465	.16511	.16843	.16696	.22551	.13439	.00318
Q45	.20723	-.05199	-.10107	-.04740	.03918	.09981	.06051	.06296	-.21911	.23963	.14619	.12929	.12512	.15067
Q46	.38885	.16953	.24218	.24696	.17843	.46016	.25187	.38397	.07315	.17749	.26148	.30318	.25232	.23831
Q47	.57038	.21529	.42197	.24627	.35066	.56059	.34414	.54059	.16355	.12328	.20505	.16139	.12722	.00734
Q48	.22393	.21472	.23357	.31886	.23728	.28693	.15670	.21004	.28384	.06923	.11588	.09741	.24424	.09179
Q49	.01124	.15012	.28611	.16220	.07802	.15431	.15375	.12857	.04581	.09527	-.07430	.08552	-.04154	-.10255
Q50	.49077	.30563	.35437	.23102	.31766	.47710	.27632	.44088	.09060	.14218	.12422	.17698	.08995	-.00051
Q51	.36171	.21246	.38396	.27610	.29459	.36429	.20992	.30896	.17929	.07943	-.05725	-.01660	.05599	-.07102
Q52	.35099	.35247	.44083	.37521	.49599	.56207	.33365	.51773	.18031	.09979	.12238	.11153	.04674	-.12649
Q39E		Q39F	Q39G	Q40A	Q40B	Q40C	Q41	Q42	Q43	Q44	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48
Q39E	1.00000													
Q39F	.44749	1.00000												
Q39G	.47296	.40908	1.00000											
Q40A	.07987	.15263	.25071	1.00000										
Q40B	.13116	.14779	.05635	.15563	1.00000									
Q40C	.11284	.25984	.26257	.43624	.26772	1.00000								
Q41	.09008	.17777	-.00325	.30123	.12165	.36401	1.00000							
Q42	.10238	.15399	.28042	.28225	.23667	.23455	.31806	1.00000						
Q43	.22390	.28668	.21873	.30187	.40649	.23613	.29475	.44273	1.00000					
Q44	.17515	.28357	.36217	.27772	.28380	.30469	.20819	.68592	.47199	1.00000				
Q45	.23759	.09189	.12117	.11061	.07840	.25449	-.01193	-.02443	.00685	-.07360	1.00000			

Table A3.4 (Cont'd)

	Q39E	Q39F	Q39G	Q40A	Q40B	Q40C	Q41	Q42	Q43	Q44	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48
Q46	.30091	.25253	.62105	.22850	.08755	.31771	.06419	.38551	.25370	.43221	.21548	1.00000		
Q47	.14927	.16848	.39348	.33374	.20389	.39654	.23650	.42670	.28840	.51753	.03900	.45590	1.00000	
Q48	.15579	.15588	.17232	.05903	.15576	.11733	.13291	.29647	.25258	.43255	-.15665	.16339	.25209	1.00000
Q49	-.13239	-.04667	-.03781	.03508	.09936	.09671	-.10173	.11171	.33999	.14586	-.06521	.00499	-.03164	.06647
Q50	.14521	.11009	.31865	.11601	.28182	.13995	.02975	.45944	.30411	.52368	.06034	.39582	.42469	.11295
Q51	.02379	.01030	.18994	-.00679	.24273	.05272	-.10001	.40915	.20545	.44951	-.10906	.24540	.36276	.27024
Q52	-.00736	.02611	.23767	.24447	.26130	.21748	.11896	.46492	.36476	.52423	-.13403	.32737	.49562	.28885
Q49		Q50	Q51	Q52										
Q49	1.00000													
Q50	.00831	1.00000												
Q51	.06551	.71418	1.00000											
Q52	.23542	.50663	.45964	1.00000										

Determinant of Correlation Matrix = .0000000

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .81000

Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 4844.7083, Significance = .00000

**APPENDIX W8**

**Data Results for Water Co: Chapter 8.**



**Main Biographic Features: Water Co. Workforce: By Occupation (% & n)**

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Professional</i>	<i>Managerial</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Sales</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Gender							
Men	6.6 (4)	6.6 (4)	4.9 (3)	6.6 (4)	11.5 (7)	4.9 (3)	41% (25)
Women		1.6 (1)	24.6 (15)	4.9 (3)	24.6 (15)		55.7% (34)
<sup>1</sup> Union Membership							
Current member		1.6 (1)		1.6 (1)			3.3% (2)
Previous member			1.6 (1)		3.3 (2)		4.9% (3)
Never been member							n/a
Main Benefits:							
Sick Pay	6.6 (4)	8.2 (5)	28.0 (17)	11.5 (7)	18.0 (11)	4.9 (3)	73.7% (45)
Holiday Pay	6.6 (4)	8.2 (5)	26.2 (16)	11.5 (7)	36.1 (22)	4.9 (3)	93.5% (57)
Co Pension Scheme	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)	3.3 (2)		8.2 (5)		14.7% (9)
Free Parking	1.6 (1)	6.6 (4)	24.6 (15)	4.9 (3)	18.0 (11)	3.3 (2)	59% (36)
Company Discounts	3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	9.8 (6)	1.6 (1)	8.2 (5)	1.6 (1)	28% (17)
Company Car				8.2 (5)			8.2% (5)
Attendance & Work Arrangements:							
Standard working day	4.9 (3)	6.6 (4)	31.0 (19)	9.8 (6)	37.5 (23)	3.3 (2)	93.5% (57)
Part-time work	1.6 (1)			1.6 (1)		1.6 (1)	4.9% (3)
Shift working					19.6 (12)		19.6% (12)
Temporary Employee			4.9 (3)	4.9 (3)	8.2 (5)		18% (11)
Age:							
16-20			3.3 (2)		4.9 (3)		8.2% (5)
21-30	4.9 (3)	6.6 (4)	23.0 (14)	8.2 (5)	29.5 (18)	3.3 (2)	75.5% (46)
31-40	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)	3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	1.6 (1)	14.7% (9)
41-50			1.6 (1)				1.6% (1)
Ethnic Origin:							
White European			8.2 (5)		4.9 (3)		13% (8)
White British	6.6 (4)	8.2 (5)	21.3 (13)	11.5 (7)	24.6 (15)	4.9 (3)	77% (47)
Asian					4.9 (3)		4.9% (3)
Other					1.6 (1)		1.6% (1)
Marital Status:							
Married	1.6 (1)	4.9 (3)	3.3 (2)	4.9 (3)	6.6 (4)	1.6 (1)	23% (14)
Live with Partner		1.6 (1)	6.6 (4)	1.6 (1)	13.0 (8)	1.6 (1)	24.6% (15)
Single	4.9 (3)	1.6 (1)	19.7 (12)	3.3 (2)	14.7 (9)	1.6 (1)	46% (28)
Divorced				1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)		3.3% (2)
Educational Level:							
No Qualifications			3.3 (2)		8.2 (5)		11.5% (7)
CSE/O'Level	4.9 (3)	3.3 (2)	11.5 (7)	6.6 (4)	11.5 (7)	1.6 (1)	39.3% (24)
GCSE/A'Level	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)	11.5 (7)	3.3 (2)	13.0 (8)	3.3 (2)	34.4% (21)
Degree		3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	1.6 (1)			8.2% (5)
Other					3.3 (2)		3.3% (2)
Annual Gross Pay:							
< 5 K			1.6 (1)		1.6 (1)		3.3% (2)
5 to 8 K	1.6 (1)		11.5 (7)	3.3 (2)	14.7 (9)	1.6 (1)	32.8% (20)
8 to 12 K	3.3 (2)	1.6 (1)	14.7 (9)	4.9 (3)	16.4 (10)	3.3 (2)	44.2% (27)
12 to 16 K	1.6 (1)	4.9 (3)	3.3 (2)	3.3 (2)	4.9 (3)		18% (11)
16 to 20 K		1.6 (1)					1.6 (1)

Cont'd

<sup>1</sup> This section of the questionnaire was deleted by management and responses are those recorded from questions during follow-up interviews with a further 16 employees.

Main Features	Professional	Managerial	Clerical	Sales	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	All Employees
Length of Service:							
< 1 year	3.3 (2)	1.6 (1)	9.8 (6)	6.6 (4)	26.2 (16)	3.3 (2)	51% (31)
1-3 years	1.6 (1)	4.9 (3)	14.7 (9)	3.3 (2)	11.5 (7)	1.6 (1)	37.5% (23)
4-7 years	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)	6.6 (4)	1.6 (1)			11.5% (7)
Working Week:							
Less than 30 hours	1.6 (1)			1.6 (1)		1.6 (1)	4.9% (3)
35-40 hours	1.6 (1)	1.6 (1)	28.0 (17)		26.2 (16)		57.4% (35)
40 hours +	3.3 (2)	6.6 (4)	3.3 (2)	9.8 (6)	11.5 (7)	3.3 (2)	37.5% (23)
<b>n</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>% of total sample</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>31.1%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Mean Score & Standard Deviation for attitudinal-related questions: By Occupation (questionnaire/statement scale = 1 to 7)

To minimise 'agreement bias' some questions were posed negatively and some positively. A Likert-type scale was used, where 1 = definitely agree (or very often) and 7 = definitely disagree (or never). For attitudinal responses to be measured in a consistent manner (i.e. the same 'direction'), negatively posed questions were re-coded (R), which included questions 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38 and 49. These are paraphrased for simplicity. During analysis some responses were scaled-down from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison purposes, and to compute latent variable scales, which are explained later.

### Trade Union Orientated Questions

These are for 16 respondents: 3 clerical; 2 sales reps; 2 call-centre operators; 4 delivery drivers; 3 production employees; 2 sanitation engineers. The questions were administered during follow-up interviews by asking respondents to complete a questionnaire given out at the end of the interview which contained these statements.

Questions Asked	Professional	Managerial	Clerical	Sales	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	For all Employees
21. Do you agree TU a good thing for workers?	-	-	2.6 (.5)	1.6 (.5)	1.3 (.5)	1.5 (.7)	1.8 (.7)
22. Do you agree pay and conditions would be improved if TU present?	-	-	3.6 (1.5)	3.3 (2.3)	2.6 (2.0)	3.0 (1.4)	4.0 (1.3)
23. A TU would create restrictive/unnecessary rules in my job? (R)	-	-	4.0 (1.0)	4.0 (1.7)	4.3 (2.0)	3.5 (.7)	4.0 (1.3)
4. Do you agree there are real benefits in having all employee views represented?	-	-	1.6 (.5)	1.3 (.5)	1.3 (.5)	1.5 (.7)	1.4 (.5)
25. A TU would make my job more secure?	-	-	3.0 (1.7)	3.0 (2.6)	2.0 (1.0)	3.0 (1.4)	2.7 (1.6)
26. a) TU are a bunch of political lefties (R)	-	-	3.3 (2.0)	1.3 (.5)	2.6 (1.1)	3.0 (.0)	2.5 (1.3)
b) TU are trouble-makers (R)	-	-	3.6 (1.5)	1.6 (.5)	3.9 (1.7)	2.5 (.7)	2.7 (1.3)
c) TU are a necessary evil (R)	-	-	4.3 (.5)	1.6 (.5)	3.3 (1.1)	4.0 (.0)	3.2 (1.2)
d) TU can be beneficial to employees	-	-	2.3 (.5)	1.6 (.5)	1.6 (.5)	1.5 (.7)	1.8 (.6)
e) TU can be beneficial to management	-	-	4.0 (.0)	2.0 (.0)	3.0 (1.7)	3.5 (.7)	3.0 (1.1)
f) TU provide necessary protection	-	-	2.6 (.5)	2.0 (.0)	1.3 (.5)	2.5 (.7)	2.0 (.7)
g) On the whole, unions are sensible	-	-	2.6 (1.1)	1.6 (.5)	1.6 (.5)	3.0 (1.4)	2.1 (.9)

### Company and Management Orientated Questions

Questions Asked	Professional	Managerial	Clerical	Sales	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	For all Employees
27. The values of the company are similar to my own personal beliefs?	4.2 (1.8)	3.0 (1.8)	3.8 (1.2)	3.4 (2.2)	2.6 (1.4)	4.6 (1.1)	3.3 (1.6)
28. I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I questioned management decisions (R)	5.7 (1.8)	5.4 (1.6)	4.3 (1.7)	3.8 (2.7)	4.4 (1.6)	3.6 (.5)	4.4 (1.8)

Cont'd

29. I have good career/promotion prospects?	4.7 (2.6)	5.6 (1.6)	4.3 (1.7)	4.6 (2.5)	3.1 (1.9)	4.0 (1.0)	4.4 (1.9)
30. There is a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors (R)	6.5 (1.0)	4.6 (2.1)	4.4 (1.9)	5.0 (1.6)	4.7 (2.0)	3.6 (.5)	4.7 (1.9)
31. I would leave this company if offered a similar job on the same pay and conditions (R)	5.5 (3.0)	6.0 (1.2)	4.6 (2.3)	3.4 (2.6)	4.7 (2.2)	3.6 (.5)	4.6 (2.2)
32. I get on very well with management?	1.2 (.5)	2.2 (1.3)	2.4 (1.2)	2.1 (2.0)	1.5 (.5)	3.0 (1.0)	2.0 (1.2)
33. I am willing to put in a great deal of extra effort to help my company be successful?	1.7 (.9)	1.8 (.8)	2.6 (1.3)	2.2 (1.2)	1.4 (2.1)	4.5 (.7)	2.1 (1.3)
34. Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions?	2.5 (1.0)	4.6 (2.3)	5.2 (1.7)	5.8 (1.6)	4.3 (1.6)	5.6 (1.5)	4.7 (1.8)
35. I am NOT very loyal to my company? (R)	1.0 (.0)	1.6 (.8)	2.8 (1.6)	3.2 (2.1)	2.5 (2.2)	4.3 (1.5)	2.6 (1.9)
36. I believe management that the company's most valued asset is the people here?	4.0 (2.1)	2.6 (1.5)	4.5 (1.6)	4.5 (2.5)	2.8 (1.4)	4.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.8)
37. You do have to be a strong minded individual to stand up to management? (R)	6.0 (1.0)	5.2 (1.6)	2.5 (1.2)	2.1 (1.3)	3.6 (1.8)	3.6 (1.5)	3.3 (1.8)
38. I do NOT mix/socialise with work colleagues (R)	5.0 (2.8)	3.8 (2.5)	5.4 (2.2)	6.5 (1.1)	4.3 (2.0)	3.0 (1.0)	4.9 (2.2)

**Working Practices/Job Design/Employee Effort**

39. Has your supervisor had more or less control over (1 = more, 7 = less)	Professional	Managerial	Clerical	Sales	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	For all Employees
a) Pace of Output	.7 (1.5)	.7 (1.2)	.1 (1.6)	0 (1.1)	.8 (1.7)	.0 (0)	.8 (1.5)
b) Product/Service Quality	.7 (1.5)	.0 (1.1)	.5 (1.3)	1 (1.0)	.2 (1.8)	.0 (0)	.7 (1.4)
c) Discipline of Employees	.5 (2.6)	.2 (1.5)	.5 (1.3)	7 (1.4)	.2 (1.4)	.0 (0)	.4 (1.5)
d) Allocation of Work	.7 (1.5)	.2 (1.5)	.6 (1.8)	7 (1.2)	.5 (1.3)	.0 (0)	.4 (1.5)
e) How the Work is to be done	.7 (1.5)	.0 (1.1)	.6 (1.3)	5 (1.1)	.8 (.9)	.0 (0)	.2 (1.2)
f) Use of New Technology	.0 (1.7)	.0 (1.7)	.0 (1.1)	0 (1.2)	.5 (1.6)	.0 (0)	.1 (1.5)
g) Communicating to Employees	.0 (0)	.2 (1.5)	.7 (1.1)	.2 (.4)	.9 (1.1)	.0 (0)	.1 (1.2)
40. In your job do you do the following often:							
a) Tell supervisors you do your job well	.0 (1.4)	.4 (2.7)	.6 (1.7)	2 (1.1)	.8 (2.2)	.6 (.5)	.0 (2.0)
b) Work hard for the company	.2 (.5)	.2 (.4)	.8 (1.2)	0 (1.8)	.6 (1.0)	.3 (.5)	.6 (1.1)
c) Suggest improvements to your job	.7 (.5)	.4 (1.1)	.6 (1.3)	7 (1.2)	.8 (1.5)	0 (1.0)	.9 (1.4)

**Perceptions of Satisfaction and Voice**

Questions Asked	Professional	Managerial	Clerical	Sales	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	For all Employees
41. Do you speak to management often about your wages and conditions?	.7 (2.2)	.0 (1.2)	.8 (1.6)	4 (2.2)	.9 (2.2)	3 (1.5)	.8 (1.9)
42. When decisions are taken which affect you, are your views taken into account by management?	.7 (1.5)	.6 (1.5)	.6 (2.0)	7 (2.9)	.7 (2.9)	.6 (.5)	.1 (2.1)
43. Do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?	.5 (.5)	.8 (.8)	.1 (1.5)	4 (1.8)	.6 (1.7)	5 (2.1)	.8 (1.6)
44. If you work hard are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	.2 (1.5)	.4 (1.3)	.0 (1.7)	2 (2.5)	.4 (1.9)	0 (1.7)	.2 (1.9)
45. Does management enforce company rules?	.2 (2.6)	.4 (.8)	.0 (.9)	1 (1.4)	.7 (1.2)	.5 (.7)	.8 (1.2)
46. Does management communicate changes often?	.5 (1.0)	.0 (1.0)	.2 (1.5)	7 (1.8)	.1 (1.3)	.6 (.5)	.5 (1.5)
47. Is your job secure for the next five years?	5 (1.2)	.2 (.4)	.5 (1.8)	8 (1.6)	.2 (1.2)	.0 (0)	.7 (1.4)
48. Have you more or less freedom to carry out your work tasks in last 1 or 2 years ?	.7 (1.5)	.6 (.8)	.9 (1.2)	1 (1.4)	.6 (1.4)	.0 (0)	.8 (1.2)
49. I find my job repetitive/routine? (R)	.2 (2.0)	.4 (2.3)	.6 (1.8)	2 (2.1)	.8 (1.8)	6 (1.5)	.2 (1.9)
50. Are pay/conditions better or worse than other companies you know of ?	.7 (1.5)	.4 (1.5)	.2 (1.6)	4 (1.5)	.6 (1.3)	0 (1.0)	.0 (1.5)
51. Does the pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/expenses	4.0 (.0)	3.8 (.4)	.7 (1.3)	.0 (1.1)	.6 (1.1)	.0 (1.4)	.6 (1.1)
52. Are the majority of employees you work with committed to the company?	.2 (2.6)	.2 (1.9)	.7 (1.1)	4 (2.3)	.3 (1.9)	.3 (.5)	.1 (1.9)

### **W8.1 Employee Voice Utility**

Statistical tests were conducted at several separate levels using Mann-Whitney-U, Kruskal-Wallis 1-Way Anova and Chi-Square. Following a summary of mean values and the extent (i.e. deviation from mid-point) of positive and negative attitudes to voice utility, each sub-scale was then examined in relation to the following independent variables: gender, age, occupation, length of service and salary. Correlation coefficients were finally computed with respect to each sub-scale as an indication of sub-scale relationships.

It should be noted that some scales used were more statistically robust than others, particularly those which were derived from the factor analysis previously explained in appendix 3. Other latent variables (or variable sub-scales) were created in addition to those derived from the factor analysis using the merged data files for all companies, which gave a large population sample. Those which displayed a degree of consistency were adopted and computed. The method for this was to identify a combination of attitudinal-related statements which were analytically linked (for example, several questionnaire statements which reflected attitudes about management). Next, separate questionnaire items were aggregated to create a latent variable. These separate responses were then correlated with each other, its latent variable, minus the separate questionnaire item. The processes was reproduced several times, eliminating the least statistically significant item, until the most robust scale was obtained as determined by the correlation coefficient. While this ensured the data had a degree of internal consistency and validity, this is less so than for factor analysed variable scales. Another disadvantage was that some statements were eliminated during this process. The main advantage, however, is that those statement items which were included were examined for significance prior to analysis. Where appropriate, the level of significance is denoted for the separate items used in each sub-scale by the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ). For some scales, weak correlation coefficients meant that only one item was used.

#### **Questionnaire statements used to make up Sub-Scales for Employee Voice Utility (some statements are paraphrased from the questionnaire for simplicity)**

<b>Sub-Scale 1: Voice 1</b>	
<b>Derived from factor 5, appendix 3, labelled 'opportunities for dialogue with management. Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.4186</b>	
Q40a	In my job, I often 'inform supervisors that I can do my job well'
Q40c	In my job, I often 'suggest to supervisors improvements in my job'
Q41	I often use the appraisal system to speak to management about wages/conditions

<b>Sub-Scale 2: Voice 2</b>	
<b>Derived from question 34.</b>	
Q34	Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions

<b>Sub-Scale 3: Voice 3</b>	
<b>Derived from question 42.</b>	
Q42	When decisions are taken, management often take employee views into account

<b>Sub-Scale 4: Voice 4</b>	
<b>Derived from question 46.</b>	
Q46	Management often communicate changes at work

**W8.1a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee voice utility**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Voice 1 <i>Dialogue</i>	10.8	+ 1.8	0	18	50.6	11	.0000 *
Voice 2 <i>Involvement</i> <sup>x</sup>	4.8	+ 1.8	0	6	5.9	2	.0514
Voice 3 <i>View Considered</i> <sup>x</sup>	5.0	+ 2.0	0	6	6.8	2	.0324 *
Voice 4 <i>Communications</i> <sup>x</sup>	5.5	+ 2.5	0	6	54.9	2	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Voice Utility</b>	26.1	+ 8.1	0	36	32.6	11	.0006 *

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**W8.1b: Tests for Independent statistical significance: Employee Voice Utility**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Voice 1 <i>(Factor 5: Dialogue with Management)</i>	Gender	Z -.5456	.5853
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=3	.6348
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.4 DF=3	.1873
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .75 DF=2	.6856
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=4	.6107
Voice 2 <i>(Q34 Involvement)</i>	Gender	Z -.59	.5548
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=3	.2228
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.1 DF=5	.1504
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.0 DF=2	.5850
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.7 DF=4	.3140
Voice 3 <i>(Q42 Employee views taken into account)</i>	Gender	Z -.71	.4768
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> .56 DF=3	.9051
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.9 DF=5	.7071
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .89 DF=2	.6393
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.2 DF=4	.2635
Voice 4 <i>(Q46: Communication)</i>	Gender	Z -1.4	.1597
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.7 DF=3	.1872
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 19.9 DF=5	.0013 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=2	.0584
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=4	.2119
<b>Overall Voice Utility</b> <i>(Σ=Voice1-4)</i>	Gender	Z -1.6	.1082
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.0 DF=3	.7906
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.9 DF=5	.0354 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.9 DF=2	.3725
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=4	.7832

**W8.1c: Correlation Analysis of Voice Utility Sub-Scales**

	ALL VOICE	VOICE1(F5)	VOICE2(Q34)	VOICE3(Q42)	VOICE4(Q46)
ALLVOICE	1.0000	.7955**	.2762*	.5466**	.5729**
VOICE1(F5)	.7955**	1.0000	.1873	.2711*	.2131
VOICE2(Q34)	.2762*	.1873	1.0000	.2833*	.1803
VOICE3(Q42)	.5466**	.2711*	.2833*	1.0000	.2792*
VOICE4(Q46)	.5729**	.2131	.1803	.2792*	1.0000
* - Signif. LE .05		** - Signif. LE .01		(2-tailed)	

**W8.2: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales of Climate**  
(some statements are paraphrased from the questionnaire for simplicity)

**Issue-Centred Climate**

<b>Sub-Scale 1: Issue-Centred Climate 1</b> Derived from question 37.	
Q37	It takes a strong-minded individual to stand-up to management

<b>Sub-Scale 2: Issue-Centred Climate 2</b> Derived from question 28	
Q28	I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I questioned management decisions

**Inter-Personal Climate**

<b>Sub-Scale 1: Inter-Personal Climate 1</b> Derived from factor 7, appendix 3, labelled 'informal, close relations'. Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.6711	
Q32	On the whole, I get on very well with the management in my company?
Q33	I am willing to put-in extra effort to help my company be successful?

<b>Sub-Scale 2: Inter-Personal Climate 2</b> Derived from question 30	
Q30	There is a tension between employees and supervisors in this company

<b>Sub-Scale 3: Inter-Personal Climate 3</b> Derived from question 38	
Q38	I mix and socialise with colleagues from work

**W8.2a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for:  
Issue-Centred & Inter-Personal Climate**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Positive)	Max Score (Negative)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up Mgmt</i> <sup>x</sup>	5.0	- 2.0	0	6	9.7	2	.0075 *
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-maker</i> <sup>x</sup>	4.2	- 1.2	0	6	6.7	2	.0343 *
Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i> <sup>x</sup>	2.2	+ 3.8	0	12	13.1	6	.0000 *
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisor Tension</i> <sup>x</sup>	4.9	- 1.9	0	6	9.2	2	.0097 *
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i> <sup>x</sup>	2.0	+ 1.0	0	6	28.6	6	.0001 *
<b>Sub-Scale:</b> Issue-Centred Climate (Σ=Issue-Centred 1&2)	9.2	- 3.2	0	12	5.5	5	.3561
<b>Sub-Scale:</b> Inter-Personal Climate (Σ=Inter-Personal 1-3)	9.1	+ 2.9	0	24	29.8	11	.0017 *
<b>Overall Climate</b>	18.3	- 0.3	0	36	24.3	14	.0020 *

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'below' mean reflect positive attitude

**W8.2b Tests for Independent statistical significance: Issue & Inter-Personal Climate**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up to Mgmt</i>	Gender	Z -1.8	.0652
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.9 DF=3	.0735
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 9.1 DF=5	.1038
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .12 DF=2	.9427
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .89 DF=4	.9250
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-Maker</i>	Gender	Z -1.5	.1477
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.0 DF=3	.1697
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=5	.2458
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.8 DF=2	.2436
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=4	.8746
Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i>	Gender	Z -1.3	.1693
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=3	.6327
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 14.9 DF=5	.0106 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.3 DF=2	.0673
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.7 DF=4	.4362
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisory Tension</i>	Gender	Z -.55	.5763
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=3	.6042
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=3	.3680
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .24 DF=2	.8853
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=4	.3616
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i>	Gender	Z -.21	.8330
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.4 DF=3	.2210
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 12.2 DF=5	.0318 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=2	.2671
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.2 DF=4	.2631
<b>Sub-Scale: Issue-Centred Climate</b> ( $\Sigma$ =Issue-Centred 1&2)	Gender	Z -.07	.9417
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 8.7 DF=3	.0330 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=5	.4752
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.3 DF=2	.4992
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .59 DF=4	.9633
<b>Sub-Scale: Inter-Personal Climate</b> ( $\Sigma$ =Inter-Personal 1-3)	Gender	Z -.08	.9358
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.7 DF=3	.4301
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.2 DF=5	.0354 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .82 DF=2	.6613
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=4	.1555
<b>Overall Scale: Climate</b>	Gender	Z -.19	.9358
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 8.0 DF=3	.0456 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 4.4 DF=5	.4892
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .29 DF=2	.8627
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.1 DF=4	.1892

**W8.2c Correlation of Climatic Sub-Scales**

	CLIMATE	ISSUE-CENTRED CLIMATE	INTER-PERSONAL CLIMATE
CLIMATE	1.0000	.6526**	.8722**
ISSUE-CLIMATE	.6526**	1.0000	.1987
PSNL-CLIMATE	.8722**	.1987	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

**W8.3: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales: Attitudes to Management**  
(some statements are paraphrased from questionnaire for simplicity)

<b>Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scale 1</b> <b>Derived from factor 3, appx 3 - Supervisory control/institutional trust.</b> <b>Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.8415</b>	
	Over the last 2 or 3 years, has your supervisor had more or less control of:
39a	'pace of output'
39d	'allocation of work'
39b	'product/service quality'
39e	'how your work tasks are performed'
39c	'discipline of employees'
39g	'communicating to employees'

<b>Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scale 2</b> <b>Derived from factor 4, appendix 3 - Managerial/Workplace Tension</b> <b>Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.6973</b>	
28	If I were to question management decisions I would be labelled a trouble-maker?
37	It takes a strong minded individual to stand up to management
30	There seems to be tension between employees and supervisors in my company
31	If offered a similar job on the same pay & conditions, I would leave this company

<b>Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scale 3</b> <b>Derived from factor 8, appendix 3 - Rules Orientation of Management</b> <b>Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.6406</b>	
37	It takes a strong minded individual to stand up to management
45	Management enforce company rules often

**W8.3a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Management.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Supervisory Control/Institutional Trust (factor 3)	9.2	- 8.8	0	36	27.1	16	.0396 *
Managerial/Work Conflict/Tension (factor 4)	11.7	- 0.30	0	24	55.2	13	.0000 *
Rules Orientation of Management (factor 8)	4.0	- 2.0	0	12	16.2	6	.0125 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Management</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>- 11.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>.8892</b>

Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude



**W8.3b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Management)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Control/Trust</i>	Gender	Z -.69	.4872
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.5 DF=2	.2785
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.7 DF=5	.2431
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 9.9 DF=5	.0777
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.0 DF=2	.3649
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.2 DF=3	.0993
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Managerial Conflict</i>	Gender	Z -.88	.3770
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=3	.2272
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=6	.4914
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=5	.2124
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.6 DF=2	.4282
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=4	.4789
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Rules Orientation</i>	Gender	Z -.62	.5304
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.9 DF=3	.1120
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 9.1 DF=6	.1658
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 3.9 DF=5	.5551
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=2	.2724
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=4	.8672
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Management</i>	Gender	Z -.55	.5769
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.9 DF=2	.0843
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=5	.2097
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 9.0 DF=5	.1067
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.6 DF=2	.1001
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.6 DF=3	.6435

**W8.3c Correlation of Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scales**

Correlation Coefficients				
	F3CONTROL	F8RULES	F4TENSION	OVERALL
F3CONTROL	1.0000	.0697	-.1330	.8309**
F8RULES	.0697	1.0000	.5338**	.4964**
F4TENSION	-.1330	.5338**	1.0000	.3622*
OVERALL	.8309**	.4964**	.3622*	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 ". " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

### W8.4 Attitudes to Trade Unions: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (some statements are paraphrased from questionnaire for simplicity)

Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scale 1 (Ideological) Derived from factor 2a, appdx 3. Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.8761 for F2	
21	Do you agree or disagree trade unions are 'generally' a good thing for workers
26d	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'can be beneficial to employees'
26f	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'provide necessary protection'
26g	Do you agree or disagree trade unions 'are, on the whole, sensible'
24	Would you agree there are benefits having views of all employee represented to management

Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scale 2 (Instrumental) Derived from factor 2b, appendix 3	
22	Do you agree your pay/conditions would improve if a trade union were in your company?
25	On the whole, a trade union would make my job more secure in my company

#### W8.4a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Trade Unions.

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Sub-Scale 1 <i>Ideological Union Attitudes</i>	23.0	+ 8.0	0	30	5.3	8	.7168
Sub-Scale 2 <i>Instrumental Union Attitudes</i>	7.1	- 1.1	0	12	9.6	4	.0472 *
Overall Attitude to Trade Unions	30.1	+ 9.1	0	42	11.8	10	.9972

Mean scores for these scales were re-coded for measures of discreteness in chapter 7, appendix 2, and deviations 'above' mid-point reflect positive attitude.

#### W8.4b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Trade Unions)

Because data for these attitudes was collected by interview, the only independent variables were gender and occupation. Respondents were not asked about other possible characteristics.

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Sub-Scale 1 <i>Ideological TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - 1.5	.1220
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.3 DF=4	.0796
Sub-Scale 2 <i>Instrumental TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - .11	.9116
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 4.2 DF=4	.3937
Overall Scale <i>Attitude to Trade Unions</i>	Gender	Z - .84	.3954
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=4	.2134

#### W8.4c Correlation of Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scales

	Correlation Coefficients		
	OVERALL-ATT	IDEOLOG TU	INSTUMT TU
OVERALL-ATT	1.0000	.9497**	.9073**
IDEOLOG TU	.9497**	1.0000	.7792**
INSTUMT TU	.9073**	.7792**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**W8.5 Attitudes to Work Satisfaction: Statements used to make-up sub-scales**

(some statements are paraphrased from the questionnaire for simplicity)

*r* denotes correlation coefficient used to test for scale consistency and validity)

<b>Sub-Scale 1: Work Attachment</b>	
Derived from factor 9, appendix 3. Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient was 0.4723	
Q43	I often feel I have accomplished something worthwhile in my job
Q49	My job is very repetitive/very varied

<b>Sub-Scale 2: Intrinsic Work Value</b>		Scale Test
Derived from questions 43, 44, 49		<i>r</i>
Q40b	In my job, I often make sure I work hard for this company	.8284
Q44	If I work especially hard, my efforts are recognised by management	.7380
Q49	My job is very repetitive/very varied	.7644

<b>Sub-Scale 3: Pay Satisfaction</b>		Scale Test
Derived from questions 50 & 51		<i>r</i>
Q50	My pay and conditions are better/worse than for other/similar companies I know of	.8753
Q51	The amount of pay adequately covers my living expenses	.9282

<b>Sub-Scale 4: Job Satisfaction</b>		Scale Test
Derived from questions 47 & 48		<i>r</i>
Q47	I think my job is very secure/insecure over the next 5 years	.5654
Q48	Over last few years, I have had more freedom to decide my work tasks	.6474

**W8.5a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee work satisfactions**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Work Attachment	7.2	+ 1.2	0	12	39.9	9	.0000 *
Intrinsic Work Value	10.9	+ 1.9	0	18	21.1	13	.0696
Pay Satisfaction	5.0	- 1.0	0	12	48.9	9	.0000 *
Job Satisfaction	6.0	neutral	0	12	28.0	7	.0002 *
<b>Overall Scale</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>+ 2.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>.5390</b>

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**W8.5b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Work Experiences/Satisfaction)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Work Attachment</i>	Gender	Z - 2.0	.0407 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.4 DF=3	.2174
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 10.6 DF=6	.1163
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.4 DF=5	.0632
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .39 DF=2	.8616
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.5 DF=4	.1596
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Intrinsic Work Value</i>	Gender	Z - 1.8	.0686
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.7 DF=3	.1247
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.9 DF=6	.2449
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.3 DF=5	.0443 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.1 DF=2	.3775
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=4	.1557
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Pay Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - 1.1	.2455
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=3	.6032
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.9 DF=6	.3245
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=5	.6987
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.0 DF=2	.6057
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 13.4 DF=4	.0094 *
<b>Sub-Scale 4</b> <i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - 3.0	.7572
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=3	.1089
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=5	.2108
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.9 DF=5	.7073
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.5 DF=2	.2851
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=4	.1278
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Work Experience &amp; Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .70	.4797
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.4 DF=3	.4834
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.7 DF=5	.4516
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=5	.3655
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.2 DF=2	.3325
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.4 DF=4	.3325

**W8.5c Correlation of Employee Work Experience/Satisfaction**

Correlation Coefficients					
	ALL-ATTD	WORK ATCH	INTRIC WRK	PAY SAT	JOB SAT
ALL-ATTD	1.0000	.8002**	.9149**	.5088**	-.0606
WORK ATCH	.8002**	1.0000	.8291**	.0590	-.2502
INTRIC WRK	.9149**	.8291**	1.0000	.2847*	-.2782*
PAY SAT	.5088**	.0590	.2847*	1.0000	-.1329
JOB SAT	-.0606	-.2502	-.2782*	-.1329	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**W8.6 Attitudes to the Company: Statements used to make-up sub-scales**

(some statements are paraphrased from the questionnaire for simplicity)

(r denotes correlation coefficient used to test for scale consistency and validity)

<b>Sub-Scale 1: Organisational Commitment</b>		Scale Test
<b>Derived from questions 31, 35, 52</b>		<i>r</i>
Q31	If offered a similar job on the same pay/conditions, I would leave this company	.6395
Q35	I have very little loyalty to this company	.8442
Q52	The majority of employees I work with are committed to the company	.7773

<b>Sub-Scale 2: Company Values</b>		Scale Test
<b>Derived from questions 27, 33</b>		<i>r</i>
Q27	The values of this company are similar to my own personal beliefs	.6421
Q33	I put in extra effort to help this company be successful	.7803

**W8.6a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to the Company**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Commitment	8.2	-0.8	0	18	39.8	13	.0001 *
Company Values	8.1	+2.1	0	12	18.3	8	.0188 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Company</b>	16.3	+1.3	0	30	21	16	.1523

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**W8.6b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Company)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Organisational Commitment</i>	Gender	Z - .47	.6349
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=3	.1417
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.2 DF=6	.6407
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 6.1 DF=5	.2898
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.9 DF=2	.1356
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.0 DF=4	.4135
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Company Values</i>	Gender	Z - 1.3	.1643
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=3	.6350
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 1.6 DF=6	.9501
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 14.9 DF=5	.0108 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.0 DF=2	.0300 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.3 DF=4	.5025
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Company</i>	Gender	Z - 1.2	.1970
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.2 DF=3	.1583
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=6	.5592
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.3 DF=5	.0661
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=2	.0892
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 2.1 DF=4	.7033

**W8.6c Correlation of Attitudes to Company**

	ATT COMPNY	COMMITMENT	CO VALUES
ATT COMPNY	1.0000	.8687**	.7495**
COMMITMENT	.8687**	1.0000	.3231*
CO VALUE	.7495**	.3231*	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

**W8.7: Descriptive Tabulation of Key Relationship Influences**

Dimensions	Summary Description of Influence
<b>External Environment</b>	
<i>Anti-union state policy &amp; Legislation</i>	Favourably disposed attitude given perceptions of managerial advantage (score of 1 and 2 on a scale of 1= advantage to 7=disadvantage from state policy). <u>High indirect influence</u> in relationship.
<i>Technology</i>	Low orientation to capital investment; score of 6 on scale of 1=high investment to 7=no investment. However, potential to control employee effort was apparent to a large degree, although this differed between occupations and sites. This can be explained because of market pressures, which affected particular employees more than others subject to technological influences (i.e. call-centre operators). Overall, <u>medium influence</u> on relationship.
<i>Product market situation</i>	Growing market share for product/service, after turbulent downturn. Competitive and volatile product market, with large degree of 'ease of market entry' for competitors meant a <u>very high influence</u> on relationship, to maintain market leadership.
<i>Labour market situation</i>	Labour easily disposable. Little difficulty in recruiting/retaining employees. Reliance on external labour supply because of product market pressures. Overall, <u>medium to high influence</u> on relationship.
<b>Structural Factors</b>	
<i>Size</i>	Small size facilitates informal, social relations between employees and supervisors, although not management generally. This can also mean conflicts ferment over time and can be <u>high influence</u> which is either positive or negative on the relationship.
<i>Ownership</i>	Foreign ownership had <u>low influence</u> on processes of the relationship, but did suggest it could influence role behaviour to some degree.
<b>Personnel Factors</b>	
<i>Management Style</i>	Exploitative and opportunistic. <u>Very high influence</u> on processes of relationship. Style and strategy vary much blurred by preferences articulated by the Chief Executive, which are shaped by market situation and filtered down to lower level supervisors. Important, but less significant, is style differs across different sites; less exploitative away from head office.
<i>Voice Mechanisms</i>	Few structural voice mechanisms exist, and little frequency of communications. <u>Low influence</u> on relationship.
<i>Voice Utility</i>	Positive perceptions of voice utility by employees, despite absence of voice mechanisms, which reflects a <u>medium influence</u> on processes of the relationship. Perceptions of utility largely explained by close relations with supervisors than with management generally, which is further illuminated by inter-personal climatic factors.

Cont'd

<b>Climatic Factors</b>	
<i>Issue-Centred Climate</i>	<u>High degree of influence</u> on relationship, with strong negative perceptions to issue-handling by management expressed by employees.
<i>Inter-Personal Climate</i>	Determined mainly by strong perception of friendly relations with supervisors, which was positively expressed by employees. <u>Medium to high influence</u> on relationship, but also contradictory as allowed conflicts to percolate and ferment over time. Inter-personal climate explains deeper understanding of other factors, suggesting when viewed as 'intervening' phenomenon, much more fruitful way to expose the contradictions inherent in relationship.
<b>Employee Attitudes</b>	
<i>Attitudes to Management</i>	Strong negative attitude to management by employees (- 11.1). Likely to have <u>high influence</u> on subsequent action and behaviour in relationship.
<i>Attitudes to Unions</i>	Employees were favourably disposed to unions, but managerial style and hostility meant unions were generally suppressed. Overall, <u>low influence</u> on relationship processes in comparison to management itself.
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	Employees positively disposed to their work (+2.1). Suggests <u>medium influence</u> on relationship from intrinsic value associated with work activity itself.
<i>Orientations to Company</i>	Marginal positive disposition (+1.3). <u>Low influence</u> on processes of relationship

## **APPENDIX C9**

**Data Results for Chem Co: Chapter 9.**



Main Biographic Features: By Occupation (% and n)

Main Features	Professional	Technical	Managerial	Clerical/ Admin	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	All Employees
Gender								
Men	1.5 (1)	37.3 (25) 12.0 (8)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	14.9 (10)	3.0 (2)	88% (59) 12% (8)
Women								
Union Membership								
Current member		3.0 (2)			9.0 (6)	1.5 (1)		13.4% (9)
Previous member		4.5 (3)	1.5 (1)		12.0 (8)	12.0 (8)	3.0 (2)	32.8% (22)
Never been member	1.5 (1)	41.8 (28)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	6.0 (4)	1.5 (1)		53.8% (36)
Main Benefits								
Sick Pay Provision	1.5 (1)	37.3 (25)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	14.9 (10)	1.5 (1)	85.1% (57)
Holiday Pay	1.5 (1)	38.8 (26)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	14.9 (10)	3.0 (2)	89.6% (60)
Company Pension		37.3 (25)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	9.0 (6)	3.0 (2)		52.2% (35)
Medical Assistance			1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	17.9 (12)	12.0 (8)	3.0 (2)	3% (2)
Free Car Parking		29.9 (20)						62.7% (42)
Attendance Patterns								
Standard day	1.5 (1)	19.4 (13) 6.0 (4)		1.5 (1)	23.9 (16)	3.0 (2)	3.0	52.2% (35)
Flexible Attendance								6% (4)
Shift/Rota Patterns		23.9 (16)	3.0 (2)		3.0 (2)	12.0 (8)		41.8% (28)
Age:								
21-30	1.5 (1)	37.3 (25)				1.5 (1)		40.3% (27)
31-40		12.0 (8)	3.0 (2)					14.9% (10)
41-50				1.5 (1)	10.4 (7)	12.0 (8)		23.8% (16)
51-60					16.4 (11)	1.5 (1)	3.0 (2)	21% (14)
Ethnic Origin:								
White European	1.5 (1)	10.4 (7) 38.8 (26)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	13.4 (9)	3.0 (2)	13.4% (9)
White British								86.6% (58)

Cont'd.

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Professional</i>	<i>Technical</i>	<i>Managerial</i>	<i>Clerical/ Admin</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
<b>Marital Status:</b>								
Married		4.5 (3)	1.5 (1)		25.4 (17)	3.0 (92)	1.5 (1)	35.8% (24)
Live with Partner		19.4 (13)	1.5 (1)			1.5 (1)		22.4% (15)
Single	1.5 (1)	25.4 (17)		1.5 (1)		10.4 (7)	1.5 (1)	38.8% (26)
Divorced					1.5			1.5% (1)
Widowed								1.5% (1)
<b>Educational Level</b>								
No Qualifications						13.4	3.0 (2)	16.4% (11)
NVQ's						1.5 (1)		1.5% (1)
Degree	1.5 (1)	43.3 (29)	1.5 (1)					46.3% (31)
Higher Degree		3.0 (2)		1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)			6.0% (4)
Apprenticeship /Technical		3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)		25.4 (17)			29.9% (20)
<b>Annual Gross Pay:</b>								
8 - 12 K		1.5 (1)		1.5 (1)			3.0 (2)	6% (4)
12 to 16 K	1.5 (1)	44.8 (30)			26.9 (18)	1.5 (1)		74.6% (50)
16 to 20 K		1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)		3.0 (2)			3% (2)
20 to 24 K		1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)			3.0 (2)		4.5% (3)
24 K +								1.5% (1)
<b>Length of Service:</b>								
< 1 year	1.5 (1)	4.5 (3)						6% (4)
1-3 years		3.0 (2)		1.5 (1)	9.0 (6)			13.4% (9)
4-7 years		38.8 (26)			16.4 (11)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	58.2% (39)
8-10 years		1.5 (1)			1.5 (1)			3% (2)
10 years +		1.5 (1)	3.0 (2)			13.4 (9)	1.5 (1)	19.4% (13)

Cont'd.

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Professional</i>	<i>Technical</i>	<i>Managerial</i>	<i>Clerical/ Admin</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Working Week: 31-35 hours 36-40 hours 40 hours +	1.5 (1)	38.8 (26) 10.4 (7)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	25.4 (17) 1.5 (1)	12.0 (8) 3.0 (2)	1.5 (1) 1.5 (1)	1.5% (1) 79% (53) 19.4% (13)
Overtime Working: At least weekly At least monthly Few times a year Never	1.5 (1)	31.3 (21) 3.0 (2) 6.0 (4) 9.0 (6)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	1.5 (1) 13.4 (9)	1.5 (1)	61.2% (41) 9% (6) 19.4% (13) 10.4% (7)
Are you paid for O/T Yes No	1.5 (1)	41.8 (28) 7.5 (5)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	13.4 (9) 1.5 (1)	3.0 (2)	91% (61) 9% (6)
Reason for overtime: Increase wages Help company out Help colleagues out None of above	1.5 (1)	20.9 (14) 14.9 (10) 6.0 (4) 7.5 (5)	1.5 (1) 1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	17.9 (12) 9.0 (6)	12.0 (8) 1.5 (1) 1.5 (1)	1.5 (1) 1.5 (1)	55.2% (37) 29.9% (20) 7.5% (5) 7.5% (5)
<i>n</i>	1	33	2	1	18	10	2	67
<i>% of total sample</i>	1.5	49.2	3.0	1.5	26.9	14.9	3.0	100

**Main Biographic Features  
By Site/Division (% and n)**

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Gender				
Men	59.7 (40)	23.9 (16)	4.5 (3)	88% (59)
Women		7.5 (5)	4.5 (3)	12% (8)
Union Membership				
Current member	9.0 (6)	4.5 (3)		13.4% (9)
Previous member	28.4 (19)	4.5 (3)		32.8% (22)
Never been member	22.3 (15)	22.3 (15)	9.0 (6)	53.6% (36)
Main Benefits				
Sick Pay Provision	46.3 (31)	31.3 (21)	7.5 (5)	85.1% (57)
Holiday Pay	49.3 (33)	31.3 (21)	9.0 (6)	89.6% (60)
Company Pension	25.4 (17)	19.4 (13)	7.5 (5)	52.2% (35)
Medical Assistance	1.5 (1)		1.5 (1)	3% (2)
Free Car Parking	37.3 (25)	19.4 (13)	6.0 (4)	62.7% (42)
Attendance Patterns				
Standard working day	28.3 (19)	19.4 (13)	4.5 (3)	52.2% (35)
Flexible Attendance		6.0 (4)		6% (4)
Shift/Rota Patterns	31.3 (21)	6.0 (4)	4.5 (3)	41.8% (28)
Age:				
21-30	16.4 (11)	16.4 (11)	7.5 (5)	40.3% (27)
31-40	4.5 (3)	10.4 (7)		14.9% (10)
41-50	20.9 (14)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	23.8% (16)
51-60	17.9 (12)	3.0 (2)		21% (14)
Ethnic Origin:				
White European	10.4 (7)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	13.4% (9)
White British	49.3 (33)	29.9 (20)	7.5 (5)	86.6% (58)
Marital Status:				
Married	29.9 (20)	4.5 (3)	1.5 (1)	35.8% (24)
Live with Partner	4.5 (3)	16.4 (11)	1.5 (1)	22.4% (15)
Single	23.9 (16)	9.0 (6)	6.0 (4)	38.8% (26)
Divorced		1.5 (1)		1.5% (1)
Widowed	1.5 (1)			1.5% (1)
Educational Level				
No Qualifications	12.0 (8)	4.5 (3)		16.4% (11)
NVQ's	1.5 (1)			1.5% (1)
Degree	16.4 (11)	25.4 (17)	4.5 (3)	46.3% (31)
Higher Degree	1.5 (1)		4.5 (3)	6.0% (4)
Apprenticeship or Technical Training	28.4 (19)	1.5 (1)		29.9% (20)
Annual Gross Pay:				
8 - 12 K	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	3.0 (2)	6% (4)
12 to 16 K	44.8 (30)	23.9 (16)	6.0 (4)	74.6% (50)
16 to 20 K	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)		3% (2)
20 to 24 K	1.5 (1)	3.0 (2)		4.5% (3)
24 K +		1.5 (1)		1.5% (1)

Cont'd.

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Length of Service:				
< 1 year	3.0 (2)		3.0 (2)	6% (4)
1-3 years	10.4 (7)		3.0 (2)	13.4% (9)
4-7 years	32.8 (22)	22.4 (15)	3.0 (2)	58.2% (39)
8-10 years	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)		3% (2)
10 years +	12.0 (8)	7.5 (5)		19.4% (13)
Working Week:				
31-35 hours			1.5 (1)	1.5% (1)
36-40 hours	53.7 (36)	17.9 (12)	7.5 (5)	79% (53)
40 hours +	6.0 (4)	13.4 (9)		19.4% (13)
Overtime Working:				
At least weekly	44.7 (30)	9.0 (6)	7.5 (5)	61.2% (41)
At least monthly	4.5 (3)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	9% (6)
Few times a year	10.4 (7)	9.0 (6)		19.4% (13)
Never		10.4 (7)		10.4% (7)
Are you paid for overtime				
Yes	59.7 (40)	22.4 (15)	9.0 (6)	91% (61)
No		9.0 (6)		9% (6)
Reason for overtime:				
Increase wages	47.8 (32)	6.0 (4)	1.5 (1)	55.2% (37)
Help company out	9.0 (6)	14.9 (10)	6.0 (4)	29.9% (20)
Help colleagues out	3.0 (2)	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	7.5% (5)
None of above		7.5 (5)		7.5% (5)
<b>n</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>% of total sample</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>100</b>

### Mean Score & Standard Deviation ( ) By Occupation

To minimise 'agreement bias' some questions were posed negatively and some positively. A Likert-type scale was used, where 1 = definitely agree (or very often) and 7 definitely disagree (or never). For attitudinal responses to be measured in a consistent manner (i.e. the same 'direction'), negatively posed questions were re-coded (R), which included questions 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38 and 49. These are paraphrased for simplicity. During analysis some responses were scaled-down from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison purposes, and to compute latent variable scales, for which the procedure was previously explained in appendix W8 (for Water Co.).

#### Trade Union Orientated Questions

Questions Asked	Professional	Technical	Supervisory	Clerical	Skilled	emi-Skilled	Un-Skilled	All
21. Do you agree TU a good thing for workers	3.0 (-)	1.9 (1.0)	2.5 (.7)	4.0 (-)	1.3 (.5)	1.9 (2.0)	1.0 (-)	1.8 (1.1)
22. Do you agree pay & conditions would be improved if TU present?	4.0 (-)	2.5 (1.5)	3.0 (1.4)	4.0 (-)	1.7 (.9)	1.9 (2.0)	1.0 (-)	2.0 (1.3)
23. A TU would NOT create restrictive/unnecessary rules in my job? (R)	5.0 (-)	3.4 (1.5)	4.0 (1.4)	3.0 (-)	2.7 (1.0)	2.0 (.8)	2.5 (-)	3.0 (1.6)
24. Do you agree there are real benefits in having all employee views represented?	1.0 (-)	1.8 (.8)	2.0 (-)	4.0 (-)	1.3 (.4)	2.0 (.8)	1.0 (-)	1.7 (.8)
25. A TU would make my job more secure?	4.0 (-)	2.8 (1.2)	4.0 (-)	4.0 (-)	2.1 (1.4)	2.6 (1.7)	5.5 (2.0)	2.7 (1.4)
26. a) TU are bunch of political lefties (R)	5.0 (-)	3.4 (1.5)	4.0 (-)	3.0 (-)	2.7 (2.1)	2.0 (.8)	2.5 (2.1)	3.0 (1.6)
b) TU are trouble-makers (R)	5.0 (-)	2.9 (1.2)	4.0 (1.4)	3.0 (-)	2.7 (2.2)	2.0 (.8)	2.5 (2.1)	2.8 (1.5)
c) TU are a necessary evil (R)	3.0 (-)	2.8 (1.0)	4.0 (1.0)	2.0 (-)	3.6 (1.9)	4.0 (1.4)	2.5 (2.1)	3.2 (1.4)
d) TU can be beneficial to employees	1.0 (-)	1.7 (.7)	2.0 (-)	5.0 (-)	1.4 (.5)	2.7 (.9)	1.0 (-)	1.8 (.9)
e) TU can be beneficial to management	1.0 (-)	2.4 (1.4)	2.0 (-)	4.0 (-)	6.3 (3.1)	3.4 (1.2)	1.5 (2.1)	4.1 (2.4)
f) TU provide necessary protection	2.0 (-)	2.3 (1.2)	2.5 (.7)	5.0 (-)	1.3 (1.7)	2.6 (1.7)	1.0 (-)	2.1 (1.2)
g) On the whole, unions are sensible	3.0 (-)	2.1 (1.0)	2.5 (.7)	4.0 (-)	1.7 (.9)	2.0 (.8)	1.0 (-)	2.0 (1.0)

Cont'd

## Company and Management Orientated Questions

Questions Asked	Professional	Technical	Supervisory	Clerical	Skilled	emi-Skilled	Un- Skilled	All
27. The values of the company are similar to my own personal beliefs?	-	3.5 (1.0)	2.5 (.7)	2.0 (-)	4.3 (1.2)	3.6 (.9)	1.5 (.7)	3.7 (1.3)
28. I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I question management decisions (R)	6.0 (-)	4.5 (1.6)	2.0 (1.4)	2.0 (-)	3.9 (1.3)	4.3 (1.3)	3.5 (-)	4.2 (1.6)
29. I have good career/promotion prospects?	4.0 (-)	3.7 (1.5)	2.5 (.7)	3.0 (-)	4.9 (1.1)	3.6 (.9)	7.0 (-)	4.1 (1.4)
30. There is a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors (R)	7.0 (-)	5.6 (1.1)	3.0 (2.8)	2.0 (-)	6.2 (.9)	4.4 (1.8)	5.5 (2.1)	5.4 (1.5)
31. I would leave this company if offered a similar job on same pay/conditions (R)	7.0 (-)	4.6 (1.9)	4.0 (2.8)	2.0 (-)	6.0 (1.4)	4.8 (1.4)	6.5 (3.5)	5.0 (1.9)
32. I get on very well with management?	6.0 (-)	2.9 (1.3)	2.0 (-)	2.0 (-)	3.6 (1.6)	2.4 (1.6)	1.5 (.7)	3.0 (1.5)
33. I am willing to put in extra effort to help my company be successful?	7.0 (-)	2.9 (1.0)	3.0 (1.4)	2.0 (-)	3.3 (1.4)	3.8 (1.5)	2.0 (1.4)	3.2 (1.3)
34. Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions?	6.0 (-)	5.2 (1.4)	4.0 (2.8)	3.0 (-)	6.3 (1.1)	5.6 (1.6)	7.0 (-)	5.5 (1.5)
35. I am NOT very loyal to my company? (R)	7.0 (-)	4.1 (1.6)	3.0 (2.8)	1.0 (-)	3.9 (1.3)	3.2 (1.3)	2.5 (2.1)	3.8 (1.6)
36. I believe management that the company's most valued asset is the people here?	7.0 (-)	5.6 (1.6)	2.5 (2.1)	2.0 (-)	2.7 (1.3)	4.8 (2.0)	5.5 (2.1)	4.6 (2.0)
37. You do have to be a strong minded individual to stand-up to management (R)	7.0 (-)	6.3 (.7)	3.5 (2.1)	2.0 (-)	6.0 (1.4)	6.0 (.8)	7.0 (-)	6.0 (1.2)
38. I do NOT mix/socialise with work colleagues (R)	7.0 (-)	2.2 (1.9)	5.5 (2.1)	3.0 (-)	5.5 (1.5)	5.3 (1.8)	4.5 (3.5)	3.8 (2.1)

Cont'd

## Working Practices and Employee Contribution

	Professional	Technical	Supervisory	Clerical	Skilled	semi-Skilled	Un- Skilled	All
39. Has your supervisor had more or less control over (1 = more, 7 = less)								
a) Pace of Output	5.0 (-)	4.4 (2.0)	1.5 (7)	3.0 (-)	4.8 (1.1)	3.4 (1.2)	2.5 (2.1)	4.2 (1.7)
b) Product/Service Quality	3.0 (-)	3.8 (1.9)	1.5 (7)	3.0 (-)	3.3 (1.4)	3.4 (1.2)	2.5 (2.1)	3.5 (1.7)
c) Discipline of Employees	4.0 (-)	3.9 (1.7)	3.5 (7)	2.0 (-)	3.1 (1.7)	4.4 (1.2)	4.0 (-)	3.7 (1.6)
d) Allocation of Work	4.0 (-)	3.3 (2.2)	4.5 (2.1)	2.0 (-)	3.1 (1.7)	3.0 (8)	6.5 (3.5)	3.3 (1.9)
e) How the Work is to be done	4.0 (-)	3.2 (2.2)	3.0 (1.4)	2.0 (-)	3.4 (1.9)	4.9 (1.9)	4.0 (-)	3.5 (2.0)
f) Use of New Technology	3.0 (-)	3.4 (2.0)	3.0 (-)	2.0 (-)	3.0 (1.5)	4.8 (2.0)	5.0 (-)	3.5 (2.0)
g) Communicating to Employees	5.0 (-)	4.5 (1.7)	3.0 (2.8)	1.0 (-)	2.8 (1.6)	3.8 (1.0)	4.0 (-)	3.8 (1.7)
40. In your job do you do the following often: (1 = very often, 7 never)								
a) Tell supervisors you do your job well	7.0 (-)	5.2 (1.5)	3.5 (7)	-	4.0 (1.5)	4.0 (2.0)	7.0 (-)	4.8 (1.8)
b) Work hard for the company	1.0 (-)	2.5 (1.2)	2.0 (1.4)	4.0 (-)	3.8 (1.3)	3.9 (2.1)	3.0 (1.4)	3.0 (1.5)
c) Suggest improvements to your job	1.0 (-)	3.1 (1.2)	2.5 (7)	2.0 (-)	2.7 (1.6)	3.2 (2.2)	4.5 (3.5)	3.0 (1.6)

Cont'd



## Perceptions of Satisfaction and Voice

Questions Asked	Professional	Technical	Supervisory	Clerical	Skilled	semi-Skilled	Un- Skilled	All
41. Do you speak to management often about your wages and conditions?	4.0 (-)	4.6 (2.2)	5.0 (-)	6.0 (-)	5.3 (1.0)	6.5 (1.5)	7.0 (-)	5.2 (1.9)
42. When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, do you think your views are taken into account by management?	6.0 (-)	4.9 (1.2)	6.5 (.7)	2.0 (1.0)	6.2 (1.0)	5.4 (1.7)	5.5 (2.1)	5.3 (1.4)
43. Do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?	3.0 (-)	2.9 (1.1)	2.5 (.7)	2.0 (-)	2.7 (.5)	4.8 (2.0)	3.5 (2.1)	3.1 (1.3)
44. If you work hard are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	6.0 (-)	5.8 (1.9)	3.5 (.7)	4.0 (-)	5.0 (1.5)	6.1 (2.0)	7.0 (-)	5.6 (1.8)
45. Do management enforce company rules?	3.0 (-)	2.5 (1.8)	3.0 (1.4)	6.0 (-)	2.1 (1.4)	2.8 (1.1)	2.5 (2.1)	2.5 (1.6)
46. Do management communicate about changes at work often?	3.0 (-)	3.1 (1.5)	3.0 (2.8)	2.0 (-)	5.8 (1.7)	3.5 (1.7)	4.0 (4.2)	3.9 (1.9)
47. Is your job secure for the next five years?	4.0 (-)	4.2 (1.2)	3.5 (.7)	4.0 (-)	4.2 (1.1)	4.7 (.4)	5.5 (2.1)	4.3 (1.1)
48. Have you more or less freedom to carry out your work tasks in last 1 or 2 years ?	4.0 (-)	3.9 (1.7)	2.5 (1.7)	3.0 (-)	3.1 (.7)	6.2 (1.2)	4.0 (-)	4.0 (1.6)
49. I find my job repetitive/routine (R)	3.0 (-)	3.8 (1.8)	1.5 (.7)	3.0 (-)	4.0 (1.1)	1.7 (.4)	7.0 (-)	3.5 (1.7)
50. Are pay/conditions better or worse than other companies you know of ?	4.0 (-)	5.3 (1.2)	2.5 (.7)	4.0 (-)	5.7 (1.6)	5.1 (1.6)	5.5 (2.1)	5.3 (1.3)
51. Does the pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/expenses	5.0 (-)	5.2 (1.1)	3.5 (.7)	5.0 (-)	5.3 (.5)	5.7 (.9)	5.5 (2.1)	5.2 (1.0)
52. Are the majority of employees you work with committed to the company?	5.0 (-)	5.3 (.9)	3.5 (2.1)	2.0 (-)	5.6 (.5)	5.0 (1.2)	2.5 (2.1)	5.1 (1.1)

**Mean Score & Standard Deviation ( ):  
By Site/Division: (Knowsley, Leeds and Group Services)**

**Trade Union Orientated Questions**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>All Sites</i>
21. Do you agree TU a good thing for workers	1.4 (.7)	1.9 (1.3)	3.6 (.5)	1.8 (1.1)
22. Do you agree pay and conditions would be improved if TU present?	1.6 (1.0)	3.1 (1.8)	3.1 (.9)	2.0 (1.3)
23. A TU would NOT create restrictive/ unnecessary rules in my job? (R)	3.4 (1.4)	3.5 (1.2)	4.8 (.9)	3.0 (1.6)
24. Do you agree there are real benefits in having all employee views represented?	1.3 (.4)	2.3 (.8)	2.0 (1.0)	1.7 (.8)
25. A TU would make my job more secure?	2.1 (1.2)	3.5 (1.3)	4.1 (1.1)	2.7 (1.4)
26. a) TU are bunch of political lefties (R)	3.0 (1.6)	2.9 (1.8)	3.5 (1.7)	3.0 (1.6)
b) TU are trouble-makers (R)	3.0 (1.7)	2.1 (1.0)	3.6 (1.2)	2.8 (1.5)
c) TU are a necessary evil (R)	3.6 (1.4)	2.4 (1.2)	3.6 (1.0)	3.2 (1.4)
d) TU can be beneficial to employees	1.7 (.8)	1.7 (.7)	2.5 (1.5)	1.8 (.9)
e) TU can be beneficial to management	5.0 (2.4)	2.3 (1.2)	3.5 (1.6)	4.1 (2.4)
f) TU provide necessary protection	1.7 (.9)	2.4 (1.4)	3.5 (1.0)	2.1 (1.2)
g) On the whole, unions are sensible	1.8 (.9)	1.9 (.9)	3.5 (.5)	2.0 (1.0)

**Company and Management Orientated Questions**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>All Sites</i>
27. The values of the company are similar to my own personal beliefs?	3.7 (1.1)	3.5 (1.2)	4.0 (2.8)	3.7 (1.3)
28. I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I question management decisions (R)	4.5 (1.4)	3.5 (1.6)	4.3 (1.9)	4.2 (1.6)
29. I have good career/promotion prospects?	4.3 (1.4)	4.0 (1.7)	2.6 (.8)	4.1 (1.4)
30. There is a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors (R)	5.8 (.9)	5.0 (2.0)	4.8 (1.9)	5.4 (1.5)
31. I would leave this company if offered a similar job on the same pay/conditions (R)	5.6 (1.4)	4.0 (2.0)	4.1 (2.4)	5.0 (1.9)
32. I get on very well with management?	2.8 (1.4)	2.9 (1.1)	4.5 (2.7)	3.0 (1.5)
33. I am willing to put in a great deal of extra effort to help my company be successful?	3.2 (1.1)	3.3 (1.4)	2.8 (2.1)	3.2 (1.3)
34. Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions?	5.8 (1.1)	4.9 (2.0)	5.8 (1.4)	5.5 (1.5)
35. I am NOT very loyal to my company? (R)	4.1 (1.2)	3.7 (1.8)	2.6 (2.4)	3.8 (1.6)
36. I believe management that the company's most valued asset is the people here?	3.8 (1.7)	5.9 (2.0)	4.8 (1.9)	4.6 (2.0)
37. You do have to be a strong minded individual to stand up to management (R)	6.1 (1.1)	6.0 (1.2)	5.6 (1.8)	6.0 (1.2)
38. I do NOT mix/socialise with colleagues (R)	4.5 (1.9)	2.3 (1.8)	3.8 (2.5)	3.8 (2.1)

*Cont'd*

**Working Practices and Employee Contribution**

	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>All Sites</i>
39. Has your supervisor had more or less control over (1 = more, 7 = less)				
a) Pace of Output	4.4 (1.6)	4.0 (1.7)	4.0 (2.7)	4.2 (1.7)
b) Product/Service Quality	3.7 (1.6)	3.0 (1.2)	4.0 (2.7)	3.5 (1.7)
c) Discipline of Employees	4.0 (1.8)	3.2 (.7)	4.0 (2.6)	3.7 (1.6)
d) Allocation of Work	3.2 (2.0)	3.5 (1.5)	4.0 (2.6)	3.3 (1.9)
e) How the Work is to be done	3.7 (2.40)	3.0 (.7)	3.8 (2.7)	3.5 (2.0)
f) Use of New Technology	3.9 (2.2)	2.9 (1.1)	3.3 (2.8)	3.5 (2.0)
g) Communicating to Employees	3.8 (1.8)	3.8 (1.0)	3.6 (3.0)	3.8 (1.7)
40. In your job do you do the following often: (1 = very often, 7 = never)				
a) Tell supervisors you do your job well	4.3 (1.5)	5.5 (1.8)	5.3 (2.4)	4.8 (1.8)
b) Work hard for the company	3.7 (1.5)	2.2 (1.3)	2.0 (1.0)	3.0 (1.5)
c) Suggest improvements to your job	2.7 (1.50)	3.8 (1.3)	1.8 (.9)	3.0 (1.6)

**Perceptions of Satisfaction and Voice**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Knowsley</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Group Services</i>	<i>For All Sites</i>
41. Do you speak to management often about your wages and conditions?	4.8 (2.1)	5.7 (1.2)	5.3 (1.9)	5.2 (1.9)
42. When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, do you think your views are taken into account by management?	5.6 (1.1)	5.2 (1.6)	4.0 (1.6)	5.3 (1.4)
43. Do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?	3.4 (1.5)	2.8 (1.1)	2.6 (.5)	3.1 (1.3)
44. If you work hard are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	5.2 (1.5)	6.6 (2.0)	4.5 (1.0)	5.6 (1.8)
45. Do management enforce company rules?	2.2 (1.6)	2.4 (1.9)	4.6 (1.2)	2.5 (1.6)
46. Do management communicate about changes at work often?	4.6 (1.9)	2.6 (1.2)	3.6 (1.2)	3.9 (1.9)
47. Is your job secure for the next five years?	4.2 (1.0)	4.5 (1.4)	4.5 (.8)	4.3 (1.1)
48. Have you more or less freedom to carry out your work tasks in last 1 or 2 years ?	4.1 (1.7)	4.0 (1.7)	3.1 (.9)	4.0 (1.6)
49. I find my job repetitive/routine (R)	3.7 (1.8)	3.2 (1.7)	3.5 (1.7)	3.5 (1.7)
50. Are pay/conditions better or worse than other companies you know of ?	5.7 (1.3)	4.7 (1.8)	4.5 (1.0)	5.3 (1.3)
51. Does the pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/expenses?	5.7 (.8)	4.4 (.8)	5.0 (.6)	5.2 (1.0)
52. Are the majority of employees you work with committed to the company?	5.4 (.7)	5.0 (1.6)	4.1 (1.4)	5.1 (1.1)

### **C9.1 Employee Voice Utility**

Statistical tests were conducted at several separate levels using Mann-Whitney-U, Kruskal-Wallis 1-Way Anova and Chi-Square. Following a summary of mean values and the extent (i.e. deviation from mid-point) of positive and negative attitudes to voice utility, each sub-scale was then examined in relation to the following independent variables: gender, age, occupation, length of service, salary. In addition, current union membership and former union experience was also examined, which was not available at Water Co. Correlation coefficients were finally computed with respect to each sub-scale as an indication of sub-scale relationships.

It should be noted that some scales used were more statistically robust than others, particularly those which were derived from the factor analysis previously explained in appendix 3. Other latent variables (or variable sub-scales) that were created were subject to various tests for internal consistency and validity. This was explained in appendix W8.1, and the results of this procedure are used for the remaining organisations studied.

#### **Questionnaire statements used to make up Sub-Scales for Employee Voice Utility (as explained in appendix W8.1)**

#### **C9.1a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee voice utility**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Voice 1 <i>Dialogue</i>	9.5	+ 0.5	0	18	55.0	14	.0000 *
Voice 2 <i>Involvement</i> <sup>x</sup>	1.4	- 1.6	0	6	49.8	6	.0000 *
Voice 3 <i>View Considered</i> <sup>x</sup>	1.6	- 1.4	0	6	38.2	6	.0000 *
Voice 4 <i>Communications</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.1	+ 0.1	0	6	52.7	6	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Voice Utility</b>	15.6	- 2.4	0	36	37.5	13	.0003 *

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**C9.1b: Tests for Independent statistical significance: Employee Voice Utility**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Voice 1 (Factor 5: Dialogue with Management)	Gender	Z - 2.7	.0057 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.3 DF=3	.0953
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.2 DF=5	.0490 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.5 DF=4	.6341
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=3	.6351
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.2	.1938
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.1	.2458
Voice 2 (Q34 Involvement)	Gender	Z - .94	.3430
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 18.2 DF=3	.0004 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.7 DF=6	.0955
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.4 DF=4	.1135
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.1 DF=3	.6110
	Current Union Member	Z - 3.0	.0021 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .16	.8662
Voice 3 (Q42 Employee views taken into account)	Gender	Z - .93	.3494
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 19.3 DF=3	.0002 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 15.8 DF=6	.0147 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 13.2 DF=4	.0101 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 2.7 DF=3	.4332
	Current Union Member	Z - 3.6	.0003 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .30	.7618
Voice 4 (Q46: Communication)	Gender	Z - .67	.4871
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 16.6 DF=3	.0008 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 26.2 DF=6	.0002 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=4	.1989
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .38 DF=3	.9433
	Current Union Member	Z - 3.3	.0009 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.3	.1768
Overall Voice Utility (Σ=Voice1-4)	Gender	Z - 2.3	.0033 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 15.3 DF=3	.0015 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 20.2 DF=5	.0011 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=4	.5573
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .82 DF=3	.8429
	Current Union Member	Z - 3.2	.0011 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .82	.3968

**C9.1c: Correlation Analysis of Voice Utility Sub-Scales**

	ALLVOICE	VOICE1(F5)	VOICE2(Q34)	VOICE3(Q42)	VOICE4(Q46)
ALLVOICE	1.0000	.6131**	.5374**	.4556**	.7902**
VOICE1(F5)	.6131**	1.0000	-.2430	-.2724*	.1427
VOICE2(Q34)	.5374**	-.2430	1.0000	.6702**	.6586**
VOICE3(Q42)	.4556**	-.2724*	.6702**	1.0000	.4888**
VOICE4(Q46)	.7902**	.1427	.6586**	.4888**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**C9.2: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales of Climate**  
(as explained in appendix W8.2)

**C9.2a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for:  
Issue-Centred & Inter-Personal Climate**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Positive)	Max Score (Negative)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up to Mgmt</i> <sup>x</sup>	5.0	- 2.0	0	6	47.8	4	.0000 *
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-maker</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.2	- 0.2	0	6	23.9	6	.0005 *
Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i> <sup>x</sup>	4.0	+ 2.0	0	12	71.7	9	.0000 *
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisor Tension</i> <sup>x</sup>	4.4	- 1.4	0	6	43.8	6	.0000 *
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i> <sup>x</sup>	2.8	+ 0.2	0	6	10.2	6	.1161
<b>Sub-Scale: Issue-Centred Climate (Σ=Issue-Centred 1&amp;2)</b>	8.2	- 2.2	0	12	83.6	9	.0000 *
<b>Sub-Scale: Inter-Personal Climate (Σ=Inter-Personal 1-3)</b>	11.2	+ 0.8	0	24	45.9	11	.0000 *
<b>Overall Climate</b>	19.4	- 1.4	0	36	69.1	13	.0000 *

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'below' mean reflect positive attitude

**C9.2b Tests for Independent statistical significance: Issue-C & Inter-P Climate**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up to Mgmt</i>	Gender	Z - 1.5	.1324
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 23.0 DF=3	.0000 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.9 DF=6	.0637
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 15.6 DF=4	.0035 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 2.1 DF=3	.5490
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.9	.0485
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.4	.1469
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-Maker</i>	Gender	Z -.94	.3452
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.1 DF=3	.1580
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 15.7 DF=6	.0153 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=4	.2243
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.2 DF=3	.0983
	Current Union Member	Z -.87	.3827
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.3	.1731

*Cont'd*

**C9.2b (Cont'd) Tests for Independent statistical significance: Issue-C & Inter-P Climate**

Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i>	Gender	Z	- 1.6		.1071
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	3.5	DF=3	.3169
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	12.2	DF=6	.0571
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	8.1	DF=4	.0848
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	5.7	DF=3	.1244
	Current Union Member	Z	- 3.5		.0004 *
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 1.0		.2762
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisory Tension</i>	Gender	Z	- .60		.5425
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	18.5	DF=3	.0003 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	16.5	DF=6	.0113 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	17.3	DF=4	.0015 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	6.6	DF=3	.0825
	Current Union Member	Z	- 1.8		.0625
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 2.5		.0108 *
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i>	Gender	Z	- 3.3		.0009 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	30.2	DF=3	.0000 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	33.7	DF=6	.0000 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	23.4	DF=4	.0001 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	1.8	DF=3	.6133
	Current Union Member	Z	- .36		.7189
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 4.1		.0000 *
<b>Sub-Scale:</b> <b>Issue-Centred</b> <b>Climate</b> <i>(<math>\Sigma</math>=Issue-Centred 1&amp;2)</i>	Gender	Z	- .06		.9513
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	6.8	DF=3	.0757
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	15.2	DF=6	.0183 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	9.6	DF=4	.0464 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	2.6	DF=3	.4529
	Current Union Member	Z	- .09		.9843
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 1.7		.0760
<b>Sub-Scale:</b> <b>Inter-Personal</b> <b>Climate</b> <i>(<math>\Sigma</math>=Inter-Personal 1-3)</i>	Gender	Z	- 2.1		.0306 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	21.8	DF=3	.0001 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	38.6	DF=6	.0000 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	2.4	DF=4	.6601
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	2.2	DF=3	.5166
	Current Union Member	Z	- 2.3		.0166 *
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 3.0		.0023 *
<b>Overall Scale:</b> <b>Climate</b>	Gender	Z	- 1.4		.1391
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	11.6	DF=3	.0088 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	19.0	DF=6	.0040 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	4.2	DF=4	.3735
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	3.9	DF=3	.2688
	Current Union Member	Z	- 2.4		.0145 *
	Former TU Experience	Z	- .60		.5421

**C9.2c Correlation of Climatic Sub-Scales**

	CLIMATE	ISSUE-CLIMTE	PSNL-CLIMTE
CLIMATE	1.0000	.7417**	.8736**
ISSUE-CLIMTE	.7417**	1.0000	.3215**
PSNL-CLIMTE	.8736**	.3215**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed



**C9.3: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales: Attitudes to Management (as W8.3).****C9.3a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Management.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Supervisory Control/Institutional Trust (factor 3)	14.2	- 3.8	0	36	77.2	16	.0000 *
Managerial/Work Conflict/Tension (factor 4)	11.3	- 0.7	0	24	34.6	15	.0027 *
Rules Orientation of Management (factor 8)	6.5	+ 0.5	0	12	108.5	7	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Management</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>- 4.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>.0000 *</b>

Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude

**C9.3b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Management)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Control/Trust</i>	Gender	Z - 1.8	.0696
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 18.5 DF=3	.0003 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 12.0 DF=4	.0168 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 13.3 DF=6	.0383 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.1 DF=4	.7138
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=3	.3789
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.5	.1297
	Former TU Experience	Z - 2.3	.0173 *
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Managerial Conflict</i>	Gender	Z - .54	.5877
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 10.2 DF=3	.0165 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=4	.3554
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.7 DF=6	.0975
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 13.0 DF=4	.0112 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=3	.1833
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.5	.1156
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.8	.0672
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Rules Orientation</i>	Gender	Z - 1.6	.1000
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=3	.1108
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.9 DF=4	.1360
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.2 DF=6	.1157
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 8.2 DF=4	.0835
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=3	.1840
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.6	.1021
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.1	.2590
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Management</i>	Gender	Z - 1.8	.0667
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.4 DF=3	.6827
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 11.3 DF=4	.0233 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 16.0 DF=6	.0135 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=3	.0849
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 8.1 DF=3	.0433
	Current Union Member	Z - .51	.6069
	Former TU Experience	Z - .45	.6517

**C9.3c Correlation of Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scales**

	Correlation Coefficients			
	F3CONTROL	F8RULES	F4TENSION	OVERALL
F3CONTROL	1.0000	.0620	.0210	.6974**
F8RULES	.0620	1.0000	.2904*	.4315**
F4TENSION	.0210	.2904*	1.0000	.7156**
OVERALL	.6974**	.4315**	.7156**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**C9.4 Attitudes to Trade Unions: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.4)****C9.4a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Trade Unions.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Sub-Scale 1 <i>Ideological Union Attitudes</i>	25.2	+ 10.2	0	30	76.8	11	.0000 *
Sub-Scale 2 <i>Instrumental Union Attitudes</i>	9.2	+ 3.2	0	12	34.6	8	.0000 *
<b>Overall Attitude to Trade Unions</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>+ 13.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>94.1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>.0000 *</b>

Mean scores for these scales were re-coded for measures of discreteness in chapter 7, appendix 2, and deviations 'above' the mid-point reflect positive attitudes.

**C9.4b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Trade Unions)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Ideological TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - 2.9	.0027 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 23.6 DF=3	.0000 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 12.8 DF=4	.0123 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 13.7 DF=6	.0330 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 12.4 DF=4	.0142 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.5 DF=3	.6752
	Current Union Member	Z - 3.1	.0016 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .48	.6266
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Instrumental TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - 3.8	.0001 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 14.3 DF=3	.0025 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 8.6 DF=4	.0701
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.0 DF=6	.2333
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.2 DF=4	.1829
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .97 DF=3	.8083
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.5	.0099 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .63	.5254
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitude to Trade Unions</i>	Gender	Z - 3.5	.0004 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 20.0 DF=3	.0002 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 12.7 DF=4	.0125 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.4 DF=6	.0759
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 9.8 DF=4	.0463 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=3	.4444
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.9	.0027 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .66	.5049

**C9.4c Correlation of Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scales**

	OVERALL-ATT	IDEOLOG TU	INSTUMT TU
OVERALL-ATT	1.0000	.9664**	.8925**
IDEOLOG TU	.9664**	1.0000	.7465**
INSTUMT TU	.8925**	.7465**	1.0000
* - Signif. LE .05    ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)			

**C9.5 Attitudes to Work Satisfaction: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.5)****C9.5a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee work satisfactions**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Work Attachment	7.4	+ 1.4	0	12	80.5	10	.0000 *
Intrinsic Work Value	9.2	+ 0.2	0	18	75.8	13	.0000 *
Pay Satisfaction	3.5	- 2.5	0	12	47.2	8	.0000 *
Job Satisfaction	5.8	- 0.2	0	12	76.5	8	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>- 1.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>94.5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>.0000 *</b>

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**C9.5b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Work Experiences/Satisfaction)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Work Attachment</i>	Gender	Z - 1.0	.2825
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 22.0 DF=3	.0001 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 2.3 DF=4	.6676
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.2 DF=6	.2185
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.0 DF=4	.1356
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 9.0 DF=3	.0292 *
	Current Union Member	Z - .94	.3454
	Former TU Experience	Z - .99	.3195
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Intrinsic Work Value</i>	Gender	Z - 1.1	.2320
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 22.9 DF=3	.0000 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=3	.7444
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.4 DF=6	.0745
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 18.3 DF=4	.0011 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 9.4 DF=3	.0235 *
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.2	.0217 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.3	.1695
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Pay Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - 1.4	.1432
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 18.0 DF=3	.0004 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.0 DF=4	.1311
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.3 DF=6	.1102
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.7 DF=4	.5937
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.5 DF=3	.1352
	Current Union Member	Z - .17	.8609
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.6	.1073
<b>Sub-Scale 4</b> <i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .53	.5921
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 16.4 DF=3	.0009 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 24.8 DF=4	.0001 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 23.2 DF=6	.0007 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 8.8 DF=4	.0655
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.1 DF=3	.7671
	Current Union Member	Z - .93	.3513
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.9	.0515

Cont'd

<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Work Experience &amp; Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z	- 1.1		.2614
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	13.6	DF=3	.0034 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup>	10.7	DF=3	.0129 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	18.0	DF=6	.0060 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	10.1	DF=4	.0579
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	5.0	DF=3	.1707
	Current Union Member	Z	- .23		.9175
	Former TU Experience	Z	- .02		.9807

### **C9.5c Correlation of Employee Work Experience/Satisfaction**

Correlation Coefficients					
	ALL-ATTD	WORK ATCH	INTRIC WRK	PAY SAT	JOB SAT
ALL-ATTD	1.0000	.8888**	.9252**	.6002**	.3482**
WORK ATCH	.8888**	1.0000	.8637**	.4656**	.0795
INTRIC WRK	.9252**	.8637**	1.0000	.4892**	.2239
PAY SAT	.6002**	.4656**	.4892**	1.0000	-.0643
JOB SAT	.3482**	.0795	.2239	-.0643	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**C9.6 Attitudes to the Company: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.6).****C9.6a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to the Company**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Commitment	8.5	+ 0.5	0	18	53.3	10	.0000 *
Company Values	7.3	+ 1.3	0	12	68.3	9	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Company</b>	15.7	+ 0.7	0	30	77.9	10	.0000 *

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**C9.6b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Company)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Organisational Commitment</i>	Gender	Z - .04	.9676
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.5 DF=3	.3118
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=4	.2245
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 6.7 DF=6	.3408
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.8 DF=4	.1457
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 8.0 DF=3	.0440 *
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.3	.1890
	Former TU Experience	Z - .01	.9855
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Company Values</i>	Gender	Z - .52	.6000
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 13.3 DF=3	.0039 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.2 DF=4	.1798
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 17.5 DF=5	.0036 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=4	.6135
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=3	.1828
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.4	.0151 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.7	.0790
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Company</i>	Gender	Z - .85	.3936
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 14.1 DF=3	.0027 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 1.6 DF=4	.7940
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.2 DF=5	.8135
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.1 DF=4	.3871
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.7 DF=3	.1934
	Current Union Member	Z - .82	.4093
	Former TU Experience	Z - .47	.6315

**C9.6c Correlation of Attitudes to Company**

	ATT COMPNY	COMITMENT	CO VALUES
ATT COMPNY	1.0000	.7286**	.3178*
COMITMENT	.7286**	1.0000	-.4179**
CO VALUES	.3178*	-.4179**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**C9.7: Descriptive Tabulation of Key Relationship Influences**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Summary Description of Influence</b>
<b>External Environment</b>	
<i>Anti-union state policy &amp; Legislation</i>	No evidence of use of anti-union laws, and <u>low direct influence</u> on relationship, although indirect influence on management style and climate below.
<i>Technology</i>	<u>High influence</u> on labour supply, and high 'potential' to control effort, although differs across occupations.
<i>Product market situation</i>	<u>High influence</u> , but not because of easy of entry for new firms, but because customers are also competitors given intermediary products manufactured by Chem Co.
<i>Labour market situation</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> on relationship, with few problems recruiting employees, although resort to use of family/friends network among existing employees adds internal peer pressures for conformity.
<b>Structural Factors</b>	
<i>Size</i>	<u>Medium to high influence</u> , but in direction of increasing formalisation and bureaucratisation, rather than informal features often associated with SMEs.
<i>Ownership</i>	No foreign ownership and influence from board of directors (many shareholders) to Operations Director. <u>Very low</u> direct influence.
<b>Personnel Factors</b>	
<i>Management Style</i>	<u>Very high influence</u> , and similarities evident across different geographical sites, particularly preferences of one dominant actor - Operations Director.
<i>Voice Mechanisms</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> , although wide range of voice mechanisms, these are often circumvented by management in practice (i.e. works committee).
<i>Voice Utility</i>	<u>Low influence</u> on relationship directly, but <u>medium to high influence on climate</u> , given negative perceptions of voice utility and links to issue-handling.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	
<i>Issue-Centred Climate</i>	<u>Medium to high influence</u> on relationship, but shaped to large extent by influence from management style
<i>Inter-Personal Climate</i>	<u>Low to Medium influence</u> on relationship, but not characteristic of SME environment (i.e. friendly relations) because of increasing bureaucratisation (from technology & nature of work).
<b>Employee Attitudes</b>	
<i>Attitudes to Management</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> , with negative attitudes by employees (-4.0)
<i>Attitudes to Unions</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> , although positive attitudes dampened by management style, which sought to 'substitute' than 'suppress' triggers to unionisation.
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> on relationship, with small negative attitude (-1.1), but transmitted through climate; minimal inter-personal relations and frustrated issue-handling of work concerns.
<i>Orientations to Company</i>	<u>Low influence</u> on relationship, with small positive attitude about Chem Co. generally among employees

**APPENDIX M10**

**Data Results for Merchant Co: Chapter 10.**



**Main Biographic Features:  
By Occupation (% and n)**

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Supervisor y</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi- Skilled</i>	<i>Un- Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Gender						
Men	7.7 (3)	23.1 (9)	5.1 (2)	15.4 (6)	5.1 (2)	56% (22)
Women		38.5 (15)			5.1 (2)	44% (17)
Union Membership						
Current member			2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	10% (4)
Previous member	2.6 (1)	19.4 (7)		5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	30% (11)
Never been member	5.1 (2)	43.1 (17)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	5.1 (2)	60% (24)
Main Benefits Reported						
Sick pay	7.7 (3)	61.5 (24)	5.1 (2)	15.4 (6)	10.3 (4)	100% (39)
Holiday pay	7.7 (3)	61.5 (24)	5.1 (2)	15.4 (6)	10.3 (4)	100% (39)
Company pension	7.7 (3)	46.1 (18)	5.1 (2)		5.1 (2)	64% (25)
Profit Share Scheme		20.5 (8)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)		25% (10)
Free Parking	7.7 (3)	46.1 (18)	2.6 (1)	15.4 (6)	10.3 (4)	82% (32)
Company discounts	7.7 (3)	41.0 (16)	5.6 (2)	15.4 (6)	10.3 (4)	80% (31)
Company car	7.7 (3)	10.3 (4)				18% (7)
Attendance Patterns						
Standard working day	5.1 (2)	59.0 (22)	5.6 (2)	12.8 (5)	7.7 (3)	87% (34)
Shift working	2.6 (1)			2.6 (1)		5.6% (2)
Part-Time working		2.6 (1)			2.6 (1)	5.6% (2)
Temporary Employee		2.6 (1)				2.6% (1)
Age						
16-20						0% (0)
21-30	2.6 (1)	30.6 (12)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	44% (17)
31-40		20.5 (8)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	30.6% (12)
41-50	5.1 (2)	10.3 (4)		5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	23% (9)
51 +					2.6 (1)	2.6% (1)
Ethnic Origin:						
White British	7.7 (3)	48.7 (19)	2.6 (1)	12.8 (5)	10.3 (4)	82% (32)
Asian		10.3 (4)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)		15.4% (6)
Other		2.6 (1)				2.6 (1)
Marital Status:						
Married	7.7 (3)	25.6 (10)		5.1 (2)	5.1 (2)	43.6% (17)
Live with Partner		5.1 (2)		7.7 (3)		12.8% (5)
Single		23.1 (9)	5.1 (2)		5.1 (2)	33.3% (13)
Divorced		7.7 (3)		2.6 (1)		10.3% (4)
Highest Educational Level						
No Qualifications		2.6 (1)			5.1 (2)	7.7% (3)
CSE/O'Level	2.6 (1)	12.8 (5)		7.7 (3)	5.1 (2)	28.2% (11)
GCSE/A'Level	2.6 (1)	17.9 (7)		5.1 (2)		25.6% (10)
NVQ		2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)			5.1% (2)
Degree	2.6 (1)	17.9 (7)				20.5% (8)
Apprenticeship		5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)		10.3% (4)
Annual Gross Pay:						
< 5 K					2.6 (1)	2.6% (1)
5 to 8 K		12.8 (5)		5.1 (2)	5.1 (2)	23% (9)
8 to 12 K		33.3 (13)	2.6 (1)	7.7 (3)	2.6 (1)	46% (18)
12 to 16 K	2.6 (1)	12.8 (5)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)		20.5% (8)
16 to 20 K	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)				5.1% (2)
20K +	2.6 (1)					2.6% (1)

Cont'd.

<i>Main Features</i>	<i>Supervisor y</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un- Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
Length of Service:						
< 1 year	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)				5.1% (2)
1-3 years	2.6 (1)	28.2 (11)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	41% (16)
4-7 years		15.4 (6)	2.6 (1)	7.7 (3)	5.1 (2)	30.6% (12)
8-10 years		10.3 (4)		2.6 (1)		12.8% (5)
10 years +	2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)		2.6 (1)		10.3 (4)
Working Week:						
< 30 hours					2.6 (1)	2.6% (1)
31-35 hours		5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)			7.7% (3)
36-40 hours	7.7 (3)	48.7 (19)	2.6 (1)	12.8 (5)	2.6 (1)	74.4% (29)
40 hours +		7.7 (3)		2.6 (1)	5.1 (2)	15.3% (6)
Overtime Working:						
At least weekly	7.7 (3)	15.4 (6)		2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	28.2% (11)
At least monthly		17.9 (7)	2.6 (1)	7.7 (3)	7.7 (3)	36% (14)
Few times a year		17.9 (7)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)		23% (9)
Never		10.3 (4)		2.6 (1)		12.8% (5)
Are you paid for O/T?						
Yes		10.3 (4)	5.1 (2)	12.8 (5)	7.7 (3)	36% (14)
No	7.7 (3)	51.2 (20)		2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	64% (25)
Reason for overtime:						
Increase wages		5.1 (2)	5.1 (2)	7.7 (3)	10.3 (4)	28.2% (11)
Help company out	5.1 (2)	28.2 (11)		2.6 (1)		36% (14)
Help colleagues out	2.6 (1)	12.8 (5)		5.1 (2)		20.5% (8)
Non of above		15.4 (6)				15.4% (6)
<b>n</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>% of total sample</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>61.5%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Mean Score & Standard Deviation ( )  
By Occupation**

To minimise 'agreement bias' some questions were posed negatively and some positively. A Likert-type scale was used, where 1 = definitely agree (or very often) and 7 definitely disagree (or never). For attitudinal responses to be measured in a consistent manner (i.e. the same 'direction'), negatively posed questions were re-coded (R), which included questions 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38 and 49. These are paraphrased for simplicity. During analysis some responses were scaled-down from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison purposes, and to compute latent variable scales, for which the procedure was previously explained in appendix W8 (for Water Co.).

**Trade Union Orientated Questions**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
21. Do you agree TU a good thing for workers	2.0 (1.0)	3.1 (1.0)	1.5 (.7)	1.3 (.5)	2.0 (1.8)	2.5 (1.6)
22. Do you agree pay & conditions would be improved if TU present?	4.3 (1.5)	3.2 (1.6)	1.5 (.7)	3.0 (2.0)	2.7 (1.5)	3.1 (1.6)
23. A TU would Create restrictive/unnecessary rules in my job? (R)	6.0 (1.0)	4.2 (1.3)	1.5 (.7)	3.6 (2.0)	4.0 (0)	4.1 (1.6)
24. Do you agree there are real benefits in having all employee views represented?	1.6 (.5)	2.0 (1.1)	1.0 (0)	1.1 (.4)	1.5 (.5)	1.7 (.9)
25. A TU would make my job more secure?	5.6 (.5)	3.6 (1.4)	2.5 (2.1)	3.0 (2.0)	2.7 (1.5)	3.5 (1.6)
26. a) TU are bunch of political lefties (R)	5.0 (2.0)	3.2 (1.4)	2.5 (2.1)	3.6 (.8)	4.6 (1.1)	3.5 (1.4)
b) TU are trouble-makers (R)	3.0 (2.6)	3.6 (1.8)	1.5 (.7)	3.6 (.8)	2.6 (1.1)	3.3 (1.7)
c) TU are a necessary evil (R)	4.0 (2.0)	3.0 (1.1)	1.5 (.7)	4.3 (.8)	4.0 (2.0)	3.3 (1.3)
d) TU can be beneficial to employees	2.3 (.5)	2.0 (1.9)	1.0 (0)	1.1 (.4)	1.7 (1.5)	1.8 (.8)
e) TU can be beneficial to management	2.6 (.5)	3.6 (1.8)	3.0 (1.4)	5.5 (1.6)	5.3 (1.1)	4.0 (1.7)
f) TU provide necessary protection	3.3 (1.5)	3.0 (1.6)	1.0 (0)	1.8 (1.1)	2.3 (.5)	2.6 (1.6)
g) On the whole, unions are sensible	2.6 (.5)	3.0 (1.6)	2.5 (2.1)	2.5 (1.1)	2.2 (.9)	2.7 (1.4)

*Cont'd*

**Company and Management Orientated Questions**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
27. The values of the company are similar to my own personal beliefs?	4.3 (1.1)	4.3 (1.6)	3.5 (2.1)	3.8 (1.4)	4.2 (1.5)	4.2 (1.5)
28. I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I question management decisions (R)	3.6 (1.5)	3.7 (1.6)	5.0 (1.4)	4.5 (2.1)	4.2 (1.7)	4.0 (1.6)
29. I have good career/promotion prospects?	5.0 (1.4)	4.8 (1.6)	5.0 (1.4)	6.0 (.6)	5.5 (1.2)	5.1 (1.4)
30. There is a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors (R)	4.6 (2.0)	3.6 (1.2)	4.0 (0)	5.0 (1.5)	4.0 (0)	3.9 (1.3)
31. I would leave this company if offered a similar job on same pay/conditions (R)	4.3 (3.0)	3.9 (1.8)	4.5 (2.1)	3.6 (1.8)	5.7 (1.2)	4.1 (1.8)
32. I get on very well with management?	2.6 (1.1)	2.5 (1.0)	2.0 (0)	2.3 (.8)	2.5 (1.0)	2.4 (.9)
33. I am willing to put in extra effort to help my company be successful?	2.6 (.5)	3.0 (1.2)	2.5 (.7)	3.1 (.9)	4.0 (.8)	3.1 (1.1)
34. Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions?	5.0 (1.0)	5.5 (1.3)	6.0 (1.0)	5.5 (1.3)	5.5 (1.0)	5.5 (1.2)
35. I am NOT very loyal to my company? (R)	5.3 (1.5)	4.7 (1.6)	4.5 (2.1)	5.0 (1.4)	3.7 (2.0)	4.6 (1.6)
36. I believe management that the company's most valued asset is the people here?	3.6 (2.5)	4.8 (1.9)	6.5 (.7)	6.1 (.4)	5.7 (.5)	5.1 (1.7)
37. You do have to be a strong minded individual to standup to management (R)	6.3 (1.1)	4.6 (1.7)	2.5 (2.1)	3.6 (1.3)	4.2 (1.2)	4.5 (1.7)
38. I do NOT mix/socialise with colleagues (R)	3.6 (1.5)	4.8 (1.9)	6.5 (.7)	5.3 (1.3)	3.5 (1.9)	4.7 (1.8)

*Cont'd*

**Working Practices and Employee Contribution**

	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
39. Has your supervisor had more or less control over (1 = more, 7 = less)						
a) Pace of Output	3.5 (.7)	3.6 (1.1)	4.0 (0)	4.0 (1.1)	3.0 (1.4)	3.6 (1.4)
b) Product/Service Quality	3.5 (.7)	3.8 (.9)	4.0 (0)	4.5 (1.0)	3.0 (1.4)	3.8 (.9)
c) Discipline of Employees	4.0 (0)	3.1 (1.2)	2.0 (0)	2.8 (1.5)	2.2 (1.9)	3.0 (1.2)
d) Allocation of Work	4.0 (0)	3.3 (1.3)	4.0 (0)	3.6 (1.6)	2.0 (1.0)	3.3 (1.3)
e) How the Work is to be done	3.0 (1.4)	3.9 (1.4)	4.0 (0)	4.8 (1.7)	2.3 (1.5)	3.8 (1.5)
f) Use of New Technology	4.0 (0)	3.7 (1.1)	2.5 (.7)	5.2 (.9)	3.5 (.7)	3.9 (1.2)
g) Communicating to Employees	3.5 (.7)	4.6 (1.4)	2.0 (0)	5.2 (.9)	4.0 (1.6)	4.4 (1.5)
40. In your job do you do the following often: (1 = very often, 7 never)						
a) Tell supervisors you do your job well	5.0 (2.0)	5.6 (1.2)	5.0 (1.4)	5.6 (1.1)	4.0 (0)	5.3 (1.2)
b) Work hard for the company	3.6 (2.8)	2.3 (1.3)	2.0 (0)	3.8 (1.3)	2.6 (1.1)	2.6 (1.4)
c) Suggest improvements to your job	4.0 (2.6)	4.6 (1.6)	3.5 (.7)	5.6 (1.5)	4.6 (1.1)	4.6 (1.6)

*Cont'd*

**Perceptions of Satisfaction and Voice**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Semi-Skilled</i>	<i>Un-Skilled</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
41. Do you speak to management often about your wages and conditions?	6.0 (1.7)	5.9 (1.0)	5.0 (1.4)	6.1 (1.1)	6.7 (.5)	6.0 (1.1)
42. When decisions are taken which affect you, are your views taken into account by management	5.0 (2.0)	5.5 (1.3)	6.5 (.7)	6.5 (.8)	6.7 (.5)	5.8 (1.3)
43. Do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?	1.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.4)	2.5 (.7)	4.4 (1.1)	4.7 (.9)	3.7 (1.4)
44. If you work hard are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	4.3 (2.5)	5.3 (1.4)	5.0 (1.4)	5.2 (1.3)	6.0 (1.4)	5.2 (1.5)
45. Do management enforce company rules	3.0 (1.0)	3.7 (1.7)	4.0 (0)	5.0 (1.0)	3.2 (1.5)	3.9 (1.4)
46. Do management communicate changes often	2.6 (1.1)	4.4 (1.3)	5.0 (1.4)	5.4 (.8)	4.2 (.9)	4.4 (1.3)
47. Is your job secure for the next five years	5.0 (2.0)	4.9 (1.5)	4.5 (2.1)	4.3 (1.2)	4.7 (1.8)	4.8 (1.5)
48. Have you more or less freedom to carry out your work tasks in last 1 or 2 years	3.3 (.5)	3.5 (1.3)	3.0 (1.4)	2.8 (.9)	4.0 (0)	3.4 (1.2)
49. I find my job repetitive/routine (R)	2.0 (1.0)	3.3 (1.5)	3.0 (0)	4.0 (1.2)	5.3 (1.1)	3.4 (1.5)
50. Are pay/conditions better or worse than other companies you know of	5.0 (1.0)	5.0 (.9)	5.0 (1.4)	5.5 (1.0)	5.2 (.9)	5.1 (.9)
51. Does the pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/expenses	5.0 (2.0)	4.6 (1.4)	4.0 (0)	4.6 (.8)	5.0 (1.1)	4.7 (1.3)
52. Are the majority of employees you work with committed to the company?	5.3 (1.5)	4.2 (1.4)	5.0 (0)	4.8 (.7)	5.0 (1.1)	4.6 (1.3)

### **M10.1 Employee Voice Utility**

Statistical tests were conducted at several separate levels using Mann-Whitney-U, Kruskal-Wallis 1-Way Anova and Chi-Square. Following a summary of mean values and the extent (i.e. deviation from mid-point) of positive and negative attitudes to voice utility, each sub-scale was then examined in relation to the following independent variables: gender, age, occupation, length of service, salary. In addition, current union membership and former union experience was also examined, which was not available at Water Co. Correlation coefficients were finally computed with respect to each sub-scale as an indication of sub-scale relationships.

It should be noted that some scales used were more statistically robust than others, particularly those which were derived from the factor analysis previously explained in appendix 3. Other latent variables (or variable sub-scales) that were created were subject to various tests for internal consistency and validity. This was explained in appendix W8.1, and the results of this procedure are used for the remaining organisations studied.

#### **Questionnaire statements used to make up Sub-Scales for Employee Voice Utility** (as explained in appendix W8.1)

#### **M10.1a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee voice utility**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Voice 1 <i>Dialogue</i>	13.0	+ 4.0	0	18	6.6	11	.8254
Voice 2 <i>Involvement</i> <sup>x</sup>	1.5	- 1.5	0	6	7.0	4	.1345
Voice 3 <i>View Considered</i> <sup>x</sup>	1.2	- 1.8	0	6	18.5	4	.0000 *
Voice 4 <i>Communications</i> <sup>x</sup>	2.5	- 0.5	0	6	23.8	6	.0005 *
<b>Overall Scale: Voice Utility</b>	18.2	+ 0.2	0	36	20.6	14	.1105

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**M10.1b: Tests for Independent statistical significance: Employee Voice Utility**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Voice 1 (Factor 5: Dialogue with Management)	Gender	Z - 1.1	.2386
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=2	.2212
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.8 DF=4	.5790
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.3 DF=4	.1206
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=3	.4584
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.3	.1638
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.7	.0840
Voice 2 (Q34 Involvement)	Gender	Z - .78	.4302
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.3 DF=3	.7236
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=4	.8713
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.7 DF=4	.5969
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> .53 DF=5	.9909
	Current Union Member	Z - .44	.6581
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.0	.2874
Voice 3 (Q42 Employee views taken into account)	Gender	Z - .15	.8806
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.3 DF=3	.4941
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=4	.2253
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.3 DF=4	.5081
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=5	.3261
	Current Union Member	Z - .12	.8992
	Former TU Experience	Z - .47	.6346
Voice 4 (Q46: Communication)	Gender	Z - 1.3	.1674
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> .32 DF=2	.8504
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.4 DF=6	.1150
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 8.9 DF=4	.0632
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=5	.5944
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.1	.2394
	Former TU Experience	Z - .97	.3286
Overall Voice Utility (Σ=Voice1-4)	Gender	Z - 1.0	.3071
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.3 DF=2	.5213
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=4	.3580
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.1 DF=4	.1905
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=4	.7556
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.0	.0449 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.0	.3034

**M10.1c: Correlation Analysis of Voice Utility Sub-Scales**

	ALLVOICE	VOICE1(F5)	VOICE2(Q34)	VOICE3(Q42)	VOICE4(Q46)
ALLVOICE	1.0000	.7307**	.5736**	.2520	.2987
VOICE1(F5)	.7307**	1.0000	.1902	-.2647	-.2194
VOICE2(Q34)	.5736**	.1902	1.0000	.1586	.1205
VOICE3(Q42)	.2520	-.2647	.1586	1.0000	.2241
VOICE4(Q46)	.2987	-.2194	.1205	.2241	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**M10.2: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales of Climate**  
(as explained in appendix W8.2)

**M10.2a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for:  
Issue-Centred & Inter-Personal Climate**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Positive)	Max Score (Negative)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up to Mgmt</i> <sup>x</sup>	2.5	+ 0.5	0	6	15.0	6	.0199 *
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-maker</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.0	0	0	6	10.2	6	.1140
Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.6	+ 2.4	0	12	35.0	8	.0000 *
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisor Tension</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.2	- 0.2	0	6	28.3	6	.0001 *
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i> <sup>x</sup>	3.7	- 0.7	0	6	9.1	6	.1674
<b>Sub-Scale: Issue-Centred Climate (Σ=Issue-Centred 1&amp;2)</b>	5.5	+ 0.5	0	12	8.8	6	.0045 *
<b>Sub-Scale: Inter-Personal Climate (Σ=Inter-Personal 1-3)</b>	10.5	+ 1.5	0	24	9.3	10	.5026
<b>Overall Climate</b>	16.0	+ 2.0	0	36	10.7	12	.5524

<sup>x</sup> Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'below' mean reflect positive attitude

**M10.2b Tests for Independent statistical significance: Issue-C & Inter-P Climate**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
Issue-Centred 1 <i>Stand-up to Mgmt</i>	Gender	Z - .51	.6067
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.9 DF=3	.2684
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> .76 DF=4	.9428
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=4	.7845
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 7.9 DF=5	.1603
	Current Union Member	Z - .40	.6892
	Former TU Experience	Z - .25	.7996
Issue-Centred 2 <i>Trouble-Maker</i>	Gender	Z - .73	.4609
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.0 DF=3	.7961
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=4	.7719
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> .28 DF=4	.9909
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 7.5 DF=5	.1848
	Current Union Member	Z - .67	.5016
	Former TU Experience	Z - .31	.7523

*Cont'd*

**M10.2b (Cont'd) Tests for Independent statistical significance: Issue-C & Inter-P Climate**

Inter-Personal 1 <i>Informal Relations</i>	Gender	Z	-.56		.5702
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	3.0	DF=3	.3832
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	3.8	DF=4	.4322
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	3.4	DF=4	.4866
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	5.8	DF=5	.3200
	Current Union Member	Z	-.07		.9414
	Former TU Experience	Z	-.62		.5352
Inter-Personal 2 <i>Supervisory Tension</i>	Gender	Z	-1.7		.0756
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	4.1	DF=3	.2497
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	3.8	DF=4	.4272
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	1.5	DF=4	.8177
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	2.8	DF=5	.7174
	Current Union Member	Z	-.35		.7215
	Former TU Experience	Z	-.95		.3397
Inter-Personal 3 <i>Social Interaction</i>	Gender	Z	-.23		.7955
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	.79	DF=3	.8507
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	5.6	DF=4	.2283
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	5.3	DF=4	.2521
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	8.4	DF=5	.1350
	Current Union Member	Z	-.39		.6922
	Former TU Experience	Z	-.31		.7560
<b>Sub-Scale: Issue-Centred Climate</b> <i>(Σ=Issue-Centred 1&amp;2)</i>	Gender	Z	-.84		.3989
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	1.8	DF=3	.5998
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	3.9	DF=4	.4126
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	4.6	DF=4	.3287
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	7.2	DF=5	.2050
	Current Union Member	Z	-.74		.4535
	Former TU Experience	Z	-.91		.3627
<b>Sub-Scale: Inter-Personal Climate</b> <i>(Σ=Inter-Personal 1-3)</i>	Gender	Z	-2.1		.0291 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	4.8	DF=3	.1827
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	2.8	DF=4	.5861
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	5.8	DF=4	.2131
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	5.4	DF=5	.3680
	Current Union Member	Z	-.83		.4040
	Former TU Experience	Z	-1.3		.1840
<b>Overall Scale: Climate</b>	Gender	Z	-2.2		.0331 *
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	2.6	DF=3	.4538
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	3.8	DF=4	.4232
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	6.5	DF=4	.1644
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	4.2	DF=5	.5136
	Current Union Member	Z	-.28		.7964
	Former TU Experience	Z	-1.1		.2583

**M10.2c Correlation of Climatic Sub-Scales**

	CLIMATE	ISUE-CLIMTE	PSNL-CLIMTE
CLIMATE	1.0000	.7109**	.9185**
ISUE-CLIMTE	.7109**	1.0000	.3749*
PSNL-CLIMTE	.9185**	.3749*	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)



**M10.3: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales: Attitudes to Management (as W8.3).****M10.3a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Management.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Supervisory Control/Institutional Trust (factor 3)	16.3	- 4.7	0	36	10.8	12	.5378
Managerial/Work Conflict/Tension (factor 4)	12.5	+ 0.5	0	24	5.0	8	.7576
Rules Orientation of Management (factor 8)	6.4	+ 0.4	0	12	20.2	8	.0094 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Management</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>- 0.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>.8386</b>

Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude

**M10.3b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Management)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Control/Trust</i>	Gender	Z - .50	.6135
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.0 DF=3	.2609
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.5 DF=4	.1088
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=4	.3360
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.4 DF=3	.2159
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.6 DF=4	.3469
	Current Union Member	Z - .21	.8288
	Former TU Experience	Z - .86	.3861
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Managerial Conflict</i>	Gender	Z - .67	.5023
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> .37 DF=3	.9427
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.8 DF=5	.5640
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.4 DF=4	.0765
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=4	.7621
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.3 DF=5	.6409
	Current Union Member	Z - .70	.4799
	Former TU Experience	Z - .57	.5668
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Rules Orientation</i>	Gender	Z - .05	.9640
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=3	.6234
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 8.8 DF=5	.1142
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 3.9 DF=4	.4176
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 9.2 DF=4	.0551
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.9 DF=5	.4171
	Current Union Member	Z - 0.1	.9942
	Former TU Experience	Z - 0.2	.9856
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Management</i>	Gender	Z - .54	.5875
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=3	.3299
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 8.0 DF=4	.0902
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=4	.4871
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.8 DF=3	.0497 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=4	.2475
	Current Union Member	Z - .24	.8089
	Former TU Experience	Z - .08	.9300

**M10.3c Correlation of Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scales**

	Correlation Coefficients			
	F3CONTROL	F8RULES	F4TENSION	OVERALL
F3CONTROL	1.0000	.4237*	.0961	.8271**
F8RULES	.4237*	1.0000	.3886*	.7239**
F4TENSION	.0961	.3886*	1.0000	.5751**
OVERALL	.8271**	.7239**	.5751**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**M10.4 Attitudes to Trade Unions: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.4)****M10.4a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Trade Unions.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Sub-Scale 1 <i>Ideological Union Attitudes</i>	23.2	+ 8.2	0	30	10.2	16	.8517
Sub-Scale 2 <i>Instrumental Union Attitudes</i>	7.2	+ 1.2	0	12	24.4	10	.0065
<b>Overall Attitude to Trade Unions</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>+ 9.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>.1496</b>

Mean scores for these scales were re-coded for measures of discreteness in chapter 7, appendix 2, and deviations 'above' the mid-point reflect positive attitudes.

**M10.4b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Trade Unions)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Ideological TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - 1.2	.2153
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=3	.3784
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=5	.6001
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.5 DF=4	.1096
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=4	.3325
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.2 DF=4	.5200
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.6	.1080
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.2	.1996
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Instrumental TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - .27	.7848
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=3	.7423
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 2.7 DF=5	.7375
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.8 DF=4	.0969
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=4	.3318
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=5	.3051
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.2	.0262 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .99	.3207
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitude to Trade Unions</i>	Gender	Z - .88	.3750
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.4 DF=3	.4837
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=5	.1608
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.0 DF=4	.1328
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=4	.1532
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.2 DF=4	.5171
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.9	.0599
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.3	.1927

**M10.4c Correlation of Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scales**

	OVERALL-ATT	IDEOLOG TU	INSTUMT TU
OVERALL-ATT	1.0000	.9615**	.8362**
IDEOLOG TU	.9615**	1.0000	.6535**
INSTUMT TU	.8362**	.6535**	1.0000
* - Signif. LE .05    ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)			

**M10.5 Attitudes to Work Satisfaction: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.5)****M10.5a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee work satisfactions**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Work Attachment	7.1	+ 1.1	0	12	9.5	9	.3876
Intrinsic Work Value	9.7	+ 0.7	0	18	18.3	9	.0313 *
Pay Satisfaction	6.4	+ 0.4	0	12	30.4	6	.0000 *
Job Satisfaction	6.0	0	0	12	22.3	8	.0043 *
<b>Overall Scale</b>	<b>29.2</b>	<b>+ 2.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>.2743</b>

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**M10.5b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Work Experiences/Satisfaction)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Work Attachment</i>	Gender	Z - 1.0	.3078
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> .11 DF=2	.9449
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 9.7 DF=5	.0830
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 10.7 DF=4	.0290 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 6.5 DF=4	.1633
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 7.7 DF=5	.1709
	Current Union Member	Z - .02	.9770
	Former TU Experience	Z - .32	.7455
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Intrinsic Work Value</i>	Gender	Z - .47	.6348
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 10.3 DF=2	.0055 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=5	.5966
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 1.8 DF=4	.7619
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.9 DF=4	.7376
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.0 DF=4	.4047
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.6	.1024
	Former TU Experience	Z - 2.0	.0367 *
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Pay Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .73	.4332
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.2 DF=3	.3537
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 2.3 DF=5	.7999
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 1.3 DF=4	.8515
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.7 DF=4	.4444
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=5	.3252
	Current Union Member	Z - .89	.3699
	Former TU Experience	Z - .60	.5439
<b>Sub-Scale 4</b> <i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .11	.9051
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.9 DF=3	.1756
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=5	.3513
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.2 DF=4	.0842
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.8 DF=4	.2992
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.8 DF=5	.4226
	Current Union Member	Z - .84	.3991
	Former TU Experience	Z - .16	.8655

Cont'd

<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Work Experience &amp; Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z	- .96		.3363
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	6.7	DF=3	.0346 *
	Education	X <sup>2</sup>	2.8	DF=5	.7262
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	1.2	DF=4	.8695
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	3.8	DF=4	.4205
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	3.2	DF=4	.5225
	Current Union Member	Z	- 1.6		.0897
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 1.7		.0823

### M10.5c Correlation of Employee Work Experience/Satisfaction

Correlation Coefficients					
	ALL-ATTD	WORK ATCH	INTRIC WRK	PAY SAT	JOB SAT
ALL-ATTD	1.0000	.3026	.7693**	.3317	.3430*
WORK ATCH	.3026	1.0000	-.1295	-.1299	-.5961**
INTRIC WRK	.7693**	-.1295	1.0000	.0940	.3980*
PAY SAT	.3317	-.1299	.0940	1.0000	-.0450
JOB SAT	.3430*	-.5961**	.3980*	-.0450	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**M10.6 Attitudes to the Company: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.6).****M10.6a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to the Company**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Commitment	10.0	+ 1.0	0	18	18.7	10	.0437 *
Company Values	5.3	- 0.7	0	12	18.6	9	.0279 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Company</b>	15.3	+ 0.3	0	30	15.0	11	.1801

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**M10.6b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Company)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Organisational Commitment</i>	Gender	Z - 1.0	.3164
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> .70 DF=2	.8725
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.8 DF=5	.5669
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 3.5 DF=4	.4649
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=4	.3671
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 10.0 DF=4	.0741
	Current Union Member	Z - .14	.8819
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.8	.0715
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Company Values</i>	Gender	Z - 1.5	.1214
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 2.0 DF=3	.5710
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.6 DF=5	.4572
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.5 DF=4	.6334
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=4	.5575
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.2 DF=5	.3822
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.3	.1693
	Former TU Experience	Z - .29	.7675
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Company</i>	Gender	Z - .43	.6657
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.2 DF=3	.7495
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 8.6 DF=5	.1229
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=4	.7798
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=4	.4833
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 10.7 DF=5	.0567
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.1	.2568
	Former TU Experience	Z - .75	.4520

**M10.6c Correlation of Attitudes to Company**

	ATT COMPNY	COMITMENT	CO VALUES
ATT COMPNY	1.0000	.6933**	.4712**
COMITMENT	.6933**	1.0000	-.3090
CO VALUES	.4712**	-.3090	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
" ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**M10.7: Descriptive Tabulation of Key Relationship Influences**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Summary Description of Influence</b>
<b>External Environment</b>	
<i>Anti-union state policy &amp; Legislation</i>	<u>High influence</u> on relationship. Definite advantage to management. No use of anti-union laws, but general anti-union climate which intervened with other factors, such as issue-centred climate and management style internally.
<i>Technology</i>	<u>Medium (indirect) influence</u> rather than direct influence. Technology allowed management to modify employee behaviour rather than replace labour (e.g. JIT system).
<i>Product market situation</i>	<u>Very high influence</u> , with overlap in labour market and climate. Dramatic outcome was large job losses and perceptions of job insecurity in internal labour market.
<i>Labour market situation</i>	<u>High influence</u> for key employee, such as branch managers, less influence for majority of employees. Also high influence on climate, especially perceptions of job insecurity.
<b>Structural Factors</b>	
<i>Size</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . Large size can account for some degree of formalisation - employee awareness and adherence to procedures.
<i>Ownership</i>	<u>Low influence</u> . UK-owned, and no foreign influence. Ownership transmitted through board rather than personnel. Explains in part rank order for HR strategy in chapter 7, but also management style important (see below).
<b>Personnel Factors</b>	
<i>Management Style</i>	<u>High influence</u> Generally, but differences across company. This had a crucial affect on climate and manipulative ways to regulate, especially given weak personnel role.
<i>Voice Mechanisms</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . Moderate range of mechanisms, and these part of manipulative regulation to avoid unions, although not as a form of union substitution.
<i>Voice Utility</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . General satisfaction for mechanisms that did exist, but overall employee voice weak which served managerial objectives.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	
<i>Issue-Centred Climate</i>	<u>Had high intervening influence</u> , especially on management style, wider political climate rather than relationship direct. Some dissatisfaction with issues-handled at line management level, some satisfaction at personnel level (+0.5).
<i>Inter-Personal Climate</i>	<u>Medium intervening influence</u> . Some group cohesion identified as source to satisfy needs and wants (+1.5), which also influenced actor attitudes to work and company, but not toward management.
<b>Employee Attitudes</b>	
<i>Attitudes to Management</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . Employees negative about management (-0.8) which is further indication of management style and manipulative features.
<i>Attitudes to Unions</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . Employees supportive of unions (+9.4), less so instrumentally than ideologically. Management style and prevailing political climate main barriers to unionisation.
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> . Workers supportive of jobs they do (+2.2), which counter-balanced attitudes to management.
<i>Orientations to Company</i>	<u>Low influence</u> . Small identity with company (+0.3), but also shaped by inter-personal climate than clear company values. E.G. attached to company because of social network of the workplace ('good crack with workmates').

**APPENDIX D11**

**Data Results for Delivery Co: Chapter 11.**



Main Biographic Features: By Occupation (% and n)

Main Features	Customer Service	Operations	Supervisory	Sales	Courier	Professional/ Technical	Other	All Employees
Gender								
Men	2.8 (3)	13.9 (15)	12.0 (13)	9.1 (10)	11.2 (12)	2.8 (3)	3.7 (4)	55% (60)
Women	6.5 (7)	12.0 (13)	2.8 (3)	16.8 (18)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	45% (48)
Union Membership								
Current member	1.9 (2)	5.6 (6)	7.6 (8)	0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	2.8% (3)
Previous member	7.6 (8)	20.0 (22)	7.6 (8)	7.6 (8)	4.6 (5)	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)	30% (32)
Never been member				17.4 (19)	9.1 (10)	2.8 (3)	2.8 (3)	67% (73)
Main Benefits Reported								
Sick Pay Provision	9.1 (10)	26.0 (28)	14.8 (16)	26.0 (28)	13.9 (15)	4.6 (5)	5.6 (6)	100% (108)
Holiday Pay	9.1 (10)	26.0 (28)	14.8 (16)	26.0 (28)	13.9 (15)	4.6 (5)	5.6 (6)	100% (108)
Company Pension	5.6 (6)	13.0 (14)	12.0 (13)	17.4 (19)	7.6 (8)	4.6 (5)	2.8 (3)	62% (68)
Medical Assistance	6.5 (7)	13.0 (14)	12.0 (13)	14.8 (16)	4.6 (5)	3.7 (4)	1.9 (2)	56% (61)
Profit Share Scheme		5.6 (6)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	12% (13)
Company Car	0.9 (1)	6.5 (7)	5.6 (6)	13.0 (14)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)		17.4% (19)
Paternity (males only)				5.6 (6)	4.6 (5)	0.9 (1)		23.8% (26) (43% of men)
Attendance Patterns:								
Standard working day	8.3 (9)	17.4 (19)	13.9 (15)	23.8 (26)	11.2 (12)	4.6 (5)	4.6 (5)	84% (91)
Flexible Attendance		3.7 (4)			0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	5.6% (6)
Shift Working	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)			3.7% (4)
Part-Time Working		2.8 (3)						4.6% (5)
Job Share			1.9 (2)					1.9 (2)
Temporary Contract		0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)	4.6 (5)
Age:								
16-20		4.6 (5)		0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)			6.5% (7)
21-30	7.6 (8)	8.3 (9)	3.7 (4)	13.9 (15)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)	39% (42)
31-40		9.1 (10)	6.5 (7)	9.1 (10)	6.5 (7)	3.7 (4)	0.9 (1)	36% (39)
41-50	1.9 (2)	2.8 (3)	4.6 (5)	1.9 (2)	3.7 (4)		0.9 (1)	16% (17)
51 +		0.9 (1)					0.9 (1)	1.9% (2)

Main Features	Customer Service	Operations	Supervisory	Sales	Courier	Professional/ Technical	Other	All Employees
Ethnic Origin:								
White British/European	7.6 (8)	23.0 (25)	9.1 (10)	14.8 (16)	13.0 (14)	4.6 (5)	2.8 (3)	74% (81)
Black British/European	0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)		0.9% (1)
Afro-Caribbean		0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)				1.9 (2)	5.6% (6)
Asian	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	4.6% (5)
Other								2.8% (3)
Marital Status:								
Married	2.8 (3)	14.8 (16)	6.5 (7)	9.1 (10)	9.1 (10)	2.8 (3)	2.8 (3)	48% (52)
Live with Partner	2.8 (3)	3.7 (4)	2.8 (3)	5.6 (6)	1.9 (2)			16.8% (18)
Single	2.8 (3)	6.5 (7)	1.9 (2)	9.1 (10)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	26.6% (29)
Divorced	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	3.7 (4)	1.9 (2)			0.9 (1)	8.3% (9)
Highest Educational Level								
No Qualifications		5.6 (6)	1.9 (2)	3.7 (4)	2.8 (3)			13.9% (15)
CSE/O'Level	3.7 (4)	8.3 (9)	6.5 (7)	11.2 (12)	5.6 (6)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)	40% (43)
GCSE/A'Level	4.6 (5)	4.6 (5)	4.6 (5)	8.3 (9)	2.8 (3)		0.9 (1)	26% (28)
NVQ		0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	3.7% (4)
Degree	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)		7.6% (8)
Higher Degree		0.9 (1)						1.9% (2)
Apprenticeship		0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)	5.6% (6)
Annual Gross Pay:								
< 5 K		4.6 (5)		1.9 (2)				6.5% (7)
5 to 8 K	0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)					0.9 (1)	4.6% (5)
8 to 12 K	2.8 (3)	4.6 (5)	0.9 (1)	3.7 (4)	4.6 (5)			16.8% (18)
12 to 16 K	5.6 (6)	10.4 (11)	5.6 (6)	12.0 (13)	6.5 (7)	1.9 (2)	3.7 (4)	44.5% (49)
16 to 20 K		3.7 (4)	7.6 (8)	4.6 (5)	0.9 (1)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	19.8% (21)
20K +			0.9 (1)	3.7 (4)		2.8 (3)		7.6% (8)

Cont'd.

Main Features	Customer Service	Operations	Supervisory	Sales	Courier	Professional/ Technical	Other	All Employees
Length of Service:								
< 1 year	3.7 (4)	5.6 (6)	0.9 (1)	5.6 (6)	4.6 (5)			20% (22)
1-3 years	3.7 (4)	8.3 (9)	2.8 (3)	7.6 (8)	5.6 (6)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	32% (34)
4-7 years	1.9 (2)	4.6 (5)	5.6 (6)	9.1 (10)	2.8 (3)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)	28% (31)
8-10 years		6.5 (7)	1.9 (2)	3.7 (4)	0.9 (1)		0.9 (1)	13.9% (15)
10 years +		0.9 (1)	3.7 (4)				0.9 (1)	5.6% (6)
Working Week:								
< 30 hours	0.9 (1)	7.6 (8)		0.9 (1)			0.9 (1)	10.4% (11)
31-35 hours	0.9 (1)	7.6 (8)		2.8 (3)	0.9 (1)			12% (13)
36-40 hours	7.6 (8)	11.2 (12)	12.0 (13)	20.0 (22)	2.8 (3)	4.6 (5)	3.7 (4)	62% (67)
40 hours +			1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)	6.5% (7)
Overtime Working:								
At least weekly	0.9 (1)	5.6 (6)	7.6 (8)	5.6 (6)	7.6 (8)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	28% (31)
At least monthly		10.4 (11)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)			16% (17)
Few times a year	5.6 (6)	10.4 (11)	4.6 (5)	10.4 (11)	1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)	36% (39)
Never	2.8 (3)			6.5 (7)	1.9 (2)	2.8 (3)	2.8 (3)	13.9% (15)
Are you always paid for O/T?								
Yes	7.6 (8)	23.0 (25)	9.1 (10)	9.1 (10)	12.0 (13)	0.9 (1)	4.6 (5)	71% (72)
No	0.9 (1)	2.8 (3)	5.6 (6)	13.9 (15)	1.9 (2)	2.8 (3)		27.3% (30)
Reason for overtime:								
Increase wages	2.8 (3)	13.0 (14)	2.8 (3)	3.7 (4)	6.5 (7)		2.8 (3)	32% (34)
Help company out	3.7 (4)	6.5 (7)	8.3 (9)	9.1 (10)	5.6 (6)	2.8 (3)	0.9 (1)	37% (40)
Help colleagues out		5.6 (6)	2.8 (3)	6.5 (7)	1.9 (2)		0.9 (1)	17.4% (19)
Non of above	2.8 (3)	0.9 (1)	0.9 (1)	6.5 (7)		1.9 (2)	0.9 (1)	13.9% (15)
n	10	28	16	28	15	5	6	108
% of total sample	9.2%	25.7%	14.7%	25.7%	13.8%	4.6%	5.5%	100

NB: There were 109 respondents in total; one declined to record occupational group. Some percentages do not always add up to 100 owing to missing responses.

**Mean Score & Standard Deviation in ( ): By Occupation**

To minimise 'agreement bias' some questions were posed negatively and some positively. A Likert-type scale was used, where 1 = definitely agree (or very often) and 7 definitely disagree (or never). For attitudinal responses to be measured in a consistent manner (i.e. the same 'direction'), negatively posed questions were re-coded (R), which included questions 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38 and 49. These are paraphrased for simplicity. During analysis some responses were scaled-down from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison purposes, and to compute latent variable scales, for which the procedure was previously explained in appendix W8 (for Water Co.).

**Trade Union Orientated Questions**

Questions Asked	Customer Service	Operations	Supervisory	Sales	Courier	Professional/ Technical	Other	All Employees
21. Do you agree TU a good thing for workers?	2.4 (1.1)	3.4 (1.4)	3.7 (1.6)	3.0 (1.3)	2.3 (1.1)	3.3 (1.2)	2.5 (1.7)	3.1 (1.4)
22. Do you agree pay & conditions would be improved if TU present?	3.0 (1.8)	3.4 (1.9)	4.2 (1.9)	3.6 (1.8)	3.5 (2.0)	4.6 (1.5)	4.2 (2.0)	3.6 (1.8)
23. A TU would NOT create restrictive/unnecessary rules in my job? (R)	4.3 (1.4)	4.3 (1.5)	5.0 (1.7)	4.6 (1.5)	5.3 (1.3)	5.4 (1.1)	4.3 (2.0)	4.5 (1.5)
24. Do you agree there are real benefits in having all employee views represented?	2.0 (1.1)	2.3 (1.4)	1.8 (1.2)	2.3 (1.3)	1.4 (0.8)	2.7 (1.3)	2.0 (1.6)	2.1 (1.3)
25. A TU would make my job more secure?	3.6 (1.7)	4.1 (1.9)	5.0 (1.6)	3.9 (1.5)	3.7 (1.7)	5.1 (1.8)	4.5 (1.7)	4.0 (1.6)
26. a) TU are bunch of political lefties (R)	3.1 (1.2)	3.3 (1.4)	3.1 (1.4)	4.0 (1.5)	3.7 (1.6)	4.2 (1.9)	3.1 (2.2)	3.5 (1.5)
b) TU are trouble-makers (R)	3.0 (1.5)	3.5 (1.2)	3.6 (1.4)	3.4 (1.6)	3.5 (1.8)	3.7 (1.6)	3.6 (2.2)	3.5 (1.5)
c) TU are a necessary evil (R)	2.6 (1.5)	3.5 (1.2)	3.6 (1.5)	3.5 (1.4)	4.2 (1.6)	3.1 (1.0)	4.0 (2.0)	3.4 (1.4)
d) TU can be beneficial to employees	2.3 (0.7)	2.5 (1.3)	2.7 (1.1)	2.8 (1.3)	2.0 (0.9)	2.8 (1.2)	2.2 (1.0)	2.5 (1.1)
e) TU can be beneficial to management	3.0 (1.2)	2.9 (1.4)	3.1 (1.0)	3.4 (1.4)	2.8 (1.4)	3.2 (1.6)	3.1 (1.8)	3.0 (1.1)
f) TU provide necessary protection	2.8 (1.1)	3.2 (1.7)	3.6 (1.0)	3.3 (1.4)	2.6 (1.3)	3.1 (1.4)	2.2 (1.0)	3.0 (1.3)
g) On the whole, unions are sensible	2.6 (1.1)	3.6 (1.6)	3.6 (1.3)	3.2 (1.3)	3.0 (1.5)	3.2 (1.3)	3.6 (1.9)	3.3 (1.3)

**Cont'd**

**Company and Management Orientated Questions**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Customer Service</i>	<i>Operations</i>	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Sales</i>	<i>Courier</i>	<i>Professional/ Technical</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
27. The values of the company are similar to my own personal beliefs	3.5 (2.2)	3.0 (1.6)	2.5 (.7)	3.1 (1.6)	2.9 (1.5)	1.8 (1.0)	3.0 (1.8)	2.9 (1.5)
28. I would be labelled a trouble-maker if I question management decisions (R)	5.1 (1.8)	3.4 (1.8)	3.1 (2.2)	3.7 (1.8)	4.5 (1.8)	3.4 (2.0)	3.7 (1.6)	3.8 (2.0)
29. I have good career/promotion prospects	2.8 (2.1)	2.7 (1.7)	3.0 (2.2)	2.7 (1.7)	2.4 (1.6)	2.8 (2.2)	2.5 (1.1)	2.7 (1.8)
30. There is a great deal of tension between employees and supervisors (R)	3.0 (2.4)	3.4 (2.0)	2.6 (1.7)	3.6 (2.0)	4.5 (2.1)	2.5 (1.5)	3.7 (2.2)	3.4 (2.1)
31. I would leave this company if offered a similar job on same pay/conditions (R)	4.3 (2.2)	2.4 (1.8)	2.6 (2.1)	2.9 (2.0)	2.8 (2.1)	1.7 (.9)	3.0 (2.6)	2.8 (2.1)
32. I get on very well with management	3.1 (1.9)	2.2 (1.3)	2.0 (.8)	1.9 (.8)	2.7 (1.9)	1.4 (.5)	2.1 (.9)	2.2 (1.3)
33. I am willing to put in extra effort to help my company be successful	2.0 (1.0)	2.5 (1.3)	2.1 (.8)	2.4 (1.4)	2.1 (1.4)	1.4 (.5)	2.5 (1.1)	2.1 (1.1)
34. Employees are very much involved with management in making decisions	4.3 (1.8)	4.5 (1.9)	3.2 (1.3)	3.1 (1.4)	4.0 (2.1)	2.1 (.6)	3.7 (1.6)	3.7 (1.8)
35. I am NOT very loyal to my company (R)	2.9 (2.0)	2.1 (1.7)	1.6 (.7)	2.3 (1.8)	1.9 (1.2)	1.2 (.4)	1.6 (1.0)	2.0 (1.5)
36. I believe management that the company's most valued asset is the people here	3.7 (2.2)	3.1 (1.9)	2.6 (1.6)	2.8 (1.5)	2.9 (1.9)	1.5 (.7)	2.1 (.9)	2.8 (1.7)
37. You do have to be a strong minded individual to standup to management (R)	5.3 (1.6)	4.6 (1.9)	3.7 (1.9)	4.7 (2.0)	5.2 (1.9)	4.7 (1.9)	5.6 (1.3)	4.7 (1.9)
38. I do NOT mix/socialise with work colleagues (R)	4.4 (1.9)	3.4 (2.2)	3.5 (2.3)	3.8 (2.2)	3.6 (2.1)	2.8 (1.5)	5.0 (1.5)	3.5 (2.1)

*Cont'd*

**Working Practices and Employee Contribution**

	<b>Customer Service</b>	<b>Operations</b>	<b>Supervisory</b>	<b>Sales</b>	<b>Courier</b>	<b>Professional/ Technical</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>All Employees</b>
39. Has your supervisor had more or less control over (1 = more, 7 = less)								
a) Pace of Output	3.6 (1.5)	3.0 (1.3)	2.8 (1.1)	3.4 (1.3)	2.5 (1.6)	3.0 (2.0)	2.5 (1.2)	3.1 (1.4)
b) Product/Service Quality	3.9 (1.5)	3.1 (1.3)	2.6 (1.3)	3.3 (1.5)	2.3 (1.4)	2.5 (1.5)	2.8 (1.7)	3.0 (1.5)
c) Discipline of Employees	3.0 (1.0)	3.3 (1.9)	2.8 (1.1)	2.8 (1.3)	2.5 (1.4)	3.0 (1.2)	2.2 (9)	2.9 (1.4)
d) Allocation of Work	2.8 (9)	3.4 (1.8)	2.7 (1.3)	3.0 (1.3)	2.5 (1.5)	3.2 (1.6)	3.1 (1.4)	2.9 (1.4)
e) How the Work is to be done	2.4 (1.2)	3.6 (1.7)	3.0 (1.3)	3.1 (1.5)	2.6 (1.7)	2.7 (1.7)	3.1 (1.5)	2.9 (1.5)
f) Use of New Technology	3.4 (1.6)	3.3 (1.8)	2.7 (1.3)	3.5 (1.5)	2.8 (1.5)	2.1 (1.0)	2.1 (1.3)	3.0 (1.6)
g) Communicating to Employees	2.7 (1.8)	3.6 (1.9)	2.7 (1.5)	2.9 (1.4)	3.1 (1.9)	2.8 (1.8)	3.7 (2.6)	2.9 (1.7)
40. In your job do you do the following often: (1 = very often, 7 never)								
a) Tell supervisors you do your job well	5.0 (1.5)	3.8 (2.0)	3.7 (1.9)	4.6 (1.9)	4.3 (1.7)	3.2 (1.8)	2.8 (1.9)	4.1 (1.9)
b) Work hard for the company	2.0 (1.7)	1.6 (7)	1.6 (8)	2.0 (1.1)	2.0 (1.4)	1.4 (7)	1.5 (7)	1.8 (1.1)
c) Suggest improvements to your job	4.0 (1.7)	2.9 (1.6)	2.4 (1.4)	3.0 (1.0)	2.7 (9)	1.8 (1.2)	2.3 (1.2)	2.8 (1.3)

**Cont'd**

**Perceptions of Satisfaction and Voice**

<i>Questions Asked</i>	<i>Customer Service</i>	<i>Operations</i>	<i>Supervisory</i>	<i>Sales</i>	<i>Courier</i>	<i>Professional/ Technical</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>All Employees</i>
41. Do you speak to management often about your wages and conditions?	5.4 (1.3)	4.5 (1.7)	5.4 (1.7)	4.6 (1.7)	4.5 (1.7)	5.0 (1.4)	4.3 (1.9)	4.7 (1.7)
42. When decisions are taken which affect your pay or work, do you think your views are taken into account by management?	4.4 (1.9)	4.5 (1.6)	4.0 (2.1)	3.9 (1.8)	4.5 (1.8)	3.5 (1.6)	3.8 (1.4)	4.1 (1.7)
43. Do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile and stimulating in your job?	3.0 (1.5)	2.6 (1.5)	2.4 (1.0)	2.9 (1.0)	2.0 (1.0)	1.8 (1.0)	2.2 (1.1)	2.4 (1.3)
44. If you work hard are your efforts rewarded and recognised by management?	4.0 (2.4)	3.6 (1.8)	3.7 (2.2)	3.3 (1.9)	3.8 (1.9)	1.8 (1.0)	3.3 (1.1)	3.5 (1.9)
45. Do management enforce company rules?	2.7 (1.3)	2.9 (1.5)	2.8 (1.0)	3.3 (1.4)	2.3 (1.2)	4.1 (1.1)	2.6 (1.3)	2.8 (1.3)
46. Do management communicate about changes at work often?	2.7 (1.8)	3.3 (1.9)	2.6 (1.6)	2.6 (1.2)	2.9 (1.7)	1.8 (1.0)	2.6 (1.1)	2.8 (1.6)
47. Is your job secure for the next five years?	2.6 (1.4)	2.8 (1.5)	2.2 (1.5)	2.2 (1.8)	2.0 (1.0)	2.0 (1.1)	3.3 (1.3)	2.4 (1.3)
48. Have you more or less freedom to carry out your work tasks in last 1 or 2 years ?	4.4 (1.3)	3.3 (1.4)	2.5 (1.3)	2.8 (1.2)	3.2 (1.7)	2.1 (1.3)	2.7 (1.3)	3.0 (1.4)
49. I find my job repetitive/routine (R)	5.4 (1.5)	4.4 (1.8)	3.6 (1.9)	3.8 (2.0)	4.2 (1.9)	2.0 (1.5)	3.7 (2.1)	4.0 (2.0)
50. Are pay/conditions better or worse than other companies you know of ?	2.4 (0.9)	3.3 (1.6)	3.5 (1.7)	3.2 (1.5)	2.6 (1.5)	3.7 (1.4)	3.3 (1.7)	3.0 (1.5)
51. Does the pay you receive adequately cover/satisfy your needs/expenses?	3.9 (1.3)	4.3 (1.5)	3.8 (1.4)	4.1 (1.6)	4.2 (1.2)	4.1 (1.3)	4.8 (1.1)	4.2 (1.4)
52. Are the majority of employees you work with committed to the company?	3.3 (1.1)	3.7 (1.5)	3.2 (1.3)	3.3 (1.5)	3.4 (1.4)	2.0 (0.8)	3.1 (1.5)	3.3 (1.4)

**D11.3: Statements used to make up Sub-Scales: Attitudes to Management (as W8.3).****D11.3a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Management.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Supervisory Control/Institutional Trust (factor 3)	23.7	+ 5.7	0	36	55.0	26	.0007 *
Managerial/Work Conflict/Tension (factor 4)	12.5	+ 0.5	0	24	34.3	23	.0599
Rules Orientation of Management (factor 8)	5.6	- 0.4	0	12	48.0	10	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Management</b>	<b>41.8</b>	<b>+ 5.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>.1676</b>

Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude

**D11.3b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Management)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Control/Trust</i>	Gender	Z - .81	.4039
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.8 DF=5	.5682
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=6	.4158
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.0 DF=6	.5419
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=4	.2406
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 7.7 DF=5	.1677
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.2	.0267 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .67	.4980
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Managerial Conflict</i>	Gender	Z - .97	.3286
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 10.0 DF=5	.0743
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.8 DF=6	.6983
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 16.8 DF=6	.0100 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=4	.4943
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.2 DF=5	.2841
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.0	.2892
	Former TU Experience	Z - .34	.7298
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Rules Orientation</i>	Gender	Z - .24	.8041
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=5	.2488
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 9.5 DF=6	.1464
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=6	.4444
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.2 DF=4	.5222
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.4 DF=5	.6273
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.6	.1024
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.3	.1763
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Management</i>	Gender	Z - 1.0	.2946
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=5	.3043
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=6	.7232
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=6	.3068
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 4.0 DF=4	.3952
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=5	.4934
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.0	.0383 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .94	.3445



**D11.3c Correlation of Attitudes to Management: Sub-Scales**

	Correlation Coefficients			
	F3CONTROL	F8RULES	F4TENSION	OVERALL
F3CONTROL	1.0000	.3072**	.2609**	.7862**
F8RULES	.3072**	1.0000	.5140**	.6208**
F4TENSION	.2609**	.5140**	1.0000	.7776**
OVERALL	.7862**	.6208**	.7776**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**D11.4 Attitudes to Trade Unions: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.4)****D11.4a Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to Trade Unions.**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Sub-Scale 1 <i>Ideological Union Attitudes</i>	20.5	+ 5.5	0	30	43.8	20	.0016 *
Sub-Scale 2 <i>Instrumental Union Attitudes</i>	6.2	+ 0.2	0	12	51.8	12	.0000 *
<b>Overall Attitude to Trade Unions</b>	26.7	+ 5.7	0	42	39.0	28	.0804

Mean scores for these scales were re-coded for measures of discreteness in chapter 7, appendix 2, and deviations 'above' the mid-point reflect positive attitudes.

**D11.4b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Trade Unions)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Ideological TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - 1.2	.2078
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=5	.4679
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.5 DF=6	.6012
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 6.5 DF=6	.3687
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 9.7 DF=4	.0456 *
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=5	.3051
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.8	.0687
	Former TU Experience	Z - .59	.5502
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Instrumental TU Attitude</i>	Gender	Z - .47	.6351
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.4 DF=5	.2664
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 14.8 DF=6	.0216 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 13.4 DF=6	.0367 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=4	.2073
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.3 DF=5	.3696
	Current Union Member	Z - .04	.9606
	Former TU Experience	Z - .02	.9747
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitude to Trade Unions</i>	Gender	Z - .25	.8022
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.0 DF=5	.6866
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 6.1 DF=6	.4084
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 9.7 DF=6	.1356
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 9.3 DF=4	.0528
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.0 DF=5	.3049
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.4	.2068
	Former TU Experience	Z - 1.2	.9019

**D11.4c Correlation of Attitudes to Trade Unions: Sub-Scales**

	OVERALL-ATT	IDEOLOG TU	INSTUMT TU
OVERALL-ATT	1.0000	.9394**	.8222**
IDEOLOG TU	.9394**	1.0000	.5774**
INSTUMT TU	.8222**	.5774**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05 \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
" ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**D11.5 Attitudes to Work Satisfaction: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.5)****D11.5a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for employee work satisfactions**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Work Attachment	6.5	+ 0.5	0	12	19.4	11	.0534
Intrinsic Work Value	10.4	+ 1.4	0	18	61.2	14	.0000 *
Pay Satisfaction	6.6	+ 0.6	0	12	33.7	11	.0004 *
Job Satisfaction	6.9	+ 0.9	0	12	23.3	11	.0157 *
<b>Overall Scale</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>+ 3.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>.0466 *</b>

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**D11.5b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Work Experiences/Satisfaction)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Work Attachment</i>	Gender	Z - .71	.4741
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=5	.3674
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 5.6 DF=6	.4644
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 14.2 DF=6	.0271 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=4	.7839
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.4 DF=5	.2652
	Current Union Member	Z - .21	.8299
	Former TU Experience	Z - .61	.5374
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Intrinsic Work Value</i>	Gender	Z - 1.7	.0885
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 6.6 DF=5	.2471
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 9.4 DF=6	.1509
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 14.7 DF=6	.0220 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 1.5 DF=4	.8252
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 8.1 DF=5	.1472
	Current Union Member	Z - .27	.7822
	Former TU Experience	Z - .10	.9195
<b>Sub-Scale 3</b> <i>Pay Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .81	.4141
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 4.3 DF=5	.4983
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 1.9 DF=6	.9214
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 2.1 DF=6	.9043
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 8.7 DF=4	.0684
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 3.9 DF=5	.5608
	Current Union Member	Z - 2.3	.0197 *
	Former TU Experience	Z - .97	.3292
<b>Sub-Scale 4</b> <i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z - .45	.6523
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 5.7 DF=5	.3297
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 13.8 DF=6	.0316 *
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 19.5 DF=6	.0033 *
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 3.6 DF=4	.4498
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 8.9 DF=5	.1102
	Current Union Member	Z - 1.3	.1673
	Former TU Experience	Z - .41	.6806

Cont'd

<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Work Experience &amp; Satisfaction</i>	Gender	Z	- 1.6		.1037
	Age	X <sup>2</sup>	4.4	DF=5	.4882
	Education	X <sup>2</sup>	4.6	DF=6	.5850
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup>	9.8	DF=6	.1291
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup>	7.5	DF=4	.1076
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup>	5.5	DF=5	.3485
	Current Union Member	Z	- .74		.7272
	Former TU Experience	Z	- 1.1		.2709

**D11.5c Correlation of Employee Work Experience/Satisfaction**

Correlation Coefficients					
	ALL-ATTD	WORK ATCH	INTRIC WRK	PAY SAT	JOB SAT
ALL-ATTD	1.0000	-.1481	.7904**	.7500**	.4489**
WORK ATCH	-.1481	1.0000	-.3835**	-.1444	-.8360**
INTRIC WRK	.7904**	-.3835**	1.0000	.2965**	.5077**
PAY SAT	.7500**	-.1444	.2965**	1.0000	.1787
JOB SAT	.4489**	-.8360**	.5077**	.1787	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**D11.6 Attitudes to the Company: Statements used to make-up sub-scales (as W8.6).**

**D11.6a: Mean scores and positive/negative deviation for Attitudes to the Company**

Attitude Dimensions	Mean	Deviation from Mid-point (- or +)	Min Score (Negative)	Max Score (Positive)	X <sup>2</sup>	D.F	Sig *
Commitment	8.9	- 0.1	0	18	49.6	11	.0000 *
Company Values	8.8	+ 2.8	0	12	61.6	10	.0000 *
<b>Overall Scale: Attitudes to Company</b>	17.6	+ 2.6	0	30	31.3	15	.0078 *

\* Mean values re-scaled from 1-7 to 0-6 for comparison and consistency. Re-coded so deviations 'above' mean reflect positive attitude.

**D11.6b: Tests for Independent statistical significance (Attitudes to Company)**

Dimension	Independent Variable	Tests for Difference	Sig *
<b>Sub-Scale 1</b> <i>Organisational Commitment</i>	Gender	Z - .10	.9185
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 3.1 DF=5	.6705
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 9.5 DF=6	.1466
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 6.7 DF=6	.2412
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 7.1 DF=4	.1284
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 5.4 DF=5	.3648
	Current Union Member	Z - .74	.4563
	Former TU Experience	Z - .81	.4126
<b>Sub-Scale 2</b> <i>Company Values</i>	Gender	Z - .20	.8365
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.7 DF=5	.8875
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 4.7 DF=6	.5758
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 8.4 DF=6	.2092
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 2.6 DF=4	.6199
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 6.8 DF=5	.2336
	Current Union Member	Z - .86	.3850
	Former TU Experience	Z - .94	.3450
<b>Overall Scale</b> <i>Attitudes to Company</i>	Gender	Z - .10	.9151
	Age	X <sup>2</sup> 1.5 DF=5	.9114
	Education	X <sup>2</sup> 7.6 DF=6	.2646
	Occupation	X <sup>2</sup> 11.1 DF=6	.0837
	Length of Service	X <sup>2</sup> 5.8 DF=4	.2123
	Salary	X <sup>2</sup> 4.6 DF=5	.4549
	Current Union Member	Z - .93	.3497
	Former TU Experience	Z - .88	.3752

**D11.6c Correlation of Attitudes to Company**

	ATT COMPNY	COMITMENT	CO VALUES
ATT COMPNY	1.0000	.8249**	.7624**
COMITMENT	.8249**	1.0000	.2631**
CO VALUES	.7624**	.2631**	1.0000

\* - Signif. LE .05    \*\* - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)  
 " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

**D11.7: Descriptive Tabulation of Key Relationship Influences**

Dimensions	Summary Description of Influence
<b>External Environment</b>	
<i>Anti-union state policy &amp; Legislation</i>	<u>High (indirect) influence.</u> This tended to influence not the relationship directly, but other aspects such as management style, climate and non-union voice. These then combined to influence key relationship dimensions (HR strategy, formalisation, trust) which point to the deliberate sophisticated union substitution approach.
<i>Technology</i>	<u>High (indirect) influence,</u> which differed by location and occupation. But the impact of technology and its uses was also shaped by product/market pressures for customer quality and speed of delivery.
<i>Product market situation</i>	<u>High (direct and indirect) influence,</u> although not revealed by ease of market entry. Instead, market pressures for quality service which intensified effort and shaped prevailing attitudes to unions (see below)
<i>Labour market situation</i>	<u>Medium influence.</u> Employees were viewed as assets, but important tensions and divisions existed between core-periphery labour markets. Dependency on informal contexts also important, as this was much more a strategy than an informal approach.
<b>Structural Factors</b>	
<i>Size</i>	<u>Low influence overall,</u> although size of work unit tended to support the prevailing climate and managerial style. Thus an important intervening influence with other factors.
<i>Ownership</i>	<u>Medium (indirect) influence,</u> as nationality of ownership was very diversified, but did affect employees' perceptual and subjective attitudes which could shape action and behaviour.
<b>Personnel Factors</b>	
<i>Management Style</i>	<u>High influence,</u> but HR strategy more an influence on style than the other way round, with a highly co-ordinated approach across the organisation. Management style also influenced and was influenced by the climate.
<i>Voice Mechanisms</i>	<u>Very high influence,</u> with wide and far-reaching mechanisms. One problem is these also overlapped with style and strategy, and direction of influence is more complex. Voice shaped key relationship dimensions; trust, regulation and formalisation.
<i>Voice Utility</i>	<u>Low influence,</u> as many employees expected to be involved to some extent, although more critical attitudes about participation, which is fundamentally different from communications or voice.
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	
<i>Issue-Centred Climate</i>	<u>Medium influence,</u> with some negative attitudes shaping action - such as couriers taking form of resistance
<i>Inter-Personal Climate</i>	<u>Very High (indirect) influence.</u> Significance of climate here is it can be used as a prism to identify other key influences, such as voice mechanisms, management style and strategy which when combined shape the 'atmosphere' in very important ways, affecting attitudes to union, management and co-workers.

Cont'd

<b>Employee Attitudes</b>	
<i>Attitudes to Management</i>	<u>High influence</u> , but again the problem is this is more prevalent through climatic influence and therefore may well be indirect.
<i>Attitudes to Unions</i>	<u>Low influence directly</u> , but again the climate, managerial style and voice mechanisms may be significant factors which determine this attitude to have a low propensity to shape action and behaviour.
<i>Work Satisfaction</i>	<u>Low influence</u> . Other factors overshadow attachment to work which give a more positive picture - such as perceptions of management, voice and a climate by promoting 'fun-at' work'
<i>Orientations to Company</i>	<u>Medium influence</u> , as employees felt proud to work for Delivery Co. However there also appeared to be less commitment to the company <i>per se</i> than for fellow works, teams, and the concept of 'fun-at-work'.

## **APPENDIX 12**

### **Integration of Results: Chapter 12**



**Table 12.A Summary Tabulation of Influences on Dimension of Relationship: 'Regulation'**

Factor/Processes of Modification	Rank Order of Each Organisation & Descriptive Explanation of Patterns of Influence			
	Water Co. 4	Chem Co. 2	Merchant Co. 3	Delivery Co. 1
Government Policy Legislation	Indirect Influence, score =2 Indirect Influence, Score =1 Important influence on management style, which in turn shaped issue-centred climate as an influence on the relationship Chapter 8: pp 196-199	Low Influence, score =7 Low Influence, score =7 Important influence on management style. Although important, this was in opposite direction to that at Water Co. Chapter 9: pp 238-40	Direct Influence, score =1 Direct Influence, score =3 Actively used anti-union policies to de-recognise unions (although not at site studied). This impacted on climate and employee attitudes. Chapter 10: pp 279-80; 285; 304-05	Indirect Influence, score =3 Marginal Indirect, score =6 Action in relation to future government changes, and in particular provision of non-union voice mechanisms. Chapter 11: pp 311-12; 331; 340
Technology	Low Direct Influence, but differed internally by occupation. Thus regulation shaped the nature of work because of technology used in key areas of business. Chapter 8: pp 199-202	Obvious use of technology because of chemical manufacture. Influence is also indirect as a process to regulate. Again, shaped nature of work with occupational diffusion. Chapter 9: pp 243-44	Relatively rudimentary uses of technology, but again important influence found on the nature of work for different occupations, especially use of JIT system to regulate effort. Chapter 10: pp 281-83	Very High Direct impact on regulation of effort and employee control, but technology itself influenced by market pressures. Chapter 11: pp 312-14; 317
Product Markets	High Influence on Management Style and Nature of Work, which then shaped unilateral regulatory processes Chapter 8: pp 203-04; 214-216	High Influence, but for different reasons, i.e. competitors were also (intermediary) customers. Chapter 9: pp 244-47	Direct high influence on regulation, with evidence of redundancies denoting market contraction. This shaped climate. Chapter 10: pp 284-86	Direct impact on regulation given emphasis on customer quality, and also shaped flavour of climate. Chapter 11: pp 317-18; 336-37

Cont'd

**NB** pp references are a simplified summary description to the key influences from each respective case study chapter. This also demonstrates that factors influenced more than one dimension of the relationship and subsequent patterns of modification are considered as multi-causal

**Table 12.A Cont'd (Regulation)**

	<b>Water Co.</b>	<b>Chem Co.</b>	<b>Merchant Co.</b>	<b>Delivery Co.</b>
<b>Labour Markets</b>	Influenced the nature of work, but also strong relationship with Management Style and Product Market	Few links between product and labour markets, and peer group pressure to regulate - recruiting family etc.	High regulatory impact, with difficulty in retaining some key employees. As such, management style shaped different regulatory approaches.	Use of sophisticated recruitment methods, but ultimately regulated by peer group similar to Chem Co.
<b>Size</b>	Chapter 8: pp 202-05 Influenced management style. Also group identity based on occupation, which then influenced climate as a route to regulation	Chapter 9: pp 247-50 Size probably facilitated dominant actor role and management style as regulatory tool.	Chapter 10: pp 286-87 Little of impact on regulation, although some marginal relationship because of large organisational size.	Chapter 11: pp 318-20 Size differed from others, but no real influence on regulation itself. Size of 'work unit' a more important influence on climate.
<b>Ownership</b>	Chapter 8: pp 206-07 No obvious regulatory influence, but indirectly from sub-text of research itself.	Chapter 9: pp 239-41; 251-53 N/A	Chapter 10: pp 291 N/A	Chapter 11: pp 321-22 Ownership was used to regulate climate rather than the relationship directly.
<b>Management Style</b>	Chapter 8: pp 207-09 Very High Direct Influence on unilateral regulation. Also shaped by market pressures and to some extent size.	Chapter 9: Very High Direct and Indirect influence on regulating to managements advantage.	Chapter 10: Very High Direct influence, but differed across Merchant Co. because of fragmentation, which indicated manipulative regulation.	Chapter 11: pp 323-24 Sophistication more rhetoric than reality. On balance strategy and not style, as defined, more important guide to regulation.
<b>Voice</b>	Chapter 8: pp 203-04; 210-11; 213-16 Influenced by Management Style (score +8.1), not directly related to regulation.	Chapter 9: pp 254-57 Influence is management 'had to work' at remaining non-union, but with negative utility (-2.4). Also used some participatory elements of joint approach.	Chapter 10: pp 293-95 Influenced regulation to some extent but because of centralised personnel function. Low utility from employees (score +0.2).	Chapter 11: pp 325; 337; 340 Some direct impact on regulation, with participatory schemes toward joint approaches with positive employee utility (+1.0)
	Chapter 8: pp 214-15; 217-19	Chapter 9: pp 255-58; 260-61	Chapter 10: pp 295-97	Chapter 11: pp 329-31

**Cont'd**

**Table 12.A Cont'd (Regulation)**

	<b>Water Co.</b>	<b>Chem Co.</b>	<b>Merchant Co.</b>	<b>Delivery Co.</b>
<b>Climate</b>	Climate supported environment giving ease of managerial regulation (overall score -0.3) Chapter 8: pp 220-21; 222-24	Nature of work more than size a major determinant of climate. More bureaucratic regulation because of chemical manufacture (-1.4) Chapter 9: pp 243-57; 262-64; 265-67	Climate mirror image of wider external climate to regulate without unions. Some employee satisfaction with informal relations (+2.0). Chapter 10: pp 299-301; 306-07	Climate encouraged employees to contribute to regulation, albeit with a marginal impact. Chapter 11: pp 333-37
<b>Actor Attitudes</b>	Employee attitudes negative to management (-1.1), but attached to work (+2.1). Perhaps because of small size of company and work units. But also strong union identity (+9.1) Chapter 8: pp 2217-28; 229-30; 234-35	Less critical of management (-4.0) but strongest identity with unions (+13.4). Small positive identity to company (+0.7), and negative attachment to work (-1.1). Chapter 9: pp 264; 268-73	Some attachment to work (+2.2) and company (+0.3), but critical of management (-0.8) and supportive of unions(+9.4). Chapter 10: pp 280; 303-05	Employee supportive of management, the company and satisfied in work. Probably influenced more by climate than regulation. Also marginal identity with unions. Chapter 11: pp 312; 328; 331; 339-44

**Table 12.B** Summary Tabulation of Influences on Dimension of Relationship: 'HR Strategy'

Factor/Processes of Modification	Rank Order of Each Organisation & Descriptive Explanation of Patterns of Influence			
	HR Strategy			
	Water Co. 4	Chem Co. 3	Merchant Co. 2	Delivery Co. 1
Government Policy Legislation	Indirect Influence, score =2 Indirect Influence, Score =1 No direct impact on strategy, but possibly an influence on management style. Some market deregulation from government economic policy. Chapter 8: pp 196; 202-04	Low Influence, score =7 Low Influence, score =7 No direct impact on strategy, but possibly an influence on management style	Direct Influence, score =1 Direct Influence, score =3 No direct impact on strategy, but possibly an influence on management style Impact from economic policies for house building. Chapter 10: pp 280-82; 304-05	Indirect Influence, score =3 Marginal Indirect, score =6 No direct influence on strategy. Delivery Co. complicated delineating between style and strategy.
Technology	Influence was that some technologies used sustained employee control (call centre & bottling plant) and this intersects with regulation. Also reactive, little forward planning of skills to operate in call centre. Chapter 8: pp 204-05	Technology used to merge production capabilities (close one site). Capital-intensive nature of work meant few employees required. Technology also important for future research & development. Chapter 9: pp 241-45	Low use of technology because of type of products/service. Influence on strategy from restructuring of work via JIT system, thus also highly regulatory. Chapter 10: pp 281-83	Chapter 11: pp 311-12 Technology had large impact on employee surveillance and control of effort as key strategic aspect. Also intersects with regulation.
Product Markets	Higher order strategy than human resources. Chapter 8: pp 202-04	Complicated as customers also chemical manufacturers (i.e. ICI). Chapter 9: pp 246-47	Higher order strategy than human resources. Chapter 10: pp 285-87	Chapter 11: pp 314 Employee role articulated as central to product market. More so than at other firms. Chapter 11: pp 316-17

Cont'd

**Table 12.B Cont'd (HR Strategy)**

	<b>Water Co.</b>	<b>Chem Co.</b>	<b>Merchant Co.</b>	<b>Delivery Co.</b>
<b>Labour Markets</b>	No difficulty recruiting. Government policy more important impact than strategy. Chapter 8: pp 204-05	Some HR strategy influence, recruiting from family and friends indicated peer group which served managerial aims. Chapter 9: pp 247-50	Stronger impact from government policy with union de-recognition. Also distinction between type of labour (light/heavy side) as link to HR strategy. Chapter 10: pp 288-89	Sophisticated recruitment mixed with informal networks of family and friends. Approach to 'get right people' implies link to HR strategy - preferred type of employee Chapter 11: pp 319-20
<b>Size</b>	Some influence in shaping management style rather than strategy directly. Small size important for Chief Executive. Chapter 8: pp 206	Again, size of Chem Co. helped legitimise Operations Director's style and preferences, which mixed with strategic intent to avoid unions by enforced persuasion. Chapter 9: pp 239-41; 244-45; 251-54	Larger size reflection of centralised personnel function, but no personnel on the board. A lack of co-ordination of HR strategy because of diffused management style - e.g. 'clerk of works' model (Tyson & Fell, 1995). Chapter 10: pp 291	Again, large size reflected in centralised personnel function, but no personnel on the board. More co-ordination of HR strategy as per the 'architect model' (Tyson & Fell, 1995). Chapter 11: pp 321-22
<b>Ownership</b>	Some indirect influence from US/Canadian owners. Pay to recruit managers. Chapter 8: pp 207-08	UK-owned, no evident impact on strategy. More facilitating role between board and HR actors. Chapter 9: pp 253-54	UK-owned, some impact on strategy. Board often instructed personnel to carry out rules, including union de-recognition on mergers. Chapter 10: pp 280; 291	Some influence from world headquarters. But difficulty in establishing given the status of UK as separate business, plus relative independence of separate stations. Chapter 11: pp 323-24
<b>Management Style</b>	Style important influence as union suppression strategy (Chief Executive preferences). Linked to non-union voice, impacted on employee attitudes. Chapter 8: pp 197-98; 209; 214-16; 231-33	Shaped HR strategy as mixture of suppression and substitution owing to charismatic role of Ops Director. Some fit between style and proactive elements of HR strategy. Chapter 9: pp 239-41; 254-57	Complicated style because of diffused patterns across organisation. Strategy of union de-recognition more direct influence from government policy. Chapter 10: pp 280; 293-95	Some differences across organisation that influenced employee behaviour and attitudes. Generally supportive of union substitution strategy. Style consistent with proactive image of HR strategy. Chapter 11: pp 325-271; 340-41

Cont'd

**Table 12.B Cont'd (HR Strategy)**

	<b>Water Co.</b>	<b>Chem Co.</b>	<b>Merchant Co.</b>	<b>Delivery Co.</b>
<b>Voice</b>	Definite absence of voice mechanisms, but some utility (+8.1) largely because of small, friendly relations at workplace level.  Chapter 8: pp 206-07; 218-19	Some patterns consistent with union substitution strategy (works council), but negative utility (-2.4). Also indicates union suppression, significance of management style.  Chapter 9: pp 256-59	Moderate voice mechanism with marginal utility (+0.2). Voice consistent with 'clerk of works' model of personnel (Tyson & Fell, 1995). Board level decisions more reflective of de-recognition strategy.  Chapter 10: pp 296-97	Sophisticated voice mechanisms and some voice utility (+1.0). Indicates union substitution strategy, but some key difference in management style counterbalanced this strategic initiative at some sites.  Chapter 11: pp 329-32
<b>Climate</b>	More reactive than strategic, differed by occupation and location (nature of work).  Chapter 8: pp 222-24; 227-28	Some influence with Hr strategy to generate image of inclusion, but often counterbalanced by lack of issue-handling.  Chapter 9: pp 262-64	Some link with strategy. Small positive employee perceptions of climate (+2.0) consistent with 'clerk of works' model - administrative of rules and procedures than proactive strategy (Tyson & Fell, 1995).  Chapter 10: pp 280; 299	Promotion of friendly climate consistent with HR strategy, but counterbalanced by some managerial styles. Voice more a pattern of climate than intended/articulated strategy.  Chapter 11: pp 314-15; 322-27; 337; 344
<b>Actor Attitudes</b>	Influenced by product markets. Strategy, style and voice intervened with role of Chief Executive as key influence on attitudes towards management and unions. Also perceptions of hostility psychological barrier to suppress unions.  Chapter 8: pp 203-04; 208-11; 214-16; 230-33	Less influence from product market, but role of Operations director key to HR approach and style as mix of union substitution. Again, management style a barrier to unionisation which indicated type of strategic orientation.  Chapter 9: pp 239-41; 269-72	High impact on attitudes of product market. Diffusion of managerial styles important influence on attitudes.  Chapter 10: pp 293-95; 302-04	Strategy of employee involvement, strong climate influenced strategy of union substitution.  Chapter 11: pp 320-22; 328; 329; 333-35; 337-42

**Table 12.C** Summary Tabulation of Influences on Dimension of Relationship: 'Trust'

Factor/Processes of Modification	Rank Order of Each Organisation & Descriptive Explanation of Patterns of Influence			
	Water Co. 4	Chem Co. 2	Merchant Co. 3	Delivery Co. 1
Government Policy Legislation	Indirect Influence, score =2 Indirect Influence, Score =1 Indirect influence on trust. Via climate and management style. Also impact on perceptions of trust - wider IR climate advantage to management over unions.	Low Influence, score =7 Low Influence, score =7 Less obvious pattern of influence on trust, but these were links to management style which could have influenced climate. Some indication of attitudes on trust about unions shaped by gov't policy.	Direct Influence, score =1 Direct Influence, score =3 More direct influence on trust, in that management advantage over unions highly visible because of previous de-recognition.	Indirect Influence, score =3 Indirect Influence, score =6 Very low link between government policy and trust from employees. Management more concerned about changes that indicated less trust of employees.
Technology	Chapter 8: pp 196; 210-11; 231-32 Very strong influence on nature of work that generated perceptions among employees that management do not trust them - reciprocated suspicion and low trust in return. Chapter 8: pp 200-02	Chapter 9: pp 238-39; 270-72 Although capital-intensive technologies used, employees expected this because of nature of firm. Some links to recruitment method and technology, which gave some perception of alienation. Chapter 9: pp 243-45; 248-50	Chapter 10: pp 279-80; 304-05 Low influence on trust overall, but some impact for small group of employees where technology was more prevalent. Also shaped attitudes between employees and managers. Chapter 10: pp 281-83	Chapter 11: pp 311-12 High influence for certain employees subject to technological surveillance. Some recorded perceptions of suspicion between parties to carry out work. Chapter 11: pp 314-16

Cont'd

**Table 12.C Cont'd (Trust)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Product Markets	Management interpretations of competitiveness shaped trust. Thus link is through management style and climate. Chapter 8: pp 202-05; 211-15	Complicated because of very different type of market competition - especially customers also chemical manufacturers Chapter 9: pp 246-47; 251-53	Very strong influence on trust as and attitudes. Employees very aware of union de-recognition and its use as part of market strategy during take-overs. Chapter 10: pp 283-85; 301-03	Strong influence on trust with emphasis on customer quality and interrelationship with technology to control effort. Chapter 11: pp 316-17
Labour Markets	Very negative impact on trust, which shaped attitudes. Key is link through management style and climate - employees expected to leave after 2 years service. Chapter 8: pp 197-98; 203-05; 211	Complicated: probably marginal impact on trust with network of family and friends. Chapter 9: pp 248-49	Strong influence via inter-personal climate, with line managers deviating from personnel guidelines. Also some tacit bargaining - employees leaving voluntarily because of redundancy situation. Chapter 10: pp 286-90	Complicated with core-periphery labour strategy inside Delivery Co. There were negative and positive indicators of trust indirectly from management style shaping climate at local, workplace levels. Chapter 11: pp 319-20
Size	Some influence from size of work unit on climate, especially inter-personal relations more trusting with supervisors than toward senior managers. Chapter 8: pp 206-07	Very mixed and contradictory. High and low trust in management shows that conflicts can ferment over time in small social setting. Chapter 9: pp 252-53	Again, size of work unit more important for management style which could then shape trust, especially line management fragmentation. Chapter 10: pp 290-91	No obvious link to trust. But again size of units shaped prevailing climate as more trustworthy. Some negative indicators by occupation. Chapter 11: pp 321-23
Ownership	No real influence on trust. Chapter 8: pp 207-08	N/A	N/A	Ownership shaped attitudes, which indicated trust indicators - targets set abroad. Chapter 11: pp 323-24

Cont'd



**Table 12.C Cont'd (Trust)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Management Style	Managerial ideologies very strong influence on trust. Also different managerial approaches between supervisors and senior managers. Latter perceived as less trustworthy. Chapter 8: pp 211; 223-24; 227-28	Again, very strong influence on trust through climate. Some evidence management style shaped attitudes. Chapter 9: pp 254; 257-58	Management fragmentation important factor here. Inter-personal relations shape attitudes and trust in very different ways in same organisation. Chapter 10: pp 292; 294; 298-300	Key differences at workplace level and some tacit bargaining evident to seek other to fulfil exchange. Overall, the organisation more trusted than some local managers. Chapter 11: pp 327-29; 337; 341-42
Voice	Network of influence is through management style. lack of voice mechanisms but some satisfaction because of inter-personal climate with supervisors. Chapter 8: pp 217-19	Strong pattern between voice and management style. Low utility because of management style which gave negative perceptions of trust. Chapter 9: pp 257-58; 260-61	In this case union membership negative influence on non-union voice utility. Perception is that management seek to gain advantage in exchange. Chapter 10: pp 295-96; 303-05	Clearer (possibly even direct influence) because of sophisticated voice mechanism and utility generating feelings of involvement. Chapter 11: pp 330-33; 339-41
Climate	Strong element of tacit bargaining, suspicions of management over issue-centred climate. Management style and effect on attitudes influence trust through climate. Chapter 8: pp 222-23; 227-28	Strong suspicion/concern at management lack of issue-handling. Trust influenced by management style and climatic atmosphere. Chapter 9: pp 262-64	High propensity to use discipline to modify behaviour. Reliance on inter-personal climate which shaped trust. Size of work unit important influence on climate, than trust. Chapter 10: pp 299-302	More favourable climatic atmosphere generating roles of more trust. Also undercurrent of lack of satisfaction with management issue-handling affecting trust. Chapter 11: pp 334; 336
Actor Attitudes	Attitudes and trust two way influence. Negative attitudes to management and climate indicative of low trust relationship.	Higher trust relationship than Water Co., again very two-way influences. Negative attitude of climate, management issue-handling point to lower trust. Chapter 9: pp 264; 269-72	Low trust relationship. Role of subordination shaped by attitudes to senior management, but closer inter-personal climate influenced by size of work unit as more trusting facet of relationship. Chapter 10: pp 301-06	Most favourable trust relationship. Attitudes influenced by voice utility and climate, but not management. lack of satisfaction with issue-handling consistent with some negative attitudes. Chapter 11: pp 334; 342-45

**Table 12.D** Summary Tabulation of Influences on Dimension of Relationship: 'Formalisation'

Factor/Processes of Modification	Rank Order of Each Organisation & Descriptive Explanation of Patterns of Influence			
	Water Co. 4	Chem Co. 2	Merchant Co. 3	Delivery Co. 1
Government Policy Legislation	Less direct influence on formalisation - more indirect through management style treating employees as disposable. Chapter 8: pp 196-98	Some evidence that senior manager against government policies and preferred informality as route to avoid unionisation. Chapter 9: pp 239-40	Some link because of de-recognition, but overall minimal influence on formalisation. Chapter 10: pp 280; 288-90	Some evidence with change in government prompting a re-evaluation which could produce more formal approaches. But again overall minimal impact. Chapter 11: pp 311-12; 340
Technology	Affected formalisation - both formality of work routine, and also informality through nature of relations with supervisors. Chapter 8: pp 200-01; 206-08	Direct impact on formality because of nature of chemical manufacturing. Chapter 9: pp 241-44; 252	Marginal influence directly, some indirect influence through management style. Chapter 10: pp 281-83	Strong direct impact through detailed surveillance. Chapter 11: pp 312-16
Product Markets	Direct influence with regard to market pressures and speed of customer delivery. But formal and informal features here. Chapter 8: pp 202-01; 212-15	Direct influence because of nature of industry and type of customers. Very formalised procedures because of market. Chapter 9: pp 247-48	Direct influence, especially restructuring of business. Promoted more formal features. Chapter 10: pp 284-87	Strong direct influence, but shaped formal work routines and also informal relations at local stations. Chapter 11: pp 317-18
Labour Markets	Insecurity of labour market influenced informal indulgency patterns with supervisors. Chapter 8: pp 204-05	Use of family and friends in recruitment gave informal edge. Chapter 9: pp 247-49	High regulated and formalised. Complicated because of dual labour market and some informal relations. Chapter 10: pp 287-89; 300	Informal image careful engineered. Shaped perception of informality against formal procedures. Chapter 11: pp 318-20

Cont'd

**Table 12.D Cont'd (Formalisation)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Size	Some impact in that relations with supervisors were more informal because of close working proximity. Chapter 8: pp 206-07	Some link with management style, in that smaller plant sizes facilitated dominant role by one senior actor Chapter 9: pp 251-53; 257-58	More relevant to influencing managerial approaches along less formal structures because of size of work unit. Chapter 10: pp 290-91	Largest of all firms. Size of smaller work units had some marginal impact on informality. Chapter 11: pp 321-22
Ownership	No evident association. Chapter 8: pp 207-09	N/A	N/A	Some influence on formality from foreign head office. Chapter 11: pp 323-34
Management Style	Very influential, but differed within firm. Created indulgency patterns between supervisors and managers. which could shape inter-personal climate. Chapter 8: pp 206-07; 210-14	Chapter 9: Management style shaped individual perceptions of informality. This illustrated extent of power inequalities as processes of modification Chapter 9: pp 252-53; 256-58; 263-64	Chapter 10: Influence probably through climate. Indulgency patterns between management-employees highly fragmented across company. Points to different informal and formal processes Chapter 10: pp 287; 291; 292-96	Probably more a strategy than actual style. Influence here was climate of involvement, but bureaucratically engineered. Chapter 11: pp 315; 323; 325-28; 329-31
Voice	Dependent on inter-personal climate. Some positive voice utility points to informal influence through relations with supervisors. Chapter 8: pp 224-28	Voice shaped through works council and management style - predominantly latter. Informal influences from ability of individual employees to question management (i.e. over taking leave). Chapter 9: pp 260; 265-67	Reliance on inter-personal climate and willingness to counteract management style. Voice and indulgency patterns together shaped informal edge. Chapter 10: pp 296; 300-01	Sophisticated voice mechanism and positive utility point to formally determined processes. But willingness of workers to resist because of issue-handling climate promoted informal responses to modify relationship. Chapter 11: pp 329-31; 334-35

Cont'd

**Table 12.D Cont'd (Formalisation)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Climate	Because of above factors, inter-personal climate strongly influenced informal processes to modify. Chapter 8: pp 222-24	Lack of issue-handling by management influenced informal processes. Chapter 9: pp 264-65	Management needed worker co-operation and informal practices lubricated output. Also reliance on inter-personal climate as source on informal processes. Chapter 10: pp 282-83, 298, 300-01	Climate very much influenced informal perceptions which had capacity to shape action along informal relations. Chapter 11: pp 316; 321-23; 327-29; 337
Actor Attitudes	Employee attitudes influenced informal relations and willingness of supervisors to accommodate employee needs and wants. Negative attitudes to management correspond to ability of workers to resist. Chapter 8: pp 206-08; 211; 230-33	Attitudes were influenced more by management style and structural rigidities of chemical manufacturing. These pointed to formal processes. Chapter 9: pp 241-45; 252-53; 274-75	Attitudes very two-way. Fragmented management style influenced attitudes among employees to modify informally. Also some willingness for management to accept workers self-control influenced informal processes. Chapter 10: pp 285; 287-88; 291; 304-05	Again attitudes very two-way. Negative attitudes to management symbolised willingness to resist which prompted informal action. In turn, this action reinforced informal processes to modify. Chapter 11: pp 333-36; 338

**Table 12.E** Summary Tabulation of Influences on Dimension of Relationship: 'Discretteness'

Factor/Processes of Modification	Rank Order of Each Organisation & Descriptive Explanation of Patterns of Influence			
	Water Co. 4	Chem Co. 2	Merchant Co. 3	Delivery Co. 1
Government Policy Legislation	Indirect Influence, score =2 Indirect Influence, Score =1 Strong indirect influence on actor attitudes, management style and climate.	Low Influence, score =7 Low Influence, score =7 More evident through management style, which then influenced actor attitudes.	Direct Influence, score =1 Direct Influence, score =3 Stronger association with actor attitudes - using government policy to de-recognise unions.	Indirect Influence, score =3 Indirect Influence, score =6 Less influence on employee attitudes, but direct impact on management style - working at keeping union-free relationship.
Technology	Chapter 8: pp 196-98; 210-11 Could have shaped attitudes through nature of work for some occupations - at bottling plant and small call centre.	Chapter 9: pp 239-42; 271-72 High capital-intensive technology. Nature of business meant this was expected.	Chapter 10: pp 279-80; 304 Influenced climate which tended to impact on attitudes - such as JIT system.	Chapter 11: pp 310-11; 340-41 Strong impact on nature of work. Managerial surveillance and control result of uses of technology - especially for couriers and call centre staff.
Product Markets	Chapter 8: pp 200-02 Competitive pressures may have influenced management style to generate negative out-group identity.	Chapter 9: pp 244-45 Unique status of customers. Probably influenced management and climate, which indicated stronger identity with inter-group.	Chapter 10: pp 281-83; 298-99 Stronger association given redundancies which can in part account for negative out-group identity.	Chapter 11: pp 312-15 Strong association on actor attitudes and climate - emphasis on customer quality among employees can account for higher out-group support.
	Chapter 8: pp 212; 214-15	Chapter 9: pp 249-50; 257-58	Chapter 10: pp 283-85; 301-02	Chapter 11: pp 316-18; 342-44

Cont'd

**Table 12.E Cont'd (Discreteness)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Labour Markets	Disposal of employees very much negative association with out-group. This was translated through climate and attitudes. Chapter 8: 211; 227-28	Use of family and friends network may have small positive link with out-group. Chapter 9: pp 247-49	Internal-external labour market re-informed negative out-group perceptions. Chapter 10: pp 285-89	Complex and contradictory. Some periphery employees negative to out-group, but many others supportive. Climate stronger explanation here. Chapter 11: pp 319-20
Size	No direct influence, although inter-personal climate facilitated relations at supervisory level. Chapter 8: pp 206-07	No direct influence, although the style of management here buttressed because of small setting to some extent. Chapter 9: pp 251-53	Larger size may have made positive out-group identification more difficult. But explanations also in fragmentation of management. Chapter 10: pp 289-91	Because of large size emphasis on nurturing informal climate as positive identity to out-group. Explanation more to do with climate than size itself. Chapter 11: pp 321-22
Ownership	No evident influence. Chapter 8: pp	N/A	N/A	Some indication that target-setting by US criteria meant less identity with out-group. This was more perceptual influence. Chapter 11: pp 323-24
Management Style	Style more consistent with Goss's Sweating category. The opportunistic and ad hoc approaches reinforced exploitative practices. This can explain some inter-group identity, and also reinforced actor roles. Chapter 8: pp 197-98; 211; 214-15; 230-33	Character of Ops Director pointed to some benevolence but also autocracy. This reinforced subordinate-superior roles that each ascribed to themselves and other to explain both out- and inter-group identity. Chapter 9: pp 255-58; 264	Style more consistent with Fox's Traditional category than strategic HRM, which is very role oriented. More importantly fragmentation of management approaches shaped climate, and this formed some negative out-group values. Chapter 10: pp 294-95; 304-05	Sophisticated human relations type was really part of a strategy. This promoted a positive climate which explains stronger out-group identity. Some inter-group support because of underlying tensions and superior-subordinate role at workplace level. Chapter 11: pp 328; 334-35; 340

Cont'd

**Table 12.E Cont'd (Discreteness)**

	Water Co.	Chem Co.	Merchant Co.	Delivery Co.
Voice	Absence of voice meant reliance on inter-personal climate, which gave some positive association with supervisors. This shaped roles at workplace level between employee and supervisors. Senior management were ascribed a different role by employees. Chapter 8: pp 206-07; 218; 225-28	Evidence that management bypassed voice channels explain lack of support for out-group and concerns at issue-handling climate Chapter 9: pp 254-57; 260-61	Well-intentioned voice mechanisms circumvented by management above personnel level. This implied some dysfunctional roles which mitigate out-group identity. Chapter 10: pp 297-98; 303-04	Involvement bureaucracy shaped climate, which explains some support for out-group. But again underlying tensions account for inter-group identity. This reinforced distinct roles. Chapter 11: pp 331; 333-34
Climate	Climate very much influenced by network of other factors, but concern with issue-handling promoted inter-group identity. Chapter 8: pp 221-24; 227-28	The concern over issue-handling (lack of management response) can account for negative out-group identification. Chapter 9: pp 262-65	Differing climate within firm because of management influences, but again concern with issue-handling climate (discipline) can explain positive inter-group and negative out-group identity. Chapter 10: pp 285; 288-89; 294; 299	Complex and contradictory. Concern at issue-handling can explain less out-group support and inter-group identity, but also friendly climate shaped attitudes of 'relative advantage'. Chapter 11: pp 323-36; 343-44
Actor Attitudes	No significant individual features to explain attitudes on discreteness. Some association with wider societal values - minimal unionisation because of former experiences. Negative attitudes about climate and management correlate with positive attitudes to unions. Chapter 8: pp 203-04; 218; 229-32	Again no individual features statistically significant, but some class and occupational association to explain strong inter-group identity. Negative attitudes about climate and management correlate with positive attitudes to unions. Chapter 9: pp 264; 269-72; 274	Less evidence of wider social values, but some evidence of communality among some manual employees. More positive attitudes about climate and management, correspond to comparatively less them and us. Chapter 10: pp 287-89; 291; 294; 301-06	Little evidence of wider social values, but again occupational identity which may interpret class/social relationships among couriers and operations. Positive attitudes about climate and management, correspond to lower inter-group identity. Chapter 11: pp 312; 338-39; 341-44; 345

**Table 12.F: COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE SCALES: ALL COMPANIES**

Organisation	Variable											
	Voice Utility	+/-	Climate	+/-	Attitudes to Management	+/-	Attitudes to Trade Unions	+/-	Work Satisfaction	+/-	Attitudes to Company	+/-
Water Co.	26.1 (1)	+ 8.1	18.3 (3)	- 0.3	24.9 (4)	- 11.1	30.1 (3)	+ 9.1	29.1 (3)	+ 2.1	16.3 (2)	+ 1.3
Chem Co.	15.6 (4)	- 2.4	19.4 (4)	- 1.4	32.0 (3)	- 4.0	34.4 (1)	+ 13.4	25.9 (4)	- 1.1	15.7 (3)	+ 0.7
Merchant Co.	18.2 (3)	+ 0.2	16.0 (2)	+ 2.0	35.2 (2)	- 0.8	30.4 (2)	+ 9.4	29.2 (2)	+ 2.2	15.3 (4)	+ 0.3
Delivery Co.	19.0 (2)	+ 1.0	14.0 (1)	+ 4.0	41.8 (1)	+ 5.8	26.7 (4)	+ 5.7	30.5 (1)	+ 3.5	17.6 (1)	+ 2.6

**NB: The positive or negative deviation (+/-) is an indication of the extent of each dimension.**