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ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF ALIENATION AMONG CLERICAL WORKERS

by

Adebayo Ninalowo

The object of this study was to investigate if the clerical worker's perception of centralization of control in the organization of clerical work was related to behavioral manifestations of structural alienation. Drawing from Marx's theory of alienation, it was conceptualized essentially as a situation whereby workers have little or no control over the work process and its outcomes.

Data were collected by the use of self-administered questionnaires. Besides close-ended items in the questionnaire, it also contained open-ended ones. These were designed in order to tap the underlying dynamics from the respondents' perspectives that might shape their response to structural alienation. A total of forty-nine cases were ultimately available.

The following central hypothesis was advanced: As the level of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control increases, behavioral manifestations of structural alienation will increase. Absenteeism, turnover, daydreaming, cooperation, slowdown, perceptions of strikes as efficacious, unionism and favourable orientation towards the union were
designated as behavioral manifestations of structural alienation.

Crosstabulations between variables, with varying degree of strengths generally lend support to the above hypothesis, albeit there were a few instances at which our prediction did not obtain.

The findings from this study suggest that workers' perceptions of centralization of control are very important in explaining behavioral manifestations of structural alienation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Although numerous empirical studies have been done in Canada to examine the effects of capitalism on blue collar workers, as Leo Johnson (1974:165) pointed out, there has been no useful Canadian study which examines some of the consequences of the process of proletarianization among such occupational groups as clerical workers. Following Braverman's (1974:295-96) specification of the term, office work is hereby used to refer to such occupations as bookkeeper, secretary, stenographer, cashier, bank teller, file clerk, telephone operator, office machine operator, payroll and time keeping clerk, receptionist and typist - in private or governmental organizations. The term "white-collar" for the purpose of this study, whenever it is used, refers to those office workers that are at the bottom of the hierarchical structure of the organization.

The number of Canadians holding clerical jobs has been increasing since the turn of this century. In 1901, white-collar workers constituted 15 percent of the Canadian labour force; by 1971, the percentage had risen to 42.4. Furthermore, in 1971, six of every ten white-collar workers performed clerical and sales jobs (Rinehart, 1975:86).

Works of Jon Shepard (1971) and that of Walker and Guest
(1952) among others, that have established the presence of alienation among factory workers, give cause to suspect a similar trend within the white-collar sector. Since as we shall further demonstrate subsequently, the organization of clerical work is becoming comparable to that in the factory.

It is such trend as described above within the white-collar sector that has inspired this study.

The Problem

The problem at hand, then, is to investigate if the clerical worker's perception of centralization of control in the organization of clerical work is related to behavioral manifestations of structural alienation.

Structure of The Writing

The rest of the present chapter focuses on Marx's conception of "Alienated Labour" and its applicability to the current project.

Chapter II is designated for a deliberation on some socio-historical dynamics that culminated in the proletarianization of the clerical work. Furthermore, the Chapter takes up some of the other pertinent studies in this area.

In Chapter III, we describe the method of data collection and the sample demographics. The Chapter also focuses on the ways in which the variables were constructed
and measured. In addition, the hypotheses for the research and its schema are presented.

Chapter IV is designated for the analysis of the data in terms of the relationships between the variables and in relation to the central hypothesis.

The final Chapter focuses on a general summary of the project and some of the possible implications of the main findings.
This study draws from Marx's theory of "Alienated Labour". It should be mentioned at the outset that in Marx's discussion of alienation, the concept was used primarily to refer to concrete objective social processes (Israel, 1971).

A. Marx on Creative Labour *

Faber (1976:13) contended that one of the basic premises underlying Marx's conception of alienation was that production was not simply a means towards satisfying extrinsic needs, but also potentially self-actualizing. That is, through work, "man could develop his universality, creativity and in the process become a part of his community" (ibid).

In Capital, Marx draws attention to the uniqueness of human creative labour by a comparison between operations performed by an architect and a bee. He writes:

...We pre-suppose labour in a form that stamps it as exclusively human. A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement (233).

Implicit in the above utterances by Marx is that work is an activity through which man could develop and realize his

*Portions of the rest of this chapter were derived from a seminar paper by the writer bearing the title: "The Division of Labour and Capitalism".
creative potential. Hence the distinction between man and the phylogenic scale; man can be creative through work and by means of man's unique reflexive knowledge, realizes the potential source of self-actualization in work. Through labour, man "objectifies" himself, meaning that through creative activity, by using his capacities in working up raw materials, creates them into objects. In essence, these objects reflect his abilities (Israel, 1971:37).

In a nutshell, an ideal labour according to Marx, is characterized by active, consciously willing, self-actualizing man in a social process of production, whereby the activity is also a goal, per se.

In his *White Collar*, C. Wright Mills perceptively describes an archetype of what Marx would call creative labour prior to the birth of capitalism as a social system. He writes:

Craftsmanship as a fully idealized model of work gratification involves six major features: There is no ulterior motive in work other than the product being made and the processes of its creation. The details of daily work are meaningful because they are not detached in the worker's mind from the product of the work. The craftsman is thus able to learn from his work; and to use and develop his capacities and skills in its prosecution. There is no split of work and play, or work and culture. The craftsman's way of livelihood determines and infuses his entire mode of living (1977:220).

As will be explained shortly, this "ideal of craftsmanship" was destructed with the birth of capitalism as a social system and the concomitant hierarchical division of labour;
which essentially entails the separation of work conception from its execution.

B. What Constitutes Capitalism?

In order to be able to account for the constituents of capitalism in a substantial manner, one has to necessarily follow Marx who in *Capital*, describes the various forms of values in a "step-by-step" fashion for an incisive illustration of what capitalism entails.

According to Marx, a use-value is the utility of a thing. That is, the use to which an object can be put. Value is the magnitude of value which is measured by the amount of labour time that goes into making it (202). A further distinction is warranted here. "A thing can be a use-value, without having value. This is the case whenever its utility to man is not due to labour" (203). For instance, spring water, the lake, atmospheric air, all have use-value, but no values. This is due to the fact that no amount of human labour time goes into making them.

Marx further points out in *Capital*, that producing use-value for others constitutes social production of commodities. This implies individuals transferring products among one another through a means of exchange (such as money). According to Marx, a commodity is a complex of two things, viz., use-value and exchange-value. Exchange-value "...is the 'ideal' ratio at which a product exchanges for others,
that is, its trading power or ability to relate to other products on the basis of embodied labour-time" (Ollman, 1976: 177).

Surplus-value "results only from a quantitative excess of labour" (Marx, ibid., 249). That is, it is the amount of labour time for which the worker is unpaid. In essence, the production of surplus-value becomes only realizable through the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist.

At this point, we necessarily have to bring forth the dichotomy of "productive" versus "non-productive" labour as it exists from the capitalist viewpoint. In his Theories of Surplus-Value, Marx expounds on what is considered to be productive and non-productive labour under the capitalist system of production. A productive worker is one whose labour is directly involved in production that directly leads to the creation of surplus value; that cumulates in the accumulation of capital. As Marx puts it:

Productivity in the capitalist sense is based on relative productivity - that the worker not only replaces an old value, but creates a new one; that he materialises more labour-time in his existence as worker. It is this kind of productive wage-labour that is the basis for the existence of capital (ibid., 153).

On the other hand, an unproductive worker is one whose labour contains use-value but does not directly lead to the

1 It should be emphasised that this dichotomy only exists under the capitalist system of production. Ordinarily, such distinction is trivial and needless.
creation of surplus-value and capital accumulation. An unproductive labour "...is labour which is not exchanged with capital, but directly with revenue, that is, with wages or profit..." (Marx, ibid., 157). Marx further distinguishes productive from non-productive labour thus:

The labour-power of the productive labourer is a commodity for the labourer himself. So is that of the unproductive labourer. But the productive labourer produces commodities for the buyer of his labour-power. The unproductive labourer produces for him a mere use-value, not a commodity; an imaginary or a real use-value. It is characteristic of the unproductive labourer that he produces no commodities for his buyer, but indeed receives commodities from him (ibid., 160).

The clerical work would fall under the categorization of unproductive labour, on account that it does not produce a vendible commodity, hence it does not create surplus-value that would directly lead to capital accumulation. However, the so-classified, unproductive labour is a "necessary evil" within the capitalist system. This is owing to the function it serves in the distribution of the products of labour, accounting, banking, handling purchasing and inventory, accounts receivable and payable, the preparation of financial statements, bookkeeping, etcetera (McDonald, 1964:4).

We notice here that the white-collar job is an integral part of the process of capital accumulation, albeit it does not directly generate surplus-value.

The whole process of capital accumulation may be summarized thus: In the capitalist system of production, there
exists the situation whereby capital (money and the means of production) is used to buy and produce commodities, including human labour time, to produce surplus-value. This becomes invested again, leading to a further accumulation of capital; and so the process goes on "ad infinitum". The cyclic schema of capitalism may be depicted thus:

![Cyclic schema of capitalism]

In essence, the utmost cardinal distinguishing characteristics of capitalism as a social system exist within the mode of production. Namely, that: (1) Human labour power is hired by capital; (2) decisions on the work process and its products are made by capital (this point is discussed more elaborately in the next section); (3) "the product is the property of the capitalist(s) given that the labour process 'is between things that the capitalists have purchased, things that have become their property'" (Wicke, 1972:116).

C. The Division of Labour

Historically, there has always been the division of labour in the society. However, the work of each productive specialty was not subdivided into limited operations
until the birth of capitalism as a social system (Braverman, 1974:70). Pre-capitalist society was characterized with functional division of labour, which is epitomized by C. W. Mills' description of "Ideal of Craftsmanship", whereby it would be recalled, there was generally no separation of work conception from its execution. An independent producer of goods was also responsible for both the conception and execution of production.

With the emergence of capitalism as a social system witnessed the vertical, hierarchical division of labour along task line. Whereby no one individual worker is solely responsible for a single product. But rather, labour becomes fragmented into a single repetitive task. Another predominant feature of the division of labour in contemporary capitalism, is the existence of the divorce of work conception from its performance. In "The German Ideology", Marx points out that: "Division of labour only becomes truly such from the moment when a division of material and mental labour appears" (123).

From the capitalist standpoint, task division of labour becomes even more profitable. Because according to the Babbage principle upon which such division of labour is predicated, dividing skills, which usually implies deskilling the workers, constitutes cheapening of labour. Babbage writes:

That the master manufacturer, by dividing the work to be executed into different processes, each requiring different degrees of skill or of force, can purchase exactly that precise quantity of both which is necessary for each process;
Whereas, if the whole work were executed by one workman, that person must possess sufficient skill to perform the most laborious, of the operations into which the art is divided (1963:175-76).

We note that the primary motive underlying the division of labour along task line is to generate the utmost surplus-value, at the expense of the worker. It is in order here to mention that aside from the fact that the capitalist assumes the control of the process and its outcomes, rather than the producer; capital and its representatives assume supervisory and disciplinary functions together with the coordination of the fractionalized activities (Marglin, 1976:29).

In summary with capitalism, the following drastic changes are perceivable:

1. The means of production becomes that of the capitalist.

2. The workers as a result of overwhelming competitive forces are driven to sell their labour power; and are gathered together en masse under one roof and become subject to despotic discipline and rules in the factory system.

3. The division of labour and what to produce are subject to impersonal market forces.

4. Products of labour are in the main, exchanged as commodities.

5. There exists the divorce of work planning from its execution.
The section that follows addresses to some of the consequences of the dynamics of capitalism on labour.

D. "Alienated Labour"

The dynamics of capitalism and the division of labour, in view of what has been enunciated about Marx's theoretical assumption on human nature are breeding grounds for "alienated labour". To repeat, alienation is a social structural phenomenon. For clarity, it may be stated that the three main antecedents that transform creative activity into "alienated labour" are (a) market economy; (b) the process of task division of labour; (c) wage-labour (Israel, 1971:40-41). It may be stated, then, that alienation exists under the following conditions which ensued from the dynamics of capitalism and the division of labour: When individuals have little or no control over: "(a) the purposes and products of the labour process, (b) the overall organization of the workplace, and (c) the immediate work process itself" (Rinehart, 1975:17).

As Rinehart (1975) points out, contrary to popular belief, the primary source of alienation is not technology, but rather the main causes are to be found in social relations of domination and subordination with the concomitant divorce of decision-making from job performance.

The lucidity and perceptiveness with which Marx expounds on the impact of the dynamics of the division of
labour and capitalism in Capital, renders it worthy of an extensive citation. He writes:

...within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productiveness of labour are brought about at the cost of the individual labourer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producer; they mutilate the labourer into a fragment of a man, degrade him..., destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour-process in the proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they distort the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labour-process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness;...as capital accumulates, the lot of the labourer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse....Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital (310).

As the deliberations hitherto would attest to, the dynamics of the division of labour and capitalism inherently constitute antagonistic relationship between labour and capital. Hence, we see workers in capitalist societies reacting against conditions of structural alienation, in ways that are antithetical to the aims of capital. This issue is briefly addressed to further in the following chapter. In addition, the next chapter focuses on some of the historical developments that culminated in the proletarianization of the clerical work.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Rinehart (1975) has made the point that at the turn of this century, office clerks were usually employed in a small office where work was performed in close contact with company owners and on personal level of interaction. Moreover, work was performed in small groups, thus allowing for a "gemeinschaft" kind of relationship whereby members of work groups identified with each other. In effect, strong feelings of identification were developed with the company and its goals (see Gooding, 1970). During this era in Canadian history, office workers performed diversified functions. An incisive illustration of the working conditions at that time by J. C. McDonald, helps drive the point home:

The traditional clerk performed as a sort of human integrated data processing system, handling purchasing and inventory, correspondence, accounts, receivable and payable, bookkeeping, the preparation of financial statements, accounting, banking and so on... (1964:4).

Harry Braverman (1974) and Mills (1964), among others, have argued that in terms of authority, pay, tasks and seniority, the clerk was similar to the employer than the production worker. Again, this would lead to a feeling of satisfaction and identification with organizational goals that might accrue from work prior to the inception of an intricate system of bureaucracy.
As numerous enterprises developed mature bureaucracies, office work was increasingly specialized and rationalized. Rinehart (1975) indicated that by the late twenties and early thirties, the trend toward the rationalization and fragmentation of office work had gained momentum in Canada.

Before we deal a little more profoundly with the proletarianization of the clerical work, it is deemed appropriate that we first address ourselves to the system of Taylorism. For it is Taylor's recommendations with respect to the rationalization of factory work that serve as a framework for the rationalization of office work.

**Scientific Management**

The leading advocate of the so-called scientific management school was Frederick Taylor. He fervently insisted that under what he dubbed "ordinary management" prior to the introduction of his science, workers were left to produce according to their own initiatives. While the function of the management remained that of maintaining discipline and supervision. Under such a condition, Taylor contended, workers had the tendency to intentionally restrict output and so thereby worked below their optimum capacity (Braverman, 1974:90-101).

In an attempt to do away with "soldiering" that is restriction of output by workers. Taylor operated on the vague assumption that it was only the management who could
afford the time and resources to control and plan the production process. He made recommendations that resulted in even a more complex division of labour both vertically and horizontally. First, Taylor recommended that: "All possible brain work should be removed from the shop and centered in the planning or laying-out department..." (1947:98-99). Secondly, he proposed "a narrowing down of functions involved in a job, an extension of the division of labour, a trimming off of all variant, non-repetitive tasks" (cited in Rinehart, 1975:44). After a further simplification and compartmentalization of tasks, Taylor did a "time and motion" study to determine the speed at which work ought to be performed (ibid.:45).

In summary, Taylorian principles resulted in the following: (1) separation of work conception from its execution, and (2) "use of...monopoly over knowledge to control each step of the labour process and its mode of execution" (Braverman, 1974:119). In consequence, these principles serve to enhance the consolidation of managerial unilateral control over labour (Stone, 1973).

**Proletarization of White-Collar Work**

As was pointed out in the introductory chapter, we are here specifically concerned with those white-collar workers who are at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy. The concept of proletarianization is used to denote: (a) the process whereby in the organization of clerical work, conception
of work is divorced from execution; (b) fragmentation and specialization of clerical work, and (c) the erosion of the advantages of high prestige, pay and skill of the white-collar work over that of the blue-collar (cf. Glenn & Feldberg, 1977; Robischon et al., 1977).

William Leffingwell, following the pattern of Taylor's managerial principles, made similar recommendations in the organization of office work. Emphasis was laid on the importance of the rationalization of white-collar tasks through fragmented sub-division of clerical duties and centralization of authority (Braverman, 1974:306-311).

Succumbing to the influence of Taylor's "time-and-motion" study, in 1960, a manual by the title of "A Guide to Office Clerical Time Standard" was published. This manual stipulates exactly what fraction of a minute it should take an individual clerk to execute certain office related activities. For instance, for a file clerk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open and close</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File drawer, open and close...</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder, open or close flaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk drawer, open side drawer of standard desk</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get up from chair</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit down in chair</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn in swivel chair</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is in order to mention that, like in the factory, both Taylor's and Leffingwell's proposals serve to consolidate the management's control over office work organization. In consequence, these proposals led to virtual lack of control
by the worker over the work process and its outcomes. The process of rationalization is tantamount to deskillling the clerical worker. With the fragmentation and specialization of office work, the task of job conception becomes management's responsibility; hence old skills are rendered superfluous. "Many clerical jobs can be taught with step-by-step manuals in a few days" (Glenn and Feldberg, 1977:57). The way in which a bank teller describes what she does exemplifies the simplified nature of clerical work:

What I do is say hello to people when they come up to my window. "Can I help?" And transact their business, which amounts to taking money from them and putting it in their account. Or giving them out of their account. You make sure it's the right amount, put the deposits on through the machine so it shows on the books, so they know. You don't really do much. It's just a service job (quoted in Terkel, 1974:257).

Studies by Crozier (1971), Mills (1964), Kraft (1977) and Braverman (1974), among others, have convincingly documented the increasing similarities of white-collar work to that of the blue-collar. For example, Mills draws attention to the increasing division of labour, routinization and rationalization of work within the white-collar sector. As Mills puts it: "None of the features of the work of craftsmanship is prevalent in office....Some of white-collar work; such as the personality market, go well beyond the alienation conditions of wage work" (1964:226-27).

Braverman (1974:340-41) illustrates how the bank tellers have been transformed from persons who once used to exercise some degree of autonomy and performed diversified
tasks to employees whose activities are subject to the control and prescription of a "superior".

Even high level white-collar occupational categories of computer programming and engineering are not immune from the process of proletarianization. In order to facilitate the centralization of control, the work of computer programmers are compartmentalized and routinized. It is this trend that has led Philip Kraft to write in the following manner:

Programmers, systems analysts, and other software workers are experiencing efforts to break down, simplify, routinize, and standardize their own work so that it, too, can be done by machines instead of people....Most of the routine and tedium associated with the daily tasks of producing programs are left to an anonymous army of people who merely do what they are told, understanding little of what they do and less of why they are doing it. At least up to now, the computer has intensified, not reduced, the separation between those who think and those who do everything else, a division now beginning to separate software workers as well (1977:22-29).

Drawing and designing of engineering materials are skills that were historically restricted to the engineers, but now these skills are being built into computers. Harry Braverman illustrates the phenomenon thus:

Since such techniques are used in accord with the management-favored division of labour, they replace engineers and draftsmen with data-entry clerks and machine operators, and further intensify the concentration of conceptual and design knowledge. Thus, the very process which brought into being a mass engineering profession is being applied to that profession itself when it has grown to a large size, is occupied with duties which may be routinized, and when the advance of solid-state electronic technology makes it feasible to do so (1974:245).
Judson Gooding (1970) did a study of white-collar workers in the United States which suggests a trend the Canadian developments might take. Gooding points out that the most important consequence of rationalization of office work has been a deep-seated and growing dissatisfaction among clerical workers.

Faber (1975) described various techniques by which the blue-collar workers seek to overcome boredom, monotony and feelings of frustration arising because they have little or no control over the work process and its results. Some of these techniques are namely, daydreaming, absenteeism, sabotage, slow-downs and strikes. Given the findings of some of the aforementioned researches that the organization of white-collar work increasingly resembles that of the blue-collar, therefore, one might assume that such behavioral manifestations of structural alienation also exist in the white-collar sector. For example, in a sample survey of white-collar workers conducted in British Columbia, it was established that those with virtual lack of control over work were the most favourable to unionization (Marchak, 1977:155). Among the lower level white-collar jobs in the United States, it has been documented that "signs of discontent among this group include turnover rates as high as 30% annually and a 46% increase in white-collar union membership between 1958 and 1968" (Robischon, et al., 1977:233).

Ken Kusterer (1978) illustrates how the bank teller uses her "working knowledge" to assert control over her
physical work environment. This might be either in ways that
are consonant with the formal organizational prescription
or antithetical to it. The learning of "working knowledge"
and participation in communal networks, Kusterer argues, are
ways by which bank tellers are able to cope with the
contingencies of structural alienation. He explicates thus:
"Knowledge about the materials or documents and knowledge
about the equipment enable workers to increase their autonomy
over aspects of the physical environment of their work
places" (166).

Other studies in this area, such as those by Hoos
(1961) and Shepard (1971) tend to emphasize technology as
the primary source of alienation. As was demonstrated in
the preceding chapter, the primary source of alienation is
not technology, but rather the virtual lack of control by
the worker over the process of work and its outcomes. As
Whyte broadly puts it: "No normal person is happy in a
situation which he cannot control to some extent" (1955:94).
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Data Collection

The data were gathered by the use of a questionnaire; the questions we asked reflected those variables picked for testing. Furthermore, it was designed in such a way as to tap deeper meanings of the responses. This was done through open-ended questions (see the Appendix).*

On the assumption that the potential respondent should be able to understand the content of the questionnaire, we used the self-administered questionnaire method. Matters of economics and time pressure nullified the option of the interview method.

As a way to stimulate the respondents' willingness to return the questionnaire, it was made anonymous. In addition, a self-addressed envelope with postal stamp affixed was supplied with each questionnaire.

The places we picked to solicit respondents were a university, three credit unions, a bank, one law firm and an insurance company. The heads of the organizations were approached for permission to have the questionnaires

*The questionnaire is a hybrid of some items from Frances Gardner (1978), Martin Patchen (1970), together with novel formulations.
distributed to as many clerical workers as might be willing to participate.

The study was essentially intended to provide some insights on the probable relationship of the perceptions of centralization of control and the behavioral manifestations of structural alienation. We did not use a random sample because we were not making generalizations about a population. In any case, we had anticipated our total number of cases to be about a hundred so that we would be able to control for the variables of education and age. Unfortunately, the return rate on the questionnaires fell short of expectation.

A total of two hundred and thirteen questionnaires were distributed among the clerical workers between the first week of March, 1979 and the third week in April, 1979. By the middle of May, 1979, when the survey was terminated, only 23 percent (49) of the total of two hundred questionnaires distributed had been completed and returned. It should be pointed out that we had to personally go around to remind the respondents to even obtain this response rate.

Demographic Characteristics

Tables 1 through 5 reflect the demographic characteristics of our respondents.
### TABLE 1

**Age**
*(in Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 17 and 25</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 26 and 39</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 40 and 64</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N\(^2\) = 46

### TABLE 2

**Sex**
*(in Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48

### TABLE 3

**Marital Status**
*(in Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The N might not always be equal to 49 as the number of non-responses is subtracted before percent aging.*
### TABLE 4

**Level of Education**
(in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some 2-year College Education or</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some University Education or</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 48**

---

### TABLE 5

**Religion**
(in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 47**

---

**Operationalization of Variables**

The variables that were the centre of our inquiry were operationalized in the following manner:
A. The Independent Variable

The independent variable is the workers' perception of centralization of control. This was operationalized in terms of how much autonomy the workers perceived they had in organizing the work. The indices that were utilized in this respect were as follows:

1) Perception of control over work goals;
2) Perception of freedom to participate in decision-making;
3) Perception of being subject to rules

In order to measure the degree of the workers' perception of centralization of control, the following questions were asked:

(1) Are there rules governing how to behave at work?
   (i) _____ Yes
   (ii) _____ No

The No category was later designated as low level of perceived centralization of control, while the Yes category was dubbed as high level of perceived centralization of control.

(2) In some jobs, there are detailed rules about what is the right way to do the job. In others, a person can choose among several possible ways of doing the job. How is it with your job?
   (1) Almost everything is covered by rules _____
   (2) Most things are covered by rules _____
   (3) About half and half _____
(4) On most things I have a choice of ways of doing the work 

(5) On almost everything I have a choice of ways of doing the work 

Categories 3 through 5 were collapsed and designated as perception of low centralization of control; 1 and 2 were merged and designated as the perception of high level of centralization of control.

(3) When you get a job to do, how often is it completely up to you to decide how to go about doing it?

(1) ___ Never
(2) ___ About one-tenth of the time or less
(3) ___ About one-quarter of the time
(4) ___ About half of the time
(5) ___ About three-quarters of the time
(6) ___ Almost always

Categories 5 and 6 were collapsed to form the workers' perception of low level of centralization of control, while 1 through 4 were collapsed and designated as the perception of high level of centralization of control.

(4) When you have several things to do on the job, how often are you able to decide which you will do first?

(6) ___ Almost always

(5) ___ About three-quarters of the time
(4) ___ About half of the time
(3) ___ About one-quarter of the time
(2) ___ About one-tenth of the time or less
(1) ___ Never

Category 6 was designated as the workers' perception of low level of centralization of control, while categories 1 through 5 were collapsed and labelled as the perception of high level of centralization of control.

In order to determine if these items were interrelated, they were crosstabulated against each other. This revealed positive correlations ranging from moderate to high. The matrix of correlation coefficients is presented in Table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules on how to</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.25581</td>
<td>.28614</td>
<td>.67143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behave at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed rules</td>
<td>.25581</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.23810</td>
<td>.77778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on doing the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow to decide</td>
<td>.28614</td>
<td>.23810</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.87234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to do the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to decide</td>
<td>.67143</td>
<td>.77778</td>
<td>.87234</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the order of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for the extent of unidimensionality of the items for measures of the worker's perception of
centralization of control, the technique of Scalogram Analysis was utilized. This technique "enables us to determine the coefficient of reproducibility in such a way that the coefficient does accurately represent the degree of accuracy with which we can reproduce the responses to statements from total scores alone" (Edwards, 1957:184).

The result of the test revealed a coefficient of Reproducibility of .8182, which fell short of the required .9; a coefficient of Scalability of .4839, this also fell short of the required .6; and a measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducibility of .6477 which is fairly low. As these scores were not excessively remote from meeting the stringent requirements of Scalogram Analysis, and in view of the moderate to high correlation coefficients between the items (see Table 6), we felt justified in combining them and using them as an index of "the workers' perception of centralization of control".

The resulting index of the workers' perception of centralization of control as distributed throughout the sample is presented in Table 7. The numerical values of the responses range from 1 (perception of low centralization of control) to 5 (perception of high centralization of control).

Categories 1 and 2 were later collapsed to constitute perceived low level of centralization of control, while 3 through 5 were merged to form perceived high level of
B. The Dependent Variable

The dependent variables were operationalized in terms of the various techniques the workers might devise in order to overcome boredom, monotony, and feelings of frustration ensuing because of the virtual lack of control over the work process and its results. These techniques that may be hereafter referred to as behavioral manifestations of structural alienation were measured in terms of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7

Distribution of the Workers' Perception of Centralization of Control in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8

Collapsed Distribution of the Workers' Perception of Centralization of Control (see Table 8 below).
indicators: individual acts, cooperation, slowdown, perception of strikes as efficacious, unionism and favourable orientation towards the union. These categories of the dependent variable were further subdivided in the following manner:

1) Individual Acts - (a) daydreaming, (b) absenteeism and (c) turnover.

2) Cooperation - this was operationalized in terms of the extent to which the workers are oriented towards helping each other at work.

3) Slowdown - this was operationalized in terms of the extent to which the workers deliberately slow down the pace of performance.

4) Perception of strikes as efficacious - this was defined in terms of the extent to which the workers believe that participation in strikes help them procure what they desire from the management.

5) Unionism - this was measured in terms of whether or not the workers belonged to a union, and the extent to which the union was used for ameliorative ends.

6) Favourable orientation towards the union - this was measured in terms of the extent to which the union was perceived positively by the workers.
Further Definitions of Some of the Other Aspects of the Dependent Variable

1. Daydreaming - the extent to which the workers think about previous or anticipated events outside of work.

2. Turnover - the extent to which workers may voluntarily change jobs in order to find better working conditions (Marglin, 1976).

3. Absenteeism - the extent to which the workers skip work just because they are tired of working and need a break.

The dependent variables were measured by asking questions relating to each of them as indicated below.

1. Individual Acts
   (a) Daydreaming -

      How often do you daydream or think about things other than your duties during office hours?

      (1) _____ About half of the time or more
      (2) _____ About one-third of the time
      (3) _____ About one-quarter of the time
      (4) _____ About one-eighth of the time
      (5) _____ Rarely
      (6) _____ Never

The frequency distribution of the responses to the question on daydreaming is presented in raw figures on Table 9.
TABLE 9

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Daydreaming (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) About half of the time or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) About one-third of the time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) About one-quarter of the time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) About one-eighth of the time</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Rarely</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Never</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48

Categories 5 and 6 were collapsed and designated as the low category, while 1 through 4 were merged and designated as the high category. The collapsed frequency distribution is provided in percentages on Table 12.

(b) Absenteeism -

How often have you taken a day off just because you were tired of working and needed a break from work?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Almost every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Once every few days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>About once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Once every few weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution of the responses to the question on absenteeism is provided in raw figures on Table 10.
TABLE 10

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Absenteeism (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Never</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) About once a month</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 49

Category 1 was designated as the low category, while the second one was dubbed as the high category. The other categories were not checked by any of the respondents. The frequency distribution is provided on percentages on Table 12.

(c) Turnover -

Do you think you will move from your present job to another in the near future?

(1) ____ Yes

(2) ____ No

The frequency distribution of the responses to the question on turnover is provided in raw figures on Table 11.

TABLE 11

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Turnover (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48
The frequency distribution for the Individual Act items is presented in percentages on Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

Frequency Distribution of the Individual Act Items (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Daydreaming</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Cooperation**

People I work with now help each other during office hours:

(1) _____ Strongly disagree  
(2) _____ Disagree  
(3) _____ Uncertain  
(4) _____ Agree  
(5) _____ Strongly Agree

The frequency distribution of the responses to the question on Cooperation is presented in raw figures on Table 13.
TABLE 13

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Cooperation (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Uncertain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 44

Categories 4 and 5 were collapsed and designated as agree, 2 remains the disagree category (category 1 was not checked by any respondent), while 3 remains the uncertain category. The collapsed frequency distribution is presented in percentages on Table 14.

TABLE 14

Collapsed Frequency Distribution of Cooperation Item (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 44

3. Slowdown

Do you sometimes slow down the pace at which you work?

(1) Yes

(2) No
The frequency distribution of the responses to the question on slowdown is presented in raw figures on Table 15, and it is provided in percentages on Table 16.

**TABLE 15**

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Slowdown (In Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 49

**TABLE 16**

Frequency Distribution of Slowdown Item (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slowdown</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 49

4. **Perception of Strikes as Efficacious**

Engaging in strikes helps workers get what they want from the management:

(1) ____ Strongly agree
(2) ____ Agree
(3) ____ Uncertain
(4) ____ Disagree
(5) ____ Strongly disagree
The frequency distribution of the responses on the question measuring the perception of strikes as efficacious is presented in raw figures on Table 17.

TABLE 17

Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perception of Strikes as Efficacious (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Uncertain</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 46

Category 2 remained the agree one, 3 the uncertain, categories 4 and 5 were collapsed to form the disagree category. The first category was not checked by any of the respondents. The collapsed frequency distribution is provided in percentages on Table 18.

TABLE 18

Collapsed Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perceptions of Strikes as Efficacious (in Per Centages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Strikes as Efficacious</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Unionism**

(a) **Being a Member of the Union**

Are you a member of the union?

(1) ____ Yes

(2) ____ No

The frequency distribution on the responses to the question on which membership is presented in raw figures on Table 19, and is presented in percentages on Table 20.

**TABLE 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 49**

**TABLE 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Distribution of Union Membership Item (in Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being a Union Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 49**

(b) **Having Grounds to Make Complaints Through the Grievance Machinery**

How often do you feel that you have grounds for making a complaint through the grievance machinery?

(1) ____ At least once a day

(2) ____ At least once a week

(3) ____ At least once a month
(4) At least once in every four-month period
(5) At least once in every eight-month period
(6) At least once in a year
(7) Less than once a year
(8) Never

TABLE 21

Frequency Distribution of the Item on Having Grounds to Make Complaints Through the Grievance Machinery (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) At least once a day</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) At least once a week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) At least once a month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) At least once in every four-month period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) At least once in every eight-month period</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) At least once in a year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Less than once a year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Never</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

Category 8 was designated as never, while 2 through 7 were collapsed to form the sometimes category, (none of the respondents checked category 1). The collapsed frequency distribution is presented in percentages on Table 22.
TABLE 22

Collapsed Frequency Distribution of the Item on Having Grounds To Make Complaints Through the Grievance Machinery (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>.48.0</td>
<td>.52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

(c) The Union Being Perceived as Important

It is important to get the workers unionized in the place at which you work:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Uncertain
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

The frequency distribution of the responses is provided in raw figures on Table 23.

TABLE 23

Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perceptions of Unionization as Important (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Uncertain</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 45
Categories 4 and 5 were collapsed to form the agree category, 3 remained the uncertain, while 1 and 2 were merged and designated as the disagree category. The collapsed frequency distribution is provided on Table 24 in percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perceptions of Unionization as Important (in percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unionization is Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 45

(d) **Perceiving the Union as Ameliorative**

A union would help workers in improving working conditions:

(1) ___ Strongly Agree
(2) ___ Agree
(3) ___ Uncertain
(4) ___ Disagree
(5) ___ Strongly Disagree

The frequency distribution to the above response categories is presented in raw figures on Table 25.
TABLE 25

Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perceptions of the Union as Ameliorative (in Raw Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Uncertain</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 47

Categories 1 and 2 were combined and designated as the agree one, 3 remained the uncertain, while 4 and 5 were merged into the disagree category. The collapsed frequency distribution is presented on Table 26 in percentages.

TABLE 26

Collapsed Frequency Distribution of the Item on the Workers' Perceptions of the Union as Ameliorative (in per centages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Union is Ameliorative</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Favourable Orientation Toward the Union

In order to measure the workers' orientation towards the union that is, the extent to which they have positive attitudes towards the workers' organization, the following questions were asked:
(i) It is important to get the workers unionized in the place at which you work.

(ii) A union would help workers in improving working conditions.

(iii) Engaging in strikes helps workers get what they want from the management.

The questions used Likert-scale categories thusly:
(1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Uncertain, (4) Disagree, (5) Strongly Disagree. This order of categories was reversed for the first item to help inhibit the probable tendency of the respondents checking the categories in just a set pattern.

For questions 1 and 2 above, categories 4 and 5 were collapsed and designated as low positive union attitude, the third category was medium and the first and second were collapsed to form the high category. On the last item above, category 2 became the low one, 3 the medium, while for 4 and 5 were merged into the high category (the first category on the last item was not checked by any respondent).

In order to determine the extent of relationship between the items, they were crosstabulated against each other. This process revealed moderate to high positive correlation coefficients between the items. The resulting correlation matrix is presented in Table 27.

* We would like to note that this dimension was considered suitable as a measure of the workers' favourable orientation towards the union.
TABLE 27

Matrix of Correlation Coefficients of Items Comprising Index of Favourable Orientation towards the Union in Gammas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Important to get Workers Unionized</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.64957</td>
<td>.58036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Union Would Help Improve Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.25778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strikers are Efficacious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Unidimensionality of the three items were determined through the use of Scalogram Analysis. The coefficient of reproducibility was .8686 which is a little below the prescribed .9. The minimum marginal reproducibility was .6288, which is fairly low; and the coefficient of scalability was .6327 which meets the required .6.

In view of the fact that the requirements of Scalogram Analysis were almost met and the correlation coefficients between the items were medium to high, it was deemed appropriate to develop an index of Favourable Orientation towards the Union and assign them scores accordingly (see Table 28).
TABLE 28

Distribution of Favourable Orientation Towards the Union Scores in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categories 1 through 3 were collapsed to form our low measure of favourable orientation towards the union, 4 became medium, and categories 5 through 7 were collapsed and dubbed the high category (see Table 29).

TABLE 29

Distribution ofCollapsed Favourable Orientation towards the Union Scores in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The Intervening Variables*

Educational Level

One of the variables that were to be controlled for, was the worker's educational level. This was based on the

*The variables of education and age could no longer be controlled for due to the limited availability of data.
the findings of previous researches that the higher an individual's educational level, the greater will be the need for control over what one does (Blauner, 1964).

The educational level was measured by asking the following question: What was the highest grade of school you completed?

(1) ____ Eight years or under
(2) ____ Between nine and eleven years
(3) ____ Completed high school
(4) ____ Post-secondary training (please specify)

The frequency distribution is presented in raw figures on Table 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Eight years or Under</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Between Nine and Eleven Years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Completed High School</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Post-Secondary</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48

Categories 1 and 2 were not checked by any of the respondents. Category 3 was designated as low educational level, while the fourth one was designated as high. The frequency distribution is presented in percentages on Table 31.
TABLE 31

Frequency Distribution of Educational Level (in Per Centages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48

Age

The other variable that was to be controlled for was age. This accrues from the following couple of insights. First, Faber and Rinehart (1970:11) indicated that younger workers were replacing persons who had experienced a major depression in the Thirties. Whereas older workers using their previous experiences as a frame of reference may be more tolerant of their present circumstances vis-à-vis their younger counterparts with no comparable previous experience. Second, in a Canadian national survey conducted by Burstein et al (1975), it was revealed that younger workers had higher aspirations for interesting work. As a result they changed jobs more often than older workers. Furthermore, the survey pointed out that younger workers expressed more dissatisfaction than the older ones on the same job (cited in Archibald, 1978:125).

The variable of age was measured by means of the following question:

Age (on last birth date): 

The frequency distribution is presented in raw figures on Table 32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 46
Ages 17 through 34 were collapsed and designated as the youth category, while 37 through 64 were merged and dubbed the middle age category. A separate category could not be designated as old due to the limited number of cases. The collapsed frequency distribution of age is presented in percentages on Table 33.

**TABLE 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Middle Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 46 \]

**Hypotheses**

(1) **Central Hypothesis**

As the level of the workers' perception of centralization of control increases behavioral manifestations of structural alienation will increase.

**Hypotheses Relating to the Intervening Variables**

(2) **Educational Level**

The relationship between the level of the workers' perception of centralization of control and behavioral manifestations of structural alienation will increase as educational level increases.

*As previously tacitly indicated, limited availability of data nullifies the desire to test for the hypotheses relating to the control variables as we had originally planned.*
(3) **Age**

(a) As the level of the workers' perception of centralization of control increases and age decreases, absenteeism rate, turnover rate, slowdown, perception of strikes as efficacious, unionism and favourable orientation towards the union will preponderate.

(b) As the level of the workers' perception of centralization of control increases and age increases, the degree of daydreaming and co-operation with co-workers will preponderate.

**Research Schema**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Intervening Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of Control:</td>
<td>1) Educational Level:</td>
<td>Behavioral Manifestations of Structural Alienation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Control over work goals</td>
<td>(a) Low</td>
<td>1) Individual Acts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Freedom to participate in decision-making</td>
<td>(b) High</td>
<td>(a) Daydreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Being subject to rules</td>
<td>2) Age:</td>
<td>(b) Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Young</td>
<td>(c) Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Middle Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Co-operation
3) Slowdown
4) Perception of strikes as efficacious
5) Unionism
6) Favourable Orientation towards the Union
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The time has now come to address ourselves to the hypotheses in order to determine their accuracy. You will recall that the general hypothesis was stated thusly: As the level of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control increases, behavioral manifestations of structural alienation will increase.

The results revealed some patterns of correlation that were in consonance with our central hypothesis, however, there were also a few rather interesting patterns that were contrary to our expectations.

Results

Absenteeism

Question: How often have you taken a day off just because you were tired of working and needed a break from work?

When this indicator of absenteeism was related to our index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control, we found a medium to high positive relationship between them; with a Gamma of .35 (see Table 34). Thus suggesting that the knowledge of perceived centralization of control would reduce our error in estimating this particular mode of response thirty-five per cent of the time. Hence validating our prediction in this regard.

Furthermore, 15.3 per cent more respondents with perceptions of high centralization of control skip work more often than those with perceptions of low centralization of control. In other words, the higher
the perceived centralization of control the greater will be the absenteeism rate.

TABLE 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Centralization of Control by Absenteeism</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .35
N = 44

Discussion on Absenteeism

The results just reported suggest that the workers' absences were functions of the social relations of subordination and domination in the organization of clerical work. This has an important implication for those investigating this mode of response, namely: That an important source of absenteeism inheres in the hierarchical social relations established in the workplace.

In order to better understand the underlying dynamics that might determine absenteeism, we asked the respondents whether or not they skip work for other reasons. It is noteworthy that thirteen per cent more respondents with perceptions of high centralization of control skipped work when compared to those with perceptions of low centralization of control (see Table 35).

Some of the reasons given for absences were, yiz.: Doctor's
appointments, sickness, family crisis, shopping, et cetera.

TABLE 35*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Centralization of Control by Absenteeism</th>
<th>(in Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Centralization of Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism 2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 43

Results

Turnover

Question: Do you think you will move from your present job to another in the near future?

A crosstabulation of our index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control with the indicator of turnover revealed a very small negative correlation between them, with a Gamma of -.07 (see Table 36). Only 3.1 per cent more respondents with high perceptions of centralization of control would want to leave their jobs for another, as compared to those with low perceived centralization of control, this percentage difference was considered negligible. In view of these results, we concluded that our prediction in this regard was probably invalid.

Discussion on Turnover

From a study on "Size and Morale" by the Acton Society Trust

*Presented for descriptive purposes only.
TABLE 36
Perception of Centralization of Control by Turnover
(in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Low (33.3)</th>
<th>High (36.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .07
N = 43

investigators, the following conclusion was derived:

There was, factory by factory, no significant correlation between voluntary turnover rate and total absenteeism, nor with size of factory. Hence it looks as if the reasons that cause men to leave their jobs are not those that cause them to stay away from them, whether for sickness or other reasons; but this conclusion needs to be investigated further (cited in Ingham, 1970:27-28).

Several other empirical studies that have sought to link absenteeism and turnover to some organizational dimensions have almost always come up with inconsistent or nebulous findings (Cf. Dewey et al, 1978; Ingham, 1970). We have earlier dealt with our findings on absenteeism and their relevant interpretations. Although our study has not come up with conclusive answers to the dilemma on turnover, it seems that we might be able to throw some light on this puzzle; albeit speculatively.

In order to probe for deeper meanings of responses to the measure of turnover, we posed the following question: If you are going to move from your present job to another, would you please explain why? Some of the reasons elicited by this question were, namely:
Disenchantment with the present job, higher pay, upward mobility, more responsibility and challenge or simply to avoid "rude" customers and co-workers. Some verbatim responses by some of the respondents in relation to the above question were:

(a) "I feel I can make more money. In my job now, I can't move up. The people in my opinion, are rude. They are always talking about someone. I talk to the public everyday and they can be rude!" (emphasis by the respondent) (a bank teller)

(b) "Because I feel there is a need to always try and better myself and I feel that if you're stuck in a job too long you are eventually in a "rut" and it gets harder to leave." (a secretary)

(c) "I feel I can do more than what I am doing now, am able to handle more responsibility, and should be able to earn more money." (a file clerk)

(d) "For a higher position or higher salary level." (a file clerk)

Evidently, then, the predisposition that some of the respondents had to leave their jobs was attributable to the above factors. It was surprising to us that a negative correlation existed between our index of perceptions of centralization of control and the indicator on turnover. Perhaps, this had something to do with "job security." It is possible that due to the general difficulty in finding a job these days, our respondents might be less inclined to leave their present jobs without another to replace them.

C. Wright Mills (1964), Rosabeth Kanter (1977) and Sergio Talacchi (1960) among others, have stated that secretaries and other clerical workers quite often derive some sense of social status and prestige from their "superordinates". Kanter further points out that
due to authorization from "superordinates" to furnish certain office related facilities, they might come to enjoy some sense of derived power as well. Talacchi discusses the situation that would ensue if the foregoing were not present. He writes:

> Status differentiation leads to increased potential for interpersonal conflict, which, in turn, leads to lower level of satisfaction and undesirable behaviour of employees-absenteeism, turnover, poor work performance, and so on (1960:402).

These factors along with a paternalistic approach by management towards clerical workers might come to instil in them the values of the organization. Consequently, the derived status, power and prestige together with the paternalistic approach might offset the workers' perceptions of centralization of control, thereby mitigating against turnover.

The foregoing views were presented because of the logical appeal they hold, for we are aware of the fact that they might be more relevant to a prior time in the history of the organization of clerical work. We have already discussed the social changes that have culminated in the proletarianization of clerical work. It seems to us that this would provoke behaviours that reflect the alienation existing in the work setting.

Further research in this area might do well to consider the role of the perception of derived status, prestige and power play in the relationship between the perceptions of centralization of control and turnover.

The fact that all of our respondents work in non-manufacturing organizations is probably another important consideration. The greater intensity in work flows and demands coupled with technological factors
in manufacturing organizations might culminate in different workers' behaviour vis-a-vis non-manufacturing organizations (Talacchi, 1960: 407). Again, further research might do well to ascertain the exact role these variables play in affecting turnover.

Results

Daydreaming

Question: How often do you daydream or think about things other than your duties during office hours?

Upon relating the index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control to the indicator on daydreaming, we found a strong positive correlation between them, with a Gamma of .49 (see Table 37). The results also revealed that 21.9 per cent more people

TABLE 37
Perception of Centralization of Control by Daydreaming (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daydreaming</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .49
N = 43

with high perceived centralization of control daydream more than those with low perceived centralization of control. That is to say, the higher the perception of centralization of control; the greater would be the tendency to daydream. Hence validating our prediction in that respect.
Discussion on Daydreaming

We asked our respondents to state some of the things they daydreamed about. Previous and/or anticipated leisure activities, romance, family obligations and alternative jobs were some of the things they daydreamed about. The following were verbatim accounts from some respondents:

(a) "About what else I could be doing or if I had attended an event the evening before or am going to an event in the near future - such as a party." (a secretary)

(b) "Simply look out the window and watch people stroll by." (a file clerk)

(c) "What the future holds in way of my career goals - What I have to do to achieve my goals." (a secretary)

(d) "Sunny, bright, green, lazy summer days with beautiful record I am listening to in the background." (a secretary)

(e) "About the thing I did the night before. The things I have to do on my lunch hour. The things I will do that night, my boyfriend ...." (a bank teller)

Owing to the virtual lack of control over the work process and its outcomes, the workers mentally detach themselves from work and think about other aspects of their lives that would bring them "good", perhaps, interesting memories.

The proportion of higher incidence of daydreaming among those who perceived themselves as greater controlled may not only serve to further obstruct effective and self-fulfilling performance at work, but might also diffuse into the workers' roles in the family and community. As the evidence we obtained would attest, the phenomenon of daydreaming in the workplace is not to be primarily attributed to
the contrived psychology of the individual worker, but rather to the concrete hierarchical social structure established in the workplace. This observation is of utmost importance to those who are genuinely interested in the workers' "welfare."

Results

Co-operation

Question: People I work with now help each other out during office hours.

Seventy-five per cent of the respondents indicated that they agree with the question. When the independent variable was related to the indicator of the above named variable, we found a moderately low positive correlation between them, with a Gamma of .16 (see Table 38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .16
N = 40

Meaning that knowledge of our respondents' perceptions of centralization of control would reduce our error in predicting the extent of co-operation among them sixteen per cent of the time, although this is a low correlation and the percentage difference is only eight per cent,
it was in the predicted direction.

Personal Discussion

In order to get a more profound understanding of the extent of intimate interaction among the respondents, we asked the following two questions. First: Do you sometimes talk about personal matters with co-workers? Eight-four per cent of the respondents answered in the affirmative (see Table 39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 39*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exchanging Gifts

Second: Do you sometimes exchange gifts with co-workers? Over sixty-five per cent of the respondents replied in the affirmative (see Table 40).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 40*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are for illustrative purposes only.
Discussion on Co-operation, Personal Discussion and Exchanging Gifts

These findings seem to suggest that the workers create a culture of their own in the workplace based on primary relations which is at variance with that of the formal organization. The findings are suggestive of ways of coping with structural alienation, hence lending credence to Kusterer's (1978) assertion that people do transform "gesellschaft" relationship into "gemeinschaft" in order to "reduce their own alienation in the work situation" (150-153).

Results

Slowdown

Question: Do you sometimes slowdown the pace at which you work?

Seventy-nine per cent of the respondents replied in the affirmative. 3.7 per cent more respondents with high perceived centralization of control slowdown more than those with low perceived centralization of control, which is a negligible percentage difference.

A crosstabulation of our independent variable with the indicator on slowdown produced a low positive Gamma of .11 (see Table 41).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slowdown</th>
<th>Perception of Centralization of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Gamma} = .11 \]

\[ N = 43 \]
Although this was in the predicted direction, we could not conclude that this was a validation of our hypothesis in this respect, due to the low degree of correlation.

**Discussion on Slowdown**

In order to determine the frequency of slowdown we asked the following question: If you sometimes slowdown the pace at which you work, how often do you do so? It is interesting to note that twenty-seven per cent of the respondents indicated that they slowdown one-quarter of the time, while over seventy-two per cent indicated that they do so one-tenth of the time (see Table 42 below).

**TABLE 42**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Slowdown</th>
<th>(in Percentages)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10 of the Time</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 of the Time</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also asked the respondents the following open-ended question: If you sometimes slowdown the pace at which you work, would you please explain why? Responses to this question revealed that the slowdown might be due to extraneous variables, such as: Low work volume, fatigue, boredom, avoidance of mistakes, relief of pressure, et cetera. It is of interest to present some verbatim responses in regard to the above question. They were as follows:

*Presented for illustrative purposes only.
(a) "I had a hard night and I don't feel like doing anything, I'm not feeling good. Or if I get fed up. The people get on my nerves because they have a lot of work but don't wish to get it done. So some days I'll slowdown." (a bank teller)

(b) "Sometimes if there isn't much work to do I have to space it out accordingly." (a file clerk)

(c) "Depending on mood, time and amount and type of work, especially monotonous jobs." (a bank teller)

(d) "If I have been really busy and working too hard and knew that there is no immediate deadline on the job I'm doing." (a secretary)

(e) "I make mistakes sometimes because I'm fairly new here." (a bank teller)

As these responses involved the workers taking the initiative on when and the basis for slowdown, it would seem that they basically possess some sense of autonomy. Otherwise, they would probably not have slowed down for the extraneous reasons stated for fear of loosing their jobs.

It became axiomatic that part of the explanation for the slowdown was inherent in the foregoing response pattern.

It is quite possible that the human propensity to seek social approval from others plays a role in the pattern of slowdown response. The subtle cultural norm in this society dictates that individuals be "nice" to each other, be it in public or elsewhere. A departure from this subtle normative standard may eventuate in disapproval from others in any conceivable manner. Given that all of our respondents are employed in organizations where they have to interact with members of an academic community or the public at large, it necessarily follows that they would be inclined to conform with the
subtle cultural normative standard of being "nice" to others; as they would try to avoid the social disapproval that might ensue, "ceteris paribus." In consequence, workers whose jobs involve interacting with others, such as our respondents, would probably not slowdown the pace of performance indiscriminately, as this could inhibit prompt service to the clientele. These circumstances might have mitigated against a stronger relationship between the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and the indicator on slowdown.

The foregoing contention may be given greater credence by the following comment from a machine operator:

I mean if I'm going to be a machine operator, then I've got to be a good one. I can't be a good person without being a good machine operator (cited in Kusterer, 1978:156).

The following observation by Kusterer is in line with the above speculation

...Fellow workers expect each other to do their share and participate fully in the necessary work. Knowledgeability and proficiency and the performance of high quality work are respected attributes. In all of the work communities studied, the people in each community who were most respected and most liked were invariably also "good workers" (Kusterer, 1978:155-56).

Results

Perception of Strikes as efficacious

Question: Engaging in strikes helps workers get what they want from the management.

A crosstabulation of our index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control with the indicator on the above named variable produced an inverse correlation between them, with a Gamma of -.22 (see Table 43). Implying therefore, that the workers'
perceiving strikes as efficacious was not a function of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control, thus invalidating our prediction.

In addition, only 7.3 per cent more people with low perceived autonomy thought of participation in strikes as efficacious vis-a-vis those with high perceived autonomy. The direction of the per cent age difference was consistent with our prediction, but since it was so low, we considered it negligible.

Discussion on the Perception of Strikes as efficacious

An explanation is in order to help us account for the unexpected inverse correlation just reported.

Previous strikes our respondents might have participated in or learned about could have oriented them towards believing that engaging in strikes is not worthwhile. The kinds of settlements could have been short of their expectations resulting in discouraging the
respondents from perceiving strikes in a favourable manner.

Another plausible explanation might be due to the cultural norms of this society which disapproves of aggressive behaviour by females. Since eight-five per cent of our respondents are females, the norms might have influenced their perceptions of strikes negatively.

Our data revealed that over forty-two per cent of the respondents felt ambivalent about engaging in strikes. Whereas objective conditions may have provoked the desire for ameliorative change in the respondents. The cultural norms disapproving of aggressive behaviour by females might have inhibited the urge for them to express positive feelings towards participation in strikes.

Results

Unionism

You will recall from the previous chapter that unionism was operationalized in terms of whether or not the workers belonged to a union, and the extent to which the union was used for ameliorative ends. In what follows the results of crosstabulations between the index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and the various indices on unionism are presented.

(a) Being a member of the Union

Question: Are you a member of the union?

The data revealed that over fifty-four per cent of the respondents belonged to the union. Fourteen per cent more of the respondents with low perceived centralization of control than those with high perceived centralization of control belonged to the union.

When this indicator of unionism was related to our independent
variable, we found a fairly high positive correlation between them, with a Gamma of .28 (see Table 44). Thus tending in the direction of our hypothesis.

(b) Having Grounds to make Complaints

Question: How often do you feel that you have grounds for making complaints through the grievance machinery?

Whereas 45.5 per cent of the respondents never had grounds to

| Perception of Centralization of Control by Being a Member of the Union (in Percentages) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| Being a Member of the Union                                  | Low    | High   |
| Yes                                                           | 61.9   | 47.8   |
| No                                                            | 38.1   | 52.2   |
| Total Per cent                                                | 100.0  | 100.0  |
| Total Number                                                  | 21     | 23     |

Gamma = .28
N = 44

make complaints through the grievance machinery, 54.5 per cent of them reported sometimes doing so.

Furthermore, twenty-eight per cent more respondents with high perceived centralization of control had grounds to make complaints more often than those with low perceived centralization of control.

A crosstabulation of the above named variable with the independent variable produced a strong positive correlation between them, with a Gamma of .53 (see Table 45). Thus lending credence to our prediction.
TABLE 45  
Perception of Centralization of Control by Complaints through the Grievance Machinery (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Per cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .53  
N = 22

(c) The Union being perceived as important

Question: It is important to get the workers unionized in the place at which you work.

The data revealed that 8.8 per cent more respondents with low perceived centralization of control agreed that it is important to get the workers unionized as compared to those with high perceived centralization of control. In addition, 12.2 per cent more respondents with high perceived centralization of control disagreed when asked whether getting the workers unionized was important (see Table 46). That is, the higher the perceived autonomy, the greater was the tendency to perceive that getting the workers unionized was important.

When we looked at the correlation coefficient, we found a moderate positive correlation between them, with a Gamma of .21 (see Table 46). Implying that our knowledge of perceived centralization of control would reduce our error in estimating the extent of the workers' perceptions of unionization as important, twenty-one per cent.
of time. Though the evidence is not overwhelming, it does give some support to our prediction in this regard.

(d) **Perceiving the Union as ameliorative**

Question: A union would help workers in improving working conditions.

47.6 per cent of the respondents agreed with the above notion, 28.6 per cent was ambivalent about it, and 23.8 per cent disagreed with it.

A crosstabulation of this indicator with the index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control produced a low positive correlation, with a Gamma of .11 (see Table 47), which was in the predicted direction.

**Discussion on Unionism**

That the workers affiliate with the union mainly for pecuniary and other material **perquisites** seems to be a popular notion
TABLE 47
Perception of Centralization of Control by Perceiving the Union as Ameliorative (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Centralization of Control</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Per cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Gamma} = .11\]

\[\text{N} = 42\]

prevalent in the literature on the sociology of work. There is probably a great deal of truth to this statement. However, the results just presented indicated that structural alienation is also an important explanatory variable to help account for the rising trend in unionism within the white-collar sector. In other words, the data suggest that union affiliation is one of the resources through which the workers seek to change their objective alienating circumstances in the workplace.

We noted above that fourteen per cent more of the respondents with low perceived centralization of control belonged to the union than those with high perceived centralization of control, rather than vice versa. It is not quite clear as to why this is so, however, we can speculate. It might be that the union played a role in producing this situation. That is, the union made changes and established procedures that gave these workers a greater sense of security and autonomy, thus
alleviating their condition. This was not true for those who had not unionized and so the social structure at work was perceived as more centrally controlled.

The strong correlation we obtained between the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and the extent to which they make complaints through the union, evidently, lends credence to the foregoing standpoint, namely, that the primary reason for which the workers would affiliate with the union would be to alleviate their alienating circumstances at work. That twenty-eight per cent more respondents with high perceived centralization of control had grounds to make complaints more often than those with low perceived centralization of control and over fifty-four per cent of all respondents reported having grounds to make complaints were further substantiation to the aforementioned statement.

With respect to respondents' opinion about the importance of unionization, we noted that the lower the perceived centralization of control, the greater was the tendency to perceive that getting the workers unionized was important. Again, it could be that this group with lower perceived centralization of control felt more secure and autonomous; so that they believed that it was within their capability to alleviate their circumstances through the union machinery. Whereas those with high perceived centralization of control, due to resignation and timidity, attached less importance to unionization.

Nevertheless, we found a moderate positive correlation between the indicator on the extent of attaching importance to unionization and the index of perceived centralization of control, thus suggesting that this mode of response is a function of structural alienation.
In regard to the question as to determining the extent to which the workers perceive that the union would be instrumental in improving working conditions, as was noted earlier, over forty-seven per cent of the respondents agreed with this notion, over twenty-eight per cent felt ambivalent about it, while over twenty-three per cent disagreed with it. Previous objective circumstances during which some of the workers were probably disappointed with the union's inability to furnish what they might have desired; might have acted to shape some of the workers' perceptions with respect to the union's ameliorative capabilities in a negative light. Consequently, this might have contributed to the weak correlation we obtained between the indicator on the workers' perceptions of the union as ameliorative and our independent variable.

Results

Favourable Orientation towards the Union*

Whereas over forty-two per cent of the respondents were low in favourable orientation towards the union, thirty per cent were medium and over twenty-seven per cent were high. Furthermore, twelve per cent more respondents with high perceptions of centralization of control were higher in terms of favourable orientation towards the union as compared to those with low perceived centralization of control. This percentage difference was in the expected direction. That is, the higher the perceived centralization of control, the greater would be the favourable orientation towards the union.

*The reader would recall that the method by which this index was constructed, was detailed in the previous chapter.
When the above named index was related to the index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control, a low positive correlation was found between them, with a Gamma of .10 (see Table 48). In view of this low degree of correlation between the variables, we could not conclusively state that our hypothesis in this connection had been validated, albeit it was in the predicted direction.

**TABLE 48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Centralization of Control by Favourable Orientation Towards the Union (in Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Orientation Towards the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .10  
N = 40

**Discussion on Favourable Orientation towards the Union**

Although the degree of correlation between the above named index and the independent variable was weak, nonetheless, since it was in the direction predicted and in view of the fact that the degree of favourable orientation towards the union had the tendency to escalate in proportion with the workers' perceptions of centralization of control, it seems that the former variable is a function of the latter. Thus this would seem to lend credence to Patricia Marchak's finding that those white-
collar workers with minimal autonomy or none were the most favourable to unionization (1977:155).

However, we can still speculate that some underlying dynamics had come to contribute to the pattern of weak correlation we noted. A previous experience or employment at which time some of the workers had come into contact with a union and were probably disappointed with the union's inability to be instrumental in improving working conditions, might have given some of the workers negative attitudes towards unions, thus mitigating against a stronger correlation between the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and favourable orientation towards the union.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

We will summarize the main findings in the same sequence as in the previous chapter. While doing this we will offer possible implications along the line.

Absenteism

Our data suggest that the workers' absenteism was a function of the social relations of subordination and domination established in the organization of clerical work. This has an important implication for those investigating this mode of response, viz.: That an important source of absenteeism inheres in the hierarchical social relations existing in the workplace.

Our results also revealed that workers do skip work for other factors such as - doctor's appointments, sickness, family crisis, shopping et cetera.

It is deemed advisable that future similar research determine the extent of the intervening influences of these personal factors.

Turnover

Contrary to our expectation our results revealed a very low negative correlation between turnover and the independent variable. Therefore, concluded that this particular mode of response was probably not due to perceived centralization of control.

The data indicated that disenchantment with the present job, higher pay, upward mobility, more responsibility and challenge were some of the other reasons for which the workers would move from their
present jobs to another.

In order to account for the inverse correlation noted, we speculated that due to the general difficulty in finding a job these days, our respondents might be less inclined to leave their jobs without others to replace them.

We also suggested that a sense of derived status and prestige from "superordinates" that might have permeated the consciousness of some of the respondents coupled with a paternalistic approach from management might have mitigated against a positive correlation coefficient. The point was also made that this suggestion was made only in view of its logical appeal. This is due to social changes that culminated in the proletarianization of clerical work, thus evoking behavioral responses that reflect alienation existing in the workplace.

It was further suggested that perhaps, the fact that our sample came from non-manufacturing organizations is an important variable in its own right. Since the intensity of work flows, work demands and pressures and other technological variables are known to be higher in manufacturing organizations; these might have made the difference in behavioral responses (Talacchi, 1960:407).

Future work might do well to ascertain the exact role the nature of the kind of activity (i.e., whether or not it is economic) of an organization plays in affecting turnover.

Daydreaming

Our findings revealed a strong positive correlation between the index of the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and daydreaming. Further, we found a higher proportion of the incidence of daydreaming among those who perceived themselves as greater controlled.
Owing to the virtual lack of control over the work process and its outcomes, the workers mentally detach themselves from work and think about other aspects of their lives that would bring them "good", perhaps, interesting memories.

The prevalence of daydreaming we observed, may not only serve to further obstruct effective and self-fulfilling performance at work, but might also diffuse into the workers' roles in the family and community.

The evidence we summarized above has important implications for those who are genuinely interested in the "welfare" of the workers. Namely, that the phenomenon of daydreaming in the workplace is not to be primarily attributed to the psychology of the individual worker, but rather arises from the concrete hierarchical social structure established in the workplace.

Co-operation, Personal Discussion and Exchanging Gifts

The results revealed a moderately positive correlation between the indicator on co-operation and our independent variable. We also found that eighty-four percent of our respondents occasionally engage in personal conversations with each other. In addition, over sixty-five per cent of them sometimes exchange gifts with each other.

These findings seem to imply that the workers do create a culture of their own in the workplace based on primary relations which is at variance with that of the formal organization. Further, the findings are suggestive of ways of coping with structural alienation.

Slowdown

The results we obtained indicated a weak positive correlation between our indicator on slowdown and the index on the workers'
perceptions of centralization of control. Although this was in the predicted direction, it was short of allowing us to conclude that our hypothesis in this regard had been confirmed. Nevertheless, we noted that twenty per cent of the respondents indicated that they slowdown one-quarter of the time, while over seventy-two per cent reported doing so one-tenth of the time.

The data also suggested that the slowdown might be attributable to extraneous variables, such as: Low work volume, fatigue, boredom, relief of pressure, et cetera. Further research might want to ascertain the extent of possible intervening influences of these variables.

We speculated that the extant subtle cultural norm requiring that individuals be "nice" to each other might have mitigated against a stronger correlation than was observed. Since slowing down indiscriminately would be a departure from this normative standard, as this would inhibit prompt and efficient service to the clientele by our respondents, it follows that the clerical workers would want to abide by this norm for fear of social disapproval.

It would be interesting for future research to determine if the cultural norm stated above would bear any intervening influence on the relationship between slowdown and perceptions of centralization of control.

**Perceptions of Strikes as efficacious**

We noted from our results that seven per cent more respondents with high perceived centralization of control thought of participation in strikes as efficacious when compared to those with low perceived centralization of control. Although this percentage difference was
so low, it was in the predicted direction.

We speculated that the kinds of settlements obtained in the past or learned about could have been short of our respondents' expectations, thus resulting in discouraging them from perceiving strikes in a favourable manner.

We also proposed that cultural norms disapproving of aggressive behaviour by females could have been antithetical to the expression of positive feelings towards participation in strikes.

Further research with a larger sample would do well to consider the possible effects of the cultural norm regulating aggressive behaviour and perceptions of the fairness of workers-management settlements on the relationship noted above.

Unionism

The results revealed a fairly high positive correlation between our indicator on being a union member and the independent variable. In other words, the data suggested that union affiliation is one of the resources through which these workers sought to change their circumstances in the work place. These findings suggest that structural alienation could be an important explanatory variable to help account for the rising trend in unionism within the white-collar sector.

We also noted that more respondents with low perceived centralization of control belonged to the union than those with high perceived centralization of control, rather than vice versa. In order to account for this, we speculated that the union might have made changes and established procedures that gave these workers a greater sense of security and autonomy, thus improving their condition.
The same did not obtain for those who were not unionized and so the social structure at work was perceived as more centrally controlled.

We found a strong positive correlation between the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and the degree to which they made complaints through the union. In consequence, we inferred that the primary reason for which the workers affiliated with the union was to improve their circumstances at work. Proportionally more respondents with high perceived centralization of control had grounds to make complaints more often than those with low perceived centralization of control and a majority reported having grounds to make complaints which gave credence to the foregoing observation.

With reference to our respondents' opinions about the importance of getting unionized, we observed that the lower the perceived centralization of control, the greater was the tendency to feel that getting the workers unionized was important. We reasoned that this group with lower perceived centralization of control might have felt more secure and autonomous; so that they consequently believed that it was within their capability to alleviate their circumstances through the union machinery. On the other hand, those with high perceived centralization of control, owing to resignation and timidity, attached less importance to unionization.

Nonetheless, a crosstabulation produced a moderate positive correlation between the indicator on the degree of attaching importance to unionization and our independent variable, thus giving support to our prediction.

With respect to the indicator on the extent to which the workers
perceive that the union would be instrumental in improving working conditions, we noted a weak positive correlation upon a crosstabulation with the independent variable. In order to explain the weak relationship, we reasoned that previous objective circumstances during which some of the respondents were probably disappointed with the union's incompetence to provide what they might have desired, could have contributed to the weak correlation we found between the independent variable and the indicator on the workers' perceptions of the union as ameliorative.

Favourable Orientation towards the Union

The degree of correlation between the above named index and the independent variable was weak. Nevertheless, our findings indicated that the higher the perceived centralization of control, the greater would be the favourable orientation towards the union.

We proposed that previous experience or employment at which time some of the workers had come into contact with a union and were probably disappointed with the union's ineptitude in improving working conditions, would have provoked negative attitudes towards unions, thereby mitigating against a stronger correlation between the workers' perceptions of centralization of control and favourable orientation towards the union.

We also thought that a sense of social status and prestige derived from "superordinates" might have contributed to negative attitudes towards the union.

Future work with a larger sample might come up with a more definitive explanation by measuring and controlling for the variables of the workers' perceptions of derived status and prestige. In
addition, further research might do well to determine whether or not workers perceive the union as competent and thereby controlling for this variable.

Further Comments

As would have been evident from the preceding pages, by being attuned to the workers' perspectives, we were able to obtain some data we would not have been able to collect otherwise. To be sure, a few illustrations are in order. By being sensitive to their perspectives, we were able to ascertain that some of the other reasons some respondents would want to quit their jobs for another, were the desire for more responsibility, challenge and higher pay. It was also from the workers' perspectives that we became cognizant that they also slowdown because of low work volume, avoidance of mistakes and relief of pressure. By subjecting the information received through probing to an analytical framework, we were able to gain deeper insights into some of the subtle underlying dynamics with respect to some of the behavioral and attitudinal responses we observed. Of course, as has already been implied, the conclusions drawn then are tentative, subject to further "verification".

The heart of the matter is, namely, that by blending "objective criteria" with the workers' framework of understanding their world, we should be able to gain more profound insights into their world. This has important implications for those who are interested in studying the labour process.

Finally, as would be recalled from chapter III, the available quantity of cases that was short of expectation nullified our
original plan to control for the variables of age and educational level. For reasons already detailed in chapter III, it is deemed advisable that a similar study might want to consider the effects of these variables.
A study that seeks to find out what people's opinions are about their work, is currently in progress. Kindly respond to this questionnaire by putting a check mark (✓) into every category that is best indicative of your opinion.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope attached, as soon as possible.

Thank you for your co-operation.

PLEASE DO NOT IDENTIFY YOURSELF ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Code Col. #
I.D.1-3: ___

1. What is your job classification (please specify)?

2. How long have you been working at your present job?

3. Would you please describe your duties in detail?

4. Are you familiar with the rules that govern employees at your place of work?

   (1) ____ All or most of them
   (2) ____ Some of them
   (3) ____ Not many of them
   (4) ____ None of them
5. Are there rules governing how to behave at work?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

6. If there are rules in your place of work governing how to behave, would you please explain what these rules are?

   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________ 

7. Are there rules governing how to dress at work?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

8. Do you adhere with the rules governing how to dress at work?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

9. Do you agree with the rules governing how to dress at work?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

10. If you do not agree with the rules governing how to dress at work, would you please explain why not?
11. In some jobs, there are detailed rules about what is the right way to do the job. In others, a person can choose among several possible ways of doing the job. How is it with your job?

(1) Almost everything is covered by rules
(2) Most things are covered by rules
(3) About half and half
(4) On most things I have a choice of ways of doing the work
(5) On almost everything I have a choice of ways of doing the work

12. Do you adhere to the rules governing how the job is to be done?

(1) Yes
(2) No

13. Do you agree with the rules governing how the job is to be done?

(1) Yes
(2) No

14. If you do not agree with the rules governing how the job is to be done, would you please explain why not?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________


_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
16. If you ever break the rules, would you please explain why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

17. Do you ever make suggestions to your boss as to improve the way of doing your work?

(1) Yes
(2) No

18. If you suggest to your immediate supervisor a way of doing some job, how often does she/he go along with your suggestion? She/he goes along with my suggestion:

(1) Never goes along
(2) About one-tenth of the time or less
(3) About one-quarter of the time
(4) About half of the time
(5) About three-quarters of the time
(6) Almost always
(7) I never suggest a way of doing a job

19. When you get a job to do, how often is it completely up to you to decide how to go about doing it?

(1) Never
(2) About one-tenth of the time or less
(3) About one-quarter of the time
(4) About half of the time
(5) About three-quarters of the time
(6) Almost always

20. Do you decide how to do your job because your supervisor wants you to decide or do you do it without her/his knowledge? Please explain.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
21. How often do you get a chance to try out your ideas?

(6) ___ Several times a week or more
(5) ___ About once a week
(4) ___ Several times a month
(3) ___ About once a month
(2) ___ Less than once a month
(1) ___ Never

22. Under what circumstances do you get a chance to try out your ideas - that is, are you able to try because your supervisor wants you to, or do you have to do it secretly? Please explain your answer:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

23. Do you always check with your supervisor before trying out your ideas?

(1) ___ Yes
(2) ___ No

24. If you do not always check with your supervisor before trying out your ideas, would you please explain why?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

25. Compared to your immediate supervisor, how much chance do you get to do the kind of things you do best?

(1) ___ No chance
(2) ___ Very little chance
(3) ___ Little chance
(4) ___ Some chance
(5) ___ A good chance
(6) ___ An excellent chance
26. Would you please explain your answer to Question #25?

27. How often have you taken a day off just because you were tired of working and needed a break from work?

(6) Almost every day  
(5) Once every few days  
(4) About once a week  
(3) Once every few weeks  
(2) About once a month or less  
(1) Never

28. Did you ever take a day(s) off from work for any other reason?

(1) Yes  
(2) No

29. If you ever took a day(s) from work for any other reason, please explain.

30. Out of stress and frustration, some individuals would sometimes mutilate office materials. Do you engage in such activity?

(1) Yes  
(2) No

31. If you responded "yes" to Question #30, please explain one occasion that this happened.
32. If you responded "yes" to question #30, please indicate how often you engage in such activity.

(6) ______ Several times a week or more
(5) ______ About once a week
(4) ______ Several times a month
(3) ______ About once a month
(2) ______ Less than once a month
(1) ______ Rarely

33. When you have several things to do on the job, how often are you able to decide which you will do first?

(6) ______ Almost always
(5) ______ About three-quarters of the time
(4) ______ About half of the time
(3) ______ About one-quarter of the time
(2) ______ About one-tenth of the time or less
(1) ______ Never

34. People I work with now help each other out during office hours.

(1) ______ strongly disagree
(2) ______ disagree
(3) ______ uncertain
(4) ______ agree
(5) ______ strongly agree

35. How often are you able to decide the pace at which work is to be performed?

(6) ______ Almost always
(5) ______ About three-quarters of the time
(4) ______ About half of the time
(3) ______ About one-quarter of the time
(2) ______ About one-tenth of the time or less
(1) ______ Never

36. How often do you daydream or think about things other than your duties during office hours?

(1) ______ About half of the time or more
(2) ______ About one-third of the time
(3) ______ About one-quarter of the time
(4) ______ About one-eighth of the time
(5) ______ Rarely
(6) ______ Never
37. Would you please specify what kind of things you daydream about?

38. Out of stress and frustration some people would sometimes hide office materials to make their jobs easier. Do you engage in such activity?

(1) ___ Yes
(2) ___ No

39. If you sometimes hide office materials, how often do you do so?

(6) ___ Several times a week or more
(5) ___ About once a week
(4) ___ Several times a month
(3) ___ About once a month
(2) ___ Less than once a month
(1) ___ Rarely

40. How closely does your supervisor watch your work?

(1) ___ About half the day or more
(2) ___ About one-third of the day
(3) ___ About one-quarter of the day
(4) ___ About one-eighth of the day
(5) ___ My work is never closely supervised

41. Following are some kinds of people with whom you may now have, or have previously, had contact. Please rank them according to how close you feel to them personally. Put a number 1 next to the kind of group which, in general, you feel closest to; put a number 2 next to the group you feel second closest to; put a number 3 next to the group you feel least close to.

(1) ___ Your neighbours
(2) ___ Your relatives, other than your immediate family
(3) ___ People you work in the same place with
42. How often does management set up the exact order in which your work is to be performed?

(6) Almost always
(5) About three-quarters of the time
(4) About half of the time
(3) About one-quarter of the time
(2) About one-tenth of the time or less
(1) Never

43. When you finish a given piece of work, how often do you have any say about what you'll be doing next?

(1) About one-tenth of the time or less
(2) About one-quarter of the time
(3) About half of the time
(4) About three-quarters of the time
(5) Almost always
(6) Rarely
(7) Never

44. For what proportion of your activities do you receive clear and specific directions from your boss? I receive clear and specific directions:

(6) For almost all activities
(5) For most of my activities
(4) For about half of my activities
(3) For a few of my activities
(2) For almost none of my activities
(1) For none of my activities

45. Do you sometimes talk about personal matters with co-workers?

(1) Yes
(2) No

46. If you sometimes talk about personal matters, would you please describe some of them?

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________
47. Do you sometimes exchange gifts with your co-workers?
   (1) __ Yes
   (2) __ No

48. If you sometimes exchange gifts, would you please indicate on what occasion(s) you do so?

49. Do you sometimes slowdown the pace at which you work?
   (1) __ Yes
   (2) __ No

50. If you sometimes slow down the pace at which you work, would you please explain why?

51. If you sometimes slow down the pace at which you work, how often do you do so?
   (1) __ About one-tenth of the time or less
   (2) __ About one-quarter of the time
   (3) __ About half of the time
   (4) __ About three-quarters of the time
   (5) __ Almost always
   (6) __ Rarely
   (7) __ Never

52. Have you ever changed jobs?
   (1) __ Yes
   (2) __ No
53. How many jobs have you had within the last three years?

54. If you have ever changed jobs, would you please explain why?

55. Do you think you will move from your present job to another in the near future?
   
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

56. If you are going to move from your present job to another, would you please explain why?

57. Are the workers in your workplace unionized?
   
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

58. Are you a member of the union?
   
   (1) Yes
   (2) No
59. Have you ever held a position in the union?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

60. If you have ever held a union position, when was it and what position was it?

61. How often do you attend union meetings?
   (1) All or most of the meetings
   (2) Some or a few of the meetings
   (3) Only important meetings like strike votes
   (4) Never attend meetings

62. How often do you feel that you have grounds for making a complaint through the grievance machinery?
   (1) At least once a day
   (2) At least once a week
   (3) At least once a month
   (4) At least once in every four month period
   (5) At least once in every eight month period
   (6) At least once in a year
   (7) Less than once a year
   (8) Never

63. When you have these complaints, how often do you actually use the grievance procedure?
   (1) Always or almost always
   (2) More than half the time
   (3) About half the time
   (4) Less than half the time
   (5) Never

64. Going through the grievance procedure is an effective way of solving work related problems.
   (5) Strongly agree
   (4) Agree
   (3) Uncertain
   (2) Disagree
   (1) Strongly disagree
65. Would you please explain why you answered the way you did to question #64?

66. It is important to get the workers unionized in the place at which you work.

   (1) ___ Strongly disagree
   (2) ___ Disagree
   (3) ___ Uncertain
   (4) ___ Agree
   (5) ___ Strongly agree

67. A union would help workers in improving working conditions of work.

   (1) ___ Strongly agree
   (2) ___ Agree
   (3) ___ Uncertain
   (4) ___ Disagree
   (5) ___ Strongly disagree

68. A union would hinder workers in improving conditions of work.

   (1) ___ Strongly agree
   (2) ___ Agree
   (3) ___ Uncertain
   (4) ___ Disagree
   (5) ___ Strongly disagree

69. Engaging in strikes helps workers get what they want from the management.

   (1) ___ Strongly agree
   (2) ___ Agree
   (3) ___ Uncertain
   (4) ___ Disagree
   (5) ___ Strongly disagree

70. Have you ever picketed?

   (1) ___ Yes
   (2) ___ No
71. If you ever picketed, was this in your present workplace or somewhere else?
   (1) Present workplace  (2) Somewhere else

WOULD YOU KINDLY RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES?

72. Sex:
   (1) Female  (2) Male

73. Age (on last birth date):

74. Marital Status:
   (1) Single  (2) Divorced  (3) Separated  (4) Widowed  (5) Married

75. What was the highest grade of school you completed?
   (1) Eight years or under  (2) Between nine and eleven years
   (3) Completed high school  (4) Post-secondary training (please specify)

76. Religious preference:
   (1) Islamic  (2) Jewish  (3) Protestant  (4) Roman Catholic  (5) Other
   (Please specify)
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