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INTRODUCTION - DEFINITION OF TERMS

It is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil.

John Maynard Keynes
The Power of Ideas

But the serpent said to the woman, "You will not die. For God knows that when you eat it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." ... She took some of its fruits and ate; and she also gave some to her husband, and he ate. Then the eyes of both were open.

The Bible
Genesis, Chpt.3, verses 4-7

Since the beginning the history of Man has been concerned with the struggles and adoption of new ideas to overcome the problems of the world in which Man has lived. Ethologists such as Konrad Lorenz have described a similar sort of phenomenon in the evolutionary adaptation of creatures to the environment for survival.

Man's survival, in a societal sense, has been through the evolution of ideas to improve on the social structure of the time, either to provide solutions to major problems or to provide a new intellectual impetus in a stagnant society. By definition, Man's idea of paradise has not included any discussion on the spread of ideas - in paradise
all is known and Man uses the ideas.

Yet for all this history of Man's struggles with ideas, there is not a general social science model to explain the spread, or diffusion, of ideas in the community. From at least the times of Thales, and certainly since Socrates, the western tradition has viewed ideas as being spread by a teacher to his pupils, who in turn spread the idea to their pupils and followers.

This "commonsense" traditional approach is the foundation of the diffusion writers, e.g. Rogers, Emery and Oeser, and Hagerstrand, and, taken to its logical conclusion, the approach should have led to complete acceptance of the idea under review.

Total acceptance has not been the case even in wartime when the State propaganda machinery has possessed unfettered rights to disseminate particular ideas. Ideas which the State opposed still diffused and affected the morale of the population.

The technique of suppression by the State under the above conditions has been to capture the "rumourmongers" and make an example of them. However, this practice has not greatly affected the spread of the messages. Ideas are not dependent on the originators of the idea once it has been first spread, and the message content is not the prerogative of the originator, but of each person who passes the message. Therefore, for the State to kill or to control the originator or a messenger, does not stop the overall passage of the message. Since no one knows how ideas spread at large in the community, it follows that it is impossible to really squash an idea once it has
reached a few people. For example, the widespread use of secret police and the military was unsuccessful in halting the growth of successful freedom movements in both the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) and French Algeria (Algeria). The idea can "die" itself if it is not relevant or too threatening to the potential messengers. The relevance of the idea would appear to be the critical factor in the survival of the concept. However, the relevance of the idea does not explain how the idea diffuses within the community.

This thesis is an attempt to devise a model of diffusion in the real life situation, to follow the way in which an idea spreads in the community and to see if the model is able to explain and/or predict the observed behaviour. The idea is Industrial Democracy, the community Britain, and the time 1974-1975.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

One of the difficulties of the English language is that the words have a wide variety of meanings and two or more words may have the same meaning. For instance, the Oxford Dictionary takes four columns to list the various usages of 'Work'. Therefore, it is necessary to attempt to define the major terms used in the research.

Diffusion is defined in the Shorter Oxford Dictionary as a 'spreading, dispersion and dissemination of ideas'. The definition sees Diffusion as the conveying and exchange of ideas between people but not necessarily the acceptance or implementation of the concepts by the receivers. The emphasis on conveying ideas agrees with the Shorter Oxford Dictionary's definition of Communications - the 'imparting, conveying, or exchange of ideas, knowledge, etc.'.
Herein lies one of the major problems of the field involved in the research into the spread of ideas. The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary does not see spreading as implying acceptance yet many writers refer to the Diffusion/Spread of ideas as implying the acceptance and use of the idea, while others see Diffusion/Communications as creating an understanding and agreement on the terms under discussion; the latter view fits the definitions mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Writers who use the term 'Diffusion' to mean the 'replication of ideas' see a further step to the implementation of an idea - Utilization. Whatever definition of Diffusion is used it will implicitly determine the construction of the model of how ideas are diffused, so a little time will now be spent identifying the various approaches to the concept of Diffusion; this action is designed to answer many potential questions regarding the final research model.

Most writers in the management and industrial psychology fields do not use the term 'Diffusion', although all frequently mention 'Communications'. In the social psychology and sociology writings the position is generally reversed with the term 'Diffusion' used frequently, and 'Communications' rarely.

As previously mentioned, the two terms appear to be synonymous and so the use of both words should not cause any problems except that two terms are used when either term would be sufficient. However, in each case, the word has a variety of other meanings, although sometimes these have to be inferred as the terms under discussion are not defined.
An influential writer on the effect of Communications, Rensis Likert, emphasised the effect of poor and of no Communications on organizations, yet he never actually defined the term.

Johnson, Kast, and Rosenweig define Communication as 'a system involving a sender, a receiver, with the implication of a feedback control'. The definition does not cover the ideas in the system, but how the system operates. The definition is supported by Browne with an additional thought that there is a purpose for the message - creating understanding in the person receiving the Communication.

Simon, and Cartier and Harwood define Communication by its purpose rather than by the system - they see Communication as any process where 'decisional premises, are transmitted from one person to another'; Bellows, Gilson, and Odiene agree with Simon when they refer to shared meanings and understandings, and Koontz and O'Donnell see that the purpose of Communications is to effect change or influence actions. Kelly believes that the term is over-used and has emerged as a gadget-word which has a wide variety of meanings for different people. He then goes on to give the most detailed and comprehensive definition of the term:

"The field of enquiry concerned with the systematic use of symbols to achieve common or shared information about an object or event. The communication process can be thought as a chain with at least three links: the sender, the medium, and the receiver. The sender encodes his message, transmits it through the chosen medium, and it is decoded by the receiver".

This definition of Communication is consistent with that of Havelock for Diffusion. Havelock perceives Diffusion as part of the 'dissemina-
tion, and utilization system' with the latter concerned with how the messages are translated into action.

Davis and Cherns\textsuperscript{31} see Diffusion as the spread and influence of ideas on people, and so too does Clark\textsuperscript{32}. Rogers regards Diffusion as 'the human interaction in which one person communicates a new idea to another person. Thus, at its most elementary level of conceptualization the diffusion consists of (a) a new idea, (2) individual A who knows about the innovation, and (3) individual B who does not know about the innovation ...\textsuperscript{33}

Not all Diffusion writers see the term as referring to only the description of new concepts to naive audiences; Herbst\textsuperscript{34} does not define the term itself but in his writings he uses the term not only to include the spreading of the message, but also the consequent change.

Schon\textsuperscript{35} defines Diffusion as 'the movement of an innovation from a centre out to its ultimate users\textsuperscript{36}, involving dissemination, training, and the provision of resources and incentives\textsuperscript{37}. This line of thought is consistent with the sociological tradition\textsuperscript{38} and with that of the history of technology\textsuperscript{39}. However, the concept of utilisation also involves a much longer time perspective than most Communication and Diffusion writers have considered; Schon talks of inventions taking only 10 years to diffuse today instead of the 150 years it took for the invention of the steam engine to spread all over the world\textsuperscript{40}.

Either time perspective is far too long for most research and is not easily made operational for study. The definition to be used in this thesis will be:
DIFFUSION IS THE TRANSFER OF AN IDEA TO ANOTHER PERSON TO INFLUENCE THAT PERSON'S BEHAVIOUR IN THE FUTURE.

Consequently, this investigation will centre on the way in which people transfer ideas within the community. The approach could be seen as based on a 'contamination' or 'infection' model of influence.

"Industrial Democracy" runs the whole gamut of interpretation from consultation to the taking over of the resources of industry and placing those resources in the hands of the workers. The Confederation of British Industry document, Employee Participation, states 'one of the few things certain about employee participation is its lack of definition'\(^41\). The ministerial statements on Industrial Democracy\(^42\) do not define the meaning of the phrase but seem to imply some form of worker participation but not worker control.

However, some writers have made attempts to define the term. Baxter\(^43\) describes it thus:

"... each person, in his capacity as a worker or a consumer, has a right to take decisions which affect his life, and in the industrial world this means that the authority of management must arise out of its accountability to its workers. It is not enough to arrange for increased consultation or to talk vaguely of 'participation'. In the workplace power must rest with the workers and not the shareholders".

The crux of the definition is the shift of power to a sharing of power with the workers and other writers make the same point\(^45\), \(^46\). The difference between the writers who emphasise the shift of power is the degree of the shift; some see a total shift\(^47\) while others talk about 'a shift' but do not define what this shift will be. Emery and Thorsrud
describe Industrial Democracy as:

"the codetermination for employees and this includes greater direct influence on the decisions of the company in economic and technical fields. It refers to day-to-day influence and increased relationships between Workers and Management". 48

The definition also envisages a shift in power within the organization but it is not a total shift but one of real influence. That is the concept that will be used within this thesis:

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IS THE SHIFT OF REAL POWER TO THE WORKERS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES IN THE PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES WITHIN THE OFFICIAL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organizations such as the Confederation of British Industry and the British Institute of Management, and the Bow Group and some writers, e.g. Ponsford and Carpenter 49, argue that the unions already have this power through collective bargaining but the argument misses the point that workers have a right of veto on management's plans and cannot positively participate in decision making of the organization. The right to withhold labour and the right to take part in the long-term planning of the organization are two very different types of power. The lack of the latter power has been a major reason why the unions have not been aware of many of the rationalizations in British industry which have led to sacking of workers and sometimes the transfer of its
organizations to another country.

Consultation does not meet the criterion of Industrial Democracy as used in this thesis, as by definition Consultation involves seeking and giving information and advice; there is no obligation on the party who chooses to consult to act on the advice of the party consulted. Consultation does not meet the criterion of transferring real power in the decision-making processes to the workers.

Our definition would be equally appropriate to the term 'Worker Participation' but the term 'Industrial Democracy' will be used as it is the one used in the discussions within Britain. Britain has, in fact, the longest history of any country in the development of worker involvement. There are many types of involvement and each has consequences. Chapter 1 discusses the differing types of involvement in detail and relates the differing types to each other. Among the developments covered are Quality Control, Consultation, Organizational Redesign, the Quality of Working Life Movement and Industrial Democracy.

Quality of Working Life (QWL) is the most difficult term of all to define. 'Working Life' covers all of the area of work, together with its interaction with the rest of one's living experiences. The

*For example, Lytton Industries in Leicester manufactured the 'Royal' typewriter. Using non-union, poorly-paid migrant women, the plant appeared to be successful. Then the women were recruited into a union and wage negotiations were attempted on the women's behalf. The company refused to negotiate and a long bitter strike took place. Eventually work resumed but in 1975 Lytton Industries transferred their typewriter production to West Germany and Britain's sole remaining typewriter factory closed down, due to labour costs and low productivity levels.
concept of Working Life is too diffuse to be useful for research. As 'quality' is equally diffuse the whole concept is vague; this vagueness makes it valuable as a slogan but is a drawback for research.

However, at the Arden House Conference in 1972 Herrick and Maccoby defined QWL as:

"something which has to do with equity, security, humanization of the job, (or democratization of the job)". 50

From this definition, QWL would at least cover Industrial Relations, Tenure, Employment Policies, Job Satisfaction, Job Enrichment, Job Enlargement and Industrial Democracy/Worker Participation.

Therefore, using the widest interpretation of the definition above, Industrial Democracy is a part of the QWL field, but not all of QWL is concerned with Industrial Democracy. Indeed some of the interest in QWL appears to be an attempt by certain managements, e.g. Chrysler until 1975, to stop or delay the movement towards greater worker power and involvement in the running of the organization by suggesting that greater job satisfaction through job enrichment and job enlargement would meet the workers' needs better and make the workers feel happier with the status quo of control and power. 51.

Wilson sees the QWL movement as concerned with five major themes 53 which concentrate on efficiency at work and its interaction with the satisfaction of workers in their jobs. Whilst concerned with the person rather than the economic system and practices that exploit the workers, Wilson sees the emphasis as concentrating on efficiency through job satisfaction, and this in turn means work re-design but
not increased worker participation\textsuperscript{54}. In Wilson's nine point list of items for possible research, none involved industrial democracy, but concentrated on better understanding of what workers require to have increased job satisfaction.

Therefore, in this thesis the term Quality of Working Life (QWL) will be seen as concentrating on increasing job satisfaction of the worker through decreasing the negative features of the work situation and increasing the positive features of the job itself. This interpretation of QWL makes industrial democracy a peripheral issue as the appointment of worker directors need not necessarily affect the individual worker's job or increase the worker's involvement in the organization.

CONCLUSION

To bring together the threads of the previous pages this thesis will study:

- the transfer of the idea that workers and their representatives should participate in the planning and decision-making processes within the official organizational structure, and that the person who receives this message will argue for and support the idea in the future.
REFERENCES


5. Ibid, p. 103.


16. Ibid, p. 73.


18. See for example:


19. See for example:


25. Ibid, p. 73


34. HERBST, P. (1975), Directions of Diffusion: The Work Democrati-
   zation Project, Oslo: Work Research Institute.
39. See for example:


47. COATES, K. (1973), \textit{The Quality of Life and Workers Control}, Nottingham: Pamphlets No. 27.


54. Ibid, pp. 7-8.
**PART I: LIMITS OF THE PROJECT**

Chapter 1

**INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CONCEPTS OF DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTIVES OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AND WORKER PARTICIPATION IN BRITAIN</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SELF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WORKER CONTROL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEMOCRACY WITHIN THE ENTERPRISE</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DECREASE OF ALIENATION AND GREATER PERSONAL FULFILMENT</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EFFECTIVE USE OF HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INCREASED CO-OPERATION AND REDUCED INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNION CONSULTATION ON PERIPHERAL MATTERS</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FIRM</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ILLEGITIMATE INTRUSION UPON MANAGERIAL PREROGATIVES</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BRAKE ON EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADE UNIONS, THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY/PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CBI</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PRESSURE GROUPS</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING EMPLOYERS FEDERATION</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

The term 'Industrial Democracy' first became a matter of particular interest in 1974. During the Australian federal elections of that year, the opposition spokesman for Industrial Relations (Mr. Fraser) proposed the introduction of legislation for the implementation of industrial democracy. During his policy statement Mr. Fraser referred to the recent establishment of an industrial democracy unit within the South Australian Premier's Department. I then read some of the well-known books on industrial democracy before I arrived in England in late 1974.

I had decided when commencing the thesis, to study the diffusion of ideas, but no particular idea had been selected. I was asked by Chrysler U.K. to study the diffusion of the idea of Vertical Slice Groups within its Ryton Assembly Plant. The two diffusion studies in the Ryton plant did not directly investigate the diffusion of industrial democracy but other concepts. However, as the two research studies progressed, we became increasingly aware of the debate on industrial democracy within Britain, and I decided to make the theme of my thesis the diffusion of the term within the country.

We then set out to discover what various groups meant by the term and quickly discovered that industrial democracy is a difficult topic to discuss. Individuals and groups have differing concepts of what participation is, differing goals for their ideas of participation, and

* See page 151 for a detailed description of Vertical Slice Groups
therefore different fears of the consequences should their concept succeed or fail\(^9\).

The main thrust of this chapter is to describe the varying concepts of industrial democracy and to set out the developments by various groups within the debate, both for and against the general idea.

**BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN BRITAIN**

When the new inventions of the Industrial Revolution were initially manufactured, fresh skills were required and the new groups of artisans joined together to protect their mutual interests, e.g. Steam Engine Makers Union\(^{10}\), Friendly Society of Ironfounders\(^{11}\). At the same time the ideas of philosophers such as Rousseau and Bentham were commonly discussed and Rousseau's idea of a participating society was widely supported by these artisans. The early unionists translated the participation of the citizen in all decision making to include their work relations. While they could not practise participation in the new factories, the workers could fully participate in their union activities. The founders of the union movement saw participation in decision making as an educative process in the widest sense which would develop responsible individual social and political action. This in turn would be self-sustaining through the person's gaining greater control over his environment. These ideas were later developed by John Stuart Mill\(^{12}\) and G.D.H. Cole\(^{13}\).

Sidney and Beatrice Webb described this type of democracy as 'primitive'\(^{14}\) as the model saw all men as equal and the positions of power were rotated, e.g. by order of name in the membership book\(^{15}\), so that all
men had the same time in positions of power. As some did not want to hold such positions, there were regulations for fining members who would not take their turn at responsibilities. Since all men were equal, it also followed that all branches were equal, and in some unions the branches took turns to act as the administrative headquarters for the union for a set number of years. Decisions were not made by union delegates, they merely acted as messengers and reported back to the next branch meeting, where the full branch membership decided the next step. The delegates were information sources but there was no advantage in keeping information to themselves. The early unionists faced the possibilities of civil and criminal action in very unsympathetic courts, and this inherent danger has been suggested as the reason for the rotation of leadership and other facets of the 'primitive democracy' model which evolved. This explanation ignores the democratic movement of the day, where the participative function was emphasised, rather than the efficiency aspect of appointing permanent officers to carry out union tasks.

The early unions dealt directly with the entrepreneur/owner who frequently had designed the original equipment and now managed the firm. The firms were usually small and the skilled tradesmen dealt fairly successfully with the owner; from this background the workingmen's Radicalism movement began. The industrial peace was not to last long when the bad harvests in the early nineteenth century and the serious business slump of 1819 occurred.

The factory workers were laid off through the slump which lasted into the 1830s, and the hunger and discontent of the outworkers grew while
they worked even faster on piece rates at home and their wages fell by 40%\(^18\). All these factors combined to create the Chartist movement which was formed with a mixture of political and economic policies that were claimed would solve the problems of the working classes. The first national convention of the Chartists was held in London in 1839, and saw the election of a Member of Parliament standing on the Chartist platform, in Nottingham in 1847\(^{19}\). The movement failed, the growth in scale of production escalated, and the close liaison between the skilled craftsman and the owner was never regained as a general feature of British industrial relations.

During the second half of the nineteenth century some of the larger unions appointed full-time officials to organize their union's affairs and bargain with the factory owners. The use of elected full-time officials was at least as effective in the work negotiations as the participatory model, but was still rejected by many unionists who felt that they, the workers in the plant, could bargain better with the owner and his family.

The size of the source of mechanical power - the stationary steam engine - limited the size of the factory to quite a moderate scale by today's standards, i.e. no more than one thousand workers. However by 1900 the invention and application of the steam turbine engine increased the practical output of the stationary steam engine sixteen fold. The development of the railway, telegraph telephone and the growth in the usage of the 'scientific management' techniques, when added to the potential size of factories, made national and international markets then a reality.
Until the beginning of the twentieth century there were very few large companies with huge resources, and large numbers of personnel. Typically, the relatively small joint stock company of the nineteen century began when the owners pooled their talent as well as their cash. Around 1900 many managers could trace their family connections to the founding of the company; they were truly 'born' to manage. To finance the ever increasing scale of operations, it was necessary to ask outsiders to invest in the company, and thus the pattern of large shareholdings decreased.

The buying and selling of shares on the Stock Exchange, plus the need for larger amounts of capital has meant that from the early twentieth century most individual shareholders have had little or no effective control over the company in which they have invested; control lies with the board members who are mainly managers of the company. The managerial web has been further reinforced in the last twenty years at annual meetings where the large institutional holders of capital, insurance companies, unit trusts, banks, superannuation funds and the like, tend to support the managers in control. These institutional groups are themselves run by senior managers who find it much easier to talk to a company senior manager than to a large individual shareholder, who may demand increased dividends, restricted growth, or even the closure of the company. 'Growth at all costs' is partly the result of the divorce of capital as is the concentration of power in increasingly fewer hands through national and international conglomerates. Galbraith presents a detailed discussion why the 'growth at all costs' has arisen through the growth of these large organizations. Growth is consistent with the interests of the senior managers as it is the
best protection against contraction and retrenchment and provides the greatest opportunities for the technologists who are the potential senior managers.  

Paralleling the growth in size and power of organizations and their managers, was the growth of a managerial tool to control the workers; originally designed to help train illiterate American migrants, Taylor's 'scientific management,' plus the legal right to hire and fire gave management the ability to totally control the individual worker on the job.

"The management must take over and perform much of the work which is now left to the workers; almost every act of the worker should be preceded by one or more preparatory acts of the management which will enable him to do his work better and more quickly than he would otherwise, could. Each man should daily be taught by, and receive the most friendly help from those who are above him."

"Management takes on new duties (which can be) grouped under four headings: First: They develop a science for each element of a worker's work which replaces the old rule of thumb method. Second. They scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop the worker, whereas in the past he chose his own work and trained himself as best he could. Third. They heartily co-operate with the men so as to incur all the work being done in accordance with the principles of the science which has been developed. Fourth. There is an almost equal division of work and the responsibility between the management and workers. The management take over all the work for which they are best fitted ... the most important single element in modern scientific management is the task idea."

Taylor saw the role of the manager as knowing exactly what was required of the workers and then seeing that it was done in the best and cheapest way (in companies of 500-1,000 men). In firms of that size, a few
managers could control the organization of work. As the size of economic units increased, overall management passed increasingly to senior managers. New middle managers were employed to handle the routine day-to-day organization of work. As larger and larger units were built, to gain the advantage of scale, more and more levels of managers were established to handle production and service tasks.

By 1914 in the face of these massive forces, and a greater faith in the concept of bureaucracy, all unions were run under the representative model of elected representatives, who became full-time paid officials.

Not all the workers were happy with the change. The hierarchy of paid union officials made decisions in the workers' name and then enforced discipline on workers if they disobeyed the rulings of trade union officials.

In the coal mines, where the dangerous conditions allowed the workers to retain some of their negotiating rights on the job, there was a strong movement to set up a system of Worker Control mines run directly by the workers in the area. Other industries, such as the railways, found Worker Control groups arising between 1910 and 1922. The shop stewards concept grew in popularity with the workers as the latter felt that the officials were too busy, not interested, or in league with the owners. During World War I many industries had a strong steward infrastructure and workers felt that after the war they would gain greater power in their workplace. The annual reports of the Trade Union Congress during the period clearly show the growing clash
between the rank and file representatives and the elected for life union officials who saw their new power disappearing if Worker Control took place.

Between 1926 and 1931 the unions suffered continual defeats at the hands of the employers and the government. Shattered in spirit, the unions accepted the role of permanent officials and turned to new ways to control industry. Morrison persuaded the unions to concentrate on owning any industry under discussion; nationalization became a Labour Party policy which was first applied in 1946 and since then by successive Labour governments.

Nationalization of an industry did not improve the industrial relations in the particular industries. Arguments on control of the workplace were raised again, and by 1950 shop stewards were once more beginning to make an impact on the British industrial relations scene. Later Conservative Governments believed that increased economic growth and non-recognition of shop stewards would solve the problem of their growing frequency. Industrial Change: The Human Aspect sets out a detailed outline of the Conservative Party view of unions and shop stewards at that time.

However, by the 1960s the Labour Government had to admit the existence and power of the shop stewards when drawing up the terms of reference for the Donovan Royal Commission to investigate Trade Union and Employers' Associations. Since then elected TUC officials have promised to hand some of their centralised power back to unions and officials have committed themselves to allowing plant bargaining by
shop stewards' committees with a full union back-up.

None of the changes in the trade union bargaining were seen as attempts to gain control of the workplace. The management still made the decisions but the workers, through collective-bargaining, felt they could influence company policy by withdrawing union labour until the organization discussed the issue in disagreement. Between 1968 and 1972 there were many negative statements by the Trade Union Congresses on the joint control of the workplace by unionists and management. Yet the Labour Manifesto drawn up by the unions and the Labour Party for the 1974 elections, specifically incorporated the concept of industrial democracy - it is now union policy to seek joint control of the workplace. The Bullock Committee's terms of reference and the majority report of the Committee suggest that 'industrial democracy' could become a reality in the next few years if Labour wins the next election.

Discovering what factors, and how the change occurred in union policy on industrial democracy is one of the purposes of this thesis.

THE CONCEPTS OF DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

As can be seen in a previous section, A Brief History of the Concept of Industrial Democracy in Britain, the view of how the concept will be implemented has changed according to the major political and social forces at the particular point in time. This does not, however, prevent one from discussing the various model of democracy and participation and the present section attempts to do this. As well, the concept of quality of working life is compared to democracy and
participation to ascertain if the ideas are similar or whether they differ significantly.

During the past ten years the word 'participation' has become the most popular in the political vocabulary. The widespread use of the term has tended to mean that any precise meaning or use has disappeared, so that today participation is used by different people to refer to a wide variety of situations.

It is rather ironical that the idea of participation should have become so popular. The widely accepted theory of democracy is one in which the concept of participation has only a minimal role. Indeed, not only has participation a minimal role, but a prominent feature of recent theories of democracy is the emphasis placed on the dangers inherent in wide popular participation in politics. Writers, such as Sydney and Beatrice Webb and Schumpeter, have argued that maximum participation by all the people would lead to dangerous instability in the political system; Michel's claim that one could have organization or democracy, but not both, is often used to support the expressed concern. Schumpeter asserts that democracy is a theory unassociated with any ideals or ends - democracy is a political method. This position is consistent with the stated position of the Trades Union Congress a decade ago when the central executive believed that a small group should negotiate on behalf of the union movement and that there was no role for shop steward or rank and file participation in industrial relations.
Schumpeter claims that democracy works best in conditions of limited participation and apathy, as these factors cushion the shock of political disagreements, adjustment and change. Dahl argues that democracy is a polyarchy, i.e. rule by multiple minorities, where political leaders fight for votes from the various minorities by agreeing to meet some of the particular needs of each minority grouping. In this model the leaders reach a consensus on competing norms and so the change of a political leader has only a marginal effect on the direction of political policy. The Dahl model foresees massive changes towards a strict authoritarian society if all people participate as the more numerous lower socio-economic groups are seen to be highly authoritarian in their attitudes. Satori believes a fully participative democracy would 'react' to present problems and not 'act' to plan for future ones. Eckstein believes democracy works in the USA and the Western European nations because the nations have a stable authoritarian society which stops any one element from upsetting the balance of political power too much - democracy works best when the system is not purely democratic.

The modern theorists mentioned above support the concept of a highly bureaucratic centralised trade union movement dealing with a similar grouping of employers, and this is the position of the Working Together Movement. Such a development has been actively rejected by the union movement in the past decade.

Participation is seen by unionists, especially shop stewards, as the best protective device the workers possess against arbitrary decisions of their own elected union leaders and the policy decisions of
Historically, philosophers like John Stuart Mill and Rousseau saw participation as central to their ideas of the democratic society - both saw their ideal society as a 'participatory society'. Rousseau's entire theory hinges on participation of every citizen in political decision making. Participation is much more than a protective device, the act of participation is seen to have psychological effect on the participants, ensuring that there is a continuous interrelationship between the working of the institutions and the psychological qualities and attitudes of the participants' interaction within them. Rousseau believed that participation by each individual in the decision making process would be an educative process in the widest sense. He believed that partaking in the process would develop responsible individual social and political action through the effects of the process itself. Rousseau saw the participatory process, once established, as self sustaining, "the individual citizen participates the better able he is to do so", now the individual would feel that he had a real sense of control over the course of his life and the structure of his environment. Eventually the ideal occurs, the person becomes his 'own master' and at the same time has greater feelings of belonging and involvement with the rest of society. Rousseau's ideas are critical to any discussion of industrial democracy and participation, as Cole based much of his influential writings on Rousseau's work. The importance of Rousseau to the industrial democracy movement is that:

"he was the first to popularise the feelings of
one's right; it was to the sound of his voice that the most generous hearts and the most independent spirits were awakened". 50

His words influenced later writers and philosophers although often there was no affinity between his writings and the later interpretations of his works. 51 It is not important in the context of this thesis to answer the claims of Talmon 52 and Satori 53 against Rousseau's writings. Rousseau's importance here rests on the diffusion of two of his ideas: that people should not be subject to the will of others 54, and that each person should be personally involved in his/her own destiny 55. These concepts had a great impact on the thinking of the supporters of the 'primitive' democracy model and G.D.H. Cole 56 in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

John Stuart Mill 57 claimed that unless one practised participation then the possession of democratic rights would have little practical effect. Mill extended the principle of participation from the national level, which nearly all writers have accepted, to the local level, such as local government and, most importantly, the job 58. He believed that it was at the local level that one learned democracy. Mill also believed that practising participation on the job would, in the long run, do away with the bureaucratic model of management.

"Instead of the usual one of superiority - subordination (authority relationships) there would be one of co-operation or equality with the managers (government) being elected by the whole body of the employees just as representatives at the local level are elected. That is today, the political relations in industry using the word 'political' in wide sense, would have to be democratised." 59
Cole tried to apply the theory of Rousseau to the world of work through his writings on Guild Socialism:

"I assume that the object of social organization is not merely material efficiency but also essentially the fullest self-expression of all the members." 60

He saw a clear difference between the existence of representative institutional arrangements at the national level and democracy:

"The democratic principle must be applied not only or mainly to some special sphere of social action known as 'politics' but to any and every form of social action, and, especially, to industrial and economic fields as much as political affairs." 61

"The political system ..... is in great measure the key to the paradox of political democracy. Why are the many nominally supreme and actually powerless? ..... A servile system in industry inevitably reflects itself in political servility." 62

Cole objected to the capitalist organization of industry; he felt that under that system labour was just another commodity to be bought and sold with the humanity of labour denied.

Cole was very prophetic when he spoke of untapped reserves of energy and initiative in the ordinary working man. He could have been writing of today, describing the rationale and performance of semi-autonomous work groups. Cole believed that a participatory system would "call forth energy and initiative which workers would never give under a system which from any moral standpoint is utterly indefensible." 63

Finally, Cole provided the clearest statement of why the unions should
fight for industrial democracy over half a century before the TUC accepted the concept as a major point of policy:

"The most important area is industry; most individuals spend a great deal of their lifetime at work and the business of the workplace provides an education in the management of collective affairs that is difficult to parallel elsewhere. The second effect of the theory of participative democracy is that spheres such as industry should be seen as political institutions in their own right, offering areas of participation additional to the national level ...". 64

This quotation shows clearly that Cole saw participatory democracy involving:

(I) a belief in the individual's being self-governing,
(II) a person can, and would like to, control his own life and environment.

Campbell 65 and Almond and Verba 66 support these beliefs of Cole and cite evidence across cultures. Almond and Verba found that participation had a cumulative effect and the structure of authority at the workplace was the most significant structure in affecting the level of participation.

More recently there has been considerable interest in the effect of different types of authority structure and technologies on people who work within them, e.g. Blauner 67. In these writings participation and democracy are frequently mentioned. Although the terms are used synonymously in most British management literature, they can be very different in their implications; participation does not necessarily mean that all the participants have equal opportunities, rights and obligations, or that any one party can be stopped from ending the
participation. Democracy, on the other hand, can occur only within a set of rights and obligations. The term 'participation' has different meanings and writers often appear unaware of these differences when citing other sources.

Blauner defines democracy on the job - industrial democracy - as the amount of control a person is able to exercise over his job and his job environment. He sees the traditional fight between management and the workers over control as a clash over the implementation of industrial democracy. This position is supported by evidence from Holte in Norway and Griffin in the United Kingdom. Griffin claimed that a government survey of disputes shows that more than 75% of the strikes are over questions of control, and very few are for increased wages or are political in nature. Griffin argues that there is "implicit pressure for more democracy and individual rights in industry".

Some writers, such as Pateman and Blumberg view the interest in job satisfaction studies and job enlargement as participation experiments. The organization in the reported cases benefited from the transfer of more functions to the worker until eventually the job is similar to the craftsman model described by Blauner.

Others see collective bargaining as a form of participation. Cole argued that collective bargaining was a natural way to encroach onto the managerial area of responsibility. He saw the coal miners as the vanguard in the struggle for working groups to eventually seize control of the industry. On the other hand, while Malman notes the way in
which bargaining led to increased work control in the Standard car plant, he does not see bargaining as able to loosen the ultimate control of management.

Likert\textsuperscript{75} writes of his Systems 4 managerial style as 'participation' as it encourages co-operation and more integration of joint effort. Opponents quickly point out that the manager persuades the workers to agree, not that the workers have the right and opportunity to influence the manager. The criticisms of Likert are supported by the work of Verba; unless the worker can legitimately and legally participate in some decision(s) there is no true participation.

The above examples illustrate that without the democratization of the authority structure of the organization, democracy and participation cannot be used interchangeably.

Some writers today clearly see the two terms as very different in meaning - the clearest case being the pamphleteers who support the Institute for Worker Control\textsuperscript{76}. They see 'participation' as joint decision making involving two unequal parties. "Participation has the closest and ugliest relationship with a whole train of mean and sleazy predecessors in the sequences of devices for 'heading off' a growing demand for control\textsuperscript{77}.

While this view reflects the fact that participation has frequently been used to mean no more than pseudo-participation, it does illustrate the lack of clarity in most discussions on industrial democracy and worker participation. It overlooks the fact that control and
participation do not represent alternatives, rather there can be no control without participation, how much depending on the form of the participation.

Another critic of participation is Clegg. He has written that industrial relations is the industrial parallel of political democracy and one does not participate with one's opposition. Ostergaard points out that this model is less than fully productive in increasing worker control. The management is always in power as the government, and can use legal constraints on the opposition. Also the management is self-recruiting, often taking the best worker delegates into their ranks as managers or supervisors. Finally, the management, unlike the political model of the government, is not accountable to any electorate.

Clegg is also accepted by the strident critics of any form of participative democracy, e.g. CBI, Aims of Industry. Eckstein states that industrial authority, and structures cannot be democratised as the effective forms of democracy contain a healthy deal of authoritarianism.

Models which argue that participation and control (or industrial democracy) are interactive in that one needs increased control for greater participation and greater participation for greater control. These models acknowledge that control and responsibility must go together for participation to work in a meaningful manner.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The previous sections frequently referred to bargaining between the
employers and trade unions; to some people\textsuperscript{81,82} collective bargaining is the preferred form of industrial democracy. This section will discuss in greater detail the historical forces which have influenced the pattern of industrial bargaining in the past century and consider why collective bargaining has become so identified by some unionists and academics as the major ingredient of industrial democracy.

"In most industries terms and conditions of employment and procedures for the conduct of industrial relations are settled by negotiation and argument between employers and trade unions. Whereas in the past the emphasis has been on industry-wide agreements supplemented as necessary by informal local agreements in firms and factories, a gradual change of attitude and structure has led to plant bargaining though the motor industry is an important exception". \textsuperscript{83}

The statement acknowledges the growing movement towards participation by workers in their own conditions of employment. Initially, laws were passed to prevent wage-bargaining by employees - from 1349\textsuperscript{84} until 1824\textsuperscript{85} bargaining was treated as an actionable conspiracy in restraint of trade. For the next 50 years the trade unions and local employer organizations gradually developed a series of non-enforceable procedures for bargaining conditions of work and wages. These were given legal status by the five bills in the 1870s after the 1867 Royal Commission on Trade Unions\textsuperscript{86}. Collective bargaining actually fell in importance in the last quarter of the nineteenth century as unemployment rose, but by 1914 bargaining had become the major means of establishing wage rates in Britain\textsuperscript{87}.

In 1916 the Committee on Relations of Employers and Workpeople\textsuperscript{88} was
set up under the chairmanship of the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, Mr. J.H. Whitley. Among the Committee's recommendations was one to establish Joint Industrial Councils (JIC) in industries where both employees and employers were adequately organized to negotiate. The JICs were primarily intended to negotiate conditions of employment, but for the first time mention was made of the possibility of joint consultations on other matters if the management so desired. The Committee also recommended conciliation and arbitration, and investigation machinery by the Government in cases where the JIC could not solve the industrial dispute. As a result of the acts flowing from these recommendations, the British Employers Confederation was formed in 1919 to act as the central organization for employers, and to represent the employers at meetings with the TUC and the government of the day.

High unemployment during the interwar period became a dominant influence on the collective bargaining system. Under conditions of underemployment, industry-wide bargaining had a great appeal to both the trade unions and employers as a means of preventing competitive wage- and price-cutting. National agreements tended to take wages out of competition and were rationalised on the ethical principle of equal pay for equal work. The agreements played an important role in stabilizing competitive relationships between firms, while at the same time preventing competitive bargaining among employers by the unions. The unions supported the idea of national bargaining because it provided them with a way of maximising their collective strength against the employers in a period when their bargaining power was weak.
The conditions of the interwar period radically altered after 1945. Unemployment, which previously averaged between 10% and 15% from 1919 to 1939, fell to a maximum of 2% between 1945 and 1965, and union membership trebled from 3,500,000 (1932) to 12,000,000 (1975). Many companies and unions supplemented or disregarded national agreements with local plant bargaining, e.g. vehicle building, chemical and food processing industries, and the status and authority of both the national unions and employers associations declined during the period 1945-1965.

Plant bargaining arose from a number of features. One obvious factor was the high employment level during the post-war period. Tight labour market conditions increased the union bargaining power in general, and at the workplace provided strong inducements to employers to pay higher wages and improve working conditions. In addition, the general inflationary climate allowed employers in most instances to pass on increases in labour costs to consumers in the form of higher prices.

In some industries it was argued that the effects of the differences in the production technologies, the level of decision making in the enterprise and the nature of the collective agreements influenced the degree of plant bargaining that occurred. McCarthy argued that the mass production systems, as commonly found in the motor industry, are more prone to conflict and the subsequent development of workplace bargaining.

Plant bargaining was acceptable to most management, as it provided the
mechanism through which issues could be settled within the plant with the minimum loss of managerial initiative and prerogatives. It permitted the maximum flexibility in adopting pay structures and local labour market conditions, without compromising a firm's membership of an employers' association. Finally, it allowed incentive bargaining to take place in the plant.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Conservative Government became concerned with the rate of inflation and the increasing number of unofficial strikes, i.e. not covered in awards or plant agreements. In 1962 the TUC and the three employer bodies were invited to join the National Economic Development Council (NEDC) - an independent planning body to study conditions necessary to sustain a high level of economic growth. The Labour Party returned to power in 1964, and immediately sought and gained a Joint Statement of Intent on Productivity, Prices and Incomes in which the respective parties to the NEDC undertook certain responsibilities related to the development of a national prices and incomes policy.

The Government and its advisors looked back to the interwar period as the time when wage settlements and industrial disputes were best handled in the national interest. The success of the period was attributed to the form of the negotiations through joint discussions at the industry level, and the lack of plant bargaining, rather than the cause, the high rate of unemployment. Between December 1964 and August 1966, the Government introduced four measures which attempted to codify a centralised collective bargaining arrangement between the TUC, the CBI (formed in 1965) and the Government.
The TUC Council had grave reservations when the body joined the NEDC in 1962; the Council realised that it had no power to bind the union movement in any way. The TUC on the whole is a deliberative body. It has limited executive functions, and very little power to commit affiliated unions in any actions. Council regulations are not binding on unions which are completely autonomous, although its deliberations have influence on union decisions.

The TUC indicated its inability to force unions to obey its resolutions to the CBI and the Government, but suggested it could develop federations and other inter-union arrangements as means of meeting functional needs without major structural change. Backed by the National Board for Prices and Incomes in 1965, the Prices and Income Policy of 1966, and the Prices and Income Act of August 1966, the TUC moved increasingly towards a controlling role in union affairs. Industrial relations writers in this period noted "the effective national negotiations carried out in 1965 and 1966." Some unions became concerned by the TUC developments. Their worries were heightened in the Autumn of 1965 when the TUC agreed to examine union pay claims sent voluntarily to it before the claims were referred to the Department of Economic Affairs. Between October 1965 and July 1966, the TUC screened over 600 claims and returned 18 as exceeding the guidelines. In July 1966 the Labour Government introduced a bill to make the screening by the TUC compulsory, but the legislation was dropped when the 1966 election was called.

From then on the TUC gradually withdrew from the joint arrangements,
and increasingly recognized that the place for negotiation of conditions of employment was at the union and plant level. During the 1970s, the TUC was restructured to clearly acknowledge the federation nature of the body, and many of the "centralist" members of the TUC Council were replaced by representatives opposed to any form of enforceable bi- or tri-partite arrangements at the national level.

In the last four years the Labour Governments have negotiated a series of wage restraint agreements with the TUC - the so-called "Social Contract". The agreements have been voluntary, and have relied on moral pressure for their implementation; wage agreements have been made outside the guidelines without any legal sanctions being applied.

Some unionists, employers, and organizations still actively work for a centralised collective bargaining body, but their influence is slight in the industrial relations field in Britain.

Plant bargaining can be seen as a swing back towards participative democracy (see page 28 for a detailed description of the concept) against the representative democracy model (see page 23) of the centralised union or TUC negotiations. While the majority of workers cannot directly participate in the plant negotiations, they do vote at section level on the proposals, and can alter or reject the proposed claim. As well, they have to vote to accept the company offer. In union-wide negotiations the stronger and more organized plants are limited in their claims by the job security of union
members working in less affluent organizations.

Industrial relations writers still write of the need to establish a strong centralized trade union body to collectively bargain and to enforce the agreements, but the union movement has been moving steadily away from such a position for the past decade. The movement will be accentuated as industrial democracy becomes a reality. A centralised scheme can only negotiate a few quite specific and clearly defined areas, e.g. wage rates, hours of work, but cannot handle such things as worker involvement in decision making in particular plants and companies. If workers become involved in plant decision making, e.g. Chrysler UK, "Employee Participation", this must be done on a plant and company level.

One common issue of recent attempts to introduce forms of industrial democracy into British plants has been the unionists strong fear that they would lose their right to bargain collectively if participation was introduced. Union officials regard the right of workers to negotiate wages and conditions as separate from the right to participate in the decision-making process, e.g. Chrysler U.K.; "Employee Participation". No participation scheme so far proposed has given the workers an equal or more powerful share of the final decision making powers than management. Consequently, the workers and union officials have feared that if all decisions were made within the new participation framework the non-unionist majority would gain complete control over the wages and conditions of the workers without surrendering any real power. This fear has been reinforced by the unionists discussions with West German union officials. These officials mentioned that in many
German companies, the management meet before the official board meeting, decide on their policies and then push them quickly through the official meeting. Examples of monthly board meetings of 30 minutes duration were given by the Germans.

The German information has been used in some unions to argue a total ban on participation proposals. Since 1974 a compromise of retaining and strengthening the collective bargaining rights together with participation at the board and plant level have been accepted by the majority of unions within the TUC.

Collective bargaining meets the definition of Industrial Democracy used in this thesis, and will be discussed in the section on the perspectives of industrial democracy. Within the main body of the thesis, the term will refer to the present bargaining rights of the unions, rather than to an attempt by industrial democracy to gain bargaining rights over a wider range of issues e.g. production totals. This is consistent with the use of the term within the union hierarchies and the workplace, although it does clash with some writers, who see the present form of collective bargaining on working conditions as industrial democracy.

QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

When Industrial democracy and participation are discussed, the term 'Quality of working life' is often mentioned as though it is part of the same movement, or is at best dealing with the same problems. In part the latter statement is correct as most of the quality of working life research does involve some form of participation, but usually
with little or no transfer of power to the workers involved.

The QWL movement arose to overcome:

"related but diverse elements of alienation, growing disillusionment in the service sector, perceived scarcity of jobs, as well as the problem of absorbing rapid technical and social change on one hand, and including and incorporating the disenfranchised workers, on the other". 110

Using a multidisciplinary approach, researchers, consultants, and management specialists have attempted to solve the problems mentioned in the above quotation. The major parties in the industrial environment have different expectations of the movement. The governments of the non-communist industrialized nations have encouraged research so as to overcome the serious social problems brought about by rapid industrial change and at the same time improving productivity to pay for the increased programmes to meet the social problems 111. Where management has encouraged the research it has been for increased profits from increased productivity 112. Some unions have been persuaded to participate for increased worker benefits 113. Many unions, especially those of left-wing leanings, believe that the increased productivity is another underhand means of weakening the benefits won by the unions 114, as they, (the unions), are never involved in the planning of the schemes and they never know the full ramifications of the particular scheme. The same unions frequently attack participation as they believe the involvement of the workers will help to shore up an economic system which is about to collapse if left to its fate.
The diffusion of the concepts of QWL has been through a network of the groups mentioned previously, i.e. academics, management consultants and managerial specialists. The movement can be dated from 1961 when the Norwegian trade unions (LO) and employers federation (NAF) agreed to a plan of Thorsrud's to apply the research findings of the Tavistock Institute groups who had investigated the sociotechnical system of work. From the research in five Norwegian industries the ideas spread throughout Europe until there are centres with similar objectives to those of the Norwegian Work Research Institute in Holland, Sweden, Denmark, France, Ireland, Britain and Italy. Of those centres Sweden has had the most influence on the man at work, as there is a national commitment by the Swedish unions, employers, and the then dominant political party to increase the quality of working life through the democratization of the workplace, i.e. industrial democracy. Davis and Cherns give an excellent description of the factors which have led the various countries to develop the research centres:

"the principles of scientific management and organizations based on them stand in the way of national industrial development, demanding a labour force trained in alienation, imposing social costs on a social infra-structure unadapted to use them. Such organizations imply a kind of family structure, organized around the daily absent wage earner whose schooling, provided by a particular kind of educational system, equipped him with the skills of compartmentalizing work from non-work, work from play, work from social life, work from social skills. Industrial countries are paying the price of this in problems which beset virtually every social institution". 117

The problems as described above are fundamental ones for the social fabric of the society and so can only be handled by the national
political system. However, although the social objectives are decided by the political system, the means of attaining those objectives are given to technocrats. Unfortunately, the quality of life in Western society described above is determined in the main by the means characteristically adopted for achieving ends, rather than by the choice of the ends themselves. This structure leads to technology's determining the type of society one shall live in rather than the type of society's determining the level and complexity of the technology. For the worker, the government of the day cannot automatically provide an environment in which he will be happy so many more workers are demanding to participate in the decisions that determine the type of technology, which in turn will affect society. The managers, technocrats and technologists deny that the workers have any right in the discussion on types of technology; the workers can only agree how they will work within the intended system. Managerial prerogatives and professional judgement are often used as defences by the senior staff. In the research reported later in Chapter V, the senior staff of Chrysler (UK) at Ryton decided on a technology which required continuous shifts yet they worked the day-shift themselves and complained if problems arose during the night-shift. The managers wanted the right to a steady family and social life yet required the workers to alternate fortnightly between the various shifts.

From discussions held by the author with union officials and workers, during the research project, it appeared that the workers and their representatives are asking increasingly for participation in the design and implementation of new technologies, and to control the decisions of the technocrats which automatically affect their whole social fabric.
The workers involved in the querying of management's rights are not all traditional blue-collar unions. Increasingly, the more strident voices are those of the white-collar workers who, in the past, have seen themselves as part of 'the management' of the organization. Now these same workers are opposed to managerial decisions in an unprecedented way and to a surprising degree.

To those researchers who see job enlargement, job enrichment, better salary design and administration as the quality of working life field, the discussion on increased worker involvement and control appears irrelevant. Those researchers who accept that personal involvement is a critical factor in the success of their programmes acknowledge that the impact on the work life of participating will spread to a wide range of social institutions - family, schools, voluntary and welfare organizations, and other groupings in which the workers are involved. Within the plant the quality of working life plan of participation would lead to better designed jobs, more involvement in work - face decision making, greater job and staffing security. Such a view of the quality of working life is very similar to those of the participation theorists, however, not all the theorists in the QWL movement see the movement as in any way being involved in any transfer of power to the workers nor the workers being involved in the decision making process.

PERSPECTIVES OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AND WORKER PARTICIPATION IN BRITAIN

In 1970 Professor K.F. Walker, then the Director of the International Institute of Labour Studies, published an influential paper in which he outlined models, concepts, and perspectives in the field of worker...
participation. Walker indicated that some of the various perspectives of participation were already in existence and in the form of an inter-mingling of management and worker skills at various levels of involvement and control. Consequently, he argued that the discussion should centre on the way in which participation would be extended, not on how it could be implemented. Walker's classification of perspectives is often referred to in the literature on participation and his classification is used in the remainder of this section of the chapter. In Walker's classification the perspectives often overlap in part but the main emphasis of each grouping is clearly different from the other groupings; this occurs in most classificatory systems.

1(I) SELF MANAGEMENT

The oldest idea of industrial democracy is that of Rousseau, who argued that the common man should participate in all the spheres of his living, including work. This would mean a radical re-organization of society, as all wealth and power would be equally spread throughout the state.

Rousseau's idea was translated into two philosophical stances, the Anarcho-Syndicalist and the Guild Socialist. The Anarcho-Syndicalists were the major force behind the foundation of the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union and attacked the British Labour Party's early policies of nationalization, especially of the railway system. By 1912 the "Syndicalist Railwaymen" claimed that nationalization would not improve the lot of the railwaymen. Real emancipation would only come when the railwaymen had complete control over the industry. This could only be achieved through industrial unity and 'direct
action'. Although the Syndicalists had such leaders as Tom Mann, Jim Larkin, and Jim Connelly, by the end of World War I the movement had fallen in power and prestige until today small groups such as Solidarity, Syndicalist Workers Federation (SWF) and the Community Development Projects (CDP) groups are the main heirs to the perspective. Many factors contributed to this decline, but two of the most important were the Syndicalists' policy of abolishing the State and the unpopularity earned by their active opposition to World War I during a period of high national patriotism.

The Guild Socialist movement also believed the State would 'wither away'. Led by G.D.H. Cole, the movement argued that society could only exist satisfactorily where the workers participated fully in the affairs of the community. The ideal society was seen as a series of associations held together by the wills of their members. If the associations had free control over their affairs then the greatest worry would be interference by an insensitive State. Cole argued for participative democracy in the associations but did recognize that groups of associations could meet by means of representatives - representative democracy. The Guild Socialists accepted nationalization as a step towards industrial democracy, provided it embodied the principle of union participation in the management of the nationalized industry. The Syndicalists preached direct action which worried many people in Britain while the Guild Socialists were 'gradualists'. After the First World War the Guild Socialists pressed for industrial democracy, but high unemployment, opposition from powerful trade union officials, e.g. J.H. Thomas (NUR), and the reaction of the State to the 1926 General Strike defeated their thrust. Not until the 1960s was Guild Socialism or industrial democracy again an issue within the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DETAILS OF THE CONCEPT</th>
<th>SUPPORTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. DEFENCE AND PROMOTION OF WORKER INTEREST | (I) **Self-Management** - aimed to overcome the contradiction of Socialist ownership and management of the resources  
(Ii) **Worker Control** - worker management in the capitalist states  
(Iii) **Greater Collective Bargaining** - traditional co-operation model but with greater strength to protect workers | Poland  
Yugoslavia.  
Cole, Institute for Worker Control (Britain)  
Some Labour Politicians eg Mr. Michael Foot, Working Together Campaign |
| 2. DEMOCRACY WITHIN THE ENTERPRISE | **Industrial Democracy** - more equitable distribution of power within the organization. Can envisage either the loyal opposition model of government (representative democracy) or active participation by all workers (participative democracy) | *Trade Union Congress.  
British Labour Party |
| 3. REDUCTION OF ALIENATION AND PROMOTION OF PERSONAL FULFILMENT | Labour is not seen as a commodity - more autonomy, decrease alienation by participating in management decisions | Quality of Working Life Movement, *Trade Union Congress, Conservative Party under Mr. Heath |
| 4. EFFECTIVE USE OF HUMAN RESOURCES | Workers can contribute (consult over) but not control the decision making process - argued on efficiency basis | Confederation of British Industry, Chrysler UK. |

* The concepts are not mutually exclusive so in the case of the Trade Union Congress they support both concepts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DETAILS OF THE CONCEPT</th>
<th>SUPPORTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. REDUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT</td>
<td>Through increased co-operation - in some cases by worker representatives on the Board; not for greater actual democracy within the plant but for increased efficiency.</td>
<td>Co-determination policy of West Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. UNION HELP ON PARTICULAR PROBLEMS</td>
<td>Organization involves workers in consultation on welfare problems, eg housing for workers. Consultation.</td>
<td>Yugoslavia before 1974, Cadbury-Schweppes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FIRM</td>
<td>Organization is responsible to the community, not to the shareholders. Concept of Stakeholders.</td>
<td>Finance Editors referring to Slater, Walker practices of asset stripping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ILLEGITIMATE INTRUSION UPON MANAGERIAL PREROGATIVES</td>
<td>Management only responsible to the owners and legitimately cannot share its responsibilities.</td>
<td>Business Graduates Association, University undergraduates research in this thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BRAKE ON EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>Opposite to concepts 4, 5 and 6 - participation slows down the decision making process. Workers not competent.</td>
<td>Confederation of British Industry, Bow Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
union movement.

The ideas of both groups were assimilated by refugee socialists during the first quarter of the twentieth century and were taken back to Europe. During the 1950s and 1960s the ideas arose under the titles of worker or self management in Poland and Yugoslavia. These countries saw industrial democracy as necessary for democracy and socialism; unlike the Webbs, the Poles and Yugoslavs saw occurrences in the work setting as affecting the general way of life rather than work as lagging behind the rest of the political process. Both models could be realistic as the European instances occurred in previously peasant rural economies while in the late nineteenth century Britain had established a strong tradition of political democracy.

1(ii) WORKER CONTROL

Another body which seeks to promote and defend the workers' interests is the British Worker Control Movement. The major source of philosophy and cant for the movement is the Institute for Worker Control in Nottingham. The institute runs annual conferences, which are attended by some of the ministers of the Labour government, and prints a large number of tracts through its press, Spokesman Books. The chief ideologues of the movement are Ken Coates and Anthony Topham. In one of his many books Coates states that the aim of worker control is to move the present British capitalist society towards a socialist organised society "by the establishment of working class centres of authority within the hostile framework of the capitalist society." He argues that the movement recognises the dual system of management and workers but it wants a complete reversal of power where the workers control the management. The worker control tracts constantly
attack the West German model of co-determination (mitbestimmung) as they see other countries, especially Britain, possibly adopting the system which "incorporates trapping the worker leaders within a hostile capitalist system." 126

1(iii) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The last type of worker defence mentioned as industrial democracy by Walker is the traditional one, collective bargaining. The supporters of this model come from both sides of the industrial system; conservative workers and managers prefer greater co-operation between the parties but both feel it would be wrong to allow workers on the top decision making body. The management supporters argue for greater participation (consultation and acquiescence by the workers), but no shift in power. The unions believe that there should be co-operation only where it is beneficial to the members of the union and that the area of collective bargaining should be increased.

2. DEMOCRACY WITHIN THE ENTERPRISE

Industrial democracy in the current debates in Britain often refers, not so much to the Rousseau ideal, but to one where there is a more equitable distribution of power within the organization; the problems are seen as being handled 'democratically'. Within the democratic problem solving concept there are two strategies - the 'loyal opposition' and participatory democracy. The loyal opposition model has been argued most strongly by Clegg 127; he argues that the unions should work as a pressure group to gain their ideals (collective bargaining). The second strategy aims to increase the amount of active participation by all the workers in the particular plant or
work setting. This is ideally done in two ways: firstly, by setting up shop stewards or worker committees in the plant in which all workers can participate, and secondly, by increasing the amount of control the individual worker has over his future within the organization. This strategy is the Yugoslav ideal as described in the 1974 Constitution in which they wish to see a fully participative society with people sharing in all decisions. Many of the British trade unionists adopt this model as their aim in all fields of their life in the fight for participation.

3. DECREASE OF ALIENATION AND GREATER PERSONAL FULFILMENT

The next concept of industrial democracy aims eventually not at the total way of life of the worker, but at his actual job satisfaction and trying to affect that part of his existence. The concept sees increased autonomy of the workers at all levels as decreasing the alienation of the worker through his participating in managerial functions including monitoring of performance, selection of staff in the area, determining work schedules and seeing that satisfactory production levels are reached. Labour, in this model, is not seen as a commodity such as raw materials to be bought and disposed of at the management's will. The participation is argued to decrease the alienation felt by the individual worker, as well as increasing his feelings of personal fulfilment at his job. The major supporters for this stance on workers participating are sections of the Confederation of British Industry, and parts of the quality of working life and trade union movements. A good example of writings by supporters of the latter grouping is Faunce and Dubin's article in Davis and Cherns especially pp. 313.
4. EFFECTIVE USE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Some managers who support the increased involvement of the individual workers do so on social conscience grounds, e.g. reducing alienation, while others are interested in the purported results of reduced alienation, e.g. increased productivity. The latter group usually write and speak in terms of 'more effective utilization of the human resources of the enterprise'. Supporters of this philosophy include sections of the Confederation of British Industry and Chrysler UK, the major firm studied in the present research.

The thrust of the human resources argument is efficiency and often the ethical and ideological issues are deliberately disclaimed by the proponents of this model. The workers are not to control or join the management structure, rather they are to be given greater information and asked for comments. The model is one of expanded consultation. With every worker potentially able to contribute ideas, the management is able to assess each worker and select the more able ones for promotion to supervisory positions. As the workers are not to control or join the management structure, there is to be no change in the power structure of the organization.

5. INCREASED CO-OPERATION AND REDUCED INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT

This model is often mentioned in connection with the German co-determination system. The model, as described in its title, concentrates on reducing industrial conflict through increased co-operation. The German model is often quoted as a model of increased industrial democracy which other countries should copy. Yet the worker representatives frequently are not workers in the company and the worker representatives
do not effectively participate or control the day to day managerial decisions which directly affect the workers. The day to day issues are handled by the Works Council which does not have power to over-rule management decisions on what occurs in the actual work situation. The major power of the worker representatives on the Supervisory Board is to know of and oppose major long-term decisions which would affect the continuity of service of the workers, e.g. relocation or closure of manufacturing plants. The main supporters of the model are the Germans and parts of the CBI, who believe the model gains the greatest co-operation in exchange for the smallest amount of control by worker representatives.

6. UNION CONSULTATION ON PERIPHERAL MATTERS

One of the earlier attempts to involve workers was that of the Cadbury Trust which consulted workers on matters concerning the welfare programme policies, including housing, of the company. This was initially started in the nineteenth century. The workers had no right to speak or be involved in management decisions, although the religious background of the Cadbury family meant that the policies of the management were more enlightened than those of most companies of the period. Another example was the practical effect of the pre-1974 Yugoslavian industrial democracy scheme. Workers and their representatives spent many hours discussing housing for the workers. In a country with a massive building problem after the German destruction during World War II, this worry was understandable, but it meant that important planning decisions, e.g. output levels, allocation of resources, were made very quickly on the recommendation of the management. This was acknowledged in the preamble to the 1974 Constitution.¹³¹
7. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FIRM

One of the assumptions of the previous models is that the organization should maximise efficiency and profit, when and wherever possible. However, the present model does not make that assumption, but rather argues that the organization should plan its policies to create the greatest public good. The organization is seen to have a responsibility to its shareholders but also to its stakeholders, e.g. workers, retail outlets, the community at large. Enlightened autocratic management would fit into this model although there would be no increase in worker involvement.

8. ILLEGITIMATE INTRUSION UPON MANAGERIAL PREROGATIVES

This model totally rejects the benefits claimed in models 4 and 5 of greater efficiency through worker involvement. Protagonists claim that management is legally and morally answerable only to the owners of the money invested in the organization, and that to share the power and authority with the workers would be abdicating managerial responsibilities. Another version of the management view states that the free enterprise system could not last with worker interference in the managerial decision making processes - if workers were involved it would be a covert Social coup. The workers are seen to possess the same rights as the customers and suppliers, there is a contractual arrangement which is legally enforceable. Supporters of this model are hard to find in the literature and in the media. However, this is the attitude among many of the younger managers as they see industrial democracy diluting their future power. The clearest evidence of this attitude is reported later in Chapter VIII in the section discussing the Business Graduates Association.
9. BRAKE ON EFFICIENCY

This model is the rationale for those who wish to keep the British industrial society in the same power relationships as today. The model denies that participation of any kind really helps to increase organizational efficiency. It is conceded that participation can be as efficient but, being much slower to act; is inappropriate for problems requiring quick solutions. Usually worker involvement is argued to be far less efficient. It is also argued that participation has hidden costs. The number of supervisors would decrease and the supervisors would need re-training; job re-design programmes would be needed and these would cost time and money. Workers are seen as inferior to managers because the latter are better trained and possess an experience the workers lack. If the workers are involved in the decision making process they may allow their own interests to override the need to make the best technological decision, e.g. replacement of workers by automated machinery. Finally, it is argued that the workers are not really interested in any form of industrial democracy or participation. The demand for involvement is blamed on to union leaders hungry for power, the ideologues of the Labour Party, and other outside pressures.

The major protagonists for this view of participation are managers of smaller businesses who are the majority of members of the CBI, and the Conservative Party members, who form the Bow Group.
Table 2
MODELS OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN DESCENDING ORDER OF WORKER POWER AND INFLUENCE

1a Self Management
1b Worker Control
2 Industrial Democracy
1c Collective Bargaining
5 Increased Co-operation and Reduced Industrial Conflict
3 Decreased Alienation and Greater Personal Fulfilment
4 Effective Use of Human Resources - Consultation on Work Matters
6 Consultation on Welfare Matters
7 Social Responsibility of the Firm

The first six models above, models 1a down to model 3, meet the criteria necessary to be classified as inter-active; model 4 can be either inter-active or non-inter-active; models 6 and 7 are definitely not inter-active.

In this outline of the various concepts a model of industrial democracy major supports of the various ideas were mentioned in passing; a more detailed description of the major forces in the British scene are described later in the chapter.

The definition of industrial democracy used in this thesis revolves around the shift of real power so models 4 (Effective Use of Human Resources by Consultation about the Job), 6 (Consultation on Worker Welfare Issues) and 7 (Special Responsibilities of the Firm) do not meet the definition of industrial democracy, although the models are part of the evolution towards acceptance by the management that the workers can meaningfully contribute towards the running of the organization.
Some writers, including Walker, argue that any action by the workers is participation. This position is inconsistent with the particular meaning of the word which connotes 'sharing' - one influences the organization's fate but does not share in the running of the firm when, for instance, labour is withdrawn in a strike situation. To participate, the workers must be able to influence a decision, which in turn increases the organization's viability and performance.

It is also argued that participation need not be objectively real but that as long as the workers feel they have participated, participation takes place. According to this line of thinking, models 4, 6 and 7 in certain circumstances could meet the criterion of participation. There are a number of firms who have run such schemes in Britain in the last half century or more, e.g. John Lewis Partnership, but in the long term the workers do not feel that they contribute or that they can affect the managerial decisions. Psychological participation may be useful to build up morale in the short term, but in the longer term there is disillusionment and increased cynicism at any later attempts to involve workers in the management of the organization, e.g. joint consultative committees in Britain.

The characteristics which are common to all managerial jobs are planning, organization, motivating, and controlling the workers. Before the Industrial Revolution the differences between the decision makers and the workers were comparatively minor, but with the advent of great increases in the scale of production and 'scientific management' the differences have been exacerbated until
a major thrust of the worker participation movement, especially the QWL influence, has been to attempt to bridge the gap between the managers and the managed, or the managing and the doing of a task.

For industrial democracy the workers and their representatives must be legitimately able to positively affect the planning and the decisions of the organization. If this occurs in the first two of management characteristics then it is argued in this thesis that the motivation and controlling of staff will be much easier and more efficient.

Any of the processes called job redesign, job enrichment, organizational design, and autonomous work groups, can be part of a participatory process depending on how they are carried out and what results occur; each example would need to be judged individually. The same must be said for all claims of industrial democracy/worker participation; one must examine the particular case, determine the scope, degree and extent of real participation by the workers and then study the short and long term effects of the programme. This will be attempted in each of the settings studied in this thesis.

In analysing the individual work settings certain structural factors will need to be considered:

(i) the autonomy of the enterprise to implement or withstand the demands for participation, e.g. obey an act of parliament, obey instructions of the headquarters of the firm if the company is an overseas controlled multinational concern;

(ii) the influences of technological factors which greatly affect
the opportunities for job redesign, job enrichment, and semi autonomous work groups;

(iii) the size of the organization - very large organizations are traditionally more open to research and to the implementation of pilot studies. Also, Clarke's research shows that the management and workers in larger plants are more in favour of worker participation as a principle than are a similar sample from smaller companies. However, this result is inconsistent with Ingram's work, which argues that smaller, less rigid organizations are more easily convinced of the worth of greater worker participation as they have a greater appreciation of the workers' skills and knowledge.

In Germany the new criterion for electing worker directors is size - over 2,000 workers;

(iv) the age of the organization - the newer the organization, the more dynamic the forces within the organization are likely to be. Consequently, newer firms have less to risk with worker participation while the very thought of worker involvement creates consternation within the older, more conservative firms;

(v) the organizational structure - following on from point (iv), older organizations usually have a static bureaucratic structure which is very slow to react to problems in times of stress; newer firms being usually less rigid in structure react better in a turbulent environment (Emery);

(vi) the authority and power structures of the organization - these structures are supposed to completely overlap each other but frequently they do not. A good example is the car industry. Because of strikes in the 1960s, in the 1970s the senior
management in many car plants during disputes dealt directly with the senior shop stewards without discussing the plans and their details with their own middle and lower level managers. Consequently, a supervisor or area manager may carry out company policy, e.g. sack a worker for a breach of rules (authority structure), yet find the worker reinstated with his lost wages paid in full without any discussion with the supervisor by his senior management; the senior management accept the arguments of the senior stewards (power structure).  

There are important managerial and trade union factors which must be considered when studying the individual case. The managerial ones include:

(i) managerial attitudes towards worker participation - managerial styles vary between dictatorial, paternalistic, constitutional, and democratic across all countries, and philosophies of management. The management must at least have a constitutional style for participation legalised by Act of Parliament to work successfully;

(ii) managerial perception of the relative power of themselves and the unions. In many British companies the policy of top management dealing directly with senior union people has meant that the workers on the shopfloor often receive information before the managers and supervisors are informed. Because in most plant participation schemes the workers and the management are told simultaneously of top management thoughts and decisions, industrial democracy would increase
the amount of knowledge with which the middle and lower
managers would have to work.

(iii) the manager's training and preparation for working in a
participatory scheme. If the manager's or supervisor's job
is secure, and if he receives more interesting work as a
result of greater worker control over the job, then he is
more likely to accept and work within a system of partici-
pation.

The important worker factors include:

(i) The workers' attitudes and objectives towards participation.
While the thrust towards participation is a major one in
senior union ranks, e.g. Trade Union Congress, it is not
always clear that the actual workers are as keen to partici-
pate in the managerial functions. While it is simple to
forecast that workers will say 'yes' in a survey to greater
worker control, it is not always the case that the person
answering in the affirmative would be prepared to partici-
pate if given the opportunity, or even that he believes the
policy is a good one to start in his organization.

(ii) Do workers wish to participate and do they believe it is
worthwhile? If workers believe the plan is a sham, a
facade, they will not waste their time and effort in trying
to participate. Sometimes the plan is a genuine move by the
management to improve industrial relations, but distrust
built up over a period of time casts doubts in the workers'
minds and the plan is not given a fair try. A sizable percen-
tage of British workers accept the present position - it would
worry them if they had to assume managerial responsibilities. Our research, reported in Chapter V, Special Products Plant, indicates that men are more likely to wish to participate than women and that the older and more skilled the man, the greater the likelihood that he will seek to participate.

Do the workers have the capacity to participate? The capacity is affected by ability and training - unlike Norway there are no British union courses to train workers to participate fully as directors or managers. Instead the workers elect representatives who may, or may not, have the capacity and whose term in the position may be short while the managers have usually received training in a tertiary education establishment and are permanent in their job.

The role conflict of elected worker spokesman is very real. If the spokesman is elected by the rank and file of the plant to a position, e.g. shop steward, is he elected as a delegate to act as a communication channel between his workmates and other workers, or is he a representative or expert who can make decisions without reference back to his electors? It is very common for the more capable workers in the work area to refuse to stand in steward elections as they see the position driving a potential wedge between themselves and their workmates. Part of the reason for the recent resurgence of shop stewards has been the desire of the men to elect representatives who are accountable to them and replaceable if necessary. Many union members elect their Union Secretary and other officials for life when the positions become vacant. After
a while the permanent servant of the union is often seen to be more comfortable discussing union matters with employers' groups than with his own men. When this happens there is no recourse to the men within the normal running of the union except to elect their own local representatives to bargain with the union hierarchy and the management. The recent industrial history of Britain has examples where the management and the union officials have reached a decision yet the workers have rejected the bargain and continued to stay out on strike against union recommendations.

Who appoints worker representatives on management boards, the union, the workers, or the management? The Guardian on 15 September 1975 reported that at the Felixstowe Dock and Railway Company the management rejected the election of worker representatives on the Board but asked the senior shop steward to join the Board. The elected official accepted and on the day he joined the Board to represent the workers the rank and file of the company dismissed him as their senior elected representative. The workers claimed that then the man could not speak or make bargains in the boardroom with the full authority of his union position. If the representative is appointed by the union, then the spectre of German co-determination is raised where in the iron and steel industry the Aufsichtsrat or supervisory board is composed of half workers representatives and half representatives of the shareholders. If the board has eleven members, then the five worker representatives are selected as follows: two are elected by the company's Works Council, two are named by the central...
union executive and one is appointed from outside the union or the organization. The ordinary German steel worker elects the Works Council who in turn appoint the two workers on the board - one must be a blue collar worker and the other a white collar worker. If the workers appoint all the representatives, then the union hierarchy are concerned if the plant is not fully unionised as the union officials fear that elected non-unionists may not present the same message as those representatives who belong to the union. Other union officials are suspicious that the involvement of workers in management decision making is intended to reduce the loyalty to the union. This would prevent the use of the threat of nationwide strikes which would close down many companies during the course of a dispute for better union-wide conditions.

(vi) Many union officials are a generation older and less qualified than the younger workers. The officials are comfortable with workers of their generation and with the management, but often fear discussions and confrontations with the younger workers. In Australia, Ford employ young migrant labour where ever possible and in 1973 a dispute arose in which the solution was negotiated by a leading union official who was often portrayed in the media as a communist agitator. The official reported back to the stop-work meeting and told the men to accept the conditions of the new agreement and return to work. The young men harangued him for an hour in front of the media, refused to lift the strike ban and pushed down a Ford brick wall to enter the plant. Eventually, after the big build up of surplus car stock was sold, Ford agreed to
the demands, the official publicly apologised for his "arrogant manner", and the men agreed to return to work.

(vii) Does worker participation in management discussions improve the communication of important company matters to the workers? From research reported later in the thesis it does not appear to occur automatically; unless there is more and improved communication channels the net effect to the shopfloor worker of greater participation is negligible.

(viii) Are all groups of workers equally interested in participation? Many union officials believe that women are only interested in continuity of work so as to maintain their salary or wage which is used to pay for extra items in the house while their husbands' earnings meet the essential costs of living. The officials claim it is harder to take industrial action in predominantly female plants or to find female elected representatives.

So far Chapter I has briefly outlined the historical background surrounding industrial democracy in Britain, described the concepts of democracy and participation, and dealt with the various interpretations of what is meant by industrial democracy in British society. The final section of the chapter looks at the major pressure groups supporting or rejecting industrial democracy, and what they mean by the term when it is used in the writings emanating from the various groups.

TRADE UNIONS, THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY, AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

As mentioned on p. 18 by the 1840s most unions had incorporated industrial democracy or work participation as a major industrial aim,
yet one hundred and thirty years later the concept was a source of dispute within the union movement at annual congresses. The early unionist clearly saw participation in decision making as an educational process in the widest sense which would develop responsible individual social and political action and would be self-sustaining through the worker's gaining greater control over his environment. This sentiment was still clearly dominant in the union movement when Cole in 1920 wrote:

"The fundamentally important thing about the various forms of capitalist organizations assume is not whether they are harsh or gentle, whether they treat the workers well or ill, but whether they foster or destroy the spirit of liberty in men's hearts." 146 (author's italics)

The Trade Union Congress of 1920 discussed in detail the possible takeover of the railways, mines, and the post office. Some like Thomas argued there would be greater appreciation of each party's problems while others argued for straight control of managerial prerogatives. However, in the same year the English Railway Stockholders Protection Society was formed to fight the railway union's demands. The group pressured the parliament, particularly the House of Lords, until in the end the Labour Party was defeated on the White Paper by the combined votes of the Conservative and Liberal members. The circumstances of 1920 were similar to those of 1974 when the principle of industrial democracy was mentioned by the unions and the Labour Party, and some members of the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) believed that similar pressure would again work successfully 149.

After the union defeats of 1926 the concept of worker participation
went into decline. Instead nationalization for efficiency was proposed and in 1932 Herbert Morrison carried his plans into union policy although some members fiercely opposed the development. Speakers such as G.M. Hann\textsuperscript{150} of the Shop Assistants Union attacked the concept of consultative committees, claiming that the management of nationalized industries would ignore them - the same claim is made today. Cole and Hellow\textsuperscript{151} proposed a system of worker control and self government in industry to meet the complaints of people such as Hann and Cliff\textsuperscript{152}. Their document is very similar in design and plan for implementation as a later Fabian tract by Radice\textsuperscript{153} in 1974. Dukes (General and Municipal Workers)\textsuperscript{154} at the 1933 Congress moved successfully that workers should by law have effective control of all industry by controlling 50\% of the votes on the Board or managerial committee of the organization. This effectively was the 1974 motion carried at the Trade Union Congress in Blackpool.

In 1935 the decision was amended to cover only nationalized industries which would have a two-tier board similar to the West German model. Later that policy was rescinded in form of joint TUC-management discussions on any important issues plus normal collective bargaining by the unions involved.

The idea of participation had not died and in 1950 a pamphlet, "Keeping Left"\textsuperscript{155} was published by politicians such as Barbara Castle, Richard Crossman, and Ian Mikardo, all leading party spokesmen in the 1974-1975 Wilson Labour government. Their document attacked the growing TUC-senior management dialogue and the exclusion of the workers from the discussions. They predicted a growth of shop stewards and less
control by the union leaders over the rank and file. These writers argued that there had to be greater participation within the unions concerned and between the workers and the management. The writings found support in the next decade with magazines such as the New Left Review, but generally the arguments were ignored until the Donovan Commission in the 1960s; among the terms of the Commission's charter was one to investigate the legitimacy of the shop stewards' role as part of the official trade union hierarchy.

The policy of the Labour Party on industrial democracy was very similar at all times to the TUC policy of the day. At the 1968 Annual Conference the national executive of the Labour Party tabled a statement entitled 'Industrial Democracy'. While calling for greater integration of the shop steward movement there is no mention of any other system of worker involvement except by collective bargaining; on page 2 there is an oblique rejection of worker representatives.

The 1972 Labour research paper on industrial democracy further develops the 1968 statement, but on page 8 does acknowledge that representation on management boards could be feasible but only in the public sector. Again collective bargaining plus government supervision are the major thrusts of the Labour policy. The TUC-Labour Party Liaison Committee report, 'Economic Policy and the Cost of Living' supports the 1968 and 1972 statements but ignores any form of worker participation in management. The Labour Party opposition Green Paper, 'Capital and Equity - 1973', whose authors included Barbara Castle and Ian Mikardo, rejects any form of worker participation as they feel the development would lead to a
'more docile work force'. At the same time another working party of the Labour Party including Tony Benn and David Lea (also on the 'Capital and Equity' working party) prepared the Green Paper, 'The Community and the Company' - 1974\textsuperscript{161} which was a response to the EEC's proposals on company harmonization across Europe - the draft Fifth Amendment\textsuperscript{162}. This latter Green Paper covers the point of worker directors for the majority of its 36 pages and argues for worker directors in a two-tier model similar to West Germany in companies with 200 or more workers; the Fifth Directive suggested 500 workers. In 1974 for the first time industrial democracy became the official policies of both the TUC and the Labour Party, apparently in response to overseas developments.

The Annual Conference of the Labour Party in 1975 discussed worker control of nationalized industry, but the series of motions were defeated in favour of the Green Paper position of 50% of directors being workers.

On 9th December 1975 the Minister for Trade announced that a Committee of Inquiry on Industrial Democracy, the Bullock Committee, would be set up to study how worker representation would be carried out with the involvement of the trade union movement.

From opposition to the principle of worker representation as late as 1972 within the TUC and 1973 in the Labour Party, by December 1975 the Labour Party and the union movement had moved to the opposite position of agreeing to set up a Committee of Inquiry to inform the government on the way to implement industrial democracy by 1977.
CONSERVATIVE PARTY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY/PARTICIPATION

In 1963 the Conservative Party published 'Industrial Change: The Human Aspect'. In this document the then Conservative Government was advised to acknowledge and integrate the role of shop stewards into the industrial scene and encourage the formation of an even more centralised trade union movement, so that TUC, CBI, and the Government could control the work force and increase productivity. There was no mention of increased participation by the workers in the running of the organization.

Yet in the very early 1970s it was a Conservative Prime Minister, Edward Heath, who first mentioned greater participation by the workers. At that time both the TUC and the Labour Party opposed the concept of works councils and worker directors.

In March 1973 the Conservative Party published the document, 'Workers on the Board'. The report noted there were no laws on employee participation. The document states that both the unions and management are too conservative as Japan, USA, and Scandinavia were already encouraging the development with better industrial relations as a result.

The document notes that consultants often ask workers for solutions to problems, management never ask. The document recommends that workers and their unions should be better informed of managerial decisions and should be involved in the control of pension planning, holiday rosters, and medical facilities through a works council.

Finally, recommendation XII argues that worker directors with full
rights should be appointed in all nationalized industries.

The recommendations became the policy of the Conservative Party when the Labour Party won power in February 1974. The opening paragraph of the statement, 'Participation in Industry' notes that the move towards participation is due to the European Community's draft of the Fifth Directive and the possibility of a Statute for a 'European Company'. Because of the acknowledged European pressure, the policy statement suggests that two boards could be considered for the private sector.

In the policy document for the October 1974 election, 'Putting Britain First', it is acknowledged that capitalism has a poor performance record which needs to be altered by greater involvement by the workers. The document supports some form of worker directors but is not prepared to recommend the draft Fifth Directive as a possible form of participation.

When Edward Heath was defeated as leader of the Conservative Party, one of the first policy decisions of the new leader, Margaret Thatcher, was to drop any policy criticising capitalism and any policy for worker participation in management. She accepted the argument of the Conservative Headquarters Industrial Relations Group that talk of workers taking on managerial roles had alienated the 'cloth cap' Conservative who was believed not to have voted in the last election.

A curious position existed in Britain in 1975. The Conservative Party introduced the idea of worker or employee participation to British politics during 1972-3 and the idea was opposed by the
Labour Party, yet two to three years later the Conservatives totally rejected the policy while the Labour Party, as the government, insti-
gated a Committee of Inquiry to advise on the implementation of industrial democracy.

The Liberal Party had little effect on the industrial relations debate during the time of the project. Although the party was the first (in the 1920s) to suggest some form of power sharing, all it did during 1974-75 was criticise the other parties' positions. The Liberal Party platform in 1975 briefly proposed worker councils to talk to management, but did not state what the councils would do or discuss.

THE CBI

The CBI is not grouped with the Conservative Party as are the Labour Party and TUC in this chapter. This is because the CBI has considered any form of worker involvement in management as improper.

In 1973 the Company Affairs Committee of the CBI responded to the Conservative Party's 'Workers on the Board' with their report, 'Responsibilities of the British Public Company'. In the report the CBI dismissed the idea that workers had any right to be involved in the running of the organization; rather they felt that unions and workers should be reduced in power. Consequently the Company Affairs Committee rejected the importation of foreign models of structure, yet at the same time the CBI supported Britain's being within the European Economic Community as this meant larger markets for British goods.

When the Labour Party and the TUC changed their position in 1974 to
favour worker participation in the management of the organization, the CBI Grand Council requested their Employment Policy Committee to comment on the union proposals. The Employment Policy Committee's task was to propose an alternative if the Labour government acted to implement their industrial democracy policy. The then President of the Company Affairs Committee of the CBI, Lord Watkinson, tried to find a policy which would meet the Confederation's requirements and represent a reasonable alternative to the Labour Party's line of action. The Committee recommended a weak form of work councils which would meet, in form, the demand for greater worker involvement but without increasing the workers' real powers. The Grand Council rejected the Committee report on at least four occasions when new versions were submitted for notification. The leaders of the multinational companies voted for accepting the report but the managers of smaller companies completely rejected any concept of greater worker involvement. The CBI decided not to have any policy on worker or employee participation except totally to reject the concept. This meant that rather than face a potential issue and adapt the firm to meet the problem, the Confederation decided to ignore the issue and hope it would disappear.

During 1974 and 1975 the CBI never publicly presented a reasoned case to the Government on the media, as to why the industrial democracy proposals of the TUC should be rejected. The Confederation also refused to co-operate by appointing members to the Bullock Committee on Industrial Democracy. In total, the major employers' organization in Britain had no policy on the question of industrial democracy except total rejection. It is not surprising then that private management orientated pressure groups became involved in the issue or that
the union case was much better presented to the public at large.

OTHER PRESSURE GROUPS

Many pressure groups operate in the British Industrial scene; some are professional groupings, others industrial, and others again are political. Many of these pressure groups speak and write about industrial democracy/worker participation.

The Aims of Industry group are an influential pressure group with managers and the Conservative Party. The group is disliked and distrusted by the TUC and the Labour Party. For three months before the February 1974 General Election, the Aims of Industry placed advertisements claiming that a Labour Government through the militant unions would destroy liberty in Britain\(^{175}\). This action is consistent with the group's previous behaviour - it was set up to fight the moves to nationalize the sugar and cement industries during the late 1940s.

The Guardian (7/1/74)\(^{176}\) stated that the Aims of Industry was a Conservative Party group but its expenses were not included in the election limits. Tony Benn referred to them as "sinister forces" in the House of Commons on the 17/1/74\(^{177}\). After the Labour success in February 1974, the group furiously attacked the Bill setting up the National Enterprise Board when it was passed through Parliament. As part of the campaign against the Bill and its minister, Mr. Tony Benn, it published the pamphlet, 'The Ugly Face of Mr. Wedgwood Benn'\(^{178}\).

The group is run by a national council led by the Director, Mr. Michael Ivens. Previously the leader of the Working Together Campaign, he resigned this position in April 1973 because his association with Aims
of Industry precluded any trade union leader from joining that organization.

Mr. Ivens now concedes that the organization is a political pressure group which tries to work in the political and industrial fields. With a budget of at least £150,000 in non-election years and £350,000-£500,000 in election years the group has a deal of advertising power to apply. Another important figure in Aims of Industry is Nigel Vinson who was influential in the Working Together Campaign. Vinson in 1972 was Chairman of the Industrial Co-operation Association, member of the Grand Council of the CBI, and a member of the Council of the Institute of Directors.

Aims of Industry has consistently attacked any attempts at greater control over the management of the organization whether it be by government or union. The group has published a number of pamphlets attacking increased worker involvement and is totally opposed to worker participation - in 'Power on the Shopfloor', it discusses participation as "creating seizure of control by the workers". The description of Aims of Industry is necessary if one is to understand the role and standing of the Working Together Campaign. Neither Ivens nor Vinson still belong to the group, but they were leaders of the WTC until late 1973. Among the present Board members of the group are Sir Anthony Bowlby and Frank Chapple; Chapple, as Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union, provides the union involvement in the group which was not possible as long as Ivens belonged to the organization.

The WTC has published a number of pamphlets, written in the main by...
writers of the Aims of Industry pamphlets. The argument of the WTC pamphlets is that British industry suffers from a lack of communication by management of their plans and a lack of co-operation by the unions. The group do not believe in worker participation, e.g. Chapple, "there is a lot of political gimmickry about Worker Participation. I don't think it is genuine, I think it's designed to be vote catching," but they do believe in management's giving the workers more information so that the latter will obey the orders willingly.

Bowlby, in the paper, 'Industrial Relations in Europe', presents an inaccurate view of the Scandinavian industrial scene which he wants the WTC to help establish in Britain. He argues that production increases in Europe are due to co-operation between strong centralised unions, employers, and government bodies. Bowlby states that the executive of the trade union movement makes the union decisions and through their own power within the union movement, and strong laws which legally enforce the contract, ensure that individual numbers and their shop stewards obey the decisions. The researcher's discussions with local trade union and central union representatives in Sweden and Denmark refuted the previous statement. Both groups said that the salaries and conditions signed in the two year contract began at the workfloor level and were taken to local, regional, union and finally combined union movement committees where compromise eventually led to the formulation of the formal demands made by the LO. The union representatives claimed that participation, not legal penalties, led to compliance to the contract by the workers and quoted the 1969 strike in Swedish iron mines as an example of what happens when union leaders make decisions on behalf of their members without consultation - the workers ignored the instructions of their leaders, the law, and the
government of the day until the safety conditions were improved.

Bowlby argues for consultation by management at the organization work council level and at the TUC/CBI level. He believes this would restrict union power and appear to meet the demand for greater worker participation. Finally, he asserts that power flows down through the union structure and that the union executive delegate some powers eventually to the plant level.

The Bowlby paper and Chapple's statement show why they both belong to the WTC; they both believe in conservative centralised union power and this desire flies in the face of the experiences in the EEC and Scandinavia, and desires expressed at recent TUC annual conferences.

THE ENGINEERING EMPLOYERS FEDERATION

Among the strongest opponents of the industrial democracy movement are the headquarters - the EEF. Set up as an executive and specialist body for the engineering employers, it negotiates with the Confederation of Ship Building and Engineering Union on industrywide conditions and pay. The Industrial Relations Division of the EEF\(^1\) admits that participation would probably reduce industrial tensions and disputes but fear that it would also mean the end of their existence so they support the CBI opposition to industrial democracy\(^2\).

There are regional bodies of the EEF and the most influential of these is the Coventry and District Engineering Employees Association. This group produced the document, 'Worker Participation - The European Experience'\(^3\) in 1974. The document reports on a number of European
countries and accurately details the history and types of participation in each country. The report also provides copies of a number of important documents, e.g. The Draft Fifth Directive. While not supporting the industrial democracy movement in Europe and Britain, it does report on the successes of the movement, and it does not attack the movement in the tones of the London central office.

It would be a very big task to list and describe all the parties publishing and arguing on industrial democracy. The ones described previously are seen as essential background, but other important bodies are acknowledged as not being described, e.g. Industrial Society, Institute of Personnel Management, British Institute of Management, the Fabian Society, the Bow Group, Political and Economic Planning (PEP) and the Institute for Worker Control. There are other smaller but still influential bodies working in the field, e.g. the Industrial Mission in Coventry argues for worker participation on the basis of bible teaching plus a knowledge of the industrial climate in Britain. When and where relevant, the arguments of the groups mentioned briefly above will be incorporated in the body of the text.

CONCLUSION

The previous sections have outlined the concepts of democracy and participation, related the history of the movements towards industrial democracy in Britain, described the various concepts called industrial democracy and worker participation in Britain up to 1975, and mentioned some of the major parties which support or reject industrial democracy.
From the above discussions it is clear that there is no one clear concept of industrial democracy or worker participation; each party has its own view of what the term means. Secondly, the major forces in the debate on industrial democracy, the union movement, the Labour Party, the CBI and the Conservatives have major differences within their own ranks as to the meaning of the terms and what policy each respective group should support. All these factors make the content of the present research - industrial democracy - very hard to investigate. Therefore, rather than follow the diffusion of one particular concept of participation, the research will follow any of the ideas of industrial democracy mentioned previously as long as the critical point, the transfer of real power to the workers, is included. Most of the models mentioned before are interactive, i.e. greater participation leads to greater control by the workers, and greater control by the workers leads to increased participation. Consequently, all models which involve the transfer of real power to the workers are interactive.

With the acceptable perspectives of industrial democracy outlined, the next step is to describe the various models of diffusion and decide which one(s) will be used in the thesis. This will be done in Chapter II.
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This lengthy chapter identifies diffusion as a process, examines the elements of the diffusion process in some detail, discusses the three major types of diffusion models, attempts to draw principles from these models to build a comprehensive "general" model, and concludes by considering criticisms of the assumptions which underlie all the models mentioned. One cannot be brief and give full justice to the concepts involved in diffusion. Some sources mention most of the concepts but no one researcher has related and integrated all the concepts as occurs in this chapter. A detailed treatment is essential to provide the foundation for the research results and conclusions which follow.

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are much more than collections of people. The people who belong to any organization must work together as they are interdependent and so must communicate. The theorists who have discussed the effect of information on organization have always considered maintenance information, but very little has been studied or written on the flow of new ideas, innovations, and new research-based knowledge.

Fig. 2.1 sets out the relationship of the research traditions in the diffusion field and Table 2.1 compares the types of the major diffusion research traditions.
Figure 2.1.
INTERRELATIONS AMONG THE SIX MAJOR TRADITIONS OF RESEARCH ON THE DIFFUSION OF INNOVATIONS

Only some of the major research studies are shown in this diagram for the sake of brevity. The arrows illustrate influences of one study upon another.
## Table 2.1
### COMPARISON OF THE MAJOR DIFFUSION RESEARCH TRADITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFUSION RESEARCH TRADITION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPIRICAL PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE</th>
<th>TYPICAL INNOVATIONS STUDIED</th>
<th>METHOD OF DATA GATHERING AND ANALYSIS</th>
<th>MAIN UNIT OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>MAJOR TYPES OF FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Anthropology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Technological ideas (steel, axe, the horse, water-boiling, e.g.)</td>
<td>Participant and non-participant observation and the case study approach</td>
<td>Tribal or peasant villages</td>
<td>Consequences of innovation; relative success of change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Early sociology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>City Manager government, postage stamps, ham radio</td>
<td>Data from secondary sources and statistical analysis</td>
<td>Communities or individuals</td>
<td>S-shaped adopter distribution; characteristics of adopter categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rural sociology</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>Agricultural Ideas (weed sprays, hybrid seed, fertilizers, e.g.) and health Ideas (vaccinations, latrines, e.g.)</td>
<td>Individual farmers in rural communities</td>
<td>S-shaped adopter distribution; characteristics of adopter categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kindergartens, driver training, modern maths, programmed instruction</td>
<td>Mailed questionnaire, survey interviews, and statistical analysis</td>
<td>School system or teachers</td>
<td>S-shaped adopter distribution; characteristics of adopter categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Medical Sociology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Medical Drugs, vaccinations, family planning methods</td>
<td>Survey interviews and statistical analysis</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Opinion leadership in diffusion; characteristics of adopter categories; communication channels by stages in the innovation-decision process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Communication</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>News events, agricultural Innovations</td>
<td>Survey interviews and statistical analysis</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Communication channels by stages in the innovation-decision process; characteristics of early and late knowers, of adopter categories and of opinion leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Marketing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>New products (a coffee brand, the touch-tone telephone, clothing fashions, e.g.)</td>
<td>Survey interviews and statistical analysis</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Characteristics of adopter categories; opinion leadership in diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other traditions</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The categories in Table 2.1 are based on Table 2.1 of Rogers (1962) and the source for the number of empirical publications is Rogers (1973). If published articles was the criterion then the number of Education articles, tradition 4, would outnumber all other traditions combined (Havelock et al., 1969).
IDEAL TYPES

When discussing terms such as diffusion and innovation, we shall be using the concept of 'ideal types'. "Ideal types" are not general or abstract concepts but hypothetically concrete individuals (personalities, social situations, changes, revolutions, and so on) constructed out of their relevant components by the researcher so that one can precisely compare phenomena. Weber, the first to use ideal types applied the technique to represent the arrangement of critical elements which constituted the ideal "church", "sect", "Protestanism", and "Christianity".

The ideal type is a strategy in empirical explanation framed in the terms of the scientific knowledge available to the researcher at the time of his study and in the terms of the empirical situation he is trying to understand.

All ideal types are "objectively possible". Constructed correctly, they allow the researcher to isolate configurations of facts which causally influence the train of events under scrutiny.

Ideal types are not arithmetic averages but a selection of items which could appear in reality. However, they are not stereotypes as the latter is an evaluative concept designed to close rather than open the analysis. Ideal types permit comparison of different situations until a new level of understanding takes place which suggests a new and better ideal type; all types are destined to be replaced.
They are not easily observable in the world about us, but must be framed or defined by the particular researcher. If the phenomena in the world were easily classifiable then framing would not be necessary. However, the world usually presents the individual case as a tangle of incidents in varying degrees of relief. 

For greater detail of the concept, Martindale provides the best available summary.

**DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIFFUSION AND INNOVATION**

Diffusion in this thesis is defined as:

"the transfer of an idea to another person to influence that person's behaviour in the future"

The critical concept in the definition is the transference of an idea and not any application of a technique which could flow from the idea. The definition must be continually kept in mind, as the most common mistake by writers in the fields of diffusion and innovation is to slip between the concepts as though they mean exactly the same thing; they do not. The difference is important; innovation is concerned with the practical application of ideas so it is observable and measurable, but diffusion, at our present state of knowledge, is not easily observable and measurable. Innovation deals with the practical application of an idea that has diffused but not all ideas have practical applicability or are observable, e.g. societal attitudes which are not codified in the law or social custom of the country, such as tolerance. Therefore it is essential that some diffusion take place for an innovation to occur but not all ideas
diffused lead to innovations.

Industrial democracy deals with an idea of equality and fairness which may take many years to take a practical form, such as an Act of Parliament or changes in organizational structures, yet it may be well diffused in the society. Also, an Act of Parliament may be passed on industrial democracy (the innovation) without the idea diffusing very much within the community.

As there is no Act of Parliament in Britain on industrial democracy, unlike the majority of the members states of the European Economic Community, it could be argued that no widespread innovation has taken place, yet diffusion has definitely occurred. The mass media, radio, T.V. and the press, have been increasingly discussing the participation of workers in the running of organizations. The TUC approved Reports on industrial democracy at their 1973, 1974, and 1975 Congresses and the CBI has rejected the idea, c.f., the press releases at the time of the release of the CBI pamphlet, "Employee Participation". If the idea had not diffused then no such discussion would have taken place.

If it is remembered that the present study is about the spread of an idea then the research reported later in the thesis makes sense. However, if one were interested only in the application of the idea then this thesis would become yet another list of small isolated attempts since Robert Owen to involve workers in the decision making processes of work organization. That approach would neither help one to understand how ideas spread nor tell us what the level of interest in industrial democracy in England was in 1974-1975.
Diffusion does not automatically imply that all spreading of information is rational and deliberate. However, some writers do. Havelock is one of the few writers to recognize the difference between diffusion (dissemination and knowledge utilization) and innovation as argued in the present research and he has tried to describe how the innovators persuaded other people to accept their ideas. In his study, he listed all the major terms used in the field concerning the spread of ideas, of practices, which are listed in Table 2.2.

The belief that all diffusion is deliberate cannot explain the growth of all new ideas. There are numerous examples of ideas being deliberately propagated to a group of "believers" who then apply the idea in a way that meets the needs of the receivers, but not in the way it was intended.

Any model of diffusion that could not explain the unplanned spread of information and ideas would be very limited in its application.

THE DIFFUSION PROCESS

Many writers have discussed "the diffusion process" (i.e. the process whereby data is passed onto other persons) but none has fully integrated the various parts of the process to create a complete picture of the diffusion process. Writers have concentrated in the past on the particular part of the process that interested them.

In the following section of the Chapter, the various parts of the diffusion process will be discussed and an integration of them will be attempted.
Table 2.2

KEY TERMS USED IN THE
INITIAL COMPARATIVE LITERATURE SURVEY (CLS) INDEX SEARCH
BY HAVELock (1969)\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>New Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>New Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>New Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Scientific Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Scientific Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEMENTS OF THE DIFFUSION PROCESS

Katz\(^6\) postulated four elements of the diffusion process which one should study. Rogers and Shoemaker\(^7\) further refined Katz's concept to:

(i) the idea
(ii) its communication through certain channels
(iii) in a social system
(iv) over time

The thesis will use Rogers and Shoemaker's model in an attempt to show the four elements by studying:

(i) the idea - industrial democracy
(ii) its communication through the mass media, the workplace, trade unions, government, tertiary education, and elites
(iii) in Britain
(iv) in the period 1974-1975

CULTURAL CONTEXT OF THE DIFFUSION PROCESS

It is obvious from the failure of even the best planned diffusion exercises (Rogers)\(^8,9\) that diffusion does not occur in a vacuum; it occurs in a culture and its success or otherwise is affected by the cultural context, (e.g. to diffuse the idea of birth control in third world countries is nearly impossible until (a) the infant mortality rate is seen to be less by the parents and (b) the country provides some system of old age support so that the parents do not see themselves as requiring large families to increase their chance of support when they are old), (Rogers)\(^10\). The cultural context can be seen as consisting of various parts which themselves can be studied in greater detail. Five of these are now treated.
COMMUNITY NORMS

Norms are 'a range of values constituting the normal performance of the group'. They have long been the subject of study by people interested in rates of diffusion and innovations. Rogers, believing that norms are critical in the diffusion of ideas, postulated a continuum of community norms ranging from traditional to modern. Von Neumann and Morgenstern found that conservative backward people knew the traditional norms and rigidly adhered to them - to use the researchers' own words - "they are bound by the 'authority of eternal yesterdays' ".

There is little research in the area or on norms in general which is highly surprising considering the importance attached to norms in sociological theory. The answer may be that the concept of norms is only another way of looking at diffusion, as norms can be thought of as the diffusion of various ideas within the community. The more widely known and believed the (diffused) idea, the more likely that it will be accepted. The conflict between competing norms, (e.g. obedience and authority and individual freedom and responsibility) can be viewed as the effort by the new idea, individual freedom and responsibility, to be diffused and to replace the belief in obedience.

So far within the diffusion research field three differing approaches to measuring norms have been reported:

1. The average score of the particular norm, e.g. innovativeness. Marsh and Coleman and Rogers and Burdge compared farmers in various American communities by listing the farming practices of the subjects.
2. Attitudes towards particular people or ideas, e.g. attitudes towards innovators. Van Den Ban\textsuperscript{17} asked Dutch farmers what they thought of farmers who adopted new farming practices.

3. Ratings given by judges from within the community who are seen as unbiased and accurate perceivers of the situation.

All three approaches have serious methodological objections. The first approach depends on the same innovations being equally applicable in each social system\textsuperscript{18}, e.g. farming community, being studied. Quite frequently this is not the case. The second approach assumes that the only difference between the people is the norm being measured. In areas of study such as diffusion and innovation factors other than the norm being investigated may prevent some of the sample from practising the norm; for example the results may reflect the wealth of the subjects rather than the acceptance of an idea. The third approach relies on correct selection by the researcher and objectivity on the part of the judges; these twin aims are very hard to achieve.

It should not be extrapolated from the criticisms above that the concept of norm is useless - it is not, but it is very difficult to measure in order that replication of experiments can take place or that two researchers can agree that they are discussing the same phenomena. Flinn\textsuperscript{19}, Coleman and Marsh\textsuperscript{20}, and Rogers\textsuperscript{21} all indicate that the tendency of the individual to believe in and adopt a new practice depends to a large extent on the community norms at the time. As the idea is adopted as being worthy of support by the community at large, so it becomes easier to diffuse the idea and harder to reject
the concept in public. Van den Ban\textsuperscript{22} found in Netherland farming communities that individual innovativeness varied directly with the norms of the social system on innovativeness.

**FAMILY INFLUENCE**

This area of the cultural context of the diffusion process is often included in community norms, because the parents are the major acculturating force in the community. However, Lionberger looked in particular at the family in its effect on the spread of ideas and reported that 'numerous studies have shown that family members often serve as referents or consultants in decisions to adopt new farm and home practices\textsuperscript{23}.

The family is a very potent force of change or conservatism as its effects are much more apparent and immediate than those of the community at large.

**CREDIBILITY**

Not all information, opinions, or pressure have the same force; the more prestigious the source of the message, the more likely the receiver is to agree and take account of the message in their actions (Zagona and Haire\textsuperscript{24}, Caird\textsuperscript{25}).

However, a high prestige person is not necessarily seen as an expert in other fields. Niehoff and Anderson\textsuperscript{26} found that apparent expertise was not seen as carrying over into other fields. One may put one's life in the hand of one's family doctor but not accept the doctor as more credible than oneself on any other topics.
The problem of credibility helps to explain why messages do not diffuse as one would normally predict. Even if all the relevant people hear the message correctly, not all are given high credibility by the next level of message receivers.

LEGITIMACY OF ROLE

Roles give a standardised pattern to the world at large and guide one in reactions to people. A role is dependent upon the features of the situation and not upon the individual filling it. This is an advantage as one can make assumptions on how to act or not to act with people and thus facilitate interactions. However, this factor has disadvantages. Rogers mentions how farmers saw salesmen who were qualified and able to speak as 'experts'; agricultural chemical salesmen were seen primarily as trying to sell their products and their advice was received with some cynicism despite their qualifications.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT OF DIFFUSION

The previous section showed that diffusion takes place in a cultural context and any complete review of diffusion must include these factors. However, such factors are general and amorphous; other more particular factors affect diffusion in the actual context where the message is heard. The latter factors are called the organizational context and are most clearly evident in large bureaucratic organizations with formal structural relationships and deliberately controlled flow of information but they are found in all organizations of any size and performance.
The classic model of bureaucracy envisages information flowing from the top to the lower echelons of the organization. Katz and Kahn\textsuperscript{29} found that there was no significant difference in the types of information which flowed across as opposed to vertically within the organization, and Davis\textsuperscript{30} found that good horizontal communications were associated with organizational efficiency.

The application of scientific management to organizations\textsuperscript{31} implies that only the superior can have full information on any one situation and so he must communicate. Likert\textsuperscript{32} and others have shown that subordinates often do, and must, pass new information up the organization if it is to survive in the long term. Benne\textsuperscript{33} argues that the information flow must be open in both directions for organizational effectiveness.

The success of work groups such as Autonomous Work Groups\textsuperscript{34}, and Participative Job Design Teams\textsuperscript{35}, is dependent on free and open communications in both directions.

The diffusion of information can create great stresses in an organization because of its challenge to the stability and maintenance functions. On the other hand, without the diffusion of the information an organization would risk losing its ability to survive, to identify its organizational purpose, and to monitor its operations consistently with the agreed purpose. Consequently, the organization is in a state of continual stress between two competing forces.

If information can have such a large effect on the unit then it is important to consider the effects of communication. The communication
can be either input, throughput, or output, and each will be considered separately below as each has different effects.

EFFECTS OF COMMUNICATIONS

Certain theorists (e.g. Havelock\textsuperscript{36}) see each of the three types of communications as having a number of effects but do not look for common patterns across the three types; it is postulated in this thesis from a survey of the available studies, that there are four possible categories of factors working on any communication, i.e. diffusion of a message within an organization. They are "stability" and "identification" or "membership" which act to keep the organization as it is, thus these factors can be seen as conservative or defensive so as to diminish the effect of any potentially threatening message. Opposed to those two factors are two others, "survival" and "organizational purpose". The latter two encourage and support most new information entering the organization because the messages increase the survival potential of the organization.

New messages are seen as being supported by the latter two categories and retarded by the former two, and each message is caught up in the competition between the opposing types. If one of the two groupings of categories becomes increasingly successful in retarding or welcoming new data into the organization then the organization is seen as ultra conservative ("stability" and "membership" dominant) or ultra radical ("survival" and "purpose" dominant).

INPUT COMMUNICATIONS

Table 2.3 sets out the types of factors operating on input entering
# Table 2.3

## INPUT OF INFORMATION INTO THE ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Factors</th>
<th>Factors operating on the Success of the Input</th>
<th>Research Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Stability** | (i) Need for stability  
(ii) Threat to change the social relationships  
(iii) Organisational paranoia  
(iv) Perceived personal threat  
(v) Preserve status differences  
(vi) Economic conditions difficult  
(vii) Small organisation more conservative | Schon\(^{37}\) Menzel\(^{38}\) Whitney\(^{39}\) \(\text{Schon}^{40}\) Marcson \(\text{Mansfield}^{42}\) Nokes \(\text{Newman}^{44}\) Paul \(\text{Rice}^{46}\) Schon \(\text{Carlson}^{48}\) Mansfield \(\text{Markham}^{50}\) |
| **2. Membership** | (i) Coding scheme barriers e.g. special languages  
(ii) Local pride - identification  
(iii) Induction of newcomers | Katz & Kahn \(\text{Seashore}^{52}\) Likert \(\text{Deutsch}^{54}\) Allen & Cohen \(\text{Schon}^{56}\) |
| **3. Survival** | (i) Reward value of information to the individual  
(ii) Crisis occurring  
(iii) Good organizational fit  
(iv) Recognised and respected outside change agent  
(v) Knowledge on organisational invaders | Mansfield \(\text{Schon}^{59}\) Schon \(\text{Etzioni}^{58}\) \(\text{Schon}^{59}\) Schon and Bennis \(\text{Deutsch}^{62}\) Meier \(\text{Bennis}^{64}\) Schon \(\text{Schon}^{65}\) |
| **4. Purpose** | (i) Change of leadership  
(ii) Examining other organisations  
(iii) Awareness of new ideas  
(iv) Training of higher managers  
(v) Importing human resources  
(vi) Research and Development function  
(vii) Professionalisation of staff | Griffiths \(\text{Carlson}^{67}\) Carter \(\text{Brickhill}^{69}\) President's Conference \(\text{Mansfield}^{71}\) Selznick \(\text{Knoerr}^{73}\) Kimborough \(\text{Kimborough}^{74}\) |
the organization, how each pressure occurs and research evidence to support categories. Some factors could fit into two or more categories but only the hypothesized major factor has been shown: 22 factors are considered within the four classifications.

THROUGHPUT COMMUNICATIONS

As in the input section, factors influencing the effect of messages within the organization are considered within the classification of the four major types. The factors are shown in table 2.4.

No factor could be classified as predominantly "survival" or "purpose" alone - all were equally "purpose" or "survival" orientated - so the "survival"/"purpose" factors have been aggregated.

OUTPUT COMMUNICATIONS

Finally, the factors and forces affecting the output of communication will be considered in table 2.5 along with the research evidence. All the inhibitors of diffusion can be classified as "stability" type factors.

SOURCE OF INFORMATION

So far the conceptual framework of diffusion has dealt with the cultural and organizational contexts which the idea must survive and move through in order to influence other people to change their actions. Now the sources of information of the messages are considered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Factors</th>
<th>Factors operation on the success of the throughput</th>
<th>Research Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stability</td>
<td>(i) Hierarchical and bureaucratic structure</td>
<td>Burns and Stalker 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Differential status in bureaucracy</td>
<td>Kelly 76 Gerand 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Stress of control</td>
<td>Woodward 78 Haire 79 Fisch 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Centralisation for efficiency</td>
<td>Katz and Kahn 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Absence of horizontal links in the bureau</td>
<td>Taylor 82 Rome &amp; Rome 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Reward patterns for obedience of roles in</td>
<td>Schon 84 Walton 85 Seashore 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Leadership behaviour and belief especially if scientific management believer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(viii) Division of Labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Membership</td>
<td>(i) Coding of messages into officialese</td>
<td>Seashore 87 Jackson 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Inter-unit competition</td>
<td>Schon 89 March &amp; Simon 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Separate sub group norms</td>
<td>Dalton 91,92 Rome &amp; Rome 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Trained to accept group allegiance</td>
<td>Schon 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Physical separation of units encourages separate subgroup norms</td>
<td>Kelly 95 Cohen 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4. Survival and Purpose</td>
<td>(i) Leadership - encouragement of staff to think for themselves, e.g. Participative Job Design</td>
<td>Lawrence 98 Katz &amp; Kahn 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Shared perceptions particularly of the organisational enemy</td>
<td>Emery and Emery 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Participation in decision making</td>
<td>Schon 101 Blake &amp; Mouton 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Overlapping groups of workers</td>
<td>Guest 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Link from specialist e.g. coordinator</td>
<td>Likert 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Decentralisation of power and decisions</td>
<td>Likert 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Geographical location of units</td>
<td>Worth 106 Katz &amp; Kahn 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(viii) Social Engineering in the work</td>
<td>Burns &amp; Stalker 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ix) Job Rotation of Workers</td>
<td>Morton 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(x) Organisational training for</td>
<td>Rice 110 Marrow 111 Trist 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managerial Grid</td>
<td>Guest 113 Allen 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Survey Feedback</td>
<td>Buchanan 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Group</td>
<td>Blake &amp; Mouton 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mann &amp; Likert 117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.5

**OUTPUT OF INFORMATION FROM THE ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Factors</th>
<th>Factors affecting the success of output</th>
<th>Research Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Stability</strong></td>
<td>(i) Need for stability</td>
<td>Sieler¹¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Inertia from rules, procedures, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Complacency and local pride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Not show perceived vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Goal definition of the organization is not the job of this group therefore they obey regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Perceived state of client readiness, i.e. client is not ready for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Change could lead to danger to clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Survival</strong></td>
<td>(i) Competition to survive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Meet a crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Purpose</strong></td>
<td>(i) Excess affluence and capacity</td>
<td>Mort¹¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Internal openness in the organization</td>
<td>Carlson¹²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Values supportive of quality output</td>
<td>Mansfield¹²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Specialised output roles and subsystems</td>
<td>Lesher¹²²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGE AGENTS

Ford defines a change agent as "a professional who attempts to secure the adoption of changes and guides the developments in a particular direction while preventing them moving in a less desirable direction in his field". The most studied and reported upon Change Agent in diffusion research is the Federal Extension Agent in the United States Department of Agriculture.

The change agent is usually a person who culturally comes from outside the client social system; he is different in many observable ways, e.g. Education, Social Class, Caste, Nationality, and Colour, and as an educated, socially superior "foreigner" is likely to be initially mistrusted by the client social system. Even if the fit between his social background and the client's is close, he is still different in that he is not a permanent member of the community and his career structure will take him away from the client system (he is always seen as a 'temporary' community member).

As the change agent has a catalyst role he cannot command and enforce his actions on the community. Havelock reports on three of the most common successful strategies for gaining acceptance:
1. direct involvement of the client society members through 'earning' the assistance of the change agent (e.g. Tannous).  
2. meeting promised datelines with materials after the clients have committed themselves to action (e.g. Najafi).  
3. dealing with the vested interest groups in the client system, (e.g. Marmor)  

The change agent has his greatest effect when the early adopters are considering giving the innovation a trial (Tully). This time is critical in the spread of the idea as others will follow the new practice if leading members in their society try the idea and support the new practice or concept (e.g. Ryan and Gross, Copp).  

To be most effective when talking to the leaders the change agent must take into account the client's cultural values (e.g. Rohrer) and stress the need in such a way that the client perceives the need as his (e.g. Erasmus).  

The change agent is a 'cosmopolite', i.e. most of his new information comes from outside the society, this makes him 'different'. If he also has a commercial interest (e.g. farm chemical salesman) he is even more distrusted than a government appointed helper. While all these factors make it hard for the professional change agent to make quick changes in client societies, he at least offers some possibility of change that might not otherwise occur.  

OPINION LEADERS  
These are local people from the community under study who have high respect within the society and so have the power to influence
acceptance or rejection of new ideas. However, opinion leaders do not have the power to "make" people accept their opinion. Researchers using the two step model of innovative change believed that once the opinion leaders accepted an idea, it automatically followed that opinion followers would accept the idea; frequently this has not occurred. For example, the opinion leader was found to have an important personal influence but this was dependent on many factors, including not being too radical in his expressed views. His greatest effect occurred in the evaluation stage for early majority, and for influencing the later adopters, i.e. late adopters and laggards, to consider the possibility of the new idea if its effects were not clear.

Unfortunately, there is little reliable evidence on how groups select opinion leaders and how they are influenced. Rogers has completed the greatest number of studies in this area. His two biggest studies could only explain 26% and 33% of the variance in opinion leadership using up to 5 independent variables. The issues of selection and influence will be considered later from another emphasis in the section on Category of Adopters.

C CHARACTERISTICS OF THE IDEA BEING DIFFUSED

Not all ideas diffuse equally well. Thus the characteristics of the idea under consideration must be taken into account; evidence on failure rates of new inventions show that not all ideas are equal in their rate of diffusion. Rogers postulated five criteria that the potential adopter applied to any idea before deciding to test the idea's practical use. These can also be included among diffusion criteria.
RELATIVE ADVANTAGE

This criterion considers the advantage of the new idea over the one in present usage. Often the "stability" considerations outweigh any possible advantage of the new idea until a crisis arises which threatens the existence of the whole organisation, e.g. Wilkening\textsuperscript{147}, Sutherland\textsuperscript{148}.

COMPATIBILITY

Compatibility is the degree to which the idea is consistent with the present values and past experiences of the potential adopters. Artificial birth control is an idea which illustrates the point. It is not consistent with the teachings of the Catholic Church yet a striving for economic security and a desire to give their children the best possible opportunities\textsuperscript{149} has led to at least 60 per cent of the professed married Australian Catholic women, of child-bearing age, taking the oral contraceptive pill. This is admittedly the researcher's estimate, but unless we make this assumption we should have to conclude from the daily Australian consumption figures that non-Catholic women were taking more than one pill a day. The "pill" is compatible with the strivings of the Australian Catholic women. Other examples of compatibility are given by Hawley\textsuperscript{150}, Parish\textsuperscript{151}, and Barnett\textsuperscript{152}.

COMPLEXITY

This concerns the degree to which an idea is difficult to understand and possibly to use. The understanding and use is mainly cultural; Australian women, who already take a large amount of pills per head, quickly learned to take the birth control pill correctly, yet
researchers in India report the incorrect use of the pill because its concept is too complex (the women often placed the pill in their vagina as that was where babies were created, not in the mouth)\textsuperscript{153}; Kivlin\textsuperscript{154} also provides support on complexity.

DIVISIBILITY

To try a new idea or practice is a risk. It can be a failure and at a high financial or social cost. Therefore, if the idea can be tried on a small and limited scale the risks are consequently decreased and more likely to be run. Ideas which require a large investment of resources are harder to diffuse.

COMMUNICABILITY

Rogers and Shoemaker\textsuperscript{155} called the characteristic 'observability' but the earlier term is used in this thesis. It concerns the degree to which an idea can be diffused to others. If the idea is simple and observable, then it is more likely to be diffused. Erasmus\textsuperscript{156} showed that the diffusion of the idea of better crops of corn was best done by growing crops in the villages of the peasants in Bolivia.

INTERRELATEDNESS OF THE FIVE CHARACTERISTICS

Research by Kivlin\textsuperscript{157} and Tucker\textsuperscript{158} suggests that the five characteristics are independent of each other. In that case, each characteristic will have its own unique effect, and five characteristics must be studied in each case.

THE ADOPTION PROCESS

Wilkening\textsuperscript{159} in 1952, was the first to conceptualize an individual's
decision to accept and adopt an idea as a process; he postulated five stages.

Stage 1 - Awareness
Emery and Oeser\textsuperscript{160} called this stage 'Exposure', both terms provide a good idea of the stage - the person is made aware or exposed to an idea but so far he is not motivated to proceed any further. The way he usually becomes aware of an idea is by chance although this argument could be debated on the point of 'selective perception' as the person would only pay attention to those topics of interest to him among those presented by the Mass Media. The Mass Media are the most effective way of presenting information generally to a very wide audience; however, they usually cannot provide the necessary precision in the information which a person requires if he is to proceed immediately to adopting the idea.

Stage 2 - Interest
If the idea does appear potentially attractive, the person is seen as trying to judge the utility of the idea and so he seeks information or knowledge. Usually this will come from outside his social grouping if the idea is new\textsuperscript{161}. However, if the idea is quite common, then a person in his own social setting, ('localite') can be used as a source of information.

Stage 3 - Evaluation
In evaluation, the person mentally tests the idea and decides whether the anticipated result merits further consideration. In this stage 'face to face' communication is critical as the person can check his idea and thoughts in a two-way interaction. He will keep the reputation of the other party in mind when making his final decision and if
the idea is attractive to the other person he will feel greater pressure to try it. The mass media cannot normally provide the interaction and clarification necessary at this stage.

**Stage 4 - Trial**

If the person is now satisfied with the idea, he will try it out for himself. The number of other instances which he can observe, will determine the size of the trial he will make. If he is the first to try the new type of corn, he will plant a small experimental plot before planting on a large scale. However, if he is one of the last farmers to try the now successful crop, he will in his initial planting use most or all of his acreage because he knows of other people's success. The decision to make a trial run, and how much to plant, will rest on his own personal judgement.

**Stage 5(a) - Adoption**

Depending on the success of the trial the person decides whether to continue with the idea or not. He will make this decision on his own judgement.

**Stage 5(b) - Discontinuance**

This stage is based on personal judgement and can occur after the trial or adoption. Research findings suggest that those last to adopt are the first to discontinue; they may not really believe in the idea and reject on the basis of any 'objective' evidence.
ACCEPTANCE CHARACTERISTICS

ADOPTION RATES

The first adopters take less time to adopt the idea than the later groups. Often in rural sociology research it can be shown that all groups learn of the idea at the same time yet the adoption rates are very different. Therefore to assume that it is just a time lapse between groups learning of the idea cannot be supported - there appears to be a difference in the speed of acceptance rates.

Rogers states that the speed of acceptance depends on the technical knowledge available and how prepared the person is to use the information. However, he also argues from evidence that earlier adopters spend longer in the trial stage looking at small scale trials. Once these are proven then the earlier adopters evaluate and adopt. The later adopters know of the idea but wait until the earlier adopters have tried and proven the idea before they decide on the trial, evaluation, and adoption process; in some cases the later adopters skipped the trial stage once the idea was proven successful by others.

TYPES OF ADOPTION

The rate of adoption is dependent on the type of adoption:

OPTIONAL ADOPTION

The adoption decision is made by the individual independent of the decision of others in the system but within the context of the norms of his social group. Optional adoption is the model which is assumed in diffusion research but such is not always the case.
The model was correctly assumed in the rural sociology\(^ {168}\) and some family planning research\(^ {169}\) where the point was to convince people to use a particular product or type of product. However, often there are other types of adoption in operation.

**COLLECTIVE ADOPTION**

By far the slowest type of adoption is the collective decision. In this type of adoption, all, or a majority of people, have to agree collectively to accept the diffusion. So far there had been no hypothesis testing research on the model, all the evidence has been post-hoc\(^ {170}\). However, evidence suggests that the process can be conceptualised as passing through five stages:

1. stimulation
2. initiation
3. legitimisation
4. decision
5. action\(^ {171}\)

which really repeats the evidence of the individual option diffusion process, except that the group requires consensus before a decision is made.

**AUTHORITY IMPLEMENTATION**

When a person or government in a superior position forces another person, or persons, to adopt an idea or innovation then it qualifies for the classification\(^ {172}\). When a government introduces a social reform (e.g. female voting) then an innovation takes place which all must accept and act upon.

The paradigm used in this type of diffusion is a bureaucratic one:
1. knowledge
2. persuasion by a pressure group
3. decision by the superiors
4. communication, and
5. action with legal sanctions against dissenters

and occurs in a structure of:
(a) predetermined goals for the organisation
(b) clearly prescribed roles for each person
(c) a clear and known authority structure
(d) a set of rules and regulations, and
(e) a set of informal relations

Consequently, the authoritarian diffusion process is the fastest to achieve as one concentrates on influencing a few people of importance whose decision is final.

COMBINATION OF THE OPTIONAL AND AUTHORITY DIFFUSION MODELS

The model is a combination of changing the individual's point of view while enacting legislation at the same time. Democratic governments interested in rapid social change which try to use this model as the appropriate model can be seen as using either Fascist or Communist authoritarian control measures and risk alienating the electorate.

Our impression is that most political change is a combination of the three types of diffusion. Firstly, individuals (optional) and then groups (collective) accept the idea and when there is a large enough collective belief the government legislates to enforce the idea (authoritarian).
EFFECTS OF DIFFUSION

Last, in the context of the diffusion process, is the effects of the process. Rogers and Shoemaker are the only writers to consider the effects and then only very briefly. Why? Because it is automatically assumed that the message is right and that all the consequences are known and correct. Since governments have 'paid the piper' in the past, their tune has been played. The agricultural extension agent 'knew' that hybrid corn was better than the corn of the 1930s. Rogers knew that birth control was right and justifies his case before speaking of diffusion in his research. But not all diffusions are planned, or certainly not controlled even if planned. Therefore one should consider the possible effects of the diffusion every time a process is considered or studied. In the past, the emphasis has been on the message only and researchers have ignored the effects and their effect in turn on later diffusion.

FUNCTIONAL VERSUS DYSFUNCTIONAL EFFECTS

Are the effects desirable or not? The famous economic phenomenon known as the 'pig cycle' is an example of dysfunctional effects. In the beginning, the price of pork is too high so the 'innovators' and 'early adopters' commence raising pigs to make good returns whilst the supply cannot meet demand. However, by the time the 'late majority' and certainly by the time the 'laggards' have started to raise pigs, the market is oversupplied and the marginal farmer cannot economically afford to feed his pigs. The farmer sells the pigs even cheaper to cover his costs and the market price continues downwards until enough farmers stop raising pigs and there is another shortage and the cycle begins again. Such occurrences in part help to explain
the conservatism of the laggard - often when he does adopt a new idea, he is financially 'punished' for his innovative behaviour.

IMMEDIATE VERSUS INDIRECT EFFECTS

Not all effects are apparent at the planning stage or even at the early stages of diffusion. Sometimes the unforeseen effects can be greater in scope and consequences than the planned effects. Linton and Kardiner studied the effect of the adoption of the idea of wet rice farming and the effect of its implementation on the life of a Madagascan tribe.

MANIFEST VERSUS LATENT EFFECTS

One can plan effects and see them in research but does one recognise other effects which were not intended?

In Australia tertiary education is financed by the Commonwealth Government which provides funds for two categories of expense, capital and maintenance. Maintenance includes salaries and the cost of the day to day running of the tertiary institution. The understood formula for maintenance expenditure has been 75% on salaries, 25% on running costs. In the mid 1950s the Commonwealth Government boosted university funding to cater for the increased society demand for tertiary graduates. The only university in Victoria at the time, University of Melbourne, quickly doubled its academic staff by selecting staff about 30 years of age. The career range for academic staff was later raised from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer; today the majority of the staff are at the top of the Senior Lecturer range with 10-15 years until they retire and 85% of maintenance expenditure is
taken up in salaries. Very little maintenance money is left to spend on teaching materials and for the day to day running of the courses. The oldest and most prestigious tertiary institution in Victoria has serious structural limitations set on its performance by unintended effects of decisions made in the 1950s and 1960s.

CONCLUSION ON THE VARIOUS POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF DIFFUSION

The effects of diffusion may at first appear to be peripheral to the main thesis. However, it is argued that this section is the real issue of the thesis - to what extent and how can we foretell what the effects of diffusion will be?

Will industrial democracy lead to greater job satisfaction, increased productivity and a higher standard of living as claimed by its supporters? The position of the employers' organisations in England is that the claimed results would not occur and the owners and managers of capital would lose their ability to survive in a tough world trading situation.

The questions of functional versus dysfunctional, immediate versus indirect, and manifest versus latent effects, are impossible to predict accurately and show quite clearly the questions of the effects of diffusion are not simple or well researched.

MODELS OF DIFFUSION

The content and workings of the diffusion process has now been described, and this information provides a background against which to study the three major models of diffusion, and to decide which,
If any, is the best model to use in the research. Havelock in his review of diffusion and innovation identified the models named below.

THE PROBLEM SOLVING OR CONSULTANCY MODEL

This model assumed that the need of the client, whether stated, implied or assumed, is the only place to start an analysis of diffusion. The need of the client organisation is the paramount consideration and the first of the Consultant Change Agent's important roles is to help the client organisation diagnose the problem. Then the consultant must help the organization to find the solution and solve the problem from within its own resources.

If the self initiated change does take place, it has the best prospects of being carried completely through as the proposed solution has the personal investment of the organisation in its success. In this model, the client employs the Consultancy Change Agent and can end the consultancy relationship at any time it wishes. See Figure 2.2 for a diagram of the model. It is the simplest of all the diffusion models.

THE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DIFFUSION MODEL

Havelock's work fits into this model better than the other two. Frequently, there is no perceived need at the time of starting the initial research project. Often the idea is perfected or invented then a use is identified for the discovery and in rural sociology the Agricultural Extension Agent is given the task of spreading the message describing the benefits of the discovery. The same procedure occurs in technology, medicine, and education (e.g. Clark and Guba.)
THE PROBLEM SOLVER PERSPECTIVE
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and Brickhill\textsuperscript{186}). See Figure 2.3 for a diagram of the model.

**THE SOCIAL INTERACTION MODEL**

This is Rogers' model\textsuperscript{187}. See Figure 2.4. It attempts to measure the movement of messages from person to person and system to system. As far as research is concerned, the model is the richest in the field and has been the basis for many of the classic studies in diffusion. (e.g. Mort\textsuperscript{188}, Carlson\textsuperscript{189}, Ryan and Gross\textsuperscript{190}, Rogers and Svenning\textsuperscript{191} and Rogers\textsuperscript{192}).

**INTEGRATING FORCES ASSISTING DIFFUSION**

Havelock\textsuperscript{193} argues that four other forces facilitate diffusion between various social sub-systems. The first is the mass media which can create an awareness of an idea and alert those interested in considering the idea\textsuperscript{194}.

Secondly, there are specialised linking roles, e.g. the International Council for the Quality of Working Life, which provides a bridge between research and practice in the field of Quality of Working Life.

Thirdly, there are temporary systems. A specialised linking organisation can create the temporary system in its attempt to diffuse its message. A good example is the International Conferences of the Quality of Working Life. The temporary system is useful but usually has no resources of its own and thus has to be funded from philanthropic groups, e.g. The Ford Foundation.

Finally, there are the permanent linking systems. These systems are
Assumption

The flow is only one-way as the message is clear and obviously to everyone's advantage.
Assumptions of this Example

(i) The flow is only one-way as the message is clear and obviously to everyone's advantage.

(ii) Each person tells three other people.

(iii) The category of adoptors is the same as the number of levels of people to hear and act on the idea being diffused.

(iv) Eventually every person in the community will know of the idea.
specialist groups working in an ongoing relationship with various groups. Figure 2.6 depicts this role of the Agricultural Extension Service in the United States.\(^5\)

THE INTEGRATED MODEL OF DIFFUSION

The three models are really the same model seen from different positions. The designer of ideas is interested in the idea's development until it is diffused in the chosen community (the research, development and diffusion model. The consultant/problem solver obviously gravitates to the problem solving model as he understands it while the outside researcher looks at innovations by measuring the spread of the idea (e.g. Menzell and Katz\(^6\)).

The three models can be, and are, put together in Figure 2.7. The figure provides a total picture of how diffusion is seen to spread in the community, system or organisation under study.

FAULTS OF THE DIFFUSION MODELS

(1) The models assume that time is unimportant for research and the actual diffusion process, but it is important. On the research side, there is a limit to the extent that one can study an area to watch diffusion so no long term studies are attempted. The length of time also means that one must rely on recall data for the research. In one of the few studies to compare recall statements with objective evidence Menzell\(^7\) found most doctors reported that they had adopted the studied drug earlier than the prescription records indicated.
Figure 2.6
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FIGURE 2.7

COMBINED DIFFUSION MODEL
There is an over-emphasis on the nature of innovation and not enough interest on generalisations across traditions and research so that a robust model can be designed. The emphasis has been due to the patrons of the research, governments who have been interested in the results of programmes and not in the concept itself.

The models see optional adoption as the only type of adoption yet collective adoptions occur (e.g. semi autonomous work-groups) and every day authoritarian adoptions (see page 118) are being made by the various levels of government when they pass laws and make regulations.

The models ignore the relationships between people and concentrates exclusively on the individual. The richness of the relationships is lost. If one considers a person as an open system then relationships become critical in decision-making.

The belief that the individual hears the message and accepts or rejects the message is too simplistic. A man may hear a message and reject it but that need not be the end of the diffusion process. For example, A tells B that industrial democracy is the only solution to the economic problems of our country. This is the first time B has heard of participation and he rejects the idea of industrial democracy but is now aware of the concept. B then attends a parents and friends evening at his own school, held to protest at the Education Department's insensitivity to the needs of the community it is supposed to serve. B proposes that the school set up a School
Council with a membership of half parents, a quarter from staff, and a quarter nominated by the Education Department. His argument is based on the participation of the people who use the school system - the children, through their parents. The message of industrial democracy may appear to have died but it now flourishes in another direction. This is how ideas start and spread.

(6) The Model does not explain why B accepts or rejects the message. Emery and Oeser tried to do this through the Heider Balance Model but they too only concentrated on the instance where the man accepts the idea, and where he thinks highly of the change agent. Heider's theory has either paradigms and four can lead to acceptance so any of the four could have occurred in the Emery and Oeser study. Until one can design an adequate attitude change theory and place it inside the diffusion model, the model is seriously deficient when applied to individuals and not to aggregates of people.

CONCLUSION

While recognising the faults of the currently investigated diffusion models, the integrated model, the process, and the context of diffusion still provides the most complete theoretical explanation of how diffusion actually takes place. To test the explanation the complex concept of industrial democracy will be studied in Britain during 1974 and 1975 and the next chapter, Chapter III, provides a detailed discussion of the concept under investigation. In testing the diffusion of the concept it is recognised that not all the
various issues raised earlier in the chapter, e.g. the adoptive process, characteristics of the idea being diffused, can be investigated in the various pieces of research. However, enough issues should be supported/not supported for a conclusion to be drawn as to whether the model of diffusion under investigation is a useful scientific tool.
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INTRODUCTION

The task of the thesis is to study the transfer of the idea of Industrial Democracy/Worker Participation so as to influence behaviour in the future. This chapter will attempt to outline the philosophy of the research methodology, problems in designing such a study, and the final research design.

RATIONALE FOR RESEARCH DESIGN EVENTUALLY CHOSEN FOR THE STUDIES

In theory, the field experiment provides the best means for studying organizational change, offering the possibility of controlled situations and before and after measurements of change.

However the rigours of experimental design seldom reflect the realities of organizational life as the experimental laboratory must always reduce and oversimplify the variables found in a complex organization.

Organizational research differs from the laboratory model with regard to the status of the researcher. Typically the experimenter in the laboratory is a senior academic or a student under his authority and the experiment is conducted on his 'territory' while the organizational researcher is usually an outside guest who can be ignored by the management and workers without their risking their jobs.
The classical experiment has come under close scrutiny and criticism in the past two decades, e.g. Campbell, Solomon and Milgram. The "limitations of the observer" are further illustrated by a number of papers by Riecken, McGuigan, Rosenthal, and Rosenthal et al.

These studies suggest that the field researcher may not be as disadvantaged as first thought. Whilst the field experimenter may have to contend with the "Hawthorne Effect", it is now evident that the laboratory conditions contribute to the experimenter influence and these conditions are not easily avoided through the use of more and tighter controls.

Another methodology for studying organizational change is the natural field experiment. Daniel Katz wrote:

"The best opportunity for the use of hypothesis testing is on the occasion of the 'natural experiment'. The difficulty with the use of hypotheses in field studies is the inability to determine causal relationships with any definiteness, since most of our measures are not taken with respect to systematic changes in some ascertained independent variable. Now, a natural experiment is a change of major importance engineered by policy-makers and practitioners and not by social scientists. It is experimental from the point of view of the scientist rather than of the social engineer".

Beside eliminating experimenter control as a problem the natural field experiment divides the research roles by leaving the design and implementation of the experiment with management and the data collection and analysis with external researchers. This approach keeps the researcher apart from the daily operations of the organization and whilst it may reduce the direct control over the experimental conditions, it also relieves the researcher of the responsibility of running the organization.
The claimed loss of experimental control in the natural field experiment, compared with the controlled field experiment, appears exaggerated. Almost all of the relatively few controls available to an outside researcher are equally at the disposal of both methodologies.

In the main the researcher in natural field settings must rely on opportunities to arise where he can use his research skills. He must take advantage of particular situations to sink probes into organizational and society settings. In some cases he must also rely on studies carried out by other researchers to confirm, reject or expand his level of knowledge. These are appropriately used providing their limitations are acknowledged and discussed, e.g. the original study may have been designed for other purposes.

DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES IN THE RESEARCH

Davis and Cherns rightly point out that many disciplines have something to say in the fields of Quality of Working Life, Worker Participation, and Industrial Democracy. They point out that disciplines relevant to heighten the understanding of quality of working life include economics, psychology, sociology, industrial relations, engineering, and systems theory. In this thesis evidence and theoretical material from most of the above mentioned fields will be included together with some research from social anthropology.

No one discipline is designed to include all the theories and hypotheses which are necessary to explain the events that occur in the work place. Therefore it is necessary to take areas of theory from each discipline and build a multidisciplinary model; each discipline is tied by its methodology which in turn provides the selected perception of the data.
As the field of study (diffusion) is poorly understood the wider the vision and possibilities of interpretation of the data, the greater the possibility that some new methodology will emerge which will explain and integrate the results of numerous industrial studies. The purpose of the thesis is to provide such a wide vision by using a variety of disciplines without losing the breadth and richness of the individual disciplines.

DESIGN OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

Figure 8 in chapter 11 sets out the detailed integrated model of diffusion. In the model numerous institutions and settings for spreading information - reference groups, work groups, outside consultants, the government, the schools, universities and polytechnics, professional associations, religious bodies, associations such as the CBI, the Trade Unions, the TUC, the media, the political parties, pressure groups, for example the Bow Group and Fabians, multi-national business organizations and the EEC - are set out in their theoretical relationship to one another. The purpose of the design is to sample as many of the settings and groups as possible, to see to what extent the model is consistent with the reality of the situation in Britain in 1974 and 1975.

Altogether the results of 24 studies are considered; 17 by the author and 7 by other researchers. In some of the author's samples were taken, e.g. 5% of the C.U.K. Ryton Assembly Plant, while in other instances the entire population, e.g. Secretary for State for Industry, Mr. A.N. Wedgwood Benn*, was interviewed. Table 3.1 below sets out the studies, and the sample of population interviewed.

* Referred to in chapter 10 as Mr. Tony Benn, the style he himself prefers.
The statistical techniques used, e.g. chi-square, were those needed to establish the existence of relationships. More precise quantification of the relationships can be made if later studies follow up the relationships which are now shown to exist.
Table 3.1

LIST OF THE STUDIES AND SIZE OF SAMPLES
COVERED IN THE THESIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STUDY/SURVEY</th>
<th>SIZE OF SAMPLE</th>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ryton Survey</td>
<td>127 or 5% of 5,000 workers.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Redirected Ryton Survey</td>
<td>Same sample as no. 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Special Products Survey</td>
<td>47 or 1.6 of the workers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schoolchildren's Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountfields</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boothfields</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willenhall Wood</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chace</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garendon</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernsford</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Colleges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burleigh</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernsford</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Survey of Sixth-Form Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Loughborough University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Brown's Study of Attitudes of Shipbuilding Apprentices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coventry Industrial Mission Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Survey of Tertiary Students' Knowledge of Industrial Democracy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aston University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwick University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanchester Polytechnic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STUDY/SURVEY</th>
<th>SIZE OF SAMPLE</th>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CBI West Midlands Survey</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fabian Society Survey</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Graduate Association Study</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Study of: Engineering Employers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Engineering Employers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Coventry Association of the Engineering Employers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>Blumler and Ewbank Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Press Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wittingslow Content Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television and Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>ACTT Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>Morley Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>Glasgow University Media Group Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>Aims of Industry Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wittingslow Content Analysis Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Department of Employment Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Department of Industry Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>European Economic Community Directorates Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Study of CUK's Industrial Democracy Proposition</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Studies carried out by other researchers.
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Chapter IV

CAR PLANT STUDIES

The choice of Coventry as a major centre of study and investigation was fortuitous. Originally the plan was to use sites in and near Loughborough, Leicestershire. Very early in the research the author, almost by accident, became involved in the British section of the International Social Sciences Council's study into the effects of automation upon workers - this was carried out in the British Leyland plant at Longbridge in Birmingham. Through the same contact, fellow Australian Dr. John Damm, the researcher was involved in a Survey Feedback exercise within the Chrysler, U.K. (C.U.K.) plant at Ryton in Coventry. As a result of the C.U.K. study a "Vertical Slice Group" was established in each of the two shifts in the Final Assembly Shop in the plant. The researcher acted as a resource person to both Slice

* Vertical Slice Group is a means of creating discussion between various levels of the organization. If one can imagine an organization as similar to a cake, then as a slice of cake includes some of the top, middle and base of the cake, a V.S.G. includes managers, supervisors, shop stewards and shop-floor workers. In the Ryton Final Assembly V.S.G. the Area Manager selected the managerial representative while the foremen, shop stewards and shop-floor workers elected two of their members to the group. The Quality and Quantity committee (mentioned in detail later in the chapter), the Motivation and Productivity section and the author provided technical assistance for the V.S.G.
Groups and suggested to the groups and the Motivation and Productivity Section of C.U.K. that a project be initiated to study the diffusion of the Slice Group concept within the plant. (See Appendix I for the proposal to C.U.K.) At the same time it was hoped that the study would tap the level of awareness of the concept of Industrial Democracy within the plant.
SITUATION.

Situated on the south western edge of Coventry, the Ryton Assembly Plant in 1974/5, was responsible for the assembly of the Avenger motor car from parts manufactured within the plant (e.g. car chassis), from other C.U.K. plants (e.g. Stoke Plant in Coventry produced engines, Special Products in Coventry made dashboards) and sub-contractors (e.g. Lucas, for headlights and batteries).

The purpose of the study was to monitor the diffusion of the Survey Feedback exercise within the plant, i.e. to see if the workers knew of the Slice Groups and what they felt the groups could achieve and had already achieved. The latter point was very important, as the Final Assembly Shop had been chosen as a test area, and depending on the success of the exercise, similar groups could be set up in the other shops in the plant.

It was proposed by the researcher that a series of interviews be held, initially in the Final Assembly, and then in the other four shops within the plant. The plant management and unions agreed. The interviews by the researcher took between 10 and 25 minutes each and were held at or near the interviewee's workplace in full view of the other workers. As the work areas were quite noisy the confidentiality of the comments was not a problem.

The closeness to the work area was intended to reduce the distrust of the potential interviewees, and to reduce the time during which the worker had to be absent from his workstation.
As the research method as regards the last two points was highly successful, the design was used again in later studies.

To gain a wide cross-section of the workforce the author proposed that the size of the sample should be 5% (125) of the total workforce (5,000) of the Ryton plant. The Whitley and Ryton C.U.K. senior management agreed to the proposal. See Appendix 1 for a copy of the proposal which sets out the rationale and design of the survey.

After two searching interviews with the Secretary of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions in London, the researcher was given a letter of introduction to the Coventry District Secretary of the Confederation and the Convenors of the Shop Stewards' Committee at Ryton. At a meeting with the Convenors, the aim of the survey was explained in detail. An undertaking was given that the report would be simultaneously released to the Management and the Convenors, and that no worker or area would be penalized for taking part in the survey.

See Appendix 2 for details of the selection of interviewees, the actual interview and sample of the Ryton Study.
THE RESULTS

After interviewing two areas, Final Assembly and Production Planning, it was clear that few people knew of the Survey Feedback exercise or the Slice Groups. Because of these results, the Ryton survey was redirected to investigating the number of people who used a source but not the name of the actual source person. Of the 127 in the sample, only 36 (28%) knew of the Survey Feedback exercise held six months previously (Q.4) and 28 of the 36 knew approximately when the survey had been held (Q.4a). The major sources of information regarding the exercise were the Foremen, 13 (10%) and Workmates, 13 (10%). Only 26 (20%) knew of the existence of Slice Groups (Q5) and only 5 (4%) knew the purposes of the groups (Q.5a). The figure was lower than it first appeared; 16 of the 26 came from the Final Assembly Shop, and they were told of the Slice Groups by their Shop Stewards, just before the researcher entered the area to interview. The management of the area was not aware of the Groups. The decision to run the Slice Groups and hold elections had been made nearly four weeks before the survey, yet no messages had been passed on to the workers. When the Shop Stewards were asked why they had told the workers just before the interviews, the three replied that they had forgotten to inform the workers, but the visit had reminded them. Of the 10 workers who knew of the Slice Groups (Q.4c and Q.5c) all expressed highly positive feelings towards the projects.
THE REDIRECTED RYTON STUDY

The lack of knowledge regarding the Slice Groups and the Survey Feedback exercise stopped any study of the diffusion system of their particular ideas within the areas. Questions 6 to 8 which thus became very important were initially included to gain information from the few isolates on what means they used to keep informed of the current situation. When it became obvious very early that most people had not heard of either initiative, it was decided to study what sources workers used, which they trusted most and least and with which sources they would check any worrying stories. The redirection was planned as a study of sources used, not used, trusted and distrusted, and the reasons for the beliefs.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION IN THE RYTON PLANT

Firstly, the interviewees were asked to nominate up to five important sources of information within the plant (Q.6a) which they used. The results are listed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

RESPONSES TO THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rumour</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Steward</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates in other areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shop Stewards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The order is the same in both categories; the most important and total response lists appear to reflect a consistent picture of the importance and use of sources. Question 6b asked which sources, up to five in number, were trusted, as it was hypothesized that usage and trust need not be in the same order. The hypothesis was supported by the results in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2**

RESPONSES TO THE TRUSTED SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED WITHIN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Most Trusted</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop Stewards</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Nobody</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shop Stewards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rumour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates in other areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results clearly indicate that the major source of information within the plant, General Rumour, was not particularly trusted; however the second major source, Shop Stewards, was the most trusted with 71 of the 77 users trusting the source. The Foreman was the second most trusted source with 31 of the 37 who used the Foreman trusting him to tell the truth. No other reply gained more than five responses in the most trusted category - a level which was obtained by the category 'Trust Nobody'. The aggregation of the responses to Q.6b
changed the picture very little. Again the Shop Stewards headed the list, followed by the Foremen. No other group gained 10 responses, i.e. were mentioned at all by at least 8% of the sample.

The list of most distrusted sources suggested the ambiguity which must have been felt. One hundred and eleven (87.4%) listed General Rumour as a source regarding the Ryton Plant, yet 95 (75%) of the same sample ranked this as the most distrusted source, i.e. at least six in every seven men who used General Rumour as a source did not trust it, see Table 4.3.

Table 4.3
RESPONSES TO THE MOST DISTRUSTED SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED WITHIN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Most Distrusted</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rumour</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Stewards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last two questions (Q.7 and Q.8), produced the same response - the person used as an information source was also used as a reference point in the case of disturbing rumours. See Table 4.4.
Table 4.4
RESPONSES TO THE MAJOR REFERENCE POINTS OF INFORMATION USED WITHIN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Point</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop Stewards</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shop Stewards</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rumour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates in other areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Stewards were the most used reference point; they were used as the major point for verifying rumour and as the major source of information within the Ryton Plant. When the Stewards spread new information the workers asked the Foreman and Higher Management questions to verify the Steward's information.

RUMOUR
There have been very few empirical studies of rumours, their birth, adventures, and death, although social scientists have always expressed interest in the phenomenon. Recently many social scientists, especially sociologists, have sought to refrain from casting value judgements on human behaviour, and as a consequent there has been a sharp increase in the interest in the functions of rumours. Rumour is defined by Rosnow and Fine as "information neither substantiated
nor rejected, often fueled by a desire for meaning, a quest for clarification and closure. Allport and Postman argue that the foundation of rumours is laid when events are important and news is lacking or ambiguous - rumours are attempts to give structure to uncertain events. It is certainly clear that surprise, shock and panic are breeding grounds for rumour in times of crisis, e.g. Deutscher and New, Larsen, Prasad and Sinha.

Shibutani, the most positive writer to argue that rumours have a definite purpose, proposes that rumour is a vehicle for group problem solving and an essential part of social process. Shibutani concludes that rumours allow people to cope with the uncertainties of life by placing a stabilizing pattern on the present and future events. Firth contends that rumour is an aid to the individual in gaining his desired ends, and Davis states that workers who are not interested in rumours about their workplace are not interested in their employment. The above mentioned writers in this paragraph, when contrasted with the general opinion of rumour, clearly show that attitudes and ideas on the subject depend greatly on the observer's frame of reference.

RUMOUR AS A MODEL OF DIFFUSION

The favoured psychological model of rumour is very similar to the diffusion model of Rogers. The model is linear with social chains made up of connecting links symbolizing proximate individual needs. Rosnow and Fine claim that the Rogers' type model is a 'neural'
one, with one way transmissions towards the extremity of the group. Recent evidence strongly conflicting with such a model comes from Degh and Vazsonyi\textsuperscript{17} who found that rumour-spreading was a two-way process, since people usually exchange information when hearing a new rumour. They hypothesized that there are different specialized channels through which particular types of information flow. Such a system of channels with connecting nodes is very similar to the network model of diffusion with its exchange of information.

As rumours are believed to arise from a lack of facts and information full information should obviate the need for rumour. Organizational theorists mention that a policy of information control by higher power people unintentionally leads to the activation of rumours by lower staff to make sense of the environment and the Information vacuum\textsuperscript{18}. Not all rumours are started unintentionally by management. Morgan\textsuperscript{19} discusses research on deliberate rumours which are sent out by the decision-makers to test public reaction. If the reaction is tolerable, then the rumour becomes official policy.

Rumours tend to be increasingly distorted as the physical distance from the point of emanation increases\textsuperscript{20}. The typical distortions include elimination of some detail, selective attention to particular details, and the reshaping of new incoming data to fit the present understanding. Rumours disappear through disproof, irrelevance or dissipation\textsuperscript{21}. The rumours do not disappear because of time alone; often the rumour is given fresh evidence after a month or more, when it is no longer associated with the particular source\textsuperscript{22} which may have been seen as biased.
Rumours can be used as a weapon in any power struggle. If a defam ing rumour is spread, it can drive a wedge between supporters of a particular cause, or between people in a particular area. To state, perhaps overstate, the salary of a person in the press is to drive a potential wedge between the man and the rest of the community; if the strikers are well paid initially compared with other workers, public sympathy will be very low. Many of these issues are discussed in the following description of the role of rumour within the Ryton Assembly Plant.

Over half of the workers in the survey relied on rumour for information. When asked how accurate rumours were on average, they considered that about 35% of all rumours contained some grain of truth. The belief in the accuracy of rumour varied between shops, see Table 4.5.
Table 4.5
PERCEIVED PERCENTAGE OF RUMOURS WHICH WERE SEEN AS ACCURATE - ACCORDING TO SHOPS

| Paint Shop  | 50 |
| Body in White | 40 |
| Final Assembly | 30 |
| Planning and Production | 30 |
| Quality Control | 25 |

Twenty-nine (23%) of the men believed that 50% of the rumours were accurate and 25 (20%) believed over half of the rumours were accurate.

When asked why not all the rumours were accurate, some men replied that accuracy of rumours decreased with the activity of Shop Stewards. Asked to explain this puzzling statement, they replied that Higher Management started rumours, and if no protests were made the rumour became company policy. All the men in the one Shop - Body in White - having heard that they would be working a shorter week, asked their Stewards to protest; with this duly done, management denied the story, and the rumour disappeared. One of the men with a brother at the headquarters of C.U.K. (Whitley Plant) asked about the rumour and was told that the instruction for short-time working had been drafted but that the instruction was later cancelled. Other versions of this type of story were told by men of all areas to illustrate why they could not trust Management.

Two of the six Stewards interviewed said that they felt obliged to protest at every rumour, otherwise it became a fact.
Workers who met men from other areas during their work tended to downgrade the accuracy of rumours. The "checkers" rejected the obviously incorrect rumours and passed on the rumours they believed to be true. Men who worked near the "checkers" frequently spoke of the alarming accuracy of rumours. The Paint and Body in White areas were isolated from the rest of the factory by large steel doors and brick walls. Except for the maintenance men and the "stock-bin fillers" from Production Planning and Control, no workers normally entered these areas. As the stock bins of parts for work in the plant were very small, frequent filling, using fork-lift trucks was necessary in each area. The fork-lift operators driving back to the Plant Receiving Store would hear rumours in other parts of the factory, which they checked for accuracy and then passed on to the two areas. The steel fire doors were sometimes left open in the Paint Shop, and men going to the nearby rest area in the Final Assembly Shop would tell the Paint workers the latest story, which would then pass through both shops. Although it was popularly believed that rumours passed along the work lines, the data showed that while some rumours did progress along the line, the majority of the stores came from men passing a work station and telling either a friend, "Floaters", * men coming back from meal breaks, maintenance men, or material handlers. The sources of the rumours were wide and varied. It was because of the variety that the Special Products Study was first considered. An important source was the wives of the men who worked

* "Floaters" is the term given to the multi-skilled men who can do all the tasks in the work area; the "Floater" relieves each man in turn for a work break.
at the Special Products Plant at Canterbury Street, Coventry. The women at Special Products Plant worked beside wives of men from the Stoke Engine Plant and some C.U.K. suppliers. The exchanged information was taken home to the husbands, and then told to others at the men's workplace the following day.

Some of the men had relatives, besides the wives, working at other plants and in supplier firms. Often they met their relatives and exchanged information. In one instance, the researcher observed a man telling other workers that the Stoke Engine Plant could be closed down by the end of the day-shift that day. This happened, and when asked by the researcher for his sources the man replied that his brother worked in the section that stopped the production line and the men from the section had met informally the day before, to demand that the Shop Steward take certain action or face a censure. When the Shop Steward obtained no satisfaction from the Area Superintendent the strike took place. The interesting point here is that that men in one section of Ryton knew of the possibility of an industrial dispute before the Stewards and the Management in the actual strike work area. Some men mentioned drinking with friends from other plants at the Wyken Working Men's Club, where information was exchanged. If C.U.K. senior management cancelled a suppliers' order or ordered new machine tools this told the workers in the respective plants what would happen long before Management officially told the Plant of the change. A few people mentioned that they had friends at the headquarters (Whitley) who told them what was planned if it affected the worker personally.
"VALIDATORS" - CHECKING DISQUIETING RUMOURS

One unexpected result of the Ryton survey was the discovery of a group of men called "Validators" or Reference men in this thesis. Since the early writings in Industrial Sociology, mention has been made of men who were informal leaders through the use of information as a means of control over others in the group. If information is scarce and one accepts the social exchange paradigm, e.g. Adams, Foa and Foa, then it is hypothesized that the rumour-monger can extract a high price for his tales, e.g. Gergen, Thibaut and Kelly.

A person who repeatedly gives good information when other sources are unavailable or unreliable, is rewarded with attention, admiration, money and increased status. No one has discussed the possibility of a person who did not use his information retrieval systems unless required to do so by the rest of the group, and only then to solve the group's particular problem.

Set out below is an account of the way a Validator was first discovered.

On the Final Assembly Line the tasks had to be done in a set time sequence or the car was not assembled correctly. The management at Ryton claimed that any man leaving the line without a relief could cause the line to stop or quality problems to arise. One man on the line heard from a Material Handler that the Body in White Shop was about to strike and close down the plant. The man told his workmates who decided to check out the validity of the rumour and they approached the interviewee just as the interviewer finished, and asked him to see a friend in the Body in White Shop to check the rumour. The man left his work area and the men in the section did his work as well as their own while he was away. The man returned and confirmed the rumour and gave the time scale as 10 minutes until the plant was closed down. The men started to sweep up the area so they could leave as soon as the line stopped and not work in their own time to tidy up their work stations. Their Foreman came past and asked the men what they were doing. He was told that the plant was about to close down. The Foreman accused the men of being rumour-mongers and asked a passing Shop Steward if he had heard of strike action. The Steward answered in the negative. The Foreman then turned to the researcher and told him...
that this was a typical example of unnecessary disruption and anxiety in the plant. Within six minutes the line stopped and the men were sent home. As the men left the area they told the researcher that this example was typical of the lack of knowledge of their representatives and the management.

Further questioning indicated that each section within each area had its own person to check on a worrying rumour. The "Validators" had a consistent pattern of characteristics. They were:

(i) usually older than the average worker in the group,
(ii) respected for their work standards. Often they were skilled craftsmen unable to use their highly specialized skills,
(iii) usually reticent to express opinions so that when they did say something it was seen as worthwhile and important,
(iv) not likely to spread rumours themselves,
(v) asked by their workmates to assist by asking their contacts; then workmates covered for the 'Validators' while he visited the contact,
(vi) frequently production line workers, but in two shops they were skilled tradesmen who were required by their job to leave the area which simplified verifying information,
(vii) never Shop Stewards, nor did they seek to take an activist role; they were prepared to use their contacts for their workmates but not as a union representative,
(viii) the most reliable source of information in their area and often had accurate information before the Shop Steward or the Foreman.

These characteristics are consistent with the results of Kelman and Hovland, and Rosnow and Robinson. Those studies revealed five basic dimensions - expertness, reliability, intentions, dynamism, and attractiveness. For most highly believed sources, expertness was a combination of authoritativeness, perceived intelligence, and certain non-verbal factors. Because the people were seen as having the facts and the skilled judgement to reinterpret them accurately,
they were viewed as trustworthy. Reliability referred to the way the source was perceived in terms of a person's value system. Being seen as dependable and consistent in one's judgement conveyed an image of high credibility. The person's intentions and motivations were the third factor. The person was not seen as unfairly profiting from any recommendations. The last two factors, dynamism and attractiveness, were seen as having lesser influence. When their workmates were asked to describe the 'Validator' as a person, a consistent pattern again emerged. The Validator was seen as:

(i) good in his job,
(ii) doing his fair share of work - he did not use his role to avoid work,
(iii) belonging to the work group,
(iv) easily available if problems arose - not all the Shop Stewards were easily found and some men felt their representatives used their responsibility to avoid work,
(v) not having an advantage in slanting a story towards the union (Shop Steward) or management (Foreman),
(vi) not having an advantage in withholding information as he did not use the information either to control or in a leadership role,
(vii) telling all he knew.

The Validator was identified as part of the primary work group, and as the best sensing mechanism if the group was to survive in the turbulent Ryton atmosphere. Until better information systems existed in the plant it was obvious that the 'Validator' would be a very important person. When the results of the survey were discussed with the senior Shop Stewards, they initially claimed that the ' Validators' were unsuccessful steward candidates, but this was not true, as none of the 'Validators' spoken to had ever stood for a
union position. The management saw the 'Validators' as the troublemaker they never could identify. Once again this was not true. From interview evidence of the primary work group, it appeared that the 'Validator' was more conservative, less in favour of industrial action than average, nor did the 'Validator' seek to become the unofficial leader of the group.

Higgin32 described how the men discussed the sounds of the timbers in the mines, and how eventually an older man with no official position would feel happy and every worker would recommence work. This example appears to be similar to the role of the 'Validator' observed in the present study.

SHOP STEWARDS AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Seventy one of the 127 men stated that they trusted their Shop Steward - 42 mentioned that they trusted the Steward as they had elected the man because of his personal characteristics. The other 29 trusted the Steward above all other resources because it was his function to report to the workers and "If he doesn't represent us then who will look after us?". Of the remaining men who voted for a Shop Steward, half claimed they could never find their Steward to ask him a question. This comment which was followed up by the researcher carried an implied criticism of the work output of the Shop Steward. The section Shop Steward was elected by all the workers in the section irrespective of the unions working in the area. He held his normal job, but was relieved when he was called to a Shop Steward's meeting, or when he handled a complaint within the section.
From these stewards, a small group of Senior Stewards was elected for the Shop or Area by the successful section Stewards. The Senior Stewards were given full time duties handling work complaints and were allowed a separate private work area. From the Senior Shop Stewards, four men were elected as Convenors and they had an office within the Industrial Relations Building where they met daily, with management representatives. The Convenors could convene the Senior Shop Stewards Committee which had the power to call the men out on strike. The criticism regarding the performance of the Steward appeared to be a function of distance and of types of work in the section. For instance, the section that included Engine Assembly, Differential Assembly, and Chassis Attachment to the Differential Assembly, had vastly differing opinions of their Steward. The Steward was from Chassis Attachment and his Senior Stewards were close to his work area. Consequently, those workers near him spoke glowingly of his performance, yet the Engine Assembly Line saw him infrequently and thought that he ignored them; this was the first area where the 'Validator' was identified.

Many Stewards held their position for only a year or two and then resigned. Consequently new Stewards would frequently not answer questions at the section Stewards meetings, but they said they would refer the query to the Convenors on Senior Stewards for a decision. The men in the section felt that either the Steward was under the power of the Convenors, or that the Steward did not trust them sufficiently to tell the workers why he was unsure.
SHOP FLOOR CONTROL OVER THE SHOP STEWARDS

The Shopfloor workers would try to assert their control by a form of social isolation. Bailey, noted in a small French Pyrenean Alpine community, the villagers isolated any person who appeared to be growing too powerful through information control. There were norms showing how many people one could speak to during trips from the house, and how long one could take on a trip. If someone spent longer periods of time than normal or appeared to know more than other villagers then the person was identified by the village leaders as a 'gossip'. For a period of time the 'gossip' was ignored or only spoken to briefly, until his or her information became outdated. When this occurred the 'gossip' was again allowed to enjoy full social contact with the rest of the village. The men described in the interviews how they handled 'know-all' Stewards and the methods were similar.

The social isolation of the Steward took many forms, including speaking only briefly to the Steward, not giving him information but telling others, so that the Steward appeared to know less than the men, ignoring an instruction of the Steward and saying later that his 'advice' was accurate or inaccurate, depending on the consequences of ignoring the information, and telling the Steward what the Convenors were supposed to have decided before the Steward went to the Joint Stewards' meeting. If the Steward was socially aware he would recognise the signs and spend more time with his fellow-workers, explain why he could not tell them information, and asking for their help in
gaining information. If not aware, he would gradually drift more into the social orbit of the Senior Stewards until the union elections when he would be replaced. Stewards aware of the technique often expressed concern that they were given information in confidence by the Convenors so that they would agree to a proposed bargaining position, but they could not tell their fellow workers who were aware that something was happening. The Stewards also knew that not all their number kept the confidence and that the men could hear the news from other than their own representative. The Steward's frequent absence from the line for long periods appeared to be part of the reason for the social isolation - it was felt by some that the Steward used his position to avoid work. Some Stewards were very well aware of the complaint and had tried to have independent worker observers included in the delegations, but management would not agree to release more men from their duties.

Some Stewards complained of long delays while they waited for a meeting with the Industrial Relations Staff. These Stewards believed that all company policy was made at Whitley and that the delegation had to wait while the bargaining details were relayed to the 'outside' body for decisions and actions. The researcher found this belief to be accurate in other studies within C.U.K. Some workers recognizing the problem of the Stewards said that they would never stand for the position with its split loyalites. Overall the tactic of "social Isolation" appeared to be a powerful weapon but it had little effect on the Senior Stewards as they did not actually work beside any of the workers and spent more time talking to the Area Management than to the Shopfloor workers. No matter how much any Steward was criticized in
the interviews, no one was prepared to make an official criticism to the Management or to state that they trusted someone other than the Steward to protect their interests. All the men expressed distrust of the C.U.K. management and saw the Stewards as their only protection against management pressure.

FOREMAN AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Four of the ten Foremen interviewed had been promoted from the shop-floor, the rest had studied and gained a sub-tertiary or tertiary qualification. Efficient Foremen could in theory rise to Plant Manager but most aimed to eventually retire at the Area Manager level. Two were highly ambitious and were completing part-time post-graduate studies in Management at the Lanchester Polytechnic in Coventry.

The workers' perception that the Foremen knew very little of the happenings within the plant was confirmed by the interviews. The shopfloor interviews indicated that a Foreman was rated good, bad, or indifferent on his personal behaviour and some had the complete confidence of their workers.

The Foreman had little control over his area. The Area and Plant Management and the Industrial Engineering specialists negotiated manning levels and actual job descriptions with the Stewards and the last person told was the Foreman. The Foremen mentioned many cases of the men telling them information after the Shop Steward's meeting with the section. Some Foremen had very good relations with their Steward and were told before the section meeting what had been agreed by the Senior Management and the Convenors.
Many Foremen felt very defensive about their position. While some rationalized that they had to be the last to know in times of quick action, others felt disgruntled and antagonistic towards the Company because it did not consult with them before making decisions. Instances were given where the Foreman was told to carry out a particular policy decision; did so and a grievance arose. Expecting to be supported by his superior he found that the latter had changed his mind after discussion with the Convenors and the Superior had not told the particular Foreman involved.

In the Production Planning and Control and Pre-Delivery Shops the Foreman and the Area Management shared a common office. In both cases the Foreman - Area Management atmosphere was the best seen in the plant. The men could hear what problems their superiors had to deal with and the Foremen felt that the Senior Plant Management created most of the problems. The Foreman and the men appeared to have the best relationships in the plant and the apparent power of the Steward was not as high as in the other Shops yet the level of trust between all the parties was the highest seen; these impressions were supported by responses given by the sample during the redirected Ryton Study.

In some Shops the men did not want information from the Foremen, claiming all he ever told anyone was bad pieces of news, such as how many days the men would not work the following week. The Steward provided the 'good' news of successes or improvements in the work environment. Some men blamed the Foreman for the problems he mentioned as he was the only source of feared information.
MANAGEMENT AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION

There are two levels of Management in the Ryton Assembly Plant - Area and Senior Management. The former, responsible for each of the five major Shops, had as its highest position that of Superintendent. The Senior Management included the specialist areas and the senior manufacturing staff.

Senior Management was distrusted by all the groups interviewed in the sample. Men in all areas and at all levels believed that Management started rumours in order to see what policy changes could be instigated. Shop Stewards felt they should protest at any worrying rumour which might be an attempt by Management to change established policy. The belligerent attitude created a reaction by the Management and further decreased meaningful interaction, especially as the men did not believe anything the company said, including the threats; when problems escalated the workers did not believe in the seriousness of the confrontation. The more cynical workers claimed the Senior Management was the last to know what was happening in and to the plant. This belief was generally accepted in at least one particular instance where a rumour was heard that Chrysler intended to close the Ryton Plant by 1979. As the Convenors, Stewards and workers felt the Management would be the last to know, a network of workers was asked to contact friends in Whitley, in France at Simca, and in London at the Government level.

Where the Management did know, there were still major communication problems. Some Foremen and "Floaters" mentioned that the instructions on quality were so poorly explained that the men had to decide for
themselves what should be done. If all went well no one knew of the message confusion. The only time problems occurred was when the men did not make the intended decision and were blamed because they had "understood" similar messages previously. Once while interviewing on the Final Assembly line the researcher observed an argument created by the lack of communication, the workers responded to the criticism by carrying out each order precisely as instructed and the line was eventually stopped when one in eight cars was found to be incorrectly assembled and finished.

COVENTRY EVENING TELEGRAPH AS A SOURCE OF COMMUNICATION

The other major source of information mentioned was the local evening newspaper. The paper was seen as the major means of discovering the position of the Senior Management Directorate of CUK at Whitley. At the time of the survey it was Whitley policy to release all policy and negotiating decisions through the Public Relations Department. The decisions were released at 2 pm in time to meet the 2.30 pm last edition deadline. Often the management in particular plants read a Directorate decision regarding their plant in the newspaper before the official memorandum reached them from Whitley. The Foremen claimed that they received more information from the newspaper than from the Senior Plant Management and the Foremen believed most of the newspaper stories.

Fourteen men and all the Stewards felt that the newspaper reports were deliberately designed to alienate the men from the town of Coventry; the men claimed they found little sympathy for Ryton men during dis-
putes. This result hardened their resolve to fight the Management. Many men in the sample felt that the Coventry Evening Telegraph emphasized Chrysler problems and disputes on the first few news pages, yet Massey Ferguson, who had a similar industrial history and the same salary structure, rated only an occasional few lines on a single column. Finally, if the story in the newspaper appeared interesting enough, the two television stations, BBC Midlands and ATVO, would ring Chrysler to arrange an interview and later see the Stewards for comments. More often than not the Stewards first heard of the company decision from the television interviewer. The television channel would then present the story in the local news service and many workers at Ryton would learn that an actual, or potential, dispute had arisen in the plant without their knowledge.

SPECIAL PRODUCTS PLANT STUDY

After the discovery of the important use of rumour, "Validators" and the shopfloor control of Stewards, it was decided to carry out another and more detailed survey of how people diffuse information within a group, see Appendix 4, for the proposal to CUK. The Special Products plant was chosen as the site for research as the smaller plant made it easier to take a larger sample, and it employed an equal number of men and women. The Ryton Assembly plant was all male and as UnionOfficials 34 and workers 35 had previously mentioned the apparent indifference of women to union and work matters so the comparison of the sexes as well as a comparison of the behaviour of workers in the two disparately sized CUK plant were planned.

See Appendix 5 for details of the plant and size of the sample.
RESULTS

The results of the Special Products study fell into two distinct groupings - male and female. The male results were, in the main, similar to the Ryton findings, except that the disparate size of the plants allowed the workers in the smaller plant to control their representatives more effectively than in the larger Ryton complex. The female results were quite different from the Ryton findings. (For greater details of the results see Appendix 7).

The women, although in many cases related to Ryton workers, held significantly different views and used different sources from the men in the larger plant. This result raises another issue which is not within the plan of this thesis, but is an important issue for investigation - the beliefs and attitudes of married women workers. Cherns\textsuperscript{36} notes that between 1951 and 1972 the working population of Britain grew by 1.3 million - all married women. Writers such as Agassi\textsuperscript{37} discuss the quality of working life for women, but no comprehensive study exists to inform the social scientist of married women's attitude to work in conditions where men also work. Until this is done, social scientists will assume that the results reported e.g. Goldthorpe et al\textsuperscript{38} apply to all workers, an assumption that is not supported by these results.

There were surprisingly few comments made about the concept under investigation - Industrial Democracy/Worker Participation. Only two of the sample of 47 mentioned Industrial Democracy in their discussion of the future of work and neither saw its occurring in the next 5-10
years. This was in a company which was publicly negotiating a form of worker involvement in the overall management of the concern; C.U.K. called their scheme 'Employee Participation', but mentioned 'Industrial Democracy' in their media handouts. When the remaining 45 were then asked if 'Industrial Democracy' was likely to occur in Britain, 30 answered affirmatively but they felt it would not occur until the end of the twentieth century.

CONCLUSION

The plant studies give no support to the belief that there was a large and growing groundswell, at the shopfloor level, to introduce 'Industrial Democracy' into Britain. Most workers appeared to be uninterested in the concept. These results, however, may not reflect the level of knowledge and belief regarding the idea among the population at large. The next chapter (chapter V) will attempt to assess the extent that the concept of Industrial Democracy has spread among younger people.
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PART 3: RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH STUDIES

Chapter V
SCHOOLCHILDREN'S SOURCES REGARDING THE WORLD OF WORK

Davis and Cherns note that society knows very little regarding the time scales of change in social values. They suggest that detailed probes are needed and "concentrated studies in one or two areas, institutions, and work organizations could give us better ideas of the channels and rates of diffusion of values". Such was part of the purpose of the Ryton and Special Products research reported in the previous chapter. Davis and Cherns then suggest that the above studies "should be supplemented by systematic scanning for developments in sectors of society which signal value changes; entertainment, media, art and education". This is the purpose of the next two surveys which investigate schoolchildren's sources of the world of work in Coventry in the area where the main Ryton workforce live, and Loughborough with potential social science undergraduates. It was intended to ascertain if there was a common pattern of work beliefs held by Coventry (Special Products) workers and the Coventry schoolchildren. Young people who had left school were to be interviewed to see if their beliefs fell on a continuum between those of the workers and schoolchildren. The study was not possible but Brown's study on apprentices working in the shipbuilding industry on Tyneside was considered instead as he had investigated whether young workers chose jobs which fitted their job expectations or had their orientation to work formed by socialization within the work context.
As mentioned in the first page of the previous chapter, originally it was intended to carry out the bulk of the research in Loughborough, Leicestershire. However, when the CUK research opportunities arose, the Loughborough planning was terminated. By that time the school research had been completed, so a number of Coventry schools were selected for the same research. A letter (Appendix 8) was sent to the Director of the Coventry Education Authority asking for his permission to carry out the studies. The letter stated that the research was investigating the diffusion of ideas of work, and at what ages these ideas led to work decisions which were realistic in the light of the child's background. No measure was taken of the subjects' past academic performance or potential for further study. The decision on how realistic the choice of occupation was based on the answers of the subject and the area where the student lived. Thus any brilliant working class student who stated "Brain Surgeon" as his job choice will have been treated as 'unrealistic'. All the students who said they would play football for England were similarly rated as 'unrealistic'. If a poorly performing student listed a trade as a career, and he knew about the job, then he was treated as 'realistic'. These types of 'errors' reduced the accuracy of the researcher's judgements, but overall the measure was still felt to be useful, at least pointing in the right direction.

See Appendix 9 for details of the questionnaire and Appendix 10 for the sample used in the research.

See Appendix 11 for detailed results of the schools tested by the researcher.
RESULTS

The 904 students mentioned 1,653 sources of work information; 459 *(51%) gave only one source of information and 28 (3%) gave five sources of information, the maximum allowed on the form. The largest source was the mass media with 587 (36%), then followed parents and family, 564 (35%), self, 182 (11%), school, 180 (11%), and the area itself, 133 (8%). See Table 5.1 for the details of the responses to the sources of information.

In the mass media category the biggest source by far was television which received 285 (17%) responses; the next highest was a surprising result, books 175 (11%); newspapers received 123 (7%) responses; last was radio with 4 (0%). When asked to name up to five sources of information, television was the second most important first and second source, and the most popular third source. Books scored well in all five source categories, and were by far the largest fifth source quoted. See Table 5.2 for the full details of the mass media usage.

The next highest scoring group of sources was Parents/Family with 35% of the responses. The major source was both parents with 278 (17%); father with 140 responses (8%) was next, then mother with 46 (3%).

No other single category scored 40 responses. 'Both Parents' was the most quoted first and second source and the second highest third source, and 'Father' the third most important first source. If one aggregates the scores of the parents, both individually and as Both

*The percentages were rounded up or down to the nearest whole number.
Table 5.1

SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED BY THE SCHOOLCHILDREN

TO UNDERSTAND THE WORLD OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE IN ORDER OF REPORTED IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>PARENTS/FAMILY</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MASS MEDIA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCY OF SCORES OF THE VARIOUS MASS MEDIA QUOTED BY SCHOOLCHILDREN AS A SOURCE OF THE WORLD OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE IN ORDER OF REPORTED IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>TELEVISION</th>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>NEWSPAPERS</th>
<th>RADIO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents, and adds the scores of the students' brothers and sisters, the total for the immediate family is 530. The other 34 responses were relatives who visited the child's home. See Table 5.3 for the full details of the results.

The third highest scoring source was the student. The student lives in a community and he or she can see people working every day of the week. Consequently the type of work and the working conditions observed by the students were restricted to local occupations. This source was quoted in all five source categories. The next largest source was information given out at school, and finally, information gained from the child's local area. The difference between the last category of sources, Local Area and the Observation category, arises because the student has not personally seen what the Local Area, e.g. friends, area gossip, and hobby groups, gives them information about. See Table 5.4 for the full details of the three remaining categories.
Table 5.3:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE IN ORDER OF REPORTED IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>BOTH PARENTS</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>BROTHER</th>
<th>SISTER</th>
<th>SIBLINGS</th>
<th>AUNT</th>
<th>UNCLE</th>
<th>COUSINS</th>
<th>BROTHER IN LAW</th>
<th>GRAND FATHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES
OF THE NEXT THREE CATEGORIES OF WORK SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE IN ORDER OF REPORTED IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>LOCAL AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next question asked what job the student would ideally like to have if there were no constraints, e.g. education level, sporting skills.

The responses were broken into the following categories:

- **BLUE COLLAR** - unskilled, e.g. street-cleaner, labourer  
  - semiskilled, e.g. fitters-mate, machinist  
  - skilled, e.g. tradesman
- **WHITE COLLAR** - unskilled, e.g. shop assistant  
  - semiskilled, e.g. accounts clerk  
  - semiprofessional, e.g. nurse
- **PROFESSIONAL** - anyone who gave an occupation requiring tertiary level training
- **SPORTSMAN** - professional athlete of any type, e.g. footballer
- **ENTERTAINER** - involved in playing or managing a professional entertainer or group of entertainers, e.g. Manager of the Bay City Rollers
- **NONE** - no response

Table 5.5 below sets out the result of the survey of the students' 'ideal job'. Nearly two in every five students (37%) gave Blue Collar jobs as their 'ideal job', and nearly a quarter (23%) gave White Collar jobs. Professional categories scored 21% and the escapist Sportsman and Entertainer categories scored 17% or 1:6 of the responses.
### Table 5.5

**FREQUENCY OF THE RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY OF THE STUDENT’S "IDEAL JOB"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SUB-TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLUE COLLAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiskilled</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- skilled</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE COLLAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unskilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiskilled</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiprofessional</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTSMAN</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERTAINER</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>904</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked what did they think would be their likely occupation, 470, or just over half (52%), thought that their 'ideal job' would also be their likely job. The same categories were used and the results are given in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6

FREQUENCY OF THE RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY OF THE STUDENT'S LIKELY JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SUB-TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLUE COLLAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unskilled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiskilled</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- skilled</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE COLLAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unskilled</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiskilled</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semiprofessional</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTSMAN</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERTAINER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>904</strong></td>
<td><strong>904</strong></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a significant difference \( p < 0.01 \) between the responses to the two questions if one compares the aggregates in the Total columns. When one compares the results in the individual categories, e.g. White Collar Unskilled, the differences are not significant. The students expect to work but in lower skilled categories of the same major groupings, e.g. some boys gave tradesmen positions as their 'ideal' job, but realistically thought they would work in semi-skilled Blue Collar occupations. The boyish dream of playing for England in the 1982 or 1986 World Cup Final, or the feminine dream of managing the Bay City Rollers, is recognized as a dream when the students were asked to state their realistic job category.

Most students, 670 (74%), believed work to be better than school, while only 146 (16%) thought the opposite; the balance (10%), were unsure of which activity would be the more enjoyable. The children gave 738 positive answers why work was better than school, while those preferring school gave 214 positive replies. The two most frequent reasons given for the superiority of work over school were money (38% responses) and the intrinsically interesting nature of work (173); the next highest response (154), emphasized the freedom of the worker compared to the school student "trapped" in the classroom. There were no categories with a large number of responses in support of the school.

Only 5 of the 904 have considered, or would consider, working with the largest employer in that part of Coventry - CUK. Some people mentioned Chrysler in their answers, but always as a description of conditions in which they did not plan to work as part of the reason their parents desired that the child gain a better education.
Overall, the patterns indicate that there was no awareness of an increased need for greater freedom of the individual worker or greater control by the worker over his own destiny. The freedom mentioned by the students was escape from school discipline. The main sources of information about work, Both Parents, Television, their own observations and school had not communicated any move in the direction of greater worker participation or industrial democracy.

There was no evidence of a groundswell from within the culture of the students to demand or expect greater control over their job.

The major interest of the students was to leave school to earn wages in a more interesting and less disciplinarian atmosphere, and to be free to decide their own social activities (social freedom, not industrial democracy). Indeed, some students mentioned the lesser freedom of work, but steady income, as leading to greater freedom in personal matters, e.g. choice of clothes and records.
SIXTH FORM STUDENTS' IDEAS ON IDEAL ORGANIZATION

During April 1975 the researcher participated in a visit by interested potential students to the Social Sciences Department at Loughborough University of Technology. Students who are interested in the courses taught by the Department are invited to spend two days to hear and see what is taught within the subjects. Firstly, the students are given an outline of the structure of the courses and potential job markets. Then they are asked to select from a variety of sessions three which they think would suit their interests. As a member of the tutorial staff, the author volunteered to run a series of sessions titled 'Characteristics of the Perfect Organization'.

Three such sessions were run with different groups of students who chose to discuss the topic. The researcher welcomed each group and discussed the rules for running the session. It was suggested that most people have a set of beliefs about organizational behaviours which they believe characterise effective organizations. The students were asked to discuss and compile a list of important characteristics a perfect organization would possess and at the end of the session the researcher would discuss the social sciences' research support for and against the proposed characteristics. The author offered to act as the scribe for the group.

After introducing the topic, establishing names and schools, and asking what constitutes the perfect organization, the researcher reflected the statements in each group, i.e. he clarified any points where it was unclear what the student meant, asked how the student knew of the characteristic and what examples they could give of the
principle. Towards the end of the session the writer checked the list of principles suggested by the group members and then discussed the research on each feature and also which research design was used. The students participated fully and controlled the direction of discussion throughout the session. At the end of the time most students expressed an interest in studying the fields of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Sociology.

The researcher noted the headings and comments on prepared sheets which served as the group discussion document, as well as the research data. The characteristics proposed by the three groups are listed below in Table 5.7:

The groups ranged in size between 8 and 15 students, girls outnumbered boys by 2 to 1, and the participants appeared from their dress, schools and speech to come from the middle and upper socio-economic classes.

This study was not originally planned but was conceived when the researcher was asked to assist in the student orientation programme. The study was designed to compare and contrast, if possible, the attitudes towards work and industrial democracy held by these senior school students and the attitudes and beliefs of the predominantly working class senior students in the Coventry study. Each Loughborough subject identified where he or she lived and not one of the 34 students came from Coventry.

Due to the ad hoc nature and structure of the testing, it was not possible to easily summarise the results. The findings are set out below.
### Table 5.7

**Characteristics of the Perfect Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>GROUP 1</th>
<th>GROUP 2</th>
<th>GROUP 3</th>
<th>TIMES MENTIONED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good detailed planning - people told what to do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discipline - rules and people agree to obey</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Control by management but not too powerful</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Freedom of speech by unionists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Co-operation between top management and shopfloor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Good communications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Incentives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pleasant surroundings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Achievement through job satisfaction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Likert's Systems Four style supervision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Worker participation and fair share of rewards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Better medical facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Better education for workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Organizational unit not too big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 5 9 8 22
FINDINGS

Because of the design, it became apparent that the discussion of the initial characteristics directed the flow of other characteristics - feature 2 followed directly on from the discussion on feature 1. In one case, Group 1, the discussion became quite heated among members of the group, so fewer points were listed, but the strongest group consensus was formed on the points after this discussion; this group made the strongest positive statements about the session. The group, their type of organization, sources and comments are discussed below.

GROUP 1: "STATUS QUO"

15 students

This group generally accepted the industrial system as it existed in 1975 as theoretically the potentially perfect system if a few problems were overcome.

**Good Planning:** This initial point was raised by a girl who claimed that management was to blame for the industrial strife in Britain because the management never planned properly. Planning meant, to her, Planning Production and Control rather than long-term planning. The discussion eventually led to the girl's having to defend her position under pressure; she then put forward F. Taylor's 'Scientific Management' as a good example of what she meant. She had read sections of the book and comments on it, and its importance while studying for her A-Levels that year.

**Discipline:** To enable the better planning to be effective, rules must be obeyed, e.g. work tasks carried out, and people must try to obey the regulations. Discipline mainly referred to self-discipline but some students raised the issue of punishment for those who did not obey the rules.
Control: The students felt that management needed to have some controls, e.g. the power of sacking, but that the controls must not be so strong that the management could act arbitrarily and unfairly. When asked for the basis of evidence in both the characteristics of Control and Discipline, the supporters of these features pointed to television and newspaper reports to support their cases.

Freedom of Speech: This feature was defended on the basis of mass media coverage. While believing the strike rate was too high in Britain, the students felt that management caused a great deal of the problems because it would not talk to the worker representatives.

Co-operation: The last point followed from the previous one. Group 1 wanted direct talk between senior management and the shop-floor workers. The students believed that the middle management often lied to both parties to hide their incompetence or manipulations.

The first group clearly see the reporting in the mass media as indicating the incompetence of management. They felt the problems could be overcome by better organizational design and greater willingness by workers and management to be more co-operative.

GROUP 2: "PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY OR BETTER QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE"

11 members

The second group began by discussing organizations in general but quickly moved to the school organization as the model they wished to discuss. The early comments were all based on the experience of the members within the school setting. The first characteristic discussed was good communications. The person who raised the point...
mentioned, by way of explanation, that her school had recently appointed a new Headmaster. He had spent a great deal of time informing staff, students and parents of policy decisions; at the moment her school was a very happy and productive place. Then other members discussed the points and all mentioned the need for communication within the context of a bureaucratic organization which was well planned, people were kept informed and discipline was accepted and obeyed within the environment of an "enlightened despotism", i.e. challenges to the enforcement of particular rules of the organization were not seen by the authorities as challenges to the body itself or its values.

The students accepted that they had to live within a body of rules drawn up without their contribution or consent. However, they felt a "perfect organization" would recognize responsibilities by all the members to abide by the objectives and rules. The rules should be as fair and unrestricted as possible, whilst still holding the organization together. This meant that the leaders would have to accept that people on lower levels of power could still inform and negotiate the changing of unsatisfactory rules.

For the negotiations between the different levels of the structure to be effective, there needed to be a set of commonly agreed goals and objectives; these goals would be regularly reviewed and assessed to see how effectively they were being met. The desire to succeed in meeting the organizational goals was perceived as highly important, but not the only means of motivating the members. There also needed to be personal benefits, e.g. bonuses, more rapid promotion, if the full potential of each person was to be tapped.
The concept of differential rewards worried some people, so they suggested that to operate the perfect organization, people would need to be highly compatible. This would mean careful initial screening by the body, further screening by the use of psychological tests, and the workers in the area would need to feel that they could work with the applicant before the new person was appointed. The compatible workers would work in pleasant surroundings which would encourage one to go to work and do one's best.

Until the last point in the discussion, Group 2 appeared to be similar to Group 1 in believing that 'tinkering' with the status quo would solve the problems of running the desired organization. From that point onwards the emphasis changed, at first slowly, but then more and more quickly towards a 'radical' position where all the members participated in running the organization, deciding its fate, and fully sharing in the organizational benefits.

The turning point was the mention of the need for trusting supervision. All students felt they were never trusted to monitor their own progress or to design their own workloads and courses. The group members wanted looser supervisory control where they used the teacher as a resource wherever necessary, while at the same time monitoring their own progress. The description of the desired supervisory style reminded the researcher of Likert's description of his 'System Four' supervisory style. The researcher asked Group 2 if they knew of Likert, but not one knew the name or the term 'System 4'.

When asked why the style of supervision was so important, the
previous point of motivation was presented as the rationale for the desired style.

Two boys stated that they sought an occupation where they would feel a deep sense of achievement from doing their day to day work. The boys claimed too much emphasis was placed on special efforts at school which need not contribute to their success at the A-level examinations. They felt the job itself should motivate one to work harder and more effectively. This in turn would increase one's feeling of achievement, which would make the job itself more interesting. The two boys' statements struck a sympathetic note with the other group members, who then adopted the idea as central to their concept of the "perfect organization".

Some members claimed that to have a highly satisfying job one needed to control the job and its environment. Some other members then mentioned the mass media's coverage of worker participation/industrial democracy. These people said that their teachers had discussed the concept of participation in terms of union power, but never in the context of controlling one's own job. The following discussion centred on what was meant by participation. The whole group saw the term as referring to controlling one's own job and job area. They could not see that union representatives on company boards would help the members on the shopfloor control their personal work area. The organizational structure, as seen by the students, was very similar to Likert's idea of the 'linking pin', as described in *The Human Organization*. The 'linking pin' was also seen to work downwards when the rewards of the work were distributed. They felt that all the workers within their own areas should discuss
the allocation of the profits and then handle the actual allocation of benefits within their own small work area.

The concept of controlling one's own destiny came as a shock to some group members when the characteristics were discussed by the researcher; the group had not seen the direction in which their list of characteristics had led them.

Eight of the 11 had heard of industrial democracy or worker participation and had been involved in class discussions on the topic before coming to Loughborough. None had seriously thought about the issue; all had seen the movement as an attempt by the unions to take advantage of the Labour Government's rule to increase their power. After the discussion all 11 felt the idea of worker participation, as they perceived it, was excellent.

In all the discussions by the students the author did not make any positive or negative comments concerning the concepts, nor did he consciously give any clues that he was seeking information in the field, or that he held opinions on the ideas.

The results did show that articles in papers such as The Guardian and on television had reached some of the senior student population.

GROUP 3: "REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY"
8 members
The third and smallest group was also the least active. One was not sure if the previous parts of the programme had answered all the students' queries, or if they were tired. Comments were made and
discussion did take place, but without the verve, colour and noise of previous groups.

The group was generally pessimistic about the world of work. They saw people in more senior positions as exploiting those below them. The initial discussion point was rules and obligations. Unlike the others, this group emphasized the use of rules to protect the individuals against the whims of those in power. The rules were seen as being strictly enforced to protect the subordinates from overt pressure and from unintentionally giving up rights by cooperating with their superiors. This highly negative view of the "perfect organization" was mentioned and the members reiterated that the body which perfectly protected its members was their ideal organization.

The protector concept was extended to cover a comprehensive, improved medical service for all workers operated by the organization. The National Health Scheme gave reasonable protection for normal illnesses, but it was strongly argued that the worker whose health was damaged by his work was not protected. If serious exotic illnesses occurred only the rich could afford to pay for immediate treatment; workers, it was claimed, had to wait years. No evidence or reasons for the statements were given, but all the group accepted the statements; the researcher did not ask any checking questions on this characteristic as the previous question on the negative nature of their perfect organization stopped the flow of group discussion for a few minutes. Previous comments indicated that the group had talked about personal background before entering the
session, so information from earlier discussions could have explained the lack of searching questions by the other group members.

One member took up the term 'exploitation' and turned it to a positive emphasis. She successfully argued that the higher education of workers within the organization was to both the individual's and the body's advantage. Appointments to senior positions would come from within the organization, and career development planning would be essential if the organization was to fully exploit its human potential.

The protection of the individual was seen within the context of good detailed planning, within a framework of rules and obligations, where the management had restricted power of control. Performance would be rewarded by known incentive schemes and all employees would know of important matters within the organization.

The last point of full disclosure then dominated the rest of the discussion. The members felt that all employees had the right to full disclosure of information; if this occurred, then all employees could make useful contributions to the decision-making process within the organization. Once that point was made, the discussion swung to one on the forms of representative democracy. The students agreed between themselves that proportional representation was fairest, and that all levels of the organization should be represented on the decision-making boards and committees. The principles discussed concerning the governing of the organization were very similar to the CUK proposal at present under investigation, and negotiation between the unions and the management.
CONCLUSIONS

Many of the sixth form students visiting Loughborough University of Technology knew of the movement towards industrial democracy/worker participation. Two of the three groups referred to publicity in the press and on the television regarding the demand for greater worker involvement. Both groups mentioned that their teachers and parents had discussed the issue with them.

The same academic level of students from Coventry did not raise worker participation as an issue of work which they would meet then they went to work. Why?

The two groups came from different socio-economic groups, the students at the Loughborough familiarisation course were self selected, while the Coventry groups were all those at the particular school in the sixth form. The middle class potential Loughborough students had actively decided to consider the social sciences as a career which would involve some of them working in the helping professions, e.g. social worker, psychologist, while the more working class Coventry students sought careers within the management structure of the large employers in the West Midlands region.

Within the Loughborough groups there was a reasonable amount of agreement on the general principles of the perfect type of organization. However, each came from a different set of premises and assumptions. The first group did not mention industrial democracy and felt that the status quo was satisfactory except for a few minor adjustments. The second group assumed that people desired growth so the greater the
opportunities for growth the more it would occur; they felt the less
the bureaucracy controlled the day to day regulation of the workplace,
the more the worker would have opportunities for development and
responsibility. The third group, like the second, knew and argued for
greater worker participation, however their assumptions were the
opposite to the second group. The third group felt workers needed to
be guarded against exploitation by the management, full disclosure of
information and representative democracy they felt offered the best
defence.

This study showed that information on industrial democracy/worker
participation was available in some of the mass media if one was aware
of the field. Either the Coventry students did not read or see the
appropriate media, or they did not consider the topic worthy of notice.
Either way, this indicates a lack of knowledge in the concept by the
Coventry students.
THE TRANSFORMATION PROCESS OF SCHOOLCHILD TO ADULT WORKER

While the results of the Special Products research and that of the Coventry schools provide interesting information on people's sources on work, there is still the problem of comparing the results to see if any common pattern can be found. Initially, the research plan called for a study of groups of young people who had left school during the past few years. Such a group could not be found and studied before the researcher left Britain to return to Australia.

During the initial planning stages of the project the author called on Dr. Mark Abrams, Director of the Survey Unit of the Social Science Research Council, who mentioned that Richard Brown, Senior Lecturer in the Sociology Department at Durham University, had recently completed a similar piece of research and would be worth contacting. This was done, and a meeting was held in which both researchers discussed their past and future research in the area. Brown then gave the author a copy of his article, "The Attitudes to Work Expectations and Social Perspectives of Shipbuilding Apprentices". The article is highly consistent with the results of the Special Products research and the Coventry schools results, and so it is discussed in relation to the two studies previously reported.

Brown's research was part of a project supported by the SSRC to understand the orientations to work and industrial behaviour of shipbuilding workers on Tyneside. One important part of the project was to investigate whether young workers chose jobs which fitted their expectations or "that their orientations to work and shared definitions of the situation resulted from socialization within the work context."
If the latter occurred, then the results of the two Coventry studies could be argued to be consistent and relevant. Brown hypothesized that "the apprentices' attitudes and expectations and 'world views' could change over the training period. Changes would tend towards a situation where apprentices shared the same attitudes and social perspectives as adult shipbuilding workers; and that the differences among the apprentices would relate to the differences of immediate social experience."^{9}

The Durham researchers measured, by questionnaire, the attitudes, priorities, expectations and social perspectives of apprentices at the time of their entry into their apprenticeships and four times during their training. The questionnaires asked many questions which are irrelevant to the present research programme, therefore those resultant replies will not be considered in this thesis.

**ATTITUDES TO WORK**

The apprentices were asked to list what they were looking for in a good job. The results of the questionnaires given at the beginning and end of the apprenticeship are set out below in Table 5.8.

When the results of the two Coventry studies are compared with the Brown results the similarity is very noticeable. See Table 5.9.

The school students and new apprentices agree on the order of importance of three of the five categories and the experienced apprentices and male CUK Special Products employees agree on four of the five categories.
Table 5.8:

FEATURES SOUGHT BY APPRENTICES IN THEIR JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGINNING</td>
<td>END</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting but varied work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9

COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM THE COVENTRY STUDIES WITH THE APPRENTICESHIP RESULTS ON FEATURES SOUGHT BY WORKERS IN THEIR JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>SCHOOL LEAVERS</th>
<th>WORKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPRENTICES</td>
<td>COVENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting &amp; Varied Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only the results of the male workers in the Special Products research are included in the Tables 5.9 and 5.10.
The results are listed and compared in rank order as the means of arriving at the percentages for each category in the four measurements are not similar. The results do suggest some interesting points for consideration. In the apprenticeship study money was clearly the major feature, and increased in importance in the intervening 42 months; however, the importance of money fell between the two Coventry studies.

The major feature for the male Coventry workers was an interesting and varied job. The same feature scored the second highest with the qualified apprentices. Neither the Coventry students nor the new apprentices ranked an interesting job as one of their major features which they would really seek when looking at work.

The new apprentices and the students were worried about their future prospects much more than their working conditions, yet the opposite was true for both groups which had worked for a number of years – the present was much more important to these people than the promises of an uncertain future.

ATTITUDES TO THE MANAGEMENT

The next relevant section of the questionnaire dealt with the worker's or potential worker's attitude to the firm and its management.

The results of the questionnaires with the apprentices are compared with the results from the Special Products survey in Table 5.10 below; the students survey information is not suitable for comparison.
Table 5.10

COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM THE SPECIAL PRODUCTS WORKERS IN COVENTRY AND BROWN'S APPRENTICESHIP RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>BROWN'S STUDY</th>
<th>SPECIAL PRODUCTS RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPRENTICE BEGINNING</td>
<td>APPRENTICE END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A Good Worker is Loyal to His Employer</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workers are Only Interested in Their Pay Packet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Company Identification by Workers not Important</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management Only Profit Orientated</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management Interested in the Good of the Employees</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Firm is like a Football Team - Relies on Co-operation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Unions Too Much Power</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Union Membership Should Be Compulsory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Union Should Fight for Issues Other Than Wages</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Workers Should Share in Control of the Company</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote:

*‘Older Workers’ was a group used as a comparison group by Brown. They are skilled tradesmen who have worked in the dockyards for 5-15 years.
The opinion of the trained apprentices agreed with those of the male workers at Special Products on 8 of the 10 items; the only ones not to coincide were items 3 and 8, which dealt with company identification by the workers and compulsory membership respectively. On the same items, the experienced apprentices disagreed with older workers in the dockyards.

The results of Brown's study generally support his hypothesis that the apprentices' attitudes would change over the training period to ones similar to the adult shipbuilding workers. The adult shipbuilding workers' attitudes were, in turn, very similar to those of the male Special Products workers.

The results of the comparisons suggest that the findings in the Special Products plants and the schools in the same area are consistent, i.e. the attitudes of the students would very likely be similar to those of the male Special Products workers after the students had worked in industry for a number of years.

The features which were studied indicate that students and new apprentices view the receipt of money, and belonging to the organization as the important issues which workers face. The experienced worker seeks an interesting job which allows him to feel worthwhile; the obstacle to this aim is the purely profit orientation of the management which leads to unfortunate consequences, e.g. in some organizations quality is sacrificed, workers are treated as pieces of equipment to be disposed of at a moment's notice, without sense of loyalty to the workers.
Overall, these results suggest that the diffusion of work attitudes, by the parents, society at large, the mass media and by personal observation in Coventry, is not unusual or inconsistent. In turn, one may use the Coventry results to check a general model of diffusion within the British society to ascertain the degree to which the model is consistent with reality.
CONCLUSION

The results of the last two chapters suggest that there is a set of work beliefs held by working class adults (Chapter IV) and children (Chapter IV). These beliefs develop and grow through work experiences. The growth of work beliefs is supported by the research of Brown (Chapter IV). The results suggest the set of beliefs and experiences are held by working class people throughout Britain.

Neither the Coventry workers or schoolchildren had heard of industrial democracy yet two of the three Loughborough groups of intended social science students had heard of the concept. This could mean the concept was noted by students interested in working in the social sciences field or that the concept was one discussed by most people in the middle and upper socioeconomic groupings. The latter possibility will be investigated in Chapter VI where sources of information regarding industrial democracy will be investigated among tertiary students who in the main belong to the middle or upper socioeconomic classes.

Another possible reason for the difference in results was the difference in methodologies used to elicit the responses. The schoolchildren were given a questionnaire which they answered privately. The sixth form students discussed the topic and generated points by interacting with one another. Given the same amount of interaction, more Coventry schoolchildren may have shown that they knew of industrial democracy. Even if this explanation is correct, it still appears unlikely that there was a high level of knowledge, interest, or expectation among the young people of Coventry that they would be involved in the decision making processes of their job when they entered the workforce.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter will study the beliefs and knowledge of the potential members of the managerial elite regarding industrial democracy/worker participation. To become a member of management one needs education and/or experience. Studies of elites emphasize the social and educational factors maintaining the continuation of a particular elite group. Education is common in both sets of writings. Parsons\(^1\) maintains that education is the most salient link with the occupational system. Therefore what is taught during education will have an important effect on the way the newly trained managers will see their work environment. As industrial democracy is claimed by its supporters, e.g. Mr. Tony Benn MP, to have wide societal support trainee managers should be introduced to the concept if they are to adopt to changing conditions. This chapter will try to ascertain if the students have been exposed to the ideas and other related concepts. The first section of the chapter will deal with the concept of elites and its ramifications for the diffusion model under investigation. The second section will deal with the actual research results and their conclusions.
ELITES

Boyd comments that not only do elites exist, "but contemporary democracy is seeing an increase in the size of many elite groups and in the sub-divisions within them." Boyd suggests that proliferation of occupational titles certified by the Registrar General of the United Kingdom (22,000 titles) supports his case.

The word 'elite' comes from the Latin ELIGERE, 'to choose'; originally to choose rare or fine articles. In eighteenth century France elite came to be used in a social sense, indicating a part of the population. The word then passed into English, where it retained the associations of a group socially distinct from the remainder of its contemporaries thus sharing one of the meanings of its closely related noun 'elect' also derived from the same Latin verb.

There is a great deal of confusion concerning the meaning of the term, and many studies on elites cannot be compared as their bases of definition are radically different. Boyd defines elites in a modern democratic society by the following characteristics:

1. High occupational position
2. Minority form
3. High status
4. Distinctive life style
5. Group consciousness and cohesion
6. Exclusiveness but openness
7. Functional capability and responsibility
8. Moral responsibility
9. Power, of varying degrees
The so defined elites are claimed by Dahrendorf\(^8\) to be the reservoir from which the powerful are regularly recruited. The first criterion—occupational position—is important, as it determines the source of income which in turn determines, to a large extent, the fourth criterion, life style. The life style is often the major criterion used by others to rate one's level of social prestige, and to identify whether one belongs to a particular elite. Glass\(^9\) concludes from his research that "in Great Britain occupation is probably the most important single criterion of status". Lasswell\(^10\) believes that the development of the Industrial society has hastened the tendency to identify elites on an occupational basis, as a man's occupation is both the source of his income, and the definition of his status. Mills\(^11\) sole criterion for selection of subjects in his work on the power elite is occupational position. By definition, the elite will always be a minority, since there is a finite number of powerful positions. Dahrendorf\(^12\) asserts that we would find it incomprehensible to talk of a majority elite enforcing its rules of authority on a non-elite minority. Unlike writers such as Searing and Edinger\(^13\), who believe an elite cannot be more than five percent of the population, Dahrendorf argues that the elite in modern industry may be as high as a third of the firm's employees if this group has heavy functional responsibilities\(^14\). The present research assumes an elite more in line with the population of Dahrendorf, than of Searing and Edinger.

The third criterion, high status, has become increasingly important, as attempts have been made to make western society more egalitarian. The greater the commonality of the characteristics of the population, the more important the differences become. This in turn has emphasized the social differences which, in theory, most people can achieve, e.g. money,
education, expensive motor car. Anthony Crosland\textsuperscript{15} remarked "Never have class divisions been so acute and anguished as since they were, theoretically, abolished". To the young university undergraduate, his entry into the tertiary education system potentially qualifies him for a high status position. Gaining this position will depend on academic success, business results, some degree of luck, and being easily identified as a high status person. Consequently, many of the potential managers accept the beliefs and attitudes of the high status people as their own. It is because of this identification with senior management and lecturers, that the series of tertiary studies were planned and completed; hopefully they give an indication of what high status managers believe, or what the lecturers believe the senior management support. This in turn should allow one to make predictions about the diffusion of the concept of industrial democracy in Britain. It is realized that not all students will finish in the business elite, even using Dahrendorf's figures, but all are hoping to join the elite and this motivation is sufficient for the purposes of the research.

Status groups are communal groups who share a specific style of life; they are stratified more in accordance with the consumption than the acquisition of goods\textsuperscript{16}. Mayer\textsuperscript{17} points out that prestige is based on the way in which a person spends his money, and on how long his family has been able to live in the particular style; consequently the accumulation of wealth and power is associated with the acceptable life patterns necessary to qualify for elite status.

A variety of writers emphasize the role of education in transmitting the moves and behaviour required by the status group membership\textsuperscript{18}. The
English public school has often been quoted as the perfect machine to produce a common approach to life for the elite. The school is so successful, as Svalastoga points out, because the lifestyle cannot just be bought, but has to be learned. Not all students need belong to the elite group, but they desire to enter it so the students practice the behaviour they hope will be expected of them in the future - Merton describes the process as "anticipatory socialization".

Eliteness implies more than holding the same values; individuals must be aware that they hold common values and interests. Unless the group acts as a unified body, it is a group of powerful persons, rather than an elite, but if the elite behave in a common manner, then they will possess a common ethos. Cole notes that status is increasingly related to education in Britain today, but the family is still significant. Once through the gate of admission to elite education, the egalitarianism of the elite obliterates origins. Although entry is selective and restrictive, once admitted everyone is in the same brotherhood of the school. Elitism implies segregated groups, as elites are defined in terms of non-elites. There must be some social distance between the elites and other groups, so that one can easily identify the groups which preside over the rest of the society. The elites must not be over-exclusive, otherwise they will degenerate and encourage their eventual overthrow. In order to survive, elites must be open to selected recruits, e.g. the British upper classes in the 18th and 19th centuries, and those not fortunate enough to join the elite must be able to fulfil themselves in other activities.

Achievement is a requirement for elite status, just as elite status is a major inducement for achievement; a leader will always be judged, in part, on how well he accomplishes the group's aims. Failure as a
leader can result in losing one's leadership position within the elite group. This is because the elites justify their specially held position by their being the best group at achieving the desired aims of the society. The elite's ethos often postulates that they should not wield power because they happen to have it, or want it, but because society as a whole is better served. To emphasize their attributes and secure popular support and approval, elites employ myths, e.g. only a trained manager can fully understand the process of decision-making necessary to run the plant, and so protect the workers' jobs. As this myth was strongly believed until very recently, managers were not only confident of their ability to lead and contend, but they had also persuaded the workers that they possessed this ability. The pattern of power and status was 'self reinforcing' in Britain until the end of World War II, but since then the myth and the patterns of power and status have been affected by the poor trading results of British industry and its inability to function adequately in a highly competitive world. Worker participation is one projected solution which, it is claimed, will overcome ineffective organizational decision-making and so threatens the managerial elites.

An elite is powerful because it does not have to agree with the societal mores of the particular society. As Dahl pointed out, a power elite can only be said to exist when the group hold a view in opposition to that of other groups, and the elite's view is the successful one. Group power is becoming harder to define and assess as the growth of associations, unions and pressure groups has further diminished the elite power. A democratically elected government with a large majority may, in theory, be able to pass whatever laws it likes, but if it ignores the associations, unions and pressure groups, it is very likely to find itself unable to enforce them which eventually will lead to it losing office. Power has become vested in many groups in today's society;
Dahl described this phenomena as a 'relatively pluralistic structure of dispersed inequalities'. Riesman's study of American democracy agrees with Dahl's point when he concludes that power in America is dispersed among many 'veto' groups too numerous and differing in membership criteria to be led by one style of leadership, or co-ordinated into one general political movement. Thus while it is a misrepresentation to speak of 'elite power' - a monolithic entry in the hands of a favoured few - one cannot regard power as haphazardly distributed throughout society.

The discussion so far has assumed that elites are 'natural', and will occur in some form in all groups. Not all political and educational writers would agree with the assumption of permanent elites. Keller argues that temporary 'strategic' elites are necessary to lead, innovate and inspire people on particular tasks and goals. Tawney concludes that temporary elites should receive special consideration for a particular task, but surrender the powers after the task has been completed. Orwell points out the problems of permanent elites in a "classless" society, and the recently amended Yugoslavian constitution builds in mechanisms theoretically to prevent any person, or group of people, from becoming a permanent elite. Social reformers, who seek an egalitarian society, seek to destroy the means by which the present elites permanently maintain their power, e.g. opening public schools to all applicants, abolishing the House of Lords.

Against the reformers' arguments are those of theorists such as Kornhauser and political 'operators' such as the industrial relations advisors of the Conservative Party. The latter, for instance, believed that Heath lost the 1974 election because of his talk of employee...
participation which alienated the so-called 'Cloth Cap Tory' who preferred to be represented by and have decisions affecting him made by those of a higher social class.

The arguments presented by the protagonists for and against elites in the government of the state and organizations, use the very same points previously discussed at length in Chapter III when considering the cases for representative (elite) and participatory (classical) democracy.

The present research is aimed at investigating the way the potential members of the managerial elite are conditioned for their entry into the workplace. Interest is centred on the inculcation of values and information on various forces within the world of work, and in particular, industrial democracy/worker participation. The two groups within the sample provide potential members of the elite with different work experience; as the undergraduates have never worked, their values will come from factors other than the actual workplace, whilst the postgraduate students will have their values and views affected by work experiences.
Milliband charges that the education system, from primary school to postgraduate teaching, inculcates a common message to students of a predestined future for all, i.e. either worker or manager according to one's education, but for the few exceptions who rise above their social class and its educational values. He further argues that the university and management training staff teach a common (capitalist) message in their courses, as they are often consultants to the economic system. The training courses and university subjects are geared to provide personnel for the system, either management or union; students are taught management skills plus "the values and purpose" of the system.

The inculcation of the values raises the issue of the way management educators perceive industrial democracy/worker participation and whether there is an increasing demand in the community for these ideas, arising from courses run in universities, polytechnics and the management and trade union training courses.

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the extent of the level of knowledge of a variety of ideas, e.g. worker control, industrial democracy, job enrichment, job enlargement and quality of working life, and the students' perception of ideas investigated in the special products research e.g. industrial relations in Britain, causes of strikes, how much workers should participate, and how much they want to participate.

A number of universities and polytechnics were asked if they wished to
take part; all agreed to do so. The number of subjects in nearly all the samples in this chapter are very small, but in most cases they include all students in the particular classes and courses. The small size of the samples is a direct result of the lack of courses in this discipline in the midlands. The institutions which agreed to participate were: Loughborough University, Sheffield University, Aston University, Lanchester Polytechnic in Coventry, Trent Polytechnic and Leicester Polytechnic. The type of student varied.

The Aston University sample, and one of the Lanchester Polytechnic classes, were made up of postgraduate students; in both cases, as with the fourth year Loughborough sample, the students had worked at least one year in industry before entering their present year of study. The Trent and Leicester Polytechnics, the first year Loughborough University sample, and Lanchester undergraduate participants had not worked before - they were 19-20 year old undergraduates. Four hundred and fifty questionnaires were sent out. A total of 256 subjects from 11 classes completed the questionnaire. The classes and institutions are set out in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1

SUBJECTS AND INSTITUTIONS TO COMPLETE THE TERTIARY INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

POST GRADUATE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston University (A)</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick University (N)</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University (B)</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Polytechnic (LNPG)</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIALIST UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Personnel stream (LNP)</td>
<td>19, 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENTS IN COURSES SPECIFICALLY COVERING MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88, 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University 2nd year (LUT2)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University 4th year (LUT4)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield University (SU)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Polytechnic (LNUG)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Polytechnic (LEIC)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Polytechnic (TREN)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENTS IN GENERAL MANAGEMENT COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The abbreviations are used in later tables to conserve space
Twice as many were in non-specialist than specialist Human Resource courses; one would expect the specialist students to have a much better knowledge of the field and concepts than the generalist students.

The questionnaire contained potentially 21 pages of reading for the subject, but it was assumed that most students would not read much more than 11 to 13 pages - this proved to be the case. Part A, sheet 1, identified the classification of subject and the terms he thought he knew. Part B set out eight terms which were frequently mentioned in Personnel and Management writings in technical and general journals in the United Kingdom - industrial democracy, worker control, employee participation, work restructuring, quality of working life movement, socio-technical systems, job enrichment and job enlargement.

Each sheet asked a series of questions; the first checked whether the respondent really knew of the concept by asking him to describe the term. The student then gave information on how he became aware of the term, whether the person who informed him of the idea favoured it or not, whether he in turn had mentioned the particular concept to others and in what circumstances, and finally, whether he had argued for practical application of the term in a particular setting.

Part C then asked a series of questions which the special products workers had answered - the industrial relations situation in Britain in 1975, the causes of the situation, sources for the opinions, whether workers should be able to participate in company decision-making, would workers wish to participate, how should workers participate in the organization of their workplace, and how should workers affect managerial decisions?

For a copy of the covering letter sent to the tertiary institutions see Appendix 11. Appendix 12 sets out the results for each of the questions on a copy of the questionnaire.
RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

PART A. Three of the eight concepts were known by a majority of the sample; employee participation (79%), job enrichment (87%), job enlargement (71%), only 30% knew of industrial democracy, 23% worker control, 21% work restructuring, 49% socio-technical systems and 10% quality of working life movement. See Table 6.2.

As predicted, the students from the Human Resources courses scored a significantly higher result ($p < .001$) than the generalist undergraduate courses; only one course, Aston, knew of all the concepts. See Table 6.3.

PART B. KNOWLEDGE OF TERMS. This part of the questionnaire was designed to study the diffusion of the particular concept which the respondent had claimed to know in Section A. Initially the student was asked how the term had been described (Q3) - positively, neutral, or negatively. The respondent was asked to write a brief description of the term as it was described in the course (Q4). The responses were then classified to see whether the students could accurately recall the concept. The researcher judged each answer to see if it gave an indication of knowledge of the term, such as key words, important writers in the field, and famous experiments. The respondents were given the benefit of the doubt when the reply was difficult to judge. The most common error was to confuse job enrichment with job enlargement.

The students were asked if they had mentioned the particular concept (Q5), where (Q6), how they had described the concept (Q7) and how the idea was received by the audience (Q8). Next, they were asked whether
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Institution</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ASTON</th>
<th>WARRICK</th>
<th>BRM</th>
<th>LAN POLY*</th>
<th>LAN PER**</th>
<th>LUT Y2</th>
<th>LUT Y4</th>
<th>SHEFF</th>
<th>LAN POLY***</th>
<th>LEIC POLY</th>
<th>TRENT POLY</th>
<th>NO. OF INSTITUTION KNEW TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ko. of replies</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Democracy</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Control</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Partic.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Restruct.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Tech. Systems</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enlargement</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lanchester Polytechnic Postgraduate Course
** Lanchester Polytechnic Undergraduate Personnel Course
*** Lanchester Polytechnic Undergraduate Course
Table 6.3

COMPARISON OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TERMS BETWEEN STUDENTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES ORIENTATED COURSES AND THOSE IN GENERAL MANAGEMENT COURSES

(a) Knew of the Term*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>General Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston University</td>
<td>8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Polytechnic P/G.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough 2nd Year</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough 4th Year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Polytechnic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Polytechnic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Polytechnic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 14.882 \text{ with 1 d.f.} \text{ i.e. } p < .0001 \]

(b) Knew of 4 Terms or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>General Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanchester Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 11.932 \text{ with 1 d.f.} \text{ i.e. } p < .0001 \]

* More than half the respondents in a course knew of the term.
** 8 was the maximum score.
they had taken any action to implement or argue for the concept (Q9) where (Q10), and what was the result of their action (Q11).

As expected the postgraduate and specialist students possessed a better understanding of the terms and were the people who argued for particular ideas within the work settings. Their attendance at the sampled courses increased the possibility of those who worked with the subjects learning of the ideas. The full time undergraduate students did not know of any controversial concepts, and they mainly told their student friends and families of the new ideas to which they were exposed, i.e. employer participation, job enlargement and job enrichment.

Unfortunately, knowing the name of a term did not mean knowing what it meant. Except for industrial democracy, industrial participation and job enrichment, nearly half of the subjects did not know what the particular term meant, yet some of those subjects still claimed to tell of it and argue for its implementation. Except for job enlargement and job enrichment they claimed their proposals were rejected; in these two instances their interpretations were accepted as readily as those who accurately reported the particular concept.

The way in which this factor affected the spread of the two terms cannot be deduced from the survey evidence.

PART C:
STUDENT ATTITUDES TO INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN BRITAIN

When asked how they viewed the industrial relations position in
Britain, the majority of students rated the situation as "poor". Their perception was significantly poorer (p < .0001) than that of the special products sample's reply of "average" (see Table 6.4). The two samples also varied significantly (p < .01) on the reasons for the industrial position (see Table 6.5). The students believed the majority of the strife was due to the normal give and take of collective bargaining; they saw the conflict as "natural" and normal. The answers display a highly pessimistic view of industrial relations in Britain, as the students see "poor" relations as the expected norm. The CUK workers, however, blamed both the company and the unions for the majority of the strife; they relied on examples from their own experience to form their beliefs. The students apportioned the management and workers equal blame for creating industrial tension. The workers mentioned defending their rights as the major way in which management created trouble, yet the students referred to the same type of incident as an example of militant trade unionists attempting to wrest control of the workplace from the management. The students saw the total control over manning levels and the free and unfettered right of the hiring and firing of labour as managerial prerogatives. Any action by the unions to limit these powers was viewed as unreasonable militant trade union interference.

The difference in allocating the blame for industrial disputes may be due, in large measure, to the sources used to collect information on industrial disputes. There were highly significant differences (p < .0001) in sources used by the students and the CUK workers (see Table 6.6). The students' main sources were the mass media; the students relied on newspaper reports, television news, and radio
Table 6.4:

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
POSITION IN BRITAIN IN 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$ of differences is significant at $p < .0001$ - 37.52 with 4 d.f.

Table 6.5

COMPARISON OF REASONS GIVEN FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
POSITION IN BRITAIN IN 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Normal strife</th>
<th>Mgt. caused strife</th>
<th>Union caused strife</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Students</td>
<td>300 (50%)</td>
<td>148 (25%)</td>
<td>152 (25%)</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Products</td>
<td>26 (35%)</td>
<td>31 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$ of differences is significant at $p < .01$ level - 10.274 with 3 d.f.

MANAGEMENT INVOLVED STRIFE
- Tertiary Students: 50% + 25% = 75%
- Special Products: 35% + 41% = 76%

UNION INVOLVED STRIFE
- Tertiary Students: 50% + 25% = 75%
- Special Products: 35% + 24% = 59%
Table 6.6
COMPARISON OF SOURCES USED IN ALLOCATING RESPONSIBILITY FOR INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Tertiary Students</th>
<th>Special Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of citations</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of sample 256 students 47 workers
Sources per person 5.75 2.40

Mass media 72% 37%
Personal 23% 62%

$X^2$ of differences significant at $p < .0001$ level - 96.312 with 5 d.f.
broadcasts, in that order of importance. The other major sources they mentioned were the lecturers in their courses. The workers' main sources were their personal experiences in the work setting, followed by the television news.

Beharrell and Philo argue that the industrial news reports on the mass media are biased against the unions and their members. This issue will be taken up later in Chapter VIII on the mass media, but it is interesting to note that the group who relied on the mass media perceived British industrial relations as significantly poorer than people who worked in one of the most strike-prone industries. One would have thought the opposite would have been the case if the mass media reports were unbiased and accurate.

From the evidence of the 11 samples, there is no strong support for any evidence that a desire for industrial democracy has been generated from within the tertiary field. The students clearly see workers and their representatives interacting with the plant management, but in the present collective bargaining system, not in a new framework where workers would be part of the actual decision-making body, e.g. Board of Directors or Production Planning Committee. Participation by workers, to most tertiary students, still means consultation and protests when the workers disagree with a managerial decision. The specialist and postgraduate students do know of the movement, and appear to be sympathetic to the principles. This would help the implementation of ideas in the company in which the postgraduate student is already employed, but it would not necessarily mean that other managers within the same plants would know of, or accept, the transfer of real power to
the workers in the running of the organization.

Another interpretation of the results is that students in 'people orientated' management courses are more aware of the industrial democracy/participation movement because of the Social Science input into their courses which those in the 'general' management courses have not received.

This interpretation would be consistent with the potential Social Science student results at Loughborough University mentioned in Chapter V; students with an interest in the Social Sciences seek out information before entering their chosen course where they are given more details about concepts such as participation.

The studies so far have investigated what knowledge and belief workers and their children have about work and industrial democracy and what potential managers know about the concept. The next chapter, chapter VII, deals with five pressure groups in which the members are managers; it will attempt to compare the awareness of industrial democracy of those in charge of workers with that of the tertiary students covered in the present chapter.
REFERENCES

2. BOYD, D. (1973) Elites and Their Education, Slough, Berks: NFER
3. Ibid, p.35
4. Ibid, p.35
5. Ibid, p.39
6. See for example KELLER, S. (1963) Beyond the Ruling Class, New York: Random House, and
10. LASSWELL, H.D. et al. (1952) op.cit.
12. DAHRENDORF, R. (1968) op.cit.
25. SOREL, G. (1903) quoted by BOYD, D., *op.cit.* p.27.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid. p. 270
40. Information supplied by the Industrial Relations Section of the Conservative Party in an interview on 11th March 1975.


42. Ibid. p 200

43. Ibid. p 253

PART 3: RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH STUDIES

Chapter VII

ASSOCIATIONS AND PRESSURE GROUPS

CBI - WEST MIDLANDS SURVEY

- RESULTS

THE FABIAN SURVEY

- RESULTS

COMPARISON OF THE CBI AND FABIAN SURVEY RESULTS

BUSINESS GRADUATES ASSOCIATION

ENGINEERING EMPLOYERS FEDERATION

COVENTRY INDUSTRIAL MISSION

CONCLUSION
Within any society there are numerous groups formed to proselytize a particular set of beliefs, and to pressure the decision makers of the society to give their values official standing within the community. The groups may be professional associations set up with full-time executive staff, or groups of interested people who meet on an ad hoc basis to guard against certain dangers.

If there was a demand within the community for industrial democracy, then one would expect that certain groups would be in the forefront of the movement to gain legal recognition of the transfer of real power to the workers. The purpose of this chapter is to ascertain if certain of the more likely groups were aware of and were arguing for or against the principle, and how successful they were at the time of the study.
CBI - WEST MIDLANDS SURVEY

During 1974-1975 the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) was seen by the public as the organization representing the interests of the employers in Britain. The Confederation was set up by a large body of employers who pay a membership fee to finance a central office in Westminster with specialist staff to assist the leaders of the Confederation when speaking to the Government of the day, the TUC, the mass media, and to give evidence to public enquiries, Royal Commissions, etc.

Organizationally, the CBI is broken up into regions, each run by a Director and regional staff; West Midlands is the biggest and most important region of the organization, with over half the total engineering industries inside its boundaries.

One of the industries concentrated in the West Midlands is the car manufacturing industry; most of the CUK plants are in this region. In 1974 the CBI published a pamphlet, "Employee Participation", which rejected the concept of industrial democracy, but supported the idea of greater worker consultation by the management. As each member of the Confederation had received a copy of the pamphlet, the researcher decided to study the impact of the document in the West Midlands region. After initial discussions with the Regional Director, it was agreed that a joint project be run. The CBI would select the sample, write to each selected member and process the data, while the researcher was to provide the questionnaire (see Appendix 13), interpret the results and write a report which both parties would release simultaneously.
The Confederation selected the sample of 200 members and prepared the envelopes, but withdrew from the joint project after a regular monthly meeting of members protested at the ever increasing governmental requests for data and their continual 'pestering' by academic researchers for information. The researcher continued with the study as planned.

Eighty-seven (43.5%) of the sample of 200 returned a completed questionnaire. This return rate was very satisfactory in the light of the feelings expressed at the regional meeting and without a covering letter from the CBI.

The problem of a biased sample was not considered important, as the members returning the completed questionnaire were likely to be those who were most interested in the issue raised by the pamphlet. The returned responses reflected the effect of the pamphlet on the more interested and active managers in the major British engineering region, where the great majority of Chrysler vehicles are manufactured and assembled.

RESULTS

For full details of the results of the CBI survey see Appendix 14.

Overall, the document appeared to have little impact. Over half the sample were not interested enough to read about the concept. Of the remainder who did read it, 29 of the 41 mentioned the document but only 10 of the 29 (or 10 of 87) spoke positively about the idea after reading the pamphlet. The lack of impact can be illustrated another
way; 12 people argued publicly for "Employee Participation" before the document was received, yet only 10 argued publicly for the idea after the receipt of the pamphlet.

The pamphlet "Employee Participation" appears to have had very little impact on the management 'opinion leaders' in the engineering concerns in the West Midlands region of England.
THE FABIAN SURVEY

At each of the 1974 and 1975 Trade Union Congresses and Labour Party Conferences industrial democracy was mentioned, and was supported by a motion at each conference. Industrial democracy appeared to be an important part of the Labour Movement's plan to change the power structure in British society. To gauge the depth of support and possible basis for the interest in the concept within the Labour movement, the researcher decided to study the Fabian Society.

The Fabian Society began in the 1880s and has traditionally drawn its membership from middle-class reformers and intellectuals. The Society has always argued that representative democracy has made it easier to win important social reforms. Originally the Society did not support any of the major parties. It argued that members should join one of the political parties and support all attempts at worthwhile reforms. The Fabians' ideal society was one in which the worst features of capitalism were abolished by government decree, but there was still room for private ownership of the means of production. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, G.D.H. Cole, George Bernard Shaw and H.G. Wells were early leaders of the Society.

After the formation of the Labour Party, the Fabian Society became more and more associated with the Labour Movement until eventually it became identified as the intellectual catalyst of the British Labour Party. Aspiring politicians found the Society and Presidency of the

*Named after the Roman General, Fabius Cunctator, 'the delayer' who exhausted Hannibal's army by fighting small skirmishes and avoiding large battles.
Society has traditionally been a step in progression to the leadership of the parliamentary Labour Party. Hugh Gaitskell, Harold Wilson, and Tony Benn have all held the office of President.

The Fabians published tracts on worker participation in the 1950s but apparently nothing came of the ideas as no later writer or group referred to the tract in their publications. Then a study group was set up by the Fabian Society to study industrial democracy and its report was published by Radice in 1974 and sent to all members. The purpose of the present study was to check the effect of the Radice report, the belief of the members in the concept, and whether they had argued for the introduction of industrial democracy. In many ways, the survey is similar to the previously reported CBI study.

The researcher approached the Fabian Society who agreed to co-operate. The Society opened its membership lists and provided a covering letter from the Assistant Secretary (see Appendix 16). The agreed sample size was 200 or 1:25 of the membership; the subjects were selected by taking every twenty-fifth person in the records who were then sent the questionnaire (see Appendix 17) which had been previously checked by the Society, the covering letter and a stamped addressed envelope.

Eighty-four or 42% of the sample returned a completed questionnaire. This return rate was satisfactory for the purposes of the survey. As in the case of the CBI study, the people who replied were likely to be the more interested and active members of the Society.
RESULTS

See Appendix 17 for full details of the results of the survey.

"Working Power" appears to have had little impact on the Fabian Society. This result was surprising as diffusion theorists suggest that the educated progressive members of the community form the bulk of the 'opinion leaders' and 'early majority' within society and the Fabian Society sees itself and its members in such a catalyst role. The members were crudely classified into social class by their occupation (Q1) and the pattern supports the Fabian belief on the potential catalyst role - 16 held occupations usually accorded upper social class status, e.g. Surgeon, Medical Specialist, Barrister. Sixty-six were rated middle class, e.g. Teacher, Accountant, Lecturer, and only 2 were rated as lower social or working class, e.g. Machinist and Labourer. This predominantly middle class sample had failed to argue the cause of greater working class involvement in the day to day running of a facet of their society.
COMPARISON OF THE CBI AND FABIAN SURVEY RESULTS

The results are directly comparable as the same basic form was used for both samples. The Fabian research was planned first and the CBI survey followed quite soon after the Fabian survey was completed; the two surveys dealt with the same period in British affairs.

Both surveys had similar total results in Q.2 - other positions held in the community. The Fabian Society recorded 88 positions for 84 subjects and the CBI subjects held 91 positions between their 87 members; however their types of position held were radically different. See Table 7.1 below for details.

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY FABIAN AND CBI MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Party Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fabian sample was significantly more publicly and educationally involved than the CBI group. Also the Fabians were more interested in Local Government affairs. The CBI were significantly more
professionally, leisure and community involved than the Fabians. The message of both groups would reach different people in the community, yet their social standing would be quite similar.

The belief and acceptance of the principle of industrial democracy was significantly different \( (p < .001) \) in both groups. Only 7% of the Fabians did not believe in worker participation in the running of the firm, yet 60% of the CBI members felt negatively towards the concept. The rejection of the concept by the CBI sample was shown in another way – only half of the CBI people remembered receiving their pamphlet, yet it was sent to all members while all the Fabian sample remembered receiving their pamphlet. In both cases half of the members in both samples who remembered receiving their pamphlet actively decided not to read the document as they did not think it was worth the time and effort. Those who read the pamphlets did not find their booklet an improvement on previous works published in the area by their organization. This result must be treated cautiously as over half of the same people in both samples could not recall accurately with what concepts the respective pamphlets dealt.

Both groups claimed to mention their document to others - Fabian 41, CBI 59. The CBI members claimed to mention their pamphlet at work, to their family and relatives, employer organizations and local activities, i.e. in a number of societal settings. The Fabians only mentioned their document at work.

The overall results suggest that while the Fabians may be more politically committed to the concept of the transfer of real power to the workers, they did not tell many others about a pamphlet which
argued the case for the transfer to occur. The CBI members, on the other hand, while the majority did not believe in the concept, did tell a variety of settings about greater worker involvement. In both cases the respective documents appear to have had little influence on the sample and the society around them. Two influential opinion forming groups did not significantly help the spread of the concept of greater worker involvement.

In both cases, the executives of the respective organizations had tried to increase such an awareness in their membership and the world at large.
The following research, unlike the two previous studies (CBI and Fabians) was not carried out in the traditional manner of the social sciences— it reports the events at a meeting at which the researcher was an invited participant/observer. Like Jacobs, the author argues that at times such evidence is legitimate and allowable. Often the participant/observer mode is the only way in which to gather the necessary evidence, and, if treated correctly, the evidence is of equal value to the apparently predictable and controlled evidence in the traditional social science research methodology.

Whyte and cultural anthropologists such as Kluckholm, Paul and Lewis have demonstrated that participant observation can make the traditional research data more meaningful and useful.

Due to the research project with the Fabian Society, the author was invited to attend a talk at the Astoria Hotel in London on the 28th January, 1975, at which the Secretary for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, was the guest speaker. The talk was held under the auspices of the Business Graduates Association and the Young Fabians. The researcher wished to speak to Mr. Benn, so accepted the invitation. The meeting was held in the largest dining-room of the hotel; approximately 70 people attended with equal numbers from each group. Both groups dressed alike, and looked about the same age range, 25-35 years old. The format explained that the speaker would talk for 30 minutes, the President of the Business Graduates Committee would comment on the talk, and then questions would be accepted from the floor of the meeting.
The Secretary for Industry spoke to the proposed legislation on planning agreements between the Government, the particular industry, and the unions involved. He outlined how fuller disclosure would be required from management so that the other two parties could better determine their future plans. The speech was given in a low key manner and all the audience were attentive and quiet.

After the talk the President of the Business Graduate Association rose and attacked the Minister's talk. As an introduction, the President, a Director of a City Merchant Bank, admitted he had read neither the proposed bill nor any press comments on the proposals. He claimed he disliked the idea and so he would not have read the proposed bill if he had time. At the end of the ten minute tirade the President sat down to loud applause from the Business Graduates Association and silence from the Young Fabians.

Then questions began, alternating between the two groups. The questions clearly showed the bias of the groups, the Young Fabians asked questions regarding the advantages to society from the Bill while the Business Graduates challenged various sections of the legislation. The questions continued in this vein for 35 minutes and one could feel a tension growing in the room as the questions continued; it was similar to the lull before a big storm which one knows will happen but not when or with what ferocity.

Then a young Business Graduate spoke. He firstly called Mr. Benn by the title which the Secretary of State had relinquished, Viscount Stansgate. After the laughter from his colleagues had ceased, the young man attacked the Minister for wanting to change the industrial
and social balance of power. He claimed that he and the other graduates had earned the right to control their workplace, including the workers. The young man argued that he decided to continue on to A-levels, the business degree and then the postgraduate qualification. By denying himself a full income for a number of years he had accumulated potential power which he now wanted to use and the Minister threatened to take away. He argued that the world was based on natural selection and he and the others had survived a long and demanding process to become managers - they were the future 'natural' leaders of British industry. Finally, the questioner stated that he would not co-operate with any legislation and would do all in his power to defeat it.

For nearly 30 seconds after the statement there was total silence, then all the audience gave a prolonged clap which lasted for two minutes. The Young Fabians clapped as loudly and vigorously as the Business Graduates.

For the remainder of the session the Speaker became unnecessary; no questions were asked but statements given by both groups why they needed help from the government, not fresh obstacles if they were to lead Britain back to economic prosperity.

After the meeting supper was served and both groups mixed freely with each other while the guest speaker was left alone at the table from where he had spoken. The researcher approached him, introduced himself and arranged a mutually satisfactory time for an interview.

The explanation for the similarity in dress, attitudes and reactions
between the two groups became apparent to the author the next day. While selecting the sample for the survey in the Fabian research, he read the information card on each selected member and discovered that nearly all the Young Fabian members were recruited whilst at University. The background of both groups (Business Graduates Association and the Young Fabians) was the same except one group apparently professed a socialist set of political values by belonging to the Fabian Society.

When this information is considered in the light of the results of the Fabian survey, it is not surprising as it first appeared that the CBI and Fabian survey results should agree on many points - both groups were members of a broad work classification (middle managers in a very broad sense) who saw their future power under threat from the planning agreement and industrial democracy.

The meeting indicated that the young managers would vigorously oppose any attempt to introduce legislation and its successful implementation as it would threaten their self images as managers.
ENGINEERING EMPLOYERS FEDERATION (EEF)

No study was directly carried out on the influence of the Federation in the diffusion of industrial democracy/worker participation, but pieces of data were collected indirectly which present an interesting picture of the conflicts that the concept caused in a particular Association.

As reported in Chapter I, the central office of the Federation was opposed to any concept which diluted the present power position of management and particularly the use of the Federation as an agent of management. Formed in 1896 as a counterweight to the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, the Federation presents the engineering employers' case to the unions and Government and carries out industry-wide bargaining with the unions. Situated across the road from the CBI, the EEF has close contact with the larger body as the CBI's major constituent industry group. Both the CBI and the EEF oppose the movement towards any shift of real power to the workers. For the EEF, the involvement of workers in management has serious ramifications for its continued existence - if the adversary model was replaced with a co-operative one, then the major adversary unit, the EEF, would no longer be necessary.

When the researcher spoke to the industrial relations unit of the Federation, the staff stated that they as a group and individually believed that greater co-operation was necessary if Britain was to recover from its economic malaise; they also recognized that the proposed industrial democracy legislation offered a means to achieve this increased co-operation. However, greater co-operation would
decrease their importance and power within the Federation so they drafted a position paper which attacked the concept as a "Socialist takeover of British Industry" knowing that the bulk of the members would support such a stand. They deliberately chose not to use their 'opinion-leader' status within the Federation to attempt to alter a position which they believed should be changed; their personal considerations were more important to them than the 'good' of the organization and the country.

However, not all the power groupings within the Federation agreed with this position. The engineering employers are concentrated in the Midlands so a regional group, called an Association, exists in Coventry. All the major engineering organizations, including CUK, belong to the Federation and make use of the Coventry office, which is seen by the members in the district as the most effective, efficient and progressive section of the Federation. The Coventry office, for instance, was particularly interested in the effect on British industry of belonging to the EEC. Starting from this base, the Coventry group carried out a survey in 1972 on labour relations and employment conditions throughout the economic community.

The report generated great interest so a follow-up survey was conducted on the handling of industrial relations in plants within the context of the particular European country's labour laws.

During 1973 and 1974 members of the Association visited three or four firms, mainly in the engineering industry, in each member state of the European Community, except for Ireland and Luxembourg. At each firm a comprehensive survey questionnaire was discussed with the
management. In addition, discussions were held with employers' organizations, governmental agencies and others.

The report takes a cautious line on the form of participative machinery which will take place in Britain, but it assumes that greater participation will take place. From this position the Association has encouraged discussions and debates on industrial democracy and the shape the coming legislation should take if management and the firm are to benefit from the changes. This position is opposite to the Federation's stand.

The Federation runs a number of training courses and whenever possible presents arguments to the participants that the industrial democracy movement is dangerous and should be opposed. In local Association courses the participants are told that the movement is inevitable and the changes, then they come, should be consistent with British conditions and not an incompatible system forced on them for the sake of uniformity across the Economic Community. Some managers spoken to during the research had attended courses run by both training groups; all accepted the Coventry Association's view of the future regarding the inevitability of the increase in worker participation in decision-making within the plant.

The Coventry report, "Worker Participation: The European Experience" was easily the best factual report on the area of debate. The report was a major source of factual information and very popular with the industrial leaders in the region and Britain; it was reprinted twice in the first year of its publication. All in all, the Coventry Association appears to have influenced their members' attitudes towards
accepting the inevitability of greater worker involvement while the Federation appears to have had no noticeable impact at all.

THE COVENTRY INDUSTRIAL MISSION

The motivation and Productivity section at C.U.K. had three professional staff with supporting typing assistance when the author began working with the section in 1974; at the end of 1975 there were four staff. Two, Mr. A and Mr. B, of the original staff were graduates with social science degrees, the other, Mr. C., was an ordained Anglican minister.

The minister had retired from parish work because of health problems which affected both him and his wife. He had received permission to work outside the church to recoup his health, and then to decide whether he would return to the role of Anglican priest. Mr. C was given duties by C.U.K. involving welfare matters, and with arranging the researcher's day to day contact with the management and workers in the plants. The author and Mr. C had frequent contact, and often discussed the philosophical and scientific assumptions behind the research programme.

One day Mr. C mentioned that he had been an Industrial Chaplain but did not appear to wish to discuss the matter any further. A month later he
volunteered that he still kept contact with the Coventry Mission and had discussed the present research projects with the Mission staff, and they had suggested that the researcher might contact them. This was done. The Coventry Industrial Mission is administered by a charitable trust which has representatives from the different protestant denominations, management, trade unions and educational authorities within the Coventry area on its governing Council. The trust is charged with improving the co-operation of men of goodwill within industry and with integrating the other church functions with this aim of greater co-operation. The mission is situated in the offices of the Coventry Cathedral and has four Industrial Chaplains. The leader of the Chaplains is a Congregationalist minister who was formerly a tool-maker; the Methodist member was a commercial photographer, one of the two Anglican members had worked as a bank officer and the other as an accountant.

The stated role of the Industrial Chaplain is to:

"encourage and stimulate a greater sensitivity among men and women to the problems of society. To encourage people to be more critical and enquiring, more willing to look at the assumptions upon which the organizations are based, and more ready to meet the changes that have to be made if the needs of a good, fair and just society are to be met" 12.

With this charter the Mission initiated in 1973 a campaign to increase industry's awareness of the concept of Industrial Democracy.

Early in its existence the Mission made contacts with similar bodies in other countries - Germany, France, India, United States, Japan and Norway. The strongest links were made with Germany, with a variety of groups, including training officers in West Berlin and Kiel, trade unionists in Hamburg, and the German Employers' Association in Dusseldorf, Cologne and Westphalia. From visits to the German contacts and
correspondence with Norway, the Coventry Mission became aware of the issue of Industrial Democracy as a major European solution to the problem of encouraging men's potential for good.

When the European thoughts on Industrial Democracy were compared with the Mission's expressed concerns for (i) the right use of human resources in the technological environment, (ii) the satisfaction of people in their work, and (iii) good industrial relations, the Mission decided to adopt the concept of Industrial Democracy as one of its major tasks.

The task was tackled by holding a series of off the job discussion groups about the area. The participants, who came from all parts of industry, were given copies of articles on West Germany and Norway to read. Discussion sessions were then run to see how practical the idea was in the English context and what ethical implications would arise from the application of greater participation by the workers.

The series of discussions led to a day long conference held on Thursday, 23rd November 1973, titled "The Quality of Working Life". The conference was attended by representatives from companies, trade unions, the Coventry staff of the Confederation of British Industry, the churches, Chamber of Trade and Commerce and educationalists. While the copious conference notes cover the field of Quality of Working Life in detail, there is a particular emphasis on greater participation and control by workers at all levels. The opening speech by Mr. Robin Chichester-Clark, the then Conservative Minister of the Department of Employment, relied heavily on Wilson's report. He emphasized consultation and participation as the means to overcome the contempt held for dissatisfying work which had permeated all levels of work in Britain.
Eighteen months later the mission felt that the conference had achieved very little except to generate a course on Industrial Democracy. The chaplains were still committed to the same expressed concerns and continued to stress the need for greater participation by workers at all levels, but felt the malaise in the British economy and industry from 1973 onwards had stopped any interest growing in the concept.

The conference had been an important factor in creating the opportunity for the present reported research.

Representatives from C.U.K. had attended the conference and Mr. C had initially met the C.U.K. staff at the conference. He then went to work at Whitley with a known commitment to greater worker participation in industry. Because of this commitment he was asked to write a report on the concept, and amongst Mr. C's recommendations was one that workers be involved in seeking out the motivation problems within the company. When C.U.K. heard of the study on the effects of automation on workers, at Longbridge in 1974, the company invited the researchers to Coventry and in particular asked Dr. Damm to carry out the survey feedback exercise. This project led to the initial Ryton study.

The Mission's courses in Industrial Democracy had not apparently made any great impact on the subjects seen in the research projects in Coventry, as no worker or school student referred to the Mission as a source of information on Industrial Democracy.
CONCLUSION

The Associations investigated are only a few of the many that exist in the British industrial fabric yet they are important organizations within the Coventry district. For that reason one would expect that any movement towards greater worker participation in decision-making would be reflected in documents and attitudes of their members.

In the first two cases the organization published and circulated a document more supportive of industrial democracy than the previous official position of the Association. Their members, when surveyed, appeared to be more conservative than their association and in many cases did not even read its document.

There is no evidence from any of the groups to suggest a growing groundswell among younger British managers for greater participation by workers in the decision-making processes of the firm.
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CONCLUSION
Any study of the diffusion of a concept which ignored the effect of the mass media would be incomplete. The influence of the media channels has already been mentioned in passing in Chapters IV (in both the Ryton and Special Products surveys) and V (the sixth form students visiting Loughborough University). The present chapter will attempt to measure and examine the media coverage of the concept under investigation during late 1974 and the whole of 1975.

INTRODUCTION

The mass media have only come about as a phenomenon in the past century, and have occurred at the same time as an increase in the scale of social change and technological innovation. The relationship or association between the developing mass media and social change is unknown. Many of the consequences of change which have been attributed to mass communication should often be seen as the effect of a particular change, not its cause. The instrumentalities of mass communication operate in situations already prepared for them rather than they

*Mass media will be used as an interchangeable term for mass communications.

**Mass media comprise the institutions and techniques by which specialized groups employ technological devices—press, radio, films, etc.—to disseminate symbolic content to large, heterogeneous and widely dispersed audiences**.
preparing the situation. It is the consensual basis of society which gives mass communication its effectiveness\(^2\).

Sociological analysis of the mass media has really only been applied in a fragmented and unsystematic way, concentrating on a model of cause and effect without properly attempting to define the features to be measured. Consequently, it is not surprising that many studies claim to measure the same variables yet report opposing results.

The disclaimer on the power of the mass media in the previous paragraphs should not be taken as arguing that the mass media are not a powerful force in the community. The mass media acquire status and authority after a period of time, and gain control over sources of information and public opinion as they can give or withhold prestige and legitimation.

The mass media can bypass the communication channels and authority structures in such spheres as politics and religion by making direct contact with the individuals, but normally the mass media are the agencies for control which reinforce dominant cultural and institutional patterns. McQuail\(^3\) found that the mass media reinforce the dominant social values and sifts out deviant ones. Expressed another way, Chinoy\(^4\) asserts that the mass media give the roles and expectations which children and adults act out.

McQuail\(^5\) postulates seven characteristics of mass communications:

(i) they normally require complex formal organizations for their operation;

(ii) they are directed towards large audiences;
(iii) they are public;
(iv) the audiences of mass communications will be heterogeneous;
(v) the mass media can establish simultaneity of contact with large numbers of people at a distance from the source and widely separated from each other (with a common message which has been selected and interpreted by the communicators);
(vi) in mass communications the relationship between communicator and audience is impersonal - mass media are organized to allow communication flow in only one direction;
(vii) the audience of mass communication is continually shifting, it has no leadership or feeling of identity.

De Fleur argues that taking into account all types of communication medium there has been a steady increase in the amount of time devoted to using mass communications. Belson found in 1959 that the average person in Britain watched 2.5 hours of television a day, and Abrams reported 2.2 hours per weekday was spent watching television. These results are consistent with the Special Products research findings in Chapter IV.

Steiner found that Americans considered 3 or more hours viewing each day was a reasonable amount for an adult. In fact, Wilensky concludes that "television has become central to leisure ...".

It is almost impossible, unless one belongs to one of a few religious sects, to live in modern western society without being exposed at length to the mass media.

Researchers interested in economic development, e.g. rural sociologists,
have long been interested in the mass media, especially television and radio, as the most efficient means of spreading information and diffusing new concepts. Those researchers catalogue the success of the spread of the innovation and assume the same will repeat itself in other circumstances. This is not the case. In agricultural communities in the third world countries the mass media clearly have an important effect, but as the audience becomes more sophisticated in the use of the media and more urbanized, so the case of the mass media messages is increasingly harder to assert and prove empirically. Even in rural communities, if the message is inconsistent with the practices of the community, it is ignored.
INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE MASS MEDIA

The media are usually perceived as neutral, reporting the facts and allowing people to decide the importance of the news item. Many sociologists have argued that the media are rooted in a basic position which conflicts with an idea such as industrial democracy.

The word "mass" is hard to precisely define, but writers such as Kornhauser argue that a mass society is a condition in which democratic institutions are threatened and totalitarianism is incipient. Kornhauser later argues that the use of mass organizations results in "relatively unmediated and depersonalized relationship between the membership and the organization." The majority are ruled by elites, located at a distance, without any possibility of personal interaction. The elite use the mass media to communicate with the majority, who in turn feel discouraged to participate and this increases the possibility of manipulation.

Mills traced a decline in democracy in the United States of America as new centres of economic and political power developed. He contrasts the 'public' of the democratic theory with the emerging mass society of contemporary America, in which individual autonomy has been reduced. Mills clearly allocates some of the responsibility for this movement to the mass media, as it makes it more difficult for the people to participate with the media and to have their messages reported. Without a greater dialogue it is postulated that eventually totalitarianism will succeed.

The image of modern society which emerges from the above description is an accentuation of largely undesirable elements
- insecurity, impersonality, alienation and manipulation - which the mass media help to accentuate and support as they reinforce the isolation of urban living.

The complaints of Mills, Peterson et al. and others above are perhaps too extreme - the mass media are not totally new phenomena, but rather new ways of meeting long-standing societal needs. The mass media are not dispensable appendages of society, but essential means of giving people information, often much more quickly and effectively than before, so making democratic discussion more possible and informed.

If the critics of the mass media are only partly correct, then the concept of industrial democracy will not be reported without bias in the media. Industrial democracy potentially gives people greater control over their own environment and reduces their alienation from society. A consequence is the reduction of the people's reliance on the mass media. This is a factor which will need to be considered in the following research and any inferences drawn from the research.
MEASUREMENT OF MASS MEDIA EFFECTS

Traditionally mass communications have been researched by two approaches:

(i) the counting and description of audiences; and

(ii) measurement of direct effects on those exposed to the communication.

These two approaches account for most of the research effort in the field of mass communications since the 1930s.

'Audience research', as the first approach is frequently described, is mainly descriptive, looking at the audience in its social setting and attempting to map out the salient features of audience behaviour, interests and opinions. This type of research was carried out in the Special Products plant of CUK and reported in Chapter IV.

The second approach, "the effectiveness of the mass media", is far less researched than audience research. This evaluation of effectiveness is much more difficult to plan and test than factual questionnaires and interviews which are used in audience research. The most careful experiments in the second approach have failed to substantiate the wide claims on behalf of the mass media or the fears of the critics of mass communications.¹⁹

These research findings do not show that the mass media have no effect on the community as some writers argue, but rather than on particular issues in certain prescribed circumstances the mass media do not radically change people's beliefs. It must always be remembered that the beliefs were formed in large part by the mass media to begin with.
Another form of media research is content analysis. The work of Head\textsuperscript{20} and Himmelweit et al\textsuperscript{21} shows that television as a medium is highly responsive to conventional, conservative norms. Berelson and Salter\textsuperscript{22} found the same in short stories in mass periodicals. It would appear that the emphasis of dominant values is a response to what the audience is believed to desire.

The research methodology of a 'before and after' survey design concerned with the impact of isolated stimuli as mentioned previously, has been the major approach to understanding how the mass media affect people's behaviour. This approach, it is argued, has been exhausted and a new approach is required. Blumler argues that the predispositions of the would-be-audience determines who is exposed to a communication and how they are influenced - the so-called "uses and gratification" approach to communication research\textsuperscript{23}.

To fully understand the effect of a particular message on one of the mass media, the researcher needs to consider the campaign of messages and their impact on particular personality types in a setting which takes full account of the uncertainty and instability of modern social values. For logistical reasons, such a research programme was not attempted in the later reported studies.

Content analysis is used in this thesis to study newspapers, television and radio programmes on industrial democracy/worker participation in the period of the study. The material is considered to assess the amount and emphasis that occur in the message. As Fearing\textsuperscript{24} points out, the message is not a fixed pattern of meanings and ideas which are received by a passive mind. Rather, the individual takes from the
message what suits his needs, and in a form that suits him.

With all the qualifications and constraints mentioned above, the chapter will now deal with particular pieces of research on the effect of the mass media on the diffusion of the concept under investigation, industrial democracy.
Any study of the diffusion of information through the mass media should, ideally, monitor all sources of information from the time the idea is first disseminated. Obviously this is impossible unless the researcher is the originator of the idea he wishes to study during diffusion, e.g. some rumour research 25.

To attempt to overcome some of the effects of the problem, attempts were made to ascertain the level of diffusion in the mass media before the studies started.

In the newspaper field, the researcher was fortunate to find the resources of the research section of the Industrial Society. This non-profit making organization collects written media reports on a variety of industrial matters including industrial democracy. After discussions with the Society 26, the researcher was allowed to work with the file of newspaper and journal articles categorized as industrial democracy, which included articles on worker participation. Figures before September 1974, unless otherwise stated, are based on the Industrial Society file.

In August 1972 the Aims of Industry commenced a monthly report on the coverage of industrial issues on television and radio. The survey ran until September 1974 when the researcher arrived in England. The Aims of Industry survey 27 aimed to list and comment upon all items - news, discussion and plays - which mentioned or portrayed the world of industry. These reports were used to ascertain the number and frequency of times that industrial democracy and worker participation were mentioned in the electronic media before the present research.
NEWSPAPERS

When the project to investigate the printed media's cover of the concept was planned there was no reported study with which to check the proposed methodology. However, Dr. J.G. Blumler, one of the experts contacted, gave the researcher a copy of a draft article which covered a wide variety of measures including the importance and usage of various types of media. The results were very similar to the Special Products research (chapter IV). For details of the Blumler and Ewbank research findings see Appendix 18.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE PRESS

On the 16th July 1974 a Royal Commission was set up to investigate the factors affecting the independence, diversity and editorial standards of newspapers and periodicals. The third in less than 30 years, the Royal Commission began in September 1974 with terms of reference which included the factors affecting both the economic state of the press and editorial standards. In the debate of the 14th May, when the Prime Minister announced his intention to appoint the third Royal Commission, he alluded to the general belief of the Labour Party and the trade unions that the press was biased against the Labour Movement, and pointed to the February 1974 election as an example.
The Royal Commission decided to compare newspaper content with that done by the 1947-49 Royal Commission on the Press. McQuail was commissioned to carry out the study and special studies of newspaper coverage relating to industrial relations, social welfare and foreign affairs were commissioned. These studies provide an excellent check of the results found in studies carried out in this thesis.

Some major differences in the design should be noted when making comparisons. McQuail sampled the newspapers by examining 24 days in great detail, this researcher logged each and every day; McQuail investigated all national daily newspapers, 17 English, Welsh and Scottish provincial morning newspapers and all Sunday national newspapers for six days in the latter half of 1975, while this researcher kept a log on the major newspapers mentioned in the Special Products survey, i.e. the Daily Telegraph and the Daily Express were not included. Finally, McQuail's case studies do not present a typical sample of reports on industrial democracy in the period. During the time of the study - 15 months - there were only five major stories concerning industrial democracy/worker participation and McQuail's sample includes three of the five:

Case 1  British Leyland Troubles, Tuesday 7th January 1975

Case 5  CUK Industrial Democracy Offer, Friday 9th May 1975

Case 7  Norton-Villiers' Liquidation Decision, Saturday 2nd August
The other major stories occurred on the 7th February, the Industry Bill and the appointment of Lord Ryder, and the 25th April when Lord Ryder presented his report on the future of British Leyland. Consequently, the Sunday newspapers were not sampled when they carried most of their articles concerning the demand for greater worker involvement in the management of British Leyland.

WITTINGSLOW RESEARCH

The newspapers reviewed in the 15th month study were:

**Daily Newspapers**
- The Guardian
- The Daily Mirror
- The Times
- The Sun
- The Financial Times

**Sunday Newspapers**
- The Observer
- The Sunday Times
- News of the World
- People

The classification criterion was that the item mentioned one of the terms, industrial democracy, worker control, worker or employee participation, or described some form of worker involvement in the running of the organization, e.g. The Observer on the 2nd February discussed the proposed Industry Bill in five different articles yet never once mentioned employee or worker participation by name; each alluded to 'worker interference' in the management of British Industry.

Originally, it was planned to search only the news items, but the whole of the newspaper was eventually checked in case mention was made of the term in some other content, e.g. advertisements. In retrospect the decision was proven to be prudent as during March and April 1975 the British Channel Ship Repairers ran a series of advertisements in the press protesting against the proposed nationalization of the ship building
industry, pointing out that their company already had worker directors and participation at all levels and that the company was successful—the advertisements stressed the company's commitment to industrial democracy.

Each item mentioned in the research was measured for total size and recorded in standard column centimetres, i.e. the column length multiplied by the number of columns. The columns vary in size between newspapers and between pages, in the case of The Times. To allow direct comparison between the newspapers, the researcher used the measure designed by McQuail—adjusted standard column centimetres. This measure is made by converting all columns to 5 centimetres and then measuring the area of the article, e.g. a column 10 centimetres wide and 10 centimetres long would be recorded as 20 adjusted standard column centimetres. This is the 'area measure' in Table 8.2.

The Industrial Society file of industrial democracy articles was used as the pre-study statement of the frequency of items on industrial democracy in the British press. The file revealed there was very little written regarding the concept before December 1974, when the magnitude of scale of the British Leyland problems became clear. The only daily national newspaper to write a series of articles on industrial democracy or worker participation was The Daily Mirror, which supported the concept. The other items mentioned such topics as worker directors in British Steel and worker directors in the German steel industry. In all, there were only 10 references in the Industrial Society file in the period between 1971 and 1974.
The results of the analysis carried out in the study are listed in Tables 8.1 and 8.2.

### Table 8.1

**ANALYSIS OF NEWSPAPER CONTENT WHICH DISCUSSED INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 1ST 1974 AND DECEMBER 31ST 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Total No. of Mentions</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunday Times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News of the World</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2

**TOTAL AREA, IN ADJUSTED STANDARD COLUMN CENTIMETRES, OF THE CONTENT ON INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN THE NEWSPAPERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News of the World</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economist</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,670</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This area is equivalent to 80 pages in a newspaper the size of The Guardian.*
Nearly half (45%) of the mentions of industrial democracy/worker participation occurred in one daily national newspaper, The Guardian, and the same newspaper provided over 80% of all positive articles regarding the concept. The Guardian became so interested that on Friday 13th June 1975 the newspaper created a new section in The Business Guardian called "Participation" which provided a weekly quarter page article. In the initial half page column, two articles argued the case for and against participation. The Guardian number of items and adjusted standard column centimetre total was greatly increased by the British Channel Ship Repairers advertisements; four full page advertisements and a series of smaller ones were placed in the newspaper.

The next highest score was recorded by The Observer with 18% of the mentions. This paper was strongly opposed on the ground that it interfered with management's doing its appointed job. Guest writers such as Heller wrote highly scathing articles on the ability of the workers to participate. The Sunday newspaper felt the government "interference" destroyed the effectiveness of competition which eliminated the weaker, less efficient firms - for this reason there was a spate of articles and editorials regarding Meriden, British Leyland and CUK. The newspaper also contained two full page advertisements for the British Channel Ship Repairers. The Observer was the only newspaper to write of a possible backlash against participation. In a full page article entitled "The Angry Middle-Class", it was mentioned that the middle classes were fed up with being overtaxed and at the same time having their power and influence reduced - the writer predicted a reaction against the government and the unions.
While The Observer opposed the concept of industrial democracy/worker participation, it was not the strongest opponent of the concept. This was the next most frequent source of newspaper items, The Sunday Times. The Sunday Times wrote four editorials directly attacking the concept of industrial democracy, and all articles carried emotionally worded headlines, e.g. Seven Stages of Paranoia. Rather than an increase in worker participation, this Sunday newspaper argued for an enforced reduction in the powers of unions in general and shop stewards in particular.

The only other newspaper to gain 10% of the mentions was The Financial Times. This paper also opposed the concept, and on three separate occasions invited the CBI to publicly present their opposition to industrial democracy through an invited article.

The proportion of positive or 'favourable' to negative or 'unfavourable' comments on industrial democracy in the survey (51:93) is almost identical to the proportion of 'favourable' to 'unfavourable' comments made on the broader classification of industrial relations in the Royal Commission study (85:146), i.e. 35:65 to 38:62 (per cent). These results would suggest that the percentages are generally consistent for topics in the industrial relations field.

Unlike McQuail's study, there is a more marked difference in attitudes for and against the concept under investigation. In Table C3 there is no daily national newspaper which runs at a greater ratio than 3:1 'unfavourable' to 'favourable' articles on industrial relations matters, yet two daily national newspapers and two Sunday national newspapers scored a proportion of 13:1 or greater in favour of 'unfavourable' on
the matter of industrial democracy. See Table 8.3 for details.

Table 8.3

COMPARISON OF McQUAIL'S STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY REGARDING THE FREQUENCY OF POINTS JUDGED LESS OR MORE FAVOURABLE TO THE UNION POSITION

| NEWSPAPER       | McQUAIL "Unfavour-able" | McQUAIL "Favourable" | WITTINGSLOW "Unfavour-able" | WITTINGSLOW "Favourable"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NC*</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NC*</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Times</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91**</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not collected by the particular survey

** "News of the World" and "Punch" not included as each scored only one response - in both cases 'unfavourable'.

The Royal Commission study outlined the major topics of industrial relations items by percentage distribution in the daily national newspapers in Table 8851. Topic 9 was: "Worker Control, Participation, Profit-Sharing and Work-Ins". The percentages varied between 1% and 4% of the industrial relations items in the daily newspapers. The actual numbers of reports on industrial democracy are listed below in Table 8.4.
Table 8.4

COMPARISON OF McQUAIL'S STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY
REGARDING THE FREQUENCY OF ITEMS MENTIONING INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
OR PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>McQuail</th>
<th>Witteringslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Times</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>NC*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>NC*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not collected by the particular survey

**The total was 167 - three single scoring press sources were not included.

There is no analysis of the items in the McQuail study as to whether the participation items were 'favourable' or 'unfavourable'. For this reason, the author was forced to use the results of Table 8.4 to compare the attitudes of the items in both studies.

The comparison of the results in Table 8.4 shows the great influence of The Guardian results; without them the percentages in the two studies would have been significantly different. When considering the Witteringslow study it is clear that the newspapers, in the main, were increasingly 'unfavourable' in tone and comment regarding industrial
democracy/worker participation. All editorial comment was 'unfavourable' and four newspapers presented only negative arguments regarding worker involvement in the management of organizations. These results are consistent with the dispute during 1975 between the editors and the printing and journalist unions regarding industrial democracy within the press. The Royal Commission refers to the dispute in Chapter 21 of the Final Report and the request of the senior management of the newspapers that the press be exempted from the Industrial Democracy Act. Chapter IX deals with the political system and how industrial democracy has fared within government circles. One point made in Chapter IX is the opposition of the Secretary of State for Employment, Mr. H. Foot, to the idea, yet his department was charged by the Labour Party to introduce it. Mr. Foot did not make one publicly reported statement on the issue for the duration of the study. Chapter IX also points out that the Secretary for State for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, was the main supporter of industrial democracy; this is supported by the content analysis, as the Secretary provides the basis of most comments on industrial democracy by his actions, e.g. introducing the Industry Bill, or by speaking publicly in favour.

In Chapter IV The Ryton and Special Products CUK workers stated that they believed that their industry and plants were unfairly emphasized in the press coverage of industrial disputes. Table B16 of McQuail's study confirms this. Although the industrial classification of "vehicles" is much wider than motor vehicles, it contains only 3% of the total workforce and has 9% of the reported strikes; 29% of all strikes reported in the daily newspapers are concerned with the "vehicle" industry, and 15% of all industrial relations reports are concerned with the industry.
Overall, the content analysis, both by McQuail and the author, indicate that the press comment was generally opposed to industrial democracy in particular, and trade unions generally. As a consequence, one would not expect the newspapers to greatly assist the positive diffusion of the concept within Britain unless they thought industrial democracy would weaken the power of the trade unions. The studies confirm beliefs held about the press in Chapter IV, and support interview statements reported in Chapter X.
TELEVISION AND RADIO

INTRODUCTION

Many unionists, cf. the Special Products survey, like the rest of the community, believe that television is unbiased in its reporting of the news, while the press is perceived to be anti-union in emphasis. Since 1970 there has been increasing disquiet among some unions and academics at the treatment of unions and unionists in television programmes, which eventually culminated in the public funding of the Glasgow University Media Group's research reported in their book, Bad News. 57

ACTT STUDY

The first doubts arose in late 1970 at the television treatment of the Power Workers dispute. The union responsible for taking the television film - the Association of Cinemagraphic, Television and Allied Technicians (ACTT) - established a Television Commission 58 to ascertain if the BBC and the Independent Television Network were impartial as required by regulation, and Act, respectively. The study copied all news reports for one week (8th to 14th January 1971) and analysed the film on three criteria - neutral language, balance of views and balance of story elements 59.

The report concludes that:

"industrial affairs are covered in a superficial and haphazard fashion; that the BBC in particular scandalously failed to maintain impartiality in dealing with three issues during the week monitored; that ITV shows conscientious efforts to achieve impartiality." 60
As a result, the union asked their investigator to recommend how the ACTT members could reduce the bias in television reports. Christine Helier recommended that the union representatives be filmed and interviewed in the same manner as management spokesmen. This was done, and no longer are Senior Shop Stewards filmed in front of a mob of men and with the camera aimed up to the Stewards’ faces, but as talking "heads" on their own.

MORLEY STUDY

Morley replicated the ACTT study in early 1973 using more sophisticated language measurements to ascertain if television presented any particular ideology in the reports. In his very detailed report, Morley points to numerous examples where:

(i) civil service unions are portrayed as irresponsible and not exhibiting "commonsense";
(ii) damaging the national interest;
(iii) ignoring the needs of the public;
(iv) easily led by a militant minority;
(v) ignoring their moral responsibilities;
(vi) seeking to settle disputes by power and not by argument.

Morley concluded that the television medium was as biased in 1973 as Heller had found in 1971.

Another group to survey the television media for bias was the Aims of Industry, who argued that their findings were the opposite to those of Morley and Heller. In monthly reports the organization presented their comments on every television and radio programme which mentioned the industrial world.
GLASGOW UNIVERSITY MEDIA STUDY

The most detailed and extensive study of bias in television is the recent Glasgow University Media study\textsuperscript{70}. The research sponsored by the Social Science Research Council\textsuperscript{71} attempted to ascertain the effect of the production process and attitudes of the media staff on the message which they spread to the community. The value of this kind of research is that it allows social scientists to better understand the effect of the selection of items for coverage. McLachlan\textsuperscript{72} noted over twenty years ago that:

"in the selection of news every trait in the character of the newspaper office has its influence: tradition, political tendency, emphasis given to home or foreign news, standards of taste and judgement, readers' preferences, proprietors' preferences and so on. These traits often influence without individuals being conscious of them. They are part of the office's pattern of behaviour".

With the Charter of the Independent Television Authority and the rules of the BBC, the media have always claimed that news presentations on television are 'objective', a mirror of reality outside, that they are merely neutral channels for presenting 'the facts'. The Glasgow Media Group, however, reported that they found the phenomena mentioned by McLachlan within the television industry, and they concluded that the news services were biased.

The Media Group findings indicate that bias is almost unconscious and unintentional as much of it is the result of the process of selection which is so speedy and habitual as to almost seem instinctive. There is too much information, so there have to be filters or devices to select what should be shown, in what order, at what length and with what stresses.
'The news' selects itself by four main filtering processes. First, by the constraints of available time, resources, or ease. Second, 'the news' is decided by a tradition of 'news values' of the more popular sector of the printed press. Third, items which are recognized as good usually are presented ahead of those which are not. The fourth and most important filter is the culture in which people live; it is the ideological atmosphere of the society, the norms which allow certain items to be mentioned in the broadcasts while excluding others; the pressure towards implicitly affirming what the staff believe to be the status quo.

By simultaneous application of all four filters, the Glasgow Group found that television staff believed they provided what they called "the objective news", and most people appeared to believe the claim. In reality, 'the news' was found to be a heavily selected interpretation of events.

ELECTRONIC MEDIA COVERAGE OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1974

As previously mentioned, the Aims of Industry produced a monthly survey that noted every television and radio programme which mentioned industry. If one applies the same criteria as used for the newspapers 12 programmes in the 24 months directly referred to the concept under investigation. The programmes and their details are listed below in Table 8.5.

The number of programmes mentioning industrial democracy or participation fell consistently over the period of the Aims of Industry surveys. There
Table 8.5

PROGRAMMES LISTED BY THE AIMS OF INDUSTRY WHICH DISCUSSED INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY OR WORKER PARTICIPATION ON THE ELECTRONIC MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Title and/or Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Aug. 1972</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Radio 4</td>
<td>&quot;Sit In&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oct. 1972</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Radio 4</td>
<td>&quot;It's Your Line&quot; with A. Wedgewood Benn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov. 1972</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Radio 4</td>
<td>&quot;You and Yours&quot; with Dr. J. Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan. 1973</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>&quot;Today&quot;, Daily of the NUM on Worker Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 1973</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>&quot;Panorama&quot; on Worker Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sept. 1973</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Radio 4</td>
<td>&quot;Participation - Mirage or Panacea?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oct. 1973</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>&quot;Midweek&quot;, Nationalization and Worker Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March 1974</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>BBC 2</td>
<td>&quot;Man Alive, For the Love of Triumph&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 1974</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>&quot;People and Politics&quot; on Worker Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 1974</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>BBC 2</td>
<td>&quot;Horizon - Who Needs Skills?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As well there were two religious programmes on ITV - 19 December 1972 and 13 May 1973 - which argued that Christianity meant greater participation and democracy in all facets of life. Neither programme actually applied the principle to work when discussing examples.*
were four in the last five months of 1972, five in 1973, and only three in the first nine months of 1974. The great interest noted in industrial democracy occurred just before and after Britain joined the European Economic Community. Possible reasons for this are put forward in Chapter X, where the European Economic Community and its effects on the spread of industrial democracy in Britain are considered.

WITTINGSLOW TELEVISION RESEARCH

The coverage of radio programmes originally planned was ruled out by the great amount of travelling involved in the research projects. The researcher did initially search the radio programmes, and recorded the first few, but none of the programmes turned out, when examined, to be relevant; then, twice in succession, radio programmes were accidently heard which were relevant. In both instances the researcher wrote unsuccessfully to the BBC for a transcript or tape of the programme.

The television media offered no such problems. Once the researcher decided not to record "news" programmes but concentrate on current affairs programmes, it was easy to set up the recording facilities. Each week's potentially relevant programmes were noted, and videotapes of the programmes were made in the Social Sciences Department at Loughborough University. These tapes were then independently content analysed by the author and another person, a Senior Lecturer in Journalism and Mass Media, on the three criteria used on the ACTT study, neutral language, balance of views and story elements. The criteria were used as they appeared to be relevant measures, the ACTT
report\textsuperscript{74} presented very good examples, and one did not need a high level of linguistics to use the measures. Heller\textsuperscript{75} gave the researcher a copy of her measurement instructions, and this, plus the examples, were used as the standard when the tapes were analysed in the Witting-slow study.

The length of each programme was measured by the running time of the video-tape and all measurements, e.g. times for the measurement of the story elements, speakers and film clips were made from the tapes. The neutral language and balance of views criteria were measured by recording the speaking times of each person, the sequence of speakers, and whether or not the language was neutral. The evaluation of the programmes listed when the bias took place, i.e. time on the video-tape, and the words or images used to slant the information, and the length of biased information.

Except for a few minor differences on the neutral language measurements, the independently assessed ratings were identical.

During the time of the study there were only five relevant programmes, three 'Panorama' programmes on BBC 1, a long special programme on industrial democracy called 'The Right to Manage' on BBC 2, and a religious programme on ITV named 'Your Point of View'. In all the BBC instances, the assembly of the programme and the emotive language were clearly anti-trade union in emphasis. The sole ITV programme presented a balanced view.

Table 8.6 below sets out the details.
Table 8.6

TELEVISION PROGRAMMES WHICH DEALT WITH INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 1974 and DECEMBER 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Name of Programme</th>
<th>Running Time (Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb. 1975</td>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>&quot;Panorama&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 1975</td>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>&quot;Your Point of View&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sept. 1975</td>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>&quot;Panorama&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept. 1975</td>
<td>BBC 2</td>
<td>&quot;The Right to Manage&quot;</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov. 1975</td>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>&quot;Panorama&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL TIME</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of the particular programmes listed above see Appendix 19.

RESULTS OF THE TELEVISION INVESTIGATIONS

The results of the research on the BBC programmes are consistent with the findings of Morley, Heller, and the Glasgow University Media Group. The BBC presentation, allocation of time for discussion, questioning and the film cutting was anti-trade union in effect. The traditional values and practices of business were rarely attacked yet the "radical" nature of industrial democracy was continually challenged in tone, language, usage and manner. Dimbleby was so blatantly anti-participation on the 9th September 1975 that parties from both sides commented on the bias in the next programme, "The Right to Manage", on the 12th September 1975. The strongest critic of Dimbleby was Sir Ralph Bateman, Chairman of the CBI.

The three BBC 1 "Panorama" programmes were basically anti-worker participation in emphasis. The BBC 2 programme, "The Right to Manage", was
biased with the presentation at the beginning of the session of the film clip of the Socialist Convenor. However, after the film clip the rest of the programme was even handed. The chief presenter, Robert McKenzie, expressed the desire to find the greatest amount of common ground. Both parties co-operated. There was little difference in the positions on industrial democracy except that the CBI wished participation to move more slowly and not by law and some managers believed consultation was full participation. Depending on the influence of the first third of the programme, "The Right to Manage", would have positively increased the awareness and feelings towards industrial democracy.

The only ITV programme was a religious one. The predominant theme was that industrial democracy was consistent with practising Christianity and increased productivity. The evidence suggests that the effect on a neutral observer would have been to create, or increase, a positive feeling towards greater worker participation.
CONCLUSION

Generally, the mass media neither supported nor propagated the message of industrial democracy/worker participation; the only exception was The Guardian. The Industry Bill and worker involvement in the management decision making process were reported as radical moves, and as having potentially bad effects on British industry.

It is clear that there was little reporting of the concept before, or during, the time of these investigations. For example, the McQuail study of content in the British press 79 occurred when three of the five stories on industrial democracy were reported, yet category 9 of industrial relations reporting, "Worker Control, Participation ..." 80, constituted only 2% or 31 of the 1,557 stories on industrial matters. Industrial relations occupied on average 4-5% 81 of the daily national newspapers, i.e. only .08% of the newspaper content dealt with the concept.

There were only five television programmes concerned, even partially, with the topic, and only one specific programme on the area in 15 months. The general theme of the television reporting was to denigrate the concept.

Thus, before or during the study the mass media created no groundswell of opinion to argue for the implementation of industrial democracy.

The results support the arguments of sociologists such as Mills 82 and Peterson et al 83 that the mass media are not neutral to any concept of greater participation within the community, either because such a
movement would reduce the power of the media\textsuperscript{84}, or because such ideas clash with the dominant social values of 1974 and 1975\textsuperscript{85}.

Diffusion models recognize that while the spreading of an idea requires increasingly larger numbers to become aware of the issue, at certain times diffusion is dependent on the behaviour of a small group of people. From Chapter IV until Chapter VII the research has reported on samples taken from large groups, but has not attempted to investigate whether certain individuals have been instrumental in the spreading of the idea.

In the integrated diffusion model (Figure 2.8), the political system is seen as an important potential positive or negative force on the diffusion process. Chapter IX will report on interviews with critical people in the political system, e.g. Secretary of State for Employment, and their effect on spreading of knowledge and interest in industrial democracy.
REFERENCES


19. For example:


26. Assistance and permission was given by Ms. P. George, Research Officer of the Industrial Society.


30. Ibid, p.2

31. Hansard (H.C.), vol. 873, cols. 1118-1240, 14th May 1974


33. Ibid. p.3

34. Ibid. p.155

35. Ibid. p.184

36. Ibid. p.196


41. The Observer, 2nd February 1979, p.11

42. The Observer, 19th January 1975, p.4

43. The Observer, 2nd February 1975

44. The Observer, 14th December 1975, p.15

45. The Observer, 2nd March 1975

46. The Sunday Times, 22nd December 1974

47. For example see The Financial Times, 1st February 1975, p.1

48. McQUAIL (1977), op.cit. p.213

49. Ibid. p.213

50. Ibid. p.213

51. Ibid. p.116


55. Ibid, appendix B5, p.334
56. Ibid, p. 134


60. Ibid, p. 1.


63. Ibid. p.5

64. Ibid. p.5.

65. Ibid. p.6.

66. Ibid. p.7.

67. Ibid. p.8.

68. Ibid. p.9.

69. AIMS OF INDUSTRY, op.cit.

70. BEHARREL, P. et.al. (1976), op.cit.

71. Ibid. p. xv.


73. See reference 58.

74. Ibid.

75. See reference 61.


77. See references 58 and 61.

78. BEHARRELL, P. et al. (1976), op.cit.


80. Ibid, p.112

81. Ibid, p. 24
82. MILLS, C.W. (1956), op.cit.
83. PETERSON, T. et al. (1965), op.cit.
84. KORNHAUSER, W. (1968), op. cit.
PART 3: RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH STUDIES

Chapter IX

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERSEAS POLITICAL INFLUENCES</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE EUROPEAN COMPANY STATUTE AND THE FIFTH DIRECTIVE</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapters IX and X will report interviews with certain individuals who in 1974-1975 occupied gatekeeper positions in the dissemination of Industrial democracy.

The intended methodology was to prepare a detailed interview schedule, ask the questions in sequence and record the replies. Tape recording the interviews was considered but rejected as it was felt that the machine could seriously inhibit the flow of answers. The first interview was run as planned and was a failure - see the next section for the description of the interview with the Secretary for State for Employment, Mr. M. Foot. After this interview the format of later interviews was changed to one more like the interviews reported in chapter IV, the CUK Plant Studies. In the later interviews initially the researcher explained who he was, what he was investigating, and asked if he could make brief notes while the interview was in progress. He answered any questions the interviewee might have and then asked "Do you (the interviewee) see a movement towards industrial democracy?" The answer to this closed question was then followed up with a series of open questions, e.g. what form of participation? why? how soon?; the researcher used the counselling skills mentioned by Ivey. The researcher noted key phrases and points as the interviewee spoke. After the first question the only time the researcher asked a direct question was when the interviewee apparently contradicted himself, or made a comment which was at odds with previously researched evidence. These interruptions to the flow of the interview were rare. Immediately after the interview the researcher wrote a detailed report of the
Interview using the list of key points and phrases as a form of summary.

Originally it was intended to sample people in the major political parties and in various parts of Britain to ascertain how important/relevant the issue of industrial democracy was to the citizen at large. This was not possible in the time available. It was possible however, to speak to some of the principal figures in the political field i.e. the politicians in power and their public servants, in both the British and the European scenes and to report how they perceived industrial democracy and what actions they stated had been taken to increase or decrease the possibility of the concept becoming a political reality. This is the thrust of chapter X.

Chapter X covers the offer by CUK to introduce employee participation into the company. The major source of information was one person - the person who made the initial recommendation. The comments made by this person are accurately reported. It is recognised that the interviewees will give information in a light which will flatter them and their desired effect on the issue. In spite of this problem, it is still contended that the information is of worth as this at least allows one to attempt to tease out the way in which ideas are helped or retarded by influential individuals.
THE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

After the Labour Party took power in 1974 two Ministers were directly involved in possible implementation of industrial democracy in Britain, the Secretary of State for Employment, Mr. Michael Foot, and the Secretary of State for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn. The Cabinet Minister who would be directly responsible for any move to carry out the British Labour Party/Trade Union Congress pledge on worker involvement in industry was the Secretary for Employment. For this reason the Secretary of Employment and the officers involved in industrial democracy were interviewed to ascertain if they supported the principle and how its implementation was progressing.

The interview with the Secretary for Employment was difficult to arrange. Eventually in early February 1975 the Secretary of State agreed to see the author at Westminster. The researcher prepared the detailed interview schedule.

Half an hour after the due time the Secretary of State appeared with an assistant. The researcher asked his questions, but the Secretary did not answer all the questions directly and spoke to the Assistant about his next appointment which was to occur immediately after the interview. Then the Minister abruptly ended the interview and left the room for the next appointment. The assistant remained and apologised for the Minister's late arrival stating among other comments that the Secretary did not favour the implementation of the policy and had opposed similar moves when he (the Minister) had been Editor of the "Tribune".
About the same time, the researcher interviewed the senior civil servant responsible for the section involved in industrial democracy within the Department of Employment. The senior civil servant spoke freely with little need for cues from the researcher about the spread of the principle. He stated that Mr. Heath as Prime Minister had been told that the rest of the European Community would move towards a universal policy of worker participation. Just before the United Kingdom joined the community in 1972 the community released a document, the EEC Draft Fifth Directive on Company Law Harmonisation, which included workers on the Board of companies with 500 or more workers.

The section in the Department of Employment was set up with the senior civil servant as advisor to the Minister on the area. Between 1971 and 1974 very little happened within the Conservative government to suggest that any radical changes would occur. Then Heath was defeated at the 1974 election.

The new Secretary of State for Employment - Mr. Foot - told the section that he opposed the concept of workers being involved in the management of their workplace. He gave two reasons for his position. Firstly, it would divert the unions from their traditional role of improving workers conditions and wages, and bind the workers representatives to policies which might not be in the best interests of their members. Secondly, it could prevent management from making the 'best' decisions for all concerned because the workers' representatives could threaten the managers with industrial trouble if an unpopular but necessary decision was taken; it would no longer be the manager's prerogative to make decisions.
However, the staff of the section continued to prepare material on the implementation of the concept. The section leader co-operated with groups or persons interested in pressuring the government to introduce participation, e.g. he advised Mr. Giles Radice, M.P. when the latter was writing "Working Power". At the same time that Mr. Foot was appointed Secretary of State, Mr. Albert Booth was appointed Minister of State for Employment, to assist the Secretary. Initially non-committal towards the concept, the section claimed that they quickly won his support until he became their channel for sending information to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet regarding the field of industrial democracy, and so avoiding what the section saw as suppression by the Secretary of State.

The section-leader frequently visited Europe and particularly the Economic Community's headquarters in Brussels. He acted as the Civil Service contact between Britain and the Community, and supplied the great bulk of the information used by the British when taking decisions on the future of industrial democracy.

He advised the Minister of State, Mr. Booth, that the other governments would introduce the concept in their legislation, and unless Britain was prepared to veto the policy at Head of State level, or withdraw from the Community, it had to implement the policy.

When the Secretary of State continued to block legislation the senior public servant contacted Radice and Professor R.W. Wedderburn. The three then drafted the Industrial Democracy Bill which Radice introduced as a private member's bill to the House of Commons on the 7th.
March 1975. Officially committed to introduce similar legislation the Secretary of State asked that the private bill be withdrawn until a government bill was introduced into the house. Radice refused and a Standing Committee was set up to consider the bill; among the members appointed were Radice, Booth, Ashley, Rooker and Richardson, all openly committed to the introduction of the concept.

The section leader's contact with the Community will be referred to in a later section of this chapter.

He was recognised by the Labour Party Research Group as the major influence for the pressure to give workers greater power in the decision-making processes of the firm.

As shown above the behaviour of the section, especially its senior officer, was directly in conflict with that of the Secretary of State, so it was not surprising that after Radice's bill was introduced into the House of Commons he was transferred from his position. Officially he was promoted to Labour Attache to the European Economic Community in Brussels which allowed him to work with the same people in the Community but reduced his influence within the Department and in the country. His staff were transferred to other sections and a completely new group was set up.

After Harold Wilson resigned as Prime Minister in March 1977 Michael Foot became the Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons, and Albert Booth was appointed Secretary for Employment. Since March 1977 the senior minister responsible for employment in
Britain has been an active supporter of the principle of industrial democracy.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

After the 1974 election Tony Benn was appointed to the Cabinet as Secretary of State for the Department. An acknowledged leader of the left-wing of the Labour Party and member of the Institute for Worker Control it was not surprising that he should immediately try to encourage industrial democracy in Britain. During the two quite lengthy discussions held with the Secretary he consistently argued that industrial growth would not occur in Britain until the full potential of the workers was tapped and the traditional class barriers were broken. He argued that if workers participate in the decision-making processes in their own right, and not by occasional invitation (consultation), then they would be more committed, better decisions would be made and the class barriers would be reduced by the managers realising that the workers also had good ideas.

Initially the Secretary appears to have hoped that the Department of Employment would enact legislation but this was not forthcoming. In the meanwhile two major British industries collapsed and requested the government to take them over, or lend finance so the firms could continue. The Secretary for Industry felt too many jobs would be lost if Alfred Herbert, the machine tool manufacturers, and British Leyland, car manufacturers, were closed so he argued to recommend finance but on a set of conditions including worker directors and the British
Government becoming the major shareholder in each concern.

This happened in both instances.

One of Mr. Benn's personal staff was Ken Griffin, a seconded Trade Union Assistant Secretary, who acted as his Special Adviser. He was also interviewed. During the interview Griffin stated quite specifically that the Department of Industry intended to force all major British industry to accept worker directors, even if the Department of Employment did not act. His comments were particularly scathing of some senior people in the Department of Employment who were described as incompetent, afraid, and traitors to the official policies of the Labour Movement. Griffin claimed that these people felt very secure when dealing with senior management but could not understand or identify at all with workers and their representatives so they used their Secretary's rejection of the concept as an excuse not to act.

Benn's policy aroused anxieties in the CBI so they approached the Prime Minister regarding the actions of the Department of Industry. Quite soon after the above meeting a cabinet reshuffle took place with Tony Benn being transferred to the position of Secretary for Energy and Mr. Eric Varley was appointed to the position of Secretary for Industry.

OVERSEAS POLITICAL INFLUENCES

In November 1975 the author spent a number of days in Brussels at
the headquarters of the European Community. There he spoke to a number of officials in the Community's Secretariats who provided documents and interesting and important insights into why industrial democracy was an issue in Britain.

From the first mention of worker involvement by Edward Heath in 1971 there were always oblique references to the Community's interest in the field and that developments in Britain would need to take place if industrial relations throughout the Community were to be harmonized. Then the Fifth Directive was released for discussion in late 1971 in the languages of the countries at that time members of the Community. There was no English translation of the document until early 1975 yet the directive was planned to be debated and formalised between all member nations by 1977. The Labour Party, the Conservative Party, CBI and Trade Union documents all mention the Fifth Directive as a reason why they are considering the concept. At the same time Dr. Vollmer, Labour Attache of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) spoke frequently on the harmony in German Industry through Worker Directors. When the referendum on remaining in the European Economic Community was announced Dr. Vollmer was transferred to Turkey where he remained until after the referendum was held. Then he returned to Britain in his old position and continued to gain a great deal of coverage in the various forms of media.

The author spoke to Mr. Trevor Roberts of the Directorate of Industrial Relations, DG5. An Englishman, Mr. Roberts had written in the field of British Industrial Relations before joining the Secretariat. He spoke with great certainty that legislation would be enacted in
Britain, no matter which party formed the government of the day.

When questioned closely why this should happen, Roberts spoke of precedents in other countries, the Fifth Directive which he felt Britain was morally obliged to accept and the need for Britain to recover its industrial competitiveness. The researcher replied that all these factors were known to writers in the field, as well as Ireland's and France's reluctance to pass similar legislation, yet the writers were nowhere as confident as he. Did he know something not known by the other commentators? At the end of the first interview Mr. Roberts arranged for the researcher to visit Mr. John Coleman of the Directorate for Internal Markets, DGII. Mr. Coleman gave a long interview in which he answered every question asked in great detail. Firstly he pointed out that as Britain asked to join the Community it had to accept the Community decisions made before its entry on New Year's Day 1973. Mr. Heath was told in 1971 that the Federal Republic of Germany strongly desired compatible company legislation including the concept of worker directors. Coleman claimed that Heath's new found enthusiasm for employee participation was acceptance of the inevitable. However, when union problems created serious problems in Britain Heath was able to delay any moves towards participation by arguing that the climate was unfavourable and would damage any initiatives by his government. Then the Labour Party won power and was expected to quickly move to enact legislation; again the Germans were disappointed.

Then two events turned the German requests into demands. Firstly the Directorate for Internal Markets was asked to co-operate in drafting
a European Companies Act intended to cover companies which traded across national boundaries with plants in more than one state, i.e. the multinational company operating in Europe. Some German industries, e.g. Agfa-Gevaert, Hoesch-Hoogevens, approached the Belgian government with overtures to establish their headquarters solely in that country and so avoid worker directors on their supervisory boards. The German government became concerned and argued that if all Community countries had a requirement for worker directors at least as demanding as theirs then the industries would remain within their present national boundaries. In the meanwhile the Community agreed that companies would need to give five years' notice before transferring to another member state of the Community. The member countries then agreed to legislate the European Companies Act within five years after the Germans informed other member countries that as the major contributor to the support funds they were not prepared to lose their industrial base. The Germans demanded that a European Companies Act be drafted with the West German requirements as the minimum.

The second event Coleman mentioned was Britain's economic strife. Between 1974 and 1976 the British official reserves fell by nearly 30% (£2,053,000,000 to £1,476,000,000) and Britain was forced to borrow a net £3,705,000,000, or over twice the official reserves left at the end of 1976 to finish in that precarious position. Britain faced financial ruin in 1975 and asked her allies for assistance. According to Coleman the only country to show any real enthusiasm to help was Germany. The Federal Republic believed that Britain was needed as a counterweight to French influence and to provide a
European community which America would have to totally defend, not just one part, Britain, as occurred in 1939-1945.

Much detailed searching by the researcher and specialist librarians in the United Kingdom and Australia has not been able to tease out many details to support the statements made above, but they are consistent with the known facts. When Britain knew the seriousness of its financial problems in 1974 it asked for reserves, if necessary, from the International Monetary Fund and the Finance Ministers of the Community. In each case they were refused assistance. In the meanwhile the Labour Party sought a solution to the fight within its ranks between the pro- and anti-marketeers and decided on a referendum in June 1975. The German government agreed to help their fellow democratic socialists if the Labour Party agreed to certain requirements. Beside the financial constraints, inflation policies, pay freezes, the British had to promise to introduce industrial democracy. The British reluctantly agreed but stated that if the British people realised that a foreign power was interfering in the internal running of the country, they could react by voting against remaining in the Community. The leading propagandist for industrial democracy, Dr. Vollmer, was sent to Turkey and articles on industrial democracy vanished from the media during the referendum campaign.

Britain voted to stay in the Community, agreed policies were implemented, the Labour Movement accepted the general principle of industrial democracy and the needed money was found without its sources being known to the British public.
Coleman suggested that if Britain was to meet her obligations to Germany it would be necessary to educate the British people and to move Mr. Michael Foot. Coleman also suggested that a Royal Commission would be an ideal method to 'educate' the people, allow a breathing space and prevent Britain from being tied to any detailed timetable set by the Germans. Within two months the Secretary for Trade, Mr. Peter Shore, announced the establishment of the Bullock Committee of Inquiry into industrial democracy to consider how to implement "industrial democracy in the control of companies by means of representation on boards of directors".

When asked what would happen should labour lose power in the meantime, Coleman asserted that a Conservative Prime Minister would be equally bound, and pointed to the fact that Mr. Heath, not Mr. Wilson, first mentioned worker directors in the 1970s. Coleman also pointed out that previously, if a clear majority of the Community passed legislation on a particular policy, the other member countries, no matter what their political philosophy, quickly followed suit before they were seen as being pressured by the Community to surrender some of their own sovereignty to accept a particular Directive, e.g. The Employee Protection Bill, presented by the Secretary of State for Employment.

Coleman argued that Britain and France looked least likely to accept the German model, but that both would quickly try to pass legislation before the other when it became evident that they were completely isolated.

Since the interview all the necessary requirements that he suggested have been met; the committee has met and recommended the form of
industrial democracy, Mr. Foot has moved and as an added bonus, a pro-worker director Secretary of Employment, Mr. Booth, has been appointed in Mr. Foot's place.

CONCLUSION

It would appear that the political system is the major force behind the move towards industrial democracy - the politicians and civil servants are the leading part of the movement for greater worker power. Traditionally the political system is seen as reacting to pressures within society, i.e. the political system is a conservative force which reacts to forces within and without society by attempting to accommodate change with the minimum effect on the society. However, in the present study the political system, through forces outside the national boundaries, i.e. Europe, and inside the country, i.e. the committed civil servants and academics, it has been forced to consider and accept the principle of worker directors in Britain, while most of the people are not aware of or greatly care about the issue.

While Britain appears committed to the principle of industrial democracy, it does not mean that the means of implementing the concept have been decided. Britain has the longest history of discussing industrial democracy, yet the thought of a two-tier company board (West Germany and Holland) has never previously been discussed. While the Germans would prefer a common system throughout the EEC, it is clear that they do require the industrial democracy laws in each member nation to be at least as comprehensive as theirs.

By the end of the project (December 1975), it was apparent that industrial
democracy would be introduced by Britain; however, it was not clear how this would be done. The lack of a definite image of what industrial democracy is has not been a disadvantage to the concept, as the term makes a fine slogan and each group can believe that the term means their particular type of participation in managerial decision-making. The Bullock Committee of Enquiry was set up to answer the question of the way the ideal would be implemented. It has since reported to the Government, and at present many groups are discussing the shape that participation should take in work organisations.

As 'trading' took place between the British and West German governments to introduce the idea, so 'trading' will continue to take place between the British government, TUC, CBI and individual unions on the final form of the Industrial Democracy legislation. A small example of the 'trading' which must happen occurred in mid 1975, when the workers in the Central Office of the Labour Party went on a 24 hour strike because their employer, the Labour Party, would not negotiate greater participation by the workers in the decision-making processes of the Central Office. The executive claimed they were elected by the party membership and were responsible to them and not to the workers. To settle the highly embarrassing strike, a joint committee of members of the executive and workers representatives was set up to investigate the possible introduction of industrial democracy into the Central Office administration.

The Government has included industrial democracy in its social contract packages with the TUC and has offered places on nationalised industry boards, e.g. British Steel Corporation is to have 7 worker directors by
the end of 1978, in return for the promise of greater co-operation in reshaping the ailing industry.

The final shape of industrial democracy in Britain has not evolved sufficiently for one to clearly recognise what it will be, but it appears to involve a one tier company board with varying thoughts on how the worker representatives will be selected, by whom and with what powers. Even this point could yet alter as the EEC discusses the European Company Statute. The reasons for the proposed Statute and its possible effects on the shape of industrial democracy are discussed in the next section.

12 THE EUROPEAN COMPANY STATUTE AND THE FIFTH DIRECTIVE

The proposed European Company Statute although not mandatory offers companies the opportunity for incorporation throughout the Community as European companies enjoying equal rights under EEC law in all member countries except where the EEC law does not cover the point at issue, then the national laws will prevail. Only joint-stock companies would be entitled to register and only if they were involved in

(i) cross-frontier mergers involving companies with their headquarters in two or more EEC countries

(ii) the establishment of joint holding companies by companies based in two or more countries

(iii) the establishment of joint subsidiaries by companies based in two or more countries

The minimum capital required would be $(US)500,000 and judicial control would rest with the Court of Justice of the European Communities. The shares would be registered on all member countries stock exchanges
although the headquarters of the company would be located in one country. For tax purposes the new companies would be considered based in the country from which they were actually managed and taxed according to the law of that country.

A central feature of the European company would be the strict separation between the management and administration and the control and supervision of the firm, as already occurs in the Federal Republic of Germany. The policy and control of the company would occur at the general meeting of the shareholders, the supervisory board and the management board.

Article 100 of the Statute proposes German style European Works Councils in all countries where the firm operates. At present some of the nine countries have employee representation but there is no common form of representation so the German model would become the dominant one in all large European countries. The council would have the power to negotiate with the management on hours of work, holidays, social facilities, industrial safety health and hygiene, job evaluations, bonus schemes, vocational training, recruitment, promotion and dismissal of workers and unless management has gained the Council's agreement any managerial decision to alter these conditions would be legally void.

Between 1971 and 1973 the literature on the proposal spoke of the benefits to the European company then in late 1973 a dramatic change in attitude by the member countries took place; instead of suggesting companies seek the status suddenly the Council of the Community
started discussing whether certain companies should be forced to register in European countries. The Council had suddenly decided to control multinational firms.

In late 1974 the European Parliament reported to Council that while the extraordinary development of multinationals had beneficial effects on productivity, technological progress and management methods—that by their size, their vast liquid assets and concentration of their decision-making methods, multinational undertakings have, however, caused serious problems and dangers, for the solution of which international regulations are lacking, especially in the areas of employment, competition, tax obligation, international monetary relations and the security of supply of certain raw materials;

— (the Parliament) congratulates the Commission on having the initiative in attempting to prevent, a development which is contrary to the objectives of the Treaties;

One of the important legal constraints referred to by the Parliament is the European Companies Statute, another was the 3rd Directive on Mergers.

The Parliament document notes that in 1969 that of the 100 largest economic units in the non-Communist world were multinational undertakings and 49 were States and each of the ten major multinational undertakings had an annual revenue exceeding the Gross National Product of two-thirds of the countries in the world.

The report quotes parts of a speech by a Mr. Lattes in which he stated a special UN report asserts that while these undertakings may increase the level of exports, employment and technology in the host country, they also prejudice the government's priorities, tax systems, and the distribution of income, and so undermine the state's national sovereignty and power to pursue its objectives, thus representing a real threat to social and political development.
The rest of the submission alludes to various means by which the sovereign state could assert control over its destiny and generally concludes that only by making the other forces, e.g. unions, competitors and the state itself more powerful could it be feasible to restrict the growth and power of the multinationals. If the holding company was forced to register as a European company then workers from all the plants within the Community could officially meet (European Works Council) and discuss developments among themselves and with the worker directors on the supervisory board. In this way the workers would protect the investment of their labour. Originally to ensure that worker directors occur legally a draft Directive, the Fifth Directive, was issued in late 1972; now it appears to some states to be essential that all the member states pass complementary legislation to protect the workers and the country from multinational management decisions.

The Fifth Directive would oblige all limited liability companies to adopt the Dutch or the German participation laws of two tier boards, employee representation on the supervisory board, and formally constituted works councils with "teeth".

The implementation of the Fifth Directive would lead to industrial democracy as defined in this thesis, i.e. "the shift of real power and decision-making processes within the official organisational structure".
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Chapter X

CHRYSLER UK'S RESPONSE TO INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

This chapter attempts to describe how an offer of industrial democracy, or employee participation as it was called, was made by the management of a large engineering organization to its workers. This chapter will describe the industrial relations background of the company before the offer was made, how the offer arose and the probable future of the proposal.
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS BACKGROUND OF THE COMPANY

Late in 1972 and early 1973 the Ryton Car Assembly Plant was almost continually on strike over questions of quality. The quality control staff and the layout designers set standards which each worker had to meet. However, in early 1970 the plant adopted the principle of allowing area managers the right to decide if they wished to correct quality problems or send the car onto the next area who had the right to accept or reject the vehicle. To quantify the system managers "bought" cars from the previous part of the production system, worked on them and "sold" the car to the next section. Extra "profits", in theory, could be earned by purchasing an imperfect car and "selling" it without any blemishes. The system did not work. Managers were happy to sell their faulty work to the next section who in turn sold the car to the next section. Eventually the pre-delivery shop was filled with unsatisfactory cars, which, in some cases, were placed in the finished stock to reduce congestion on the workfloor. Customers bought the cars and complained of unsatisfactory workmanship.

The company immediately issued statements to the media blaming the workers for the poor quality of the cars.

Industrial strife increased and production lines halted. Then the plant management introduced a quality campaign. Signs were placed all around the plant and meetings were held to emphasize that both workers and management had much to gain by cooperation. The campaign's success lasted about a month; when production lines fell
behind in certain areas, e.g. body in white and the paint shops, the managers told the workers to increase the work rate and drop the quality control. Managers' performance are measured "objectively" in the plant by counting the number of units (cars) that are handled in a shift - a man who processes 300 units in a shift is a 10% better manager than one who handles 272.

The shop stewards protested at the instructions but were reminded that their work contract gave complete control over production decisions to the management. Later the pre-delivery men refused to accept the cars and plant management decided to admonish the men in the areas with the poor quality standards. When the plant manager complained to the men they replied that the management had given the order and they had objected to the decision. After this incident the quality programme failed.

Desperate to find a solution to the quality of the Avenger cars the Midlands Manufacturing Manager asked the third most senior manager in the plant to investigate the problem and report directly to him. The man was English and had been the plant manager before Chrysler acquired the Rootes group. A former skilled tradesman who had risen by work and study to the most senior position, he was respected and liked by the men. He wrote a report which stated that the men blamed management for quality problems and would never believe that workers would be fairly judged by management when quality disputes arose. It was proposed that a joint management-worker body be set up to handle quality problems.
The Midlands Manufacturing Manager went further than the recommendations; he established a permanent Quality and Quantity Committee in the plant. The committee had seven members, three elected by the shop stewards, three nominated managers and the chairman was the author of the report. Office space was given and the committee was charged with discussing, and adjudicating on, any production problems which involved the quality and/or quantity of cars manufactured in the plant. The committee reported directly to the plant manager and could approach the Midlands Manufacturing Manager at the Whitley CUK head office if they believed the manager was uncooperative. A section was set up in the Central Personnel Directorate called Motivation and Productivity and one of its first tasks was to liaise with the committee. This section invited Dr. Damm and later the researcher to work in CUK.

The committee was successful and was soon used as a means of defusing potentially dangerous situations by union representatives and top management. For example, a shop steward might clash with a foreman on an important issue. The steward would know that if the foreman enforced his interpretation of a company directive that the plant would be closed down by a serious industrial dispute. The steward would ring a committee member and ask for his help. The committee would discuss the issue, decide on a policy and the chairman would ring or see the foreman's boss to see if the problem could be solved. In nearly all cases this was sufficient to avert personal clashes.

As the committee solved more and more problems the other plants
began to consider the setting up of such a committee in each plant. By early 1975 the policy of appointing a Quality and Quantity Committee in each plant was accepted but was shelved when another development - industrial democracy - was introduced by the senior CUK management.

The committee had shown that problems could be solved by co-operation so when Dr. Damm's study recommended slice groups to improve working conditions in the Final Assembly Shop, the plant manager accepted the concept.

The Motivation and Productivity Section was seen as successful and its leader was appointed to a more senior post.

HOW THE OFFER AROSE

Next door to the Section office was the office of the Salaries Section which negotiated salaries of the workers. The biggest bane of the salaries area was the relativities of the various plants. Ryton, Stoke Engine and Special Products plants were the highest paid as they worked in Coventry where the highest engineering salaries were paid in Britain. The Scottish workers at Linwood claimed the same level of salary and whenever they were successful in decreasing the difference the Coventry men would submit a claim to keep their previous differential. The Board of CUK was desperate to control salary costs to make the company more viable and reducing this "leapfrogging" of salaries was critical - the salaries section
suggested that the company offer industrial democracy to the workers at a cost - a common wage structure for the whole company, an independent Conciliation and Arbitration Board to negotiate all disputes before strike action was taken, the surrender of the right of the convenors in individual plants to negotiate their own conditions and take independent action if their claims were not met. The company accepted the plan and offered it as "employee participation" to the unions. The researcher immediately visited the Whitley plant to speak to the Salaries Section leader to discuss the rationale of his plan. The young graduate section leader explained that he heard of the research being carried out by a number of academic institutions in CUK but had not really taken much interest until the head of the Motivation and Productivity Section was promoted. Then the Salaries Section leader attended a day course run by the Coventry and District Engineering Employers Association (see Chapter VII).

When he returned to Whitley the problem of relativities was discussed again with the workers. The various group of unionists refused to move from their position regarding their respective claims - the Linwood workers for equal pay with Ryton and Ryton for the relativity differences based on past skills. A senior company manager suggested a company wide vote but the Coventry workers threatened to walk out of the discussion so the conference failed to solve the problems. Meanwhile the company made public announcements on future plans and the unions protested they were not consulted and called on the Departments of Employment and Industry to defend their jobs. The young section leader then put the workers' demands and
the company's needs into a single package - the company should negotiate workers being involved in the decision-making of the company at section, area, plant and company level if they would accept a common salary scale throughout the company and less freedom by convenors to handle their own affairs. The Board accepted the proposal and offered it to the unions who were given three months in which to accept or reject the offer. The CUK Board made large political capital out of their 'unforced' offer and the unions accepted after long and bitter debates at the Coventry plants. When asked what protection the company shareholders had in such arrangement the section leader replied that the unions had been told they could not negotiate the Articles and Memorandum of Association of the Company. The negotiations involved the share of control of the various decision-making bodies and the company promised to allot 2 seats to union elected representatives by the Board's altering the Articles. Then worker directors would be selected but they could not move any later changes in the Articles or Memorandum of Association.

The unions investigated the Articles and apparently found nothing to worry them so they agreed on this pre-condition for negotiation. They did not see the Memorandum of Association and did not know that the Memorandum required the international Chrysler Board to approve all major decisions made by CUK. The international Board consisted of the senior company officials in Detroit plus the Regional Managing Directors; the international Board delegated their ratification power to the Regional Managing Director. In effect the rest of the full CUK Board could vote unanimously to carry out a policy and be
overruled by the Managing Director of CUK. The section leader commented that by the time this was discovered by the workers he would have gained recognition for his plan and probably have left CUK for a more senior position. He then qualified the statement by saying that the workers would probably never be intelligent enough to be aware of the right of veto that the Managing Director possessed.

The section leader was the same as, and possessed equivalent qualifications to, the Business Graduate Associates and the Young Fabians previously reported in Chapter VI. As the unions had won most of the disputes in the previous three years, the derogatory statements were inconsistent with events in the plants and with two of the conditions of the offer. The thrust of conditions (a) and (d) - participation by employee representatives on the plant decision making committees and establishment of a CUK Conciliation and Arbitration Board - is to reduce the power of the individual shop stewards, senior stewards, and convenors in each plant. The "unintelligent" workers' representatives have consistently won disputes with the industrial relations function. Placing representatives on the decision-making boards is intended to commit them to decisions taken by a joint group, while the Conciliation and Arbitration Board is intended to stop any single shop or plant dispute growing into a major industrial confrontation by appointing worker representatives to the board who would place moral pressure on the convenors to compromise and settle the dispute. Neither of these schemes would be necessary with unintelligent workers.

The researcher was then reminded of his agreement not to give either
party information he gained during his investigations, unless he first obtained the approval of the party which provided the information; the section leader stated that under no condition could this information be given to the unions.

The researcher's CUK contact, Mr. C in Chapter V, heard the comments and the demand for silence. As the first person to write a paper on Employee or Worker Participation he held a high interest in what happened to the concept and he was bitterly disappointed by the statements. Within the next two months Mr. C resigned from CUK and returned to the Ministry as a Church of England Minister in the Midlands. Before going to his parish Mr. C called on the researcher to apologise for leaving the projects just before the end of the research time. He said that he could no longer work for the company, and particularly the Personnel Directorate, as it had cynically used a principle he believed in; he could never again believe in their integrity and honesty.

At the time of the researcher's leaving Britain in December 1975 the unions, shop steward representatives from each plant, and the CUK bargaining team had negotiated for five months the terms of the shift of decision-making power to worker representatives. Chrysler appointed a director in charge of industrial democracy who is responsible for making the agreed plans work. Among the early agreements was one to set up Quality and Quantity Committees in each plant; the original co-operation effort was to become standard for every plant.
Industrial democracy moved from a nebulous and foreign concept in the large multinational engineering organisation to one of probable implementation within a period of three years; the period of greatest growth was in the twelve months between and 1974 and mid 1975. The Government had mentioned the concept, the unions had suddenly supported its introduction, salary costs were crippling and the concept offered a possible solution to a number of problems. The company believed it would not surrender real decision-making power through its veto right.

It was confidently prepared to try the transfer of decision-making powers by lower levels of management to joint committees in the hope that the move would lead to greater job satisfaction, productivity and acceptance of rationalization schemes. The negotiations for implementing employee participation ground to a halt in late October 1975 when CUK announced it was about to close through large sustained losses. On November 3rd 1975 the company informed the Government of this position. In the ensuing seven weeks the CUK management and high government officials had 11 meetings which resulted in the British Government lending CUK £55 million between 1976 and 1979, and subsiding half the CUK losses in that period. In return CUK has promised to continue to operate at the present level and repay the loans should CUK become insolvent in that period.

CUK also promised to enter into a Planning Agreement with the Government and to accept two Government appointed Directors on the Company Board.

After the Planning Agreement has been made the company has promised to reopen the participation negotiations.
FUTURE OF THE OFFER

The worker attitude to the plan was one of cynicism. The convenors at Ryton and the senior shop stewards at the Special Products plant felt the plan was an attempt to curb the effectiveness rather than an attempt to increase worker participation in the company. The shop-floor workers at Special Products (see Chapter V) did not see the offer as a form of industrial democracy when they were surveyed on the topic.

The workers at Ryton uncovered the employee participation offer and identified the person who had proposed the package before it was officially announced. The researcher was told, by one of the Ryton Quality and Quantity Committee, that the package was to be offered to the unions. Standing beside the researcher, at the time, was the new leader of the Motivation and Productivity section; he worked next door to the proposer of the plan yet he did not know of the plan until that moment. The manner in which the researcher learned of the offer is consistent with the example given in Chapter IV—when the Ryton Assembly Plant was to work half time. The men in the car plant, knew from undisclosed sources, that the employee participation plan was being prepared before the leader of the section responsible for the previous research had been told and he worked next door to the proposer of the plan. The men mentioned all the details in the proposal except the Memorandum of Association loophole. The men felt cynical towards the plan and believed the company would "have some trick up their sleeve"; a sign in one of the senior shop steward's offices at Ryton read "Beware of Chrysler Bearing Gifts!". Some workers and stewards believed the company was trying to trick them but felt they were
smarter than the management and would discover the loophole during the negotiations. Then they would negotiate the closure of the loopholes.

The company made the offer to the joint meeting of CUK plant convenors and in the presence of senior union officials. The union officials had previously made public statements on the British Leyland proposals for worker directors so they were committed to accept the offer. The convenors in plants not in the West Midlands were keen to accept the salary increases. This meant the West Midland convenors were outnumbered by other convenors and they were pressured by the union officials to accept the offer. The union officials also told the convenors that there was a strong possibility that CUK would close down and transfer all the European car manufacturing facilities to one site of Simca in France. The convenors were asked to keep disputes and strikes to an absolute minimum to protect the jobs of all the workers. Later when the bitter plant meetings were held to ratify the CUK proposal the convenors presented these facts to support the acceptance of the offer.

In the two largest West Midlands plants, Stoke Engine and Ryton Assembly, the voting was roughly 50% for, 50% against the proposal. Those who opposed the plan threatened to set up a separate system of shop stewards to continue the 'adversary' role of worker representatives. This threat was taken seriously by all the parties as initially the present shop steward system had been opposed by the union officials and the company yet eventually became a part of the official industrial relations system.

As reported earlier the workers' cynicism is well founded and one
wonders how the negotiations will proceed should they be resumed. In the nearly two years since the offer was suspended no negotiations have been held. In the meantime the new Alpine range has been launched and the management has since argued that the company must become viable before participation can be discussed again. If the negotiations do not proceed then not only will the workers become more cynical of the company's intentions but so will many managers. Once the plan was announced and negotiated most plant management supported the principles of the offer. Amongst the proposals was one for a freer flow of information and another for the delegation of much of the decision-making processes at Whitley to the individual plants, e.g. the numbers of units to be manufactured and assembled. Many managers felt isolated in their job and believed the proposed joint planning boards would give them greater control over their work areas. None of the plant management appeared to know of the Memorandum of Association loophole.

If the negotiations are reopened it is a matter of conjecture whether they would improve the long-term industrial relations climate in the company. Any short-term increase in trust would be forfeited if the Managing Director - Chrysler Europe used his veto powers.

The offer of employee participation demonstrates the point made in Chapter II - the diffusion of an idea does not depend on the intentions and words of the initial proposer/change agent but on how the idea is understood and internalized by those who hear the message. How the community perceives the proposal decides the fate of the idea, not the
Intentions and motives of the change agent. The employee participation proposal could work if the management and unions wish it to succeed. If the management, however, see the scheme as a tactic to out-maneuver the unions then they may achieve some short-term successes, but at the long term cost of increased belief in the CUK management's good intentions.
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As stated in the Introduction, this thesis is an attempt to devise a model of diffusion, test it in a real life situation by following the spread of an idea within the community, and assess how well the model is able to predict and explain the results. In Chapter II the three major diffusion models were presented, together with the model tested in the thesis - an amalgam of the three.

Chapter I examined industrial democracy/worker participation and indicated some of the meanings which various groups attach to the term. The solution to this difficult research problem was to accept any statement or writing which mentioned the transfer of some real power to workers and their representatives in the planning and decision making processes in the organisation (for example, worker directors), as meeting the definition of industrial democracy.

The test of the four models outlined in Chapter II is whether they adequately explain the findings in Chapters IV to X and integrate the results into a meaningful whole. This Chapter attempts to assess the success of the models of diffusion used in the research. Some points should be clarified before proceeding to evaluate the models. The first is the issue of what is meant by the terms diffusion and innovation. Although often used interchangeably by researchers they are quite separate concepts. Diffusion deals with the spread of an idea to others while innovation is concerned with its practical adoption;
to evaluate the diffusion of an idea by its practical application is to underestimate its spread.

The second point deals with the various conceptions of industrial democracy within the British political arena. Whilst acknowledging that the three major parties hold different views of what constitutes the term under discussion, it is argued here that because of forces outside the control of whatever British Government may be in power, the end result will be the same, worker directors on the Boards of large British companies. Each party would introduce the legislation in differing forms and would still bargain with the unions and the CBI on the details and timing of the enabling legislation to introduce industrial democracy.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR THE HYPOTHESES-DIFFUSION PROCESS

All four models make similar assumptions regarding the diffusion process - the effects of communication, sources of information, characteristics of the idea being diffused, the adoption process, acceptance characteristics and the effects of diffusion. If these assumptions are not supported, the respective models cannot successfully explain the spread of industrial democracy. On the other hand, if the assumptions are supported each model can be considered to see if it is able to explain the results found in the field studies.

As mentioned in Chapter 11, there are many assumptions and no researcher has found all assumptions clearly identified and supported in any one research project. Such was the case in the present research - all assumptions were supported by some research, but no one assumption was clearly tested in all studies. The concept of
Industrial democracy was communicated through the mass media (Chapters IV, VIII), in the workplace (Chapter IV), trade unions (Chapter IV), government (Chapter IX) and tertiary institutions (Chapter VI) within Britain in 1974-75. The idea was diffused in a cultural content where norms allowed the idea to be discussed publicly (Chapters IV to X) and within the family (Chapter IV). The people who discussed the idea were seen as credible (Chapters IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX) and with a legitimate role to do so (Chapters IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX).

The concept was discussed within the organizational context (Chapters IV and X) expands, downwards and across the hierarchy. Chapter IV in particular supported the factors raised in Tables 2, 3 to 2.5 - the flow of information within the organization.

Chapters IV and X confirmed that the Change Agent(s) differed in Education, Social Status and Nationality, yet he was able to influence the Opinion Leaders by meeting their perceived needs within agreed guidelines. The Opinion Leaders, e.g., Convenors, Senior Shop Stewards, Shop Stewards, in turn influenced the community to accept the idea.

The characteristics of industrial democracy allowed it to be diffused. It offered advantages to C.U.K. which was economically foundering, was compatible with commonly held values, was not too complex to stop its Introduction, was divisible into smaller schemes, e.g. in a particular plant or section, and could be communicated to others.

People were aware of industrial democracy, and interest was aroused as the mass media discussed the concept until some people were prepared
to try the idea to ascertain if they would adopt it on a permanent basis.

Within groups adopting the idea all three types of adoption were found—optional, collective and authority. Some effects were functional but others, e.g. shop work meetings at the Ryton plant to prevent discussions on industrial democracy, were dysfunctional. Not all the effects would be immediate and manifest.

All the examples support the assumptions upon which the four models are based.

RESEARCH, DESIGN AND DIFFUSION MODEL (R,D & D Model)

As indicated by the name the person who generates the idea, the need, is the researcher, not the end user or consumer. The researcher defines what he feels is a need and produces the product or strategy which he believes will meet the perceived need. After testing his solution in a laboratory the researcher uses his prestige and influence to encourage leaders in the field to adopt it. For this model examples come traditionally from the medical, farming and educational fields. The researcher always assumes that his plan is good and beneficial to the end user. New 'wonder drugs' have had this assumption working for them until recently. After the Thalidomide case this assumption has been open to challenge. In education the assumption has never been as fully accepted but many of the unsuccessful radical educational changes can be traced back to this model when it is supported by authoritarian educational administrators. For example the Queensland Education Department moved from a long-accepted centrally controlled twelfth year examination system, for
entrance to tertiary education, to one where the teachers assessed each student in their subject area six times during the last two years at school and agreed on an overall ranking of the student within the school. The radical change was never discussed with the teachers or regional administrators before it was introduced. Education authorities run on democratic principles, make errors too, but at least the staff and users in these systems are aware of the intended changes, can participate in the debate and possibly alter the design and/or format of the intended change.

The RD&D model makes no stated assumptions on how an idea is diffused expect that once leaders in the field are convinced of the worth of the idea they convince others to follow. The idea itself is highly specific e.g. a particular drug and is always spread to gain acceptance in a very limited field.

The preceding paragraphs indicate that the RD&D model is unlikely to explain how industrial democracy diffused in Britain and at best would plot the spread of a particular practice which one could call industrial democracy, e.g. numbers of appointments of worker directors.

The RD&D model appears to explain how the idea diffused from West Germany to Britain. The Federal Republic accepted the concept of worker directors from the British Government during the occupation of West Germany. In the following 25 years the "German economic miracle" took place until by 1975 Germany was the strongest economic force in Western Europe. One of the explanations given for the "miracle" was the co-operation between the management and the workers through worker directors. Therefore it can be argued that the Germans, having
designed and researched the concept, sought to diffuse it through the rest of the ECC and, thus, since 1974, in Britain; Chapter IX strongly supports such a hypothesis.

Chapter X also supports the model. The Ryton Assembly Plant first tried the idea of a joint Quality and Quantity Committee (research and design); it was successful and the company offered to negotiate establishing one in every CUK plant in Britain (diffusion). Otherwise the other research studies do not support the RD&D model; it is too narrow and specific to explain effectively how a multi-faceted concept such as industrial democracy was spread through Britain during 1972-1976.

CONSULTANT MODEL (Problem Solver Model)

As indicated in the title the critical factor is the importation into the group or organisation of an outside specialist. His purpose is to collaborate with the client system to solve a problem identified by the client. Usually the consultant possesses special diagnostic skills although more recently some consultants have been appointed as 'Process Consultants' to assist the client to solve his own problems through some form of effective group methods of problem solving.

The model assumes that the client is aware of the problem and asks for help - the client can end the relationship at any time. The consultant provides special skills which the client believes will reduce his problem - the model is a need reduction one. The client feels the need, articulates the need as a problem, sends for a consultant to help it search for solutions, chooses from the possible solutions, applies the solution and either solves the problem (reduces the needs) or starts
The spread of employee participation through CUK followed this model. The company employed a person interested in the field who in turn convinced his boss to invite Dr. Damm to the Ryton Plant. The projects carried out by Dr. Damm, and later the researcher, raised the awareness of the management and workers of the claimed benefits of participation. It was only a small step from this stage for a section leader at Whitley to propose that employee participation be introduced in return for some constraints on union activities in individual plants. The results of the initial Ryton study by the researcher - that very little information was diffused by official means within the plant - led to the amended Ryton study and the special products research. The consultant identified problems of which the management had not been aware and was asked to carry out further studies to identify possible solutions to the newly identified problems. The results were in turn used by the salaries section leader to propose a solution to a confirmed problem - leapfrogging of salary claims between plants and independent plant industrial action. In Chapter IX it was mentioned that the then Secretary of State for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, had on his staff a special advisor on industrial democracy, Mr. Ken Griffin, who acted as the minister's consultant. However, the model cannot explain the results in Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII as consultants were not used.

THE INTERPERSONAL MODEL (Rogers' Model)

This model is by far the most researched and comprehensive model of the three. Like the previous RD&D model it assumes that the idea is always good⁹, e.g. a new hybrid strain of corn is better than the present type. The same arguments which were levelled at the RD&D model
regarding validity of this belief can be made here.

Unlike the previous models the Interpersonal Model specifically deals with how ideas and practices are transmitted from person to person. This model deals with change agents, innovators, early adopters, early majorities, later majorities and laggards, as the groups through which the idea and practice pass. Built on research in fields such as rural sociology the practice was easy to measure as it dealt with an innovation and not the diffusion of an idea. One can count acres of hybrid corn and classify individuals in order of planting the corn. It is not intended at this point to discuss the findings with regard to the Interpersonal Model as the model designed and tested in this thesis makes the same assumptions. Both models' shortcomings will be considered together.

INTEGRATED DIFFUSION MODEL

As argued in Chapter II this model integrates the findings and strengths of the three previous models. The previous models are seen as separate views of the same process from differing vantage points. Writers in the RD&D field have been interested in the spread of ideas for practitioners in medicine and education. Knowledge of the Consultant Model relies on writings by practising consultants and the Interpersonal Model draws strongly on written reports of attempts to influence the people at large that a particular idea is worth adopting, e.g. birth control.

The Integrated Model predicts that the concept of industrial democracy/worker participation started with some innovator group (see Figure 2.8) and was then transmitted to change agents who introduced the concept
to the mass media and other change agents, e.g. the Government, political parties, the civil service and tertiary institutions, who, in turn, introduced the concept to opinion leaders. The opinion leaders then diffused the concept to the various categories of adopters within the community at large. The model, on a macro-scale, appears to be supported by the studies.

The model(s) postulates that an innovator, perhaps not even from within the society, presented the idea of industrial democracy which:

(I) suggested the concept's relative advantages;
(ii) was compatible with British industry;
(iii) was capable of being understood;
(iv) could be implemented in stages; and
(v) was a concept which could be easily communicated to the population at large.

This was found to be the case.

The European Economic Community, in 1971, resolved to draft a fifth directive which envisaged worker directors as a matter of form throughout the community. When the British Conservative Government led Britain into the European Economic Community in 1972, it knew that worker directors would be an issue which they must accept and implement. The policy was incorporated into the Conservative party's platform and was part of the Heath Government's policy at the February 1974 elections. The Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress had tentatively looked at worker directors but at the 1972 Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party Congress the concept was not a major policy area, as the Labour Movement still favoured a strengthened collective bargaining solution opposed to greater worker involvement in industry. By the 1974 congresses of the Trade Union Congress and
Labour Party, industrial democracy was an accepted principle and decisions were taken to implement it in conjunction with the collective bargaining system. The pressure for change came not from a groundswell within the Labour Movement, but from pressure by fellow democratic socialists in the West German Government.

The German Social Democrats pointed to Britain's economic and trade problems and offered help conditional upon the British social democrats (the Labour Party) promising to pass legislation to implement worker directors. In 1975 the position of the £ sterling reached a stage where the economic collapse of Britain was forecast unless the International Monetary Fund gave massive support. The support was not forthcoming. Evidence given to the author suggests that West Germany provided the finance on the conditions mentioned before. In late 1975, the Secretary for State for Trade, Mr. Peter Shore, announced the formation of the Bullock Committee of Enquiry into the method by which worker directors would be introduced into British industry.

The relative advantages of industrial democracy, according to the Minister's press release, included tapping the great potential of British workers, increasing productivity, decreasing industrial strife and providing a more equitable distribution of power in industry.

Industrial democracy presents great problems for definition. The form proposed by the Government was a compromise. In response to the German demand for compatibility with their legislation, the idea was presented by the British Government and the TUC as worker directors in large companies, no Works Councils, worker directors in the same proportion as directors appointed by the shareholders and only one Board, not the
two tier Board of Germany. This presentation of industrial democracy took into account many old issues within the Labour Movement, e.g. Works Councils which were unpopular with many unions and two-tier Boards of Directors, and provided a plan which exceeded the minimum requirements of the West Germans - no company would leave West Germany to establish its headquarters in Britain to avoid worker directors as legislated in West Germany.

The proposed form of industrial democracy was consistent with the appointment of worker directors in the British Steel Industry and the majority view within the trade union movement of the philosophy of responsibility.

Because the large companies, i.e. holding companies with more than 2,000 workers, are the ones to introduce the proposals, British Industry and the public at large will be able to judge their effectiveness in a small number of companies, and yet more than half of British industrial production will fall within the ambit of the legislation.

Finally, it is easier to discuss worker directors on a single Board than worker participation throughout the various levels of management within the organization, or to enter into the debate whether or not the various forms of worker involvement mentioned in Chapter 16 are Industrial democracy. Overall, the proposed form of industrial democracy meets the requirements mentioned earlier in this chapter and appears to have a reasonable chance of being effectively diffused within Britain, even if the practice of worker directors is not accepted. The concept of worker directors was accepted by the Labour Party and given to the Secretary of State for Employment to introduce - he did not do so. However, the civil service section in the Department of
Employment involved in the implementation of the concept was committed to the principle, and its senior civil servant took positive steps, both inside and outside the Department, to increase the probability of industrial democracy legislation's being enacted. Without the commitment of the section leader, it is possible that the Bullock Committee would never have been established. The same person provided a contact between the Department, an academic innovator, Professor K.W. Wedderburn and Giles Radice, the politician who was prepared to present a private member's bill to force the Secretary for State for Employment into action on the matter.

As stated previously, by 1974 all three major political parties had incorporated some policy on industrial democracy in their election platform; the least innovative or radical of the three parties' platforms, in 1974, was the Labour Party's. This changed when the Labour Party took power. The West German Government informed the new Labour Government of their desire for worker directors, and at the same time the British financial position deteriorated. The Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party's National Executive Committee, led by Mr. Tony Benn, then changed the official policy of the Labour Movement from that of the 1968 National Executive Committee's statement on industrial democracy as more collective bargaining to worker directors. The Fabians printed the pamphlet "Working Power" which proposed worker directors. The Conservative Party, on the other hand, moved against their previous position after the loss of the October 1974 election. One of Mrs. M. Thatcher's first moves, when elected leader of the Conservative Party, was to drop all mention of industrial democracy. She was supported in this move by the Industrial Relations Secretariat within the party, and the move was consistent
with the statements of groups that traditionally support the Conservative Party in times of elections - CBI, EEF. The Liberals were the first to argue for worker participation, but after the debacle of the 1975 election the size of the Liberal Secretariat was drastically cut and the remaining Industrial Relations advisors had no coherent policy. As it had lost influence except in its ability to keep the Labour Party in power, and as time was short, the Liberal Party was not studied in the same depth as the two bigger political parties.

The industrial groups varied in their positions, ability to speak coherently on the matter, their effect on the political system and the public at large. The largest and most united group was the Trade Union Congress. Although the left and right wings of the union movement voted to amend the centre group's motion on industrial democracy at the 1975 Congress, the amended motion was the basis of the Labour Government's commission to the Bullock Committee to consider how to implement industrial democracy; all sections of the Trade Union Congress are prepared to accept the non-compulsory introduction of worker directors. On the television at the Blackpool conference, and in the press, the Trade Union Congress argued about how industrial democracy would be introduced, e.g. compulsory or optional legislation, number of members on the Company Boards, whether the elections should be held within the union structure or by an independent body.

The most important body representing British management, the Confederation of British Industry, could not agree on any policy except to reject the concept, even when it was clear that the government intended to enact legislation and asked for comments on how the draft legislation could be improved. The Central Office of the Engineering Employers Federation rejected the concept believing it
threatened their very existence, but the Coventry Association of the Federation accepted it, arguing that it could have positive benefits for British Industry.

The mass media hardly mentioned industrial democracy. The majority of newspapers attacked the practical effects of the bills, and the television presented the trade unions as the disruptive force in the industrial relations field; one would not, by implication, want to give trade unions even greater power to disrupt industrial production. The one exception to the comments on the mass media was 'The Guardian' which actively promoted the idea to their predominantly middle-class clientele. The surprising finding was the strong support and involvement of the churches in the field. Tawney\textsuperscript{23} and Weber\textsuperscript{24} link the rise of Protestantism with the development of Capitalism and the Industrial Revolution. Capitalism is the philosophical basis of the Confederation of British Industry's rejection of the industrial democracy, so one would expect that at best the churches would be neutral. The opposite was the case. The churches with their twentieth century emphasis on living the Christian way while on earth, and less on the life hereafter, have applied the Christian teachings to all spheres of living, including work. Participation is seen as a fundamental teaching translated into everyday living.\textsuperscript{25} To the churches participation includes nearly all the concepts mentioned in Chapter III, e.g. quality of working life, job enrichment, job enlargement, job redesign and Industrial democracy. The religious programmes on the radio, the television programme "Your Point of View" and the Coventry Industrial Mission's conference, all contain statements of commitment to greater worker participation at all levels. The churches reach a great number of people in many different settings, so it is impossible to know what effect the religious support for the concept was, but it is
certain that no one could argue that industrial democracy was against Christian morals. An important consequence of the Coventry Industrial Mission's commitment to greater participation was the appointment of Mr. C. to CUK, which significantly increased the probability that a researcher would be called in to study the CUK plants.

The elites and the potential elites in the business world either have no concept of industrial democracy or reject the proposal. The undergraduate students in the University and Polytechnic courses sampled appeared to know nothing about it, although in some cases classes were taught on the topic. In the postgraduate courses those who worked in the field, e.g., Aston University and Lanchester Polytechnic, knew of the concept and could accurately recall the fundamentals. All these students claimed to have argued for industrial democracy within their workplace and in various settings. Postgraduate trained managers with the Business Graduates Association and the Young Fabians who listened to the Secretary of State for Industry, were hostile and totally opposed to the concept, as it would reduce their future power and influence.

The majority of schools in the Loughborough University of Technology pre-university student survey had not discussed the issue, although some teachers had collected relevant newspaper and magazine articles for discussion and debate. Some students had very lucid and penetrating thoughts on the effect of introducing industrial democracy. The schools in the region of the CUK plants did not discuss work or participation. The students did not gain ideas of worker participation from their parents, so nearly all were totally ignorant of any movement to increase their potential work responsibility and power. Hardly any student claimed to be happy to leave school on the grounds that he
would experience greater autonomy over his life by working than at school.

Results of the studies previously mentioned in this chapter refer to attempts at taking "snapshots" of the level of knowledge of industrial democracy and where the knowledge of the concept was obtained. Chapter IV does not fit the "snapshot" description, as it attempts to understand the dynamics of how concepts actually diffuse in a restricted space while Chapters V to VIII measure the level of knowledge at a particular point in time. The model builders appear to assume that the same dynamics occur in all situations, so to understand the dynamics in one setting allows one to generalise in other settings. For example, in the model in Fig. 2.8, the only detailed attempt to see how individuals are influenced to accept and spread a new idea is in the sections of the global model called the Interpersonal Model and the Problem-Solving Model. The Research, Design and Diffusion model of writers such as Clark mention boxes, e.g. Basic Research, but does not attempt to say why the concept diffuses from Basic Research to Applied Research. The research on the CUK workers was aimed to give an understanding of how people accept and spread ideas, and whether the two models are useful.

The Interpersonal Model is not really a Diffusion Model, but represents the plotting of adoption rates within a community. However, it is assumed that the two phenomena occur in a similar manner or pattern, i.e. the last person told adopts and tells the next listener-adopter. Rogers however, shows that for a period of time all the members of the community know equally of the innovation before adoption begins. This would suggest that diffusion and innovation movements do not have similar patterns; as shown by Ford to know of an idea (diffusion) is
not enough to lead to the adoption (innovation) of the idea. This alternative hypothesis is supported by the results in the Ryton Assembly Plant study. All the workers used rumour as one of the main sources of information, and in most cases it was the major channel by which ideas were diffused. The official trade union plant hierarchy, which is similar in shape to the Interpersonal Model, sends information from the convenors to the senior shop stewards, to the stewards and finally to the shopfloor workers. The flow of information is through a hierarchy where all the positions are deliberately created to ensure that the communications can be passed forwards and backwards easily and speedily. The people in the hierarchy trusted those above themselves more than any other source, yet the major source of new information was rumour.

Figures 11.1 and 11.2 set out the Interpersonal Model and the Plant Trade Union hierarchy in the Ryton Plant.
Figure 11.1

ROGERS' MODEL OF INTERPERSONAL DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION

The model as shown here assumes that each person, e.g. C, will tell 3 other people, E, F, G. In this figure only one person on each line is drawn showing the spread of the idea - otherwise the diagram would have been too complex to follow.

Figure 11.2

PLANT TRADE UNION HIERARCHY AT THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

Chief Convenor
Convenors:
Senior Shops Stewards
Shop Stewards
Shop floor Workers
The research results show that the flow of new information is:

(i) up and down the union plant hierarchy, e.g. a shop steward at Ryton heard from his brother-in-law at Lucas that Ryton had cancelled half its order for headlights, the shop steward told the senior shop stewards and convenors, and this forewarned them that in eight weeks time the plant would be on half-time working and

(ii) across the hierarchy, "validators" were used to check on rumours of which the shop stewards were not aware.

Rather than the hypothetical model, as shown in Figure 11.3, the flow of new information more closely approximates Figure 11.4. Information "bounces" about the organization and some people are used more than others as their sources of information are more accurate and/or faster. There were information "nodes", i.e. intersecting points in the information networks, within the plant.

The Interpersonal and the Integrated Models received greater support in the much smaller Special Products plant. There the "validators" do not appear to exist to the same level of importance as in the larger Ryton assembly plant. There were no full-time trade union officials in the Special Products plant - the highest level in the union hierarchy was senior shop steward, and all four of them worked on the shopfloor in the day-to-day working of the plant. Another factor was the large number of women workers, married to fellow CUK workers, who were frequently mentioned in the interview as knowing what was happening in other parts of the company, i.e. the husbands, brothers and sons acted as "validators" for the women workers.

The Ryton research suggests that industrial information reaches the
Figure 11.3

THEORETICAL FLOW OF INFORMATION WITHIN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

Chief Convenor
Convenor
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Shop Steward
Shopfloor Worker

Figure 11.4

ACTUAL FLOW OF INFORMATION WITHIN THE RYTON ASSEMBLY PLANT

The flow shows a great deal of horizontal information flow. J is a person who has friends outside the plant and is a close friend of the Chief Convenor, A, who will ask him questions and reciprocate with little known information. J tells Shop Steward G what is happening, R and L use J as a source.
workers from many sources. The workers appear to sift through the
information and select what appears realistic, i.e. possibly true,
because consonant with beliefs or with other information) and trans­
mit these stories to other workers. When a worker or group of workers
hear a worrying rumour or report, many take steps to verify the infor­
mation by asking their most trusted information source - in most cases
their shop steward. As a consequence, new information flows both up
and down the union hierarchy, and not only down as the model would
suggest. In three instances a shop steward reported that he spent
most of his work day protesting to area management on issues raised in
rumours, e.g. plans for halftime working, brought to him by his shop­
floor electorate. At Ryton most new information flowed up from the
shopfloor and not down from the convenors as the model suggests.

The shop steward does not pass on all the information of which he is
aware to the people next in the communication network. He passes on
selected information. The retained information can be diffused to
the next in line if a "triggering" event occurs. Some workers at
Ryton claimed that their stewards kept back information to make them­
selves more powerful. The researcher's initial entry into the Final
Assembly Shop at Ryton acted as a "triggering" event for the steward
to pass on to his section knowledge about the Vertical Slice Groups
to be set up in the shop which he had had for four weeks earlier. The
appearance of the researcher in the area could not be explained by the
steward unless he gave the men the information whose diffusion the
researcher was trying to trace.

The evidence of Chapter V strongly suggests that most shop stewards
are information "nodes" who collect and transfer information up, down
and across the union hierarchy in their role as reference points for the shopfloor workers.

**SUPPORT FOR A NETWORK MODEL FROM PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED RESEARCH**

Every person is embedded or located in a series of social relations which can be viewed as a network; in fact, society can be viewed as a network and, via his links, an individual, in theory, can eventually contact every other person in his society, e.g. Travers and Milgram's *Study of the Small World Problem*[^31]. A social network is more than a communications network; the messages are in fact exchanges where both parties plan to gain from the exchange, even if the gain is not from the other person with whom the exchange is made. For example, A, a forklift driver tells B, a friend who works on the final assembly line, a rumour; B tells C, who works next to B on the assembly line. In this example B's exchange is to become dependent on A's accuracy, and stake his reputation by passing on A's rumour, B's gain is to be seen as highly knowledgeable by C. A person who persistently loses in exchange with another will tend to break the connection.

We can use 'exchange' to cover both Boissevain's[^32] transactions (one-way) and exchange (reciprocal) by broadening 'exchange' to encompass psychological gains and losses including the psychological gain from being selected for exploitation by another: e.g. one Foreman was used by the Area Management to spread false information in a particular Ryton Shop, yet the Foreman expressed a feeling of superiority over the other Area Foreman as he was the supervisor to whom the Area Management imparted the information.

The assumption of a network model is implicit in the traditional models.
New ideas and inventions do not appear from nowhere, they have a history which can explain their present form. Ideas are spread by word of mouth, by correspondence, by selective media (e.g. professional journals) and by the mass media.

SOCIAL NETWORKS

Leinhardt\(^{33}\) assembled the first comprehensive book of readings in the field of social networks in late 1977. He included the classical work of Heider\(^{34}\), Cartwright and Harary\(^{35}\), Coleman, Katz and Menzel\(^{36}\), Radcliffe-Brown\(^{37}\), Barnes\(^{38}\) and Bott\(^{39}\), as well as the recent innovative research of Lorrain and White\(^{40}\), Holland and Leinhardt\(^{41}\) and Laumann and Pappi\(^{42}\). In his introduction, Leinhardt sweepingly proposes that for the first time the social network paradigm allows the notion of social structure to be empirically tested. This is done by studying the pattern or systematic organization of social relations which tie distinct social entities to one another. The paradigm also includes the associated issues of interdependence of the patterns formed by different relations, the implication the patterns have for the behaviour of the individual entities, and the impact that the qualities of the entities have on the patterns.

Leinhardt\(^{43}\) claims that the data generated by the social network paradigm can potentially explain any pattern of relations between defineable social entities whether they be individuals or groups. He does concede, however, that until now researchers have not concentrated sufficiently on establishing criteria for distinguishing between networks. Consequently, most studies cannot be directly compared.

Network analysis is dominated by mathematicians because it lends itself to mathematical treatment. This is due in part to the work of Moreno\(^{44}\).
The appeal of his use of networks in sociometric analysis was in its concrete and quantitative representation of a social 'system'. Since then, social scientists have expanded the analytic paradigm of the social network beyond recording and organizing data. By focusing attention on ties between individuals, rather than on the qualities possessed by the individuals, it allows social scientists to think about constraints on individual behaviour.

The use of the concept of networks of social relations is strongest in the fields of sociology and social anthropology. It was in 1954 that the term was first used analytically in sociology. Originally, it was used as a metaphor (e.g. Radcliffe-Brown in 1952 defined social structure as "a network of actually existing social relationships") but by the use of digraphs and graph theory it is possible to talk of a network in a precise and restricted manner required for use as an analytic tool. (See Appendix 21 for a detailed outline on Digraph Theory.) Since Barnes, Bott, Phillip Mayer, Epstein, Pauw, Adrian Mayer, and Boissevain have contributed a great deal of information regarding networks but they would not go beyond the use of digraphs given the network's membership and did not deal with the multiplexity of links of the persons in the network.

The approach in network research has been to explain people's behaviour on the basis of the characteristics of their linkages to one another rather than on the attributes of the people themselves. This approach is similar to the concept of sociogram used by social psychologists such as Moreno.

From sociograms such phenomena as clique formation, leadership, and
task performance have been studied. In studies of friendship, particular patterns of linkages (the star, the wheel, the chain, the isolate) were identified. This line of research, however, differs markedly in methodology from the sociological and social anthropological traditions using formal questionnaires (Moreno) as against field observations (Barnes).

Social psychologists have also investigated the way in which rumours, ideas, or information in general diffuse among a set of people. The classic study of the chains of linkage along which information flows was the field study by Coleman, Katz and Menzel; this traced the chains of personal influence which resulted in the adoption of a new drug. Local colleagues were the most potent influence.

Barnes introduced the idea of a social network to describe an order of social relationships which he felt was important in understanding the social behaviour of the parishioners of Bremnes and which were not included in the structural concepts of Territorial Groupings and Occupational Groupings. He took the linkages to be a salient factor in interpreting social action and so made the concept of network useful analytically. Bott showed the analytical capabilities of the concept in her study of the conjugal roles in London families, relating the way in which couples assigned conjugal roles to the 'density' of the networks to which each spouse was connected.

Phillip Mayer specifically used the idea of social network to explain the behaviour of different types of migrants and of settled townsmen in the South African town of East London. Like Bott he found that the wishes and expectations of friends in a 'close knit' group had great
Influence on behaviour. By applying Bott's classification of 'open' and 'closed' networks, Epstein explained how the norms and values of local elites in a town percolated into the ranks of the non-elites with whom the elites had no direct contact.

Mitchell argued that social network theory is one of the three ways to look at large scale societies. The other two are the structural order, by which the behaviour of people is interpreted in terms of action appropriate to the position they occupy, and categorical order where social stereotypes are used to interpret people's behaviour. Mitchell emphasized that there are not three different types of behaviour but rather different ways of making "abstractions from the same actual behaviour to achieve different types of understanding and explanation".

CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL NETWORKS

It is necessary to distinguish certain features of the networks if one is to use the concept in fieldwork. Writers concentrate on different uses of network theory; Bott concentrated on the links among the network members, while Phillip Mayer appears more concerned with the differences between networks.

As yet there is no commonly agreed set of criteria for distinguishing one type of network from another. There are at least three reasons for this:

(i) The study of personal networks requires meticulous and systematic detailed recording of data on social interaction for a fairly large group of people - not even Bott's study, which is the most detailed so far, did this and her conclusions cannot be checked.
There is no set of criteria, e.g. content, directness, intensity, which are commonly accepted among sociologists as important for understanding how networks affect behaviour. There is no standard way of recording data about networks.

The fieldwork required for a systematic check of the interconnections in a single network is onerous (Bott 68).

NETWORK THEORY AND DIGRAPHS

Networks are a special type of digraph with loops allowed and in which lines have values assigned to them; loops are included to allow people to carry out self evaluation and values enable one to distinguish between the strength of the various lines and to estimate the intensity of the relationship measured by the network. Therefore a network consists of a relation on a definite set V of points, with its set of lines denoted as usual by X with a "value" assigned to each line.

The values on the lines may be numerical for measurement of frequencies, probabilities, capacities, and flows or non-numerical, i.e. qualitative or categorical, which allows the study of different types of relations such as interpersonal evaluations containing both positive and negative affective components.

The capacity for the flow of information from a transmitter to a receiver depends on the maximum receivable capacity of the network ("maximum flow theorem"). As the flow value of each line cannot exceed its capacity, it is usual that some of the transmitted material does not reach the receiver.

Figures 11.5 and 11.6 show two situations – one with a perfect match of
line capacities (Figure 11.5) and another where the match is not perfect (Figure 11.6). The two examples can be seen as, say, communication channels in an organization. In Figure 11.5 the Worker receives all the information from the Managing Director and can fully understand the message. However, in Figure 11.6 the maximum theoretical receipt of information can only be 75% of all information transmitted and in practice cannot exceed 58% as the Manager with the greatest capacity to transmit (Manager B) has less information than Manager C who has very limited transmitting capacity.

Figure 11.6 illustrates why lower echelons rarely know all of the proposed plans and changes in an organization, even if all levels of management genuinely try to communicate fully.
Figure 11.5
PERFECT MATCH OF LINE CAPACITIES FOR THE FLOW OF COMMUNICATION

Figure 11.6
IMPERFECT MATCH OF LINE CAPACITIES FOR THE FLOW OF COMMUNICATIONS
CRITICISMS OF THE NETWORK MODEL

No studies have looked at all the characteristics mentioned; a few researchers have looked at a certain number of the same characteristics but none have looked at all. How can replication take place? What research instruments should be used? Bott used questionnaires but found serious problems of recording all relationships with only twenty families. While most researchers observe the events and allocate relative importance to interactions, they cannot be sure that their weightings are correct unless they interviewed both parties on every interaction. Because collection of complete data is a practical impossibility, it has become the tradition in network research to use personal observation.

Wheeldon and Boswell used participant observers because they knew the situation but this introduces the bias of 'observers' into their fieldwork reports.

Normal fieldwork reporting takes a descriptive and narrative form and the features of the personal networks are abstracted from the notes. However, with the interaction often complicated and happening rapidly, even the most gifted field workers could miss much and the parts missed could be crucial.

Few field workers appear to have heard of the application of digraphs and graph theory to social network research and even fewer have used the method. Most of the articles in the field appear in journals of mathematics which most field workers would not read. The problem is a good illustration of network theory - neither group belongs to the same network so they do not influence each other. The groups will
need to establish an on-going dialogue if the theoretical models are to be tested in the field.

An important question in network theory is 'what are the limits of the network?'. Each researcher decides for himself, but is he right? One important feature often overlooked is potential links (e.g. family connections). While these links may be activated only if serious problems arise, they can be very important. If the researcher decides person G is powerless against person L, then he ignores any threat G may pose to L. On the particular issue the assumption may be correct, but if the issue was important then G might use distant relatives (e.g. relatives on his mother's side of the family) or friends which G can approach only if the matter is serious. In either case the researcher would have ignored G's network.

The research has ignored that a person can recruit others into one's network. In a Victorian State Government Department in which the author worked a critical factor in one's network range was whether a person was a Catholic or a Mason. Promotion was determined largely by one's personal affiliation relative to that of the group he was in. As a young man entering the service one was told this by older and more senior members of the group. Therefore, if H was powerless against I, his boss, then H could join the Masonic Lodge and privately ask J, I's boss, to protect him against I. This was done in instances known to the author.

SUMMARY

The research results suggest that the diffusion model in Figure 2.8 is really an innovation model. The model in Figure 2.8 indicates the
forces which lead to ideas being spread within, but not how the diffusion takes place within the various parts of the model. The research also suggests that the proposition in Figure 2.8 that the three models of innovation are really part of a global model is correct; instances were found to support each of the three models in the spread of industrial democracy within Britain.

The diffusion of the concept among people was not the same as the Interpersonal or Integrated models. The idea did not flow from opinion leader to early majority to late majority and then to the laggards. All appeared to hear the same information at approximately the same time, but the adoption occurred at varying rates. Where the convenors, senior shop stewards, or shop stewards negotiated or decided the new information, the flow of information was closer to the interpersonal model, but even here many instances were given where the men knew by rumour of decisions taken by the active participants before the parties had a chance to inform their electorates.

The research did not locate the claimed groundswell for greater Industrial democracy/worker participation (a claim of Mr. Benn) within the British community or in specialist groups.

A fairly large minority was aware of the term, but very few subjects in all the studies referred to industrial democracy without being asked. When asked to explain what they thought it meant, most of them could not accurately describe "industrial democracy". Even in CUK, where negotiations were taking place to involve workers in all decision-making bodies in the company, there was a low level of knowledge.
To locate a groundswell which has forced the government to legislate is a frequent political science/public administration research project, e.g. Nie, Clem, yet the concept of a groundswell is inconsistent with the innovation/diffusion models. If ideas flow down to others, then the government will start to draft legislation before most of the community is aware of it. The Bullock Committee is a case in point; it was not the response to a groundswell but a manoeuvre to increase the public's awareness and to prepare it for the legislation and its enforcement. Groundswells do occasionally occur, e.g. the 'Stop the Vietnam War' Movement in the USA and Australia, but they are not covered by the innovation model unless the politicians are among the ultimate laggards in the community.

Using the adoption categories outlined in Chapter 11, the implementation of the concept so far has been an "authoritarian" one. Some people did know of, and supported, the values of industrial democracy/worker participation ("optional" model) but most people were not aware of the idea. The Government was committed to introduce the concept through negotiations with West Germany, so a Committee of Enquiry was established to recommend how industrial democracy should be introduced into Britain. The Committee of Enquiry met and formulated many proposals, including the "2x + y" formula* for the number of directors on

---

* Page 104 of the Committee's report recommends that the company shareholders (x) and the workers (x) elect an equal number of directors to the Company Board. Then the two parties have to agree on a number of independent directors (y) to complete the full complement of the Board, e.g. a company with 6000 workers would have 11 directors, 4 shareholders elected, 4 workers elected, and 3 selected by mutual agreement.
the Board of the organization covered by the proposed Act. The adoption of industrial democracy was to become "authoritarian", then "optional", as knowledge of the workings of the Act spread and finally "collective" as the majority of people saw the Bill as a sensible piece of legislation; the Bill would make the people aware of the concept and become interested as it affected them. Then the people would evaluate the workings of the Act, see how trials had worked elsewhere and finally convince all industry in Britain, large and small, Government, and private, to appoint worker directors. From the evidence the diffusion model does not have the same dynamics as the Innovative Interpersonal model. Rather there appears to be a lattice of 'information nodes', who pass information backwards and forwards to each other, and the 'nodes' tell those in their close proximity what is happening. Some people are nodes by virtue of occupying certain positions, e.g. shop steward, while other people become nodes by having reliable and accurate sources of information, e.g. validators, and are therefore thrust into the information transmitter's role by their workfellows.

The diffusion model in Figure 2.8 does explain generally the movement over time, of the way the concept of industrial democracy/worker participation has been adopted, and the action that has been taken to implement it. It does not explain in a meaningful way how the idea was diffused to various members of the same organization or in the same area. Without this information, one cannot predict whether an idea to be diffused will be likely to be accepted.

The findings are not all negative. They do suggest a better way to visualise and understand how ideas are diffused between people in the
same work area, the network model of diffusion. Although still presenting significant problems, the network model appears to be more likely to be a better way of describing relationships between entities. The rapid development of technology and techniques over the past decade suggest that very soon the informational analysis of larger groups will be feasible. For example, the total number of points (entities) capable of being covered by the most advanced computer package is 1000. This is enough to theoretically measure the flow of information into, through, and out of the Special Products Plant; in the late 1950s the maximum sized net (set of connected points) was 15.

The recent works of Laumann and Pappi \textsuperscript{72}, Leinhardt \textsuperscript{73}, the Centre de Mathematique Sociele on Combinatorics \textsuperscript{74} and Dorean and Hummon \textsuperscript{75}, illustrate both growth of interest in and improvement in mathematical techniques. The major problems facing the network analysts will remain the selection of criteria and accurate measurement rather than the processing of data, especially as new sophisticated mathematical techniques, e.g. Combinatorics, are designed.

Appendix 21 provides the tools, within certain limitations, to handle network analysis within a work situation. This has been done in at least one reported case - Kapferer \textsuperscript{76} who investigated the relations of 15 workers. The recent work of Laumann and Pappi \textsuperscript{77} covered a city of 20,000 people when the points were identified as groups and not individuals. A way will doubtless be found to integrate the computer packages capable of handling a thousand or more entities, and the more global approach of Laumann et al. If this is done successfully, social scientists may, at last, be able to study in detail the dynamics of the diffusion of an idea within a group, as well as the dynamics of diffusion between groups.
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MONITORING OF THE SURVEY FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

The dissonance that has steadily grown between man's potential (physical and psychological) and his assigned work tasks is well known and documented. However, information on the attempts to rectify the situation have not been so well disseminated; this in particular applies to how "action" research has been carried out.

Very little has been written in depth to explain why some Survey Feedback Analysis (SFA) have been successful while others apparently similar have failed. I would suggest that a major factor in the success/failure of the SFA has been the environment in which the technique has been applied. Therefore I contend that the continued success of the present exercise will greatly depend on the way the information about the SFA is diffused and accepted or rejected by employees and management. Theoretically diffusion of the SFA information should be controlled to reduce misunderstanding of its objectives but within the present methodology this cannot be done. However it is possible to monitor how the messages on the project are being received and what effect they are having; this would allow the project to react to negative information and attempt to short circuit the potential damage to the environment within which the SFA is operating.

Recommendation

1. That the monitoring be done on a regular basis - initially weekly whilst the first slice group commences by sampling people within the Ryton plant. Obviously people on the track of the Final Assembly will be highest in order of priority for sampling but other areas as well should be sampled. One error in some SFA's has been an overconcentration on the actual workers involved and forgetting to see how service and white collar personnel whose jobs are radically affected by the SFA feel about the project. Sometimes their non-cooperation has been sufficient to defeat the good intentions of all the parties involved.

2. The time for monitoring should be approximately 10 minutes a person. This should be sufficient time to establish how much the interviewee knows and what was his source of information. About 30 interviews a day, a week, could be done on this basis.
3. The style of interview should be informal and on the work floor wherever possible. The questions should be open ended and as long as the points mentioned below are covered then the interview will be rated as "satisfactory".

4. The open ended interview would cover the following points:
   (i) Did the interviewee know about the initial plant survey?
   (ii) Does the interviewee know of the "slice group"?
   (iii) If yes, where did he learn about the "slice group"?
   (iv) If no, where does he learn most of his information about the plant from?

5. People who are given as a source of information would be interviewed. This will be to see:
   (i) The source of their data
   (ii) How the information has altered from them to the person who originally quoted them as a source.

The method could lead to 4 or 5 interviews in a chain and by this means it would be possible to trace the message path and content changes.

6. All interviewees must be confident that the interviewer is impartial. Therefore it is unlikely that any Chrysler employee could initially run the monitoring process. As well the interviewee must be confident that his private opinions will be treated confidentially i.e. not repeated to any other person, Management or Trade Union, so that he could be identified.

7. That I monitor the diffusion of information on the SFA.

8. Managers and Supervisors must be told what I am doing and what is the purpose of my presence in their area; sometimes they will be the interviewees.

9. The writer has a general letter of introduction from the Secretary of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and he would need to meet the Coventry District Secretary and Senior Shop Stewards at Ryton to explain his purpose in talking to workers.

10. If 8 and 9 are carried out successfully there should be very little interference with the daily work routine of the plant but the success of the SFA should be greatly increased.

11. My point of contact in the plant should remain Mr. Colin Brody and Mr. Dick Williams of the Motivation and Productivity Section as they are responsible for servicing the SFA within the Ryton plant.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)
G.E. Wittingslow
Researcher
APPENDIX 2

RYTON STUDY

SELECTION OF INTERVIEWEES, INTERVIEW, AND SAMPLE SIZE

SELECTION

Initially, the interviewees were selected by the Foreman or the Shop Steward within the section in the shop, depending on the instructions of the Superintendant for the area. The selection was in part based on the skills of the "floater" or relieving worker, who filled the workstation while the worker was being interviewed; where the "floater" was not competent to replace a worker, the latter was not considered for interview.

Some interviewees were chosen for their opinions, e.g. "This fellow will give you a different opinion from the last two you have seen", but in the main the workers were chosen by the researcher, who attempted to obtain a representative sample of the areas. The refusal rate was 10% overall, but most of these occurred when asked by the Foreman or Shop Steward. The researcher's criterion for selecting interviewees was that they worked in positions where information might be expected to enter or leave the work area, e.g. close to the door, beside the Foreman's work desk, and on the way to and from the toilets. These selections were initially made to find information 'nodes' i.e. people used for their sources of information; it was hoped to ask the 'nodes' where they received the information and so trace the diffusion of the idea.
THE INTERVIEW

The interviewee was first told that both Management and the Unions had agreed to the survey, that any comments would be treated in the strictest confidence, and that no comments would be reported which would identify a particular worker or work area. The researcher identified himself as an Australian national who would return to his country at the end of 1975. This point was considered important, as discussions with the unions revealed that they believed that the workers had taken some researchers into their confidence and given full information on union attitudes, policies, strengths and weaknesses only to see the "independent" researcher later appointed to a senior Industrial relations position in the particular plant, where he used his privileged information in his dealings with the unionists. Following the explanatory comments, no one refused to answer the questions or raised any comments during or after the questioning to suggest concern about answering the questionnaire (see Appendix 3 for a copy of the questionnaire).

The first questions identified the person, his job, and his area. Initially, this information was thought to be critical, for the model of diffusion hypothesized a chain in which A told B who told C and so on. In order to trace the pattern the researcher needed to follow the ideas back to the source.

Questions 4 and 5 were intended to plot the spread of information about the Survey Feedback exercise, the Slice Groups, and to identify those who spread the information; these were the two critical questions of the survey.
Question 6 was included in case the person had not heard of either development. The sections of this question were intended to show the sources of information and the most and least trusted sources. Finally, questions 7 and 8 were used to tease out the way the sample sought information and how people checked on worrying rumours.

SAMPLE

The actual size of the sample interviewed was 127. The men came from the following shops:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shop</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Assembly</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Planning</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body in White</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Shop</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 127

and held the following work positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop-floor Worker</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Steward</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 127

During the time of the study the number of workers in the Ryton Plant was reduced by 20%, from 5,000 to 4,000; the plant was placed on a five day fortnight by the C.U.K. Senior Management; strikes by other plants and suppliers closed the plant for short periods of time, and there was a series of strikes within the plant itself.
QUESTIONS FOR RYTON MONITORING SCHEME

Standard Details

1. Name
2. Classification
3. Area

4. Have you heard anything about a survey held in this plant to find out how workers feel about their job?
   a) Do you know roughly about when it was held?
   b) How did you find out about the survey? (Search for source)
   c) What do you think about the survey?

5. Have you heard about the discussion group which has been set up to look at the results of the survey?
   If Yes:
   a) What did you hear?
   b) How did you find out about the group?
   c) What do you think of the idea?

6. a) How do you find out what is going on in the plant?
    b) Which source(s) do you trust the most?
    c) Which source(s) do you trust the least?

7. To whom would you go to find out what is going on?

8. To whom would you go to check whether something you heard was correct or not?
Dear Colin,

DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION IN INDUSTRY

The Survey Feedback Analysis (SFA) presently being experimented within the Ryton Plant is one of the most heartening developments in the application of the social sciences to industry. In various field applications it has shown a high potential for increasing productivity while at the same time increasing the worker's involvement in his job. This is claimed to occur because there is a much better use of all available skills in a plant as all the workers have the opportunity to assist in the improvement of their job and to feel that they have some influence in the decision making processes.

By all appearances the SFA has begun successfully in the Ryton Plant. It will probably take 2-3 years before all the suggested areas have been worked through to the final work configuration for their respective areas if previous experience is any guide.

However the detailed information on how the successful and unsuccessful SAF's were run has not been well documented and this leads to the problem I raised in the memo dated the 28th November 1974 re Monitoring of the Survey Feedback Analysis - how is information diffused in a plant. Apparently similar SAF's have had radically different rates of success and, whilst this could be due to the skill of the experimenters and the willingness of the company, it is also likely that the atmosphere in the plant was at least as significant in the success or otherwise of the SFA.

I am suggesting that some research be done to understand how information is diffused through a plant. Two very good plants exist in Coventry to research this important issue, Bagginton Trim and Bagginton K.D. Bagginton Trim has 230 workers, most of whom are female operators while Bagginton K.D. has 201 workers, most of whom are male. The two plants are small and so are easier to study and vary markedly in the preponderance of sexes; one important variable could be the way in which female and male workers learn about information they are prepared to act upon. Any subsequent model that arose from the two investigations could be retested on larger plants, either other Chrysler plants, or other companies in the West Midlands.
If this research was successful it would greatly improve the chances of the SFA working within Chrysler and give important clues to how people learn about information which they regard as critical to their decision making. As well there could be a spin-off from the investigation—a general report on how management information is passed through the plants and which types are most likely to be successful. This report would have to be general so as not to give any information which would destroy the trust people would place in the honesty of the researcher.

I believe this type of research is critical if the interaction between management and workers is to move beyond the sterile role expectancies of conflict encased in collective bargaining. As well it would provide badly needed information on why particular applications succeed or fail.

I would appreciate a quick reply to this request, say December, as it will take time to organise and I must return to my post in Australia at the end of 1975.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)
G.E. Wittingslow
Researcher
APPENDIX 5

CHRYSLER SPECIAL PRODUCTS PLANT SURVEY

DETAILS OF THE PLANT AND SIZE OF THE SAMPLE

The factory is four kilometres from the headquarters of CUK, the Whitley Plant, and five kilometres from the Ryton Assembly Plant. The Special Products Division shapes and assembles the plastic based products used in the construction of all CUK cars; the parts include front grills, dashboards and air-ventilators.

The site is situated very close to the centre of Coventry on the edge of the city ring-road system. The buildings were formerly the Singer car plant and four of the men interviewed were the fourth generation to work at the location. Opposite the plant is a very large council high-rise housing development and most of the women plant workers live within easy walking distance. The number of shopfloor employees in the plant in early 1975 was 250. Some areas, e.g. manufacturing, worked a two-shift day while others, e.g. assembly lines, worked a one-shift day. Manufacturing employed men in mostly noisy and dirty conditions; in the Moulding and Vacuum Form Shops for instance, the worker is isolated by the noise of the machines which must be continuously fed and emptied and the worker cannot leave the machine unless relief is arranged. The almost exclusively female staffed Assembly Area is non-mechanised and the workers can rest at any time as long as they meet their daily quota. The women work on individual work benches and each passes her completed section to the next table until the part is finished, ready for installation. The loudest sound
In the Assembly Areas is the sound of the chatter of the employees.

SAMPLE

Selection of subjects was random, but structured, in agreement with the management and unions, in that one in six shop-floor workers was interviewed and that all 13 of the manufacturing processes were to be included. These conditions meant that 47 workers, or 18.2% of staff and workers were interviewed, see Figure 1 for a ground floor plan of the plant.

The sample was 25 men and 22 women, the same proportion of men to women as in the plant. Twenty-one of the men and nineteen women were shop-floor workers, two men and two women were Shop Stewards, and finally there were two foremen and one forewoman. The researcher visited the plant twice before interviewing the employees. Maps of the factory layout were drawn and the conditions and workplaces were observed in order to draw up a list of interview sites. The researcher selected the interviewees on the basis of every sixth person in each area, told them individually of the purpose of the study, and then asked for their co-operation; not one person refused to answer the Interview schedule (Appendix 6) which took between 40 and 75 minutes. Relief was arranged for the interview so that the work area did not suffer through having a workstation unattended. People were interviewed in the rest area nearest to their workstation and in full view of, but not overheard by, the workers.

In 1975 the plant paid one of the highest rates in Coventry; car workers are traditionally the highest paid workers in the West Midland
Figure 1
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region. Originally all the workers in a car plant were skilled males, but as techniques of car building altered, so the demand for skills in C.U.K. has fallen. All Chrysler Plants have accepted the general principle of a common salary across the plant, and recently women have been selected for lighter, monotonous tasks. Consequently the women in the Special Products Plant earned up to twice as much as other Coventry women doing tasks of a similar difficulty.

When vacancies arise the job is advertised first in the plant, then throughout C.U.K., and finally locally. The last course of action is rarely employed, since Irish workers have joined the company and recruited their families to fill the vacant positions. Four of the sample were single Irish women between 20 and 30 who had left small Irish farms to join their brothers or sisters. Eight of the women, but none of the men, were Irish, six of the men were skilled Scots who had left the Clyde dockyards to move to the Midlands in search of work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 Name</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
<th>Mrs.</th>
<th>Miss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Apprenticeship</td>
<td>YES / NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Father's Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Did/does your father work in this Company?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Did/do any of your relatives work in this Company?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 If YES in Q9, whom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 How did you first gain your ideas of work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Was it adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 What is your present job like?</td>
<td>Very good 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 What do you like most about the job?

Q16 What do you like least about the job?

Q17 How do you find out what is going on in the plant?

Q18 Which source do you believe most?

Why?

Q19 Which source do you believe least?

Why?
Q20 Who would you go to check something you had heard?

Q21 Who are your mates at work?
(a) Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(1i)</th>
<th>(1ii)</th>
<th>(1iv)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q21 Do you see them outside work? 
(b) YES / NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q21 Do you visit each other? 
(c) YES / NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q22 Does your mother or father belong or did they belong to a trade union? 
(a) Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>D.K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.K.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22 Are there any other people in your household who belong to trade unions? 
(b) YES / NO

Q22 Would you describe yourself as 
(c) 1 very involved in trade union affairs?  
   2 fairly involved  
   3 not involved
Q22 How often do you attend your trade union branch meeting?
   Always or nearly always 1
   Usually 2
   Occasionally 3
   Hardly ever 4
   Never 5

Q22 How often do you discuss matters relating to your trade union with people you work with, that is, apart from your shop steward or other union official?
   Once a week or more 1
   At least once a month but less than once a week 2
   Once a month to once every six months 3
   Less often than this 4

Q23 How would you describe industrial relations in Britain?
   Very good 1
   Good 2
   About average for industrial countries 3
   Poor 4
   Very bad 5

Q24 From time to time there are strikes in British industry. Generally speaking, what would you say are the main causes or reasons behind most of the strikes that take place in Britain?

Q24 You say ... (NAME EACH REASON GIVEN AT Q24(a) is the reason for strikes. (b) Can you tell me where you got that idea from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) REASONS</th>
<th>(b) SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25 (a) For the past year or so the government has been operating its policy of the social contract, that is it has been trying to control wages, prices and profits by consent. How far do you think the government's policies for controlling prices have been effective? I know you may not think they have been totally effective or totally ineffective but on balance would you say they've been ...........

... on the whole effective? 1
... on the whole ineffective? 2
... don't know 3

Q25 (b) In what ways have you learned that this is the case?

Q26 (a) How effective do you think the government policy on pay claims has been?

... on the whole fair 1
... on the whole unfair 2
... don't know 3

Q26 (b) In what ways have you learned that this is the case?

Q27 Taking into consideration the kind of work you normally do, and the amount of work you do for your money, how do you think you are paid?

Far too little 1
Too little 2
About right 3
Too much 4
Q28 What do you think work will be like in the next 10 years?

Q29 What sources do you use for your ideas?

Q30 Do you think you individually, or shop-floor workers as a group, will be more involved in the planning and running of the organisation that they work for?

(a) Yes 1
No 2
Don't know 3

(b) Sources for your ideas
Q31 Are you happy about the future for workers that your children/grandchildren face

(a) Yes 1
    No 2
    Don't know 3

(b) Why?

Q32 How important would you say each of the following has been in giving you information and ideas about trade unions and industrial relations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Quite unimportant</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Involvement with my union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Family or relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Friends and acquaintances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33 How important would you say each of the following has been in giving you general information about your company and industrial relations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>NVI</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Involvement with my union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Family or relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Friends &amp; acquaintances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34 From your viewing experience, do you think that television is biased or not?

- More favourable to employers 1
- Favours neither one side nor the other 2
- More favourable to unions 3
- DK/NA 4

Q35 Do you think the newspapers tend to favour the employers, the trade unions or neither?

- More favourable to employers 1
- Favours neither one side nor the other 2
- More favourable to unions 3
- DK/NA 4

Q36 And what about radio? In general, do you think radio tends to favour the employers, trade unions, or neither?

- More favourable to employers 1
- Favours neither one side nor the other 2
- More favourable to unions 3
- DK/NA 4

Q37 Now for some questions on television. Do you regularly watch television?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Q38 On average, how many times each day do you see the news on television?

- Less than once a day on average 1
- About once a day 2
- About twice a day 3
- More than twice a day 4
- Don't see television 5
Q39 Which channels do you watch and at what times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q40 Which channel do you watch most frequently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBC 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41 How long do you normally watch television each day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 30 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 60 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 120 minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 2 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42 How often do you watch documentary programmes like Panorama, World in Action or This Week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a fortnight</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every week or nearly every week</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q43 In dealing with industrial relations does television place too much attention on

(a) Strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Pay claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) The Social Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q43  
Contd.  
(d) Inflation  
Yes 1  
No 2  
DK 3

Q44 Do you regularly read newspapers?  
Yes 1  
No 2

Q45 Please tell me the names of any daily or evening newspapers, either national or local, that you regularly look at.  

Q45  
On average, on how many days a week do you look at ....  
(Name paper) (Record Below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Newspapers looked at</th>
<th>(b) No. of days look at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None looked at ....... 9
Q46 How long do you read the newspapers each day?

- less than 30 minutes [1]
- less than 60 minutes [2]
- less than 120 minutes [3]
- more than 120 minutes [4]

Q47 Which parts of the papers do you read regularly?

- Headlines only [1]
- General news [2]
- Industrial relations [3]
- Editorials [4]
- Business [5]
- Sport [6]
- Other [7]
- All the paper [8]

Q48 Which Sunday newspapers, if any, do you look at most Sundays?

- News of the World [1]
- People [2]
- Sunday Times [3]
- Sunday Express [4]
- Sunday Telegraph [5]
- Sunday post [6]
- Observer [7]
- Sunday Mirror [8]

- Other (specify) [9]

- None looked at [0]

Q49 On average how long do you read the Sunday newspapers?

- Less than 30 minutes [1]
- Less than 60 minutes [2]
- Less than 120 minutes [3]
- More than 120 minutes [4]
Q50 What parts of the Sunday newspapers do you regularly read?

- Magazine
- Headlines only
- General news
- Industrial relations
- Editorials
- Business
- Sport
- Other
- All the paper

Q51 Do you receive or see your trade union journals or any newspaper or periodical published by your union for the members?

(a) 
Yes
No
Don't know

(b) Would you tell me the name or other details of the publication?

(c) How often do you normally look at .......

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications or other details</th>
<th>Every issue/nearly every issue</th>
<th>About half the issues</th>
<th>Under half the issues</th>
<th>Never read it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q52** In general do you think your Trade Union publication tends to favour the Trade Union, employers or neither?

- More favourable to Trade Unions: 1
- Favourable to neither side: 2
- More favourable to employers: 3
- DK/NA: 4

**Q53** Apart from those you've told me about, are there any other newspapers, newsheets, or periodicals that you see, from which you may get information and ideas about trade unions or industrial relations?

(a) Yes: 1
No: 2

IF YES AT (a)

(b) Please tell me the names or other details of these publications or where they come from. (RECORD FULL DETAILS BELOW)

FOR EACH PUBLICATION AT (b)

(c) How often do you look at this publication? (SHOW CARD N AND RECORD BELOW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications or other details</th>
<th>Every issue/nearly every issue</th>
<th>About half the issues</th>
<th>Under half the issues</th>
<th>Never read it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q54 In dealing with industrial relations does the press pay too much attention to

(a) Strikes

   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(b) Pay claims

   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(c) The Social Contract

   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(d) Inflation

   YES
   NO
   Don't know

Q55 Now for some questions on Radio. Firstly do you listen to Radio at all?

   YES
   NO

Skip to Q62 if the answer is NO.

Q56 On average how many times each day do you listen to the news on radio?

   Less than once a day on average
   About once a day
   About twice a day
   More than twice a day

   1
   2
   3
   4

Q57 Which radio station do you listen to for the news?

   Station
   Time
   1
   2
   3
   4
Q58 Which radio station do you listen to most frequently?

Q59 In dealing with industrial relations does radio spend too much time on

(a) Strikes
   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(b) Pay claims
   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(c) The Social Contract
   YES
   NO
   Don't know

(d) Inflation
   YES
   NO
   Don't know

Q60 On average how long each day do you listen to radio?

   less than 30 minutes  1
   less than 60 minutes  2
   less than 120 minutes 3
   more than 120 minutes 4

Q61 Are there any magazines you read regularly which have given you ideas about work and how it should be run?
Q62 Are there any book(s) you have read which have given you ideas about work and how it should be run?

Q63 Where do you learn most about the affairs of your company from?

- Newspapers 1
- Television 2
- Radio 3
- Magazines 4
- Books 5
- Talking to workmates 6
- Talking to management 7
- Talking to shop stewards 8
- Trade Union journals 9
- Trade Unionists from outside the company 10
- Union meetings 11
- Shop floor meetings 12
- Trade union courses 13
- Plant union handouts 14
- Gossip heard in Coventry 15
- Others (write in) 16
Q64 Where do you learn most about the affairs of your trade union from?

- Shop Steward: 1
- Branch official: 2
- People you work with (other than officials or steward): 3
- Other friends/relatives: 4
- A trade union publication: 5
- Newspapers: 6
- Television: 7
- Other (write in): 8

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PATIENCE IN ASSISTING ME.
When the backgrounds of the men and women were compared, there appeared many significant differences*. The items and the significance of their differences are discussed below. As mentioned previously, there was a significant difference \((p < .01)\) in the allocation of men and women to different work areas (Q.3). All the workers came from working-class homes if one classified the small Irish farmer as working-class (Q.7), but not all the sample had the same family trade union background. Eight of the men but no women had been apprenticed (Q.6) \((p < .02)\), and the men had a significantly higher proportion of fathers \((p < .02)\) and mothers \((p < .02)\) who were, or had been, trade unionists (Q.22a). The women had a significantly greater number of other trade unionists in their homes than the men (Q.22b) \((p < .02)\). Nearly half of the men were the sole breadwinner in the family, yet only three of the women were in the same position; the women had husbands, brothers, sisters and sons who were earning a wage and living at home.

All of the sample were asked to rate their jobs on a five-point scale "Very Good" to "Very Poor". The women and men perceived their jobs significantly differently (Q.13) \((p < .001)\), see Table 1.

* When a chi-square test of significance was applied.
Table 1

RATINGS OF JOBS BY WORKERS AT THE SPECIAL PRODUCTS PLANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-five percent of the women rated their job as "Good" to "Very Good", whereas only 52% of the men rated their job at the same level; 40% of the men rated their job as "Adequate".

When asked what they "liked most" (Q.15) and least (Q.16) about the job, the reason for the differences became much clearer. Twenty-four of the 53 "most liked" responses by the men involved achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement - all factors described by Herzberg as "Motivators", while only 12 of the women's 46 responses named the same factors; the women mentioned working conditions, salary, and workmates in 32 of the remaining 34 responses (p < .05). These female results contrast with Viola Klein's belief that women work primarily for personal fulfilment.

The men disliked the work itself, as it was boring and stultifying. They disliked the company policy, its administration, and the working conditions in that order. Only 14 women had anything they disliked.
and all stated that none of the dislikes was serious. These answers appeared to be honest, as the same women gave answers to the other questions which would have been equally threatening to their job security if they had feared the researcher would report their comments to the management. The results are consistent with the observed working conditions, and with concerns expressed by some women interviewees. When asked (Q.16) what they liked least about the job, the women said that they enjoyed their job, but the men's working conditions were much poorer. The women then commented that the implementation of obligatory equal pay in 1976 would, they believed, lead to men replacing the women and realising how much better women workers are treated.

Men and women differed significantly (p < .001) on their rating of their level of wages (Q.27). Only one of the 22 women felt she was paid "too little", yet 12 of the 25 men felt their pay was "too little". The men saw their wages as supporting their families and the job providing their work future for the rest of their working life. As with most similar previous research, most women saw the job as providing the money to pay for the luxuries of modern living, e.g. colour television set, better furniture, and carpets. The two sexes had different attitudes to industrial action - the women fearing missed repayments through strike action, while the men felt that strong action was necessary at times to gain a better longterm working environment. The two groups perceived the Senior Shop Stewards and Shop Stewards Committee in differing lights, and this was brought home to the researcher very early in the study.

Whilst mapping the plant, the researcher observed the calling and running of a stop work meeting. The dispute arose when a foreman took disciplinary action during the night shift. The Industrial
Relations section did not work at night, and the Foreman sacked the worker for insubordination, without first clearing the action with the Industrial Relations Officer. The Shop Stewards Committee met the next morning and demanded the reinstatement of the worker without loss of pay. Management refused to act until the head office Industrial Relations Department of C.U.K. checked for precedents in other plants. After a long and bitter stop work meeting, the workers voted to strike by a small majority, with the men voting for the motion while the women voted to stay at work until the C.U.K. information was collected on reinstatement precedents. During the debate the speakers emphasized that the vote for or against the strike was a personal action. After the vote most women went back to work as they had opposed the strike action, and they received the full support of the plant management. When the District Organizer of the Transport and General Workers Union arrived to negotiate the reinstatement of the worker, he was told of the women's action and he approached them to abide by the majority decision. When they refused the Organizer immediately set up a picket line outside the plant gate and threatened the management with a strike of indefinite length unless the women ceased work instantly. The management capitulated and sent the women home without pay for the extra hour worked after the stop work meeting.

Some women were still antagonistic towards the unions when interviewed a fortnight later; the man had been reinstated as demanded, but the workers were only paid for part of the time they were on strike.

The background questions were followed by a series of probes on the sources of information available to the workers; in some cases there were significant sex differences, but on the whole the results were common across the Special Products plant. The spread of C.U.K. information within the plant was very quick, as 34 of the 47 in the sample had relatives working in C.U.K. (Q.9) and most were close family relatives, as shown in Table 2.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVES WORKING IN C.U.K. PLANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The women had significantly more relatives than the men (p< .05); the ratio of one relative working in C.U.K. for every person in the sample (48 relatives for 47 workers), is a highly unusual occurrence. This result is partly explained by the selection policy previously mentioned.

The questions concerning the diffusion of ideas began by asking each worker his or her sources of information regarding the world of work before leaving school. This and other related questions were designed to compare the ideas of work of the adults with those of Coventry school-children's (Chapter V) living in the same suburb and to see if succeeding generations used the same or different sources of information about work. The men relied mainly on those whom they respected as knowing the field (Q.11) - their fathers, brothers and other relatives, but not their mothers. The women relied more on sources outside the home such as friends, school and observing others at work. The men used more means of collecting information than the women, but the women felt that their sources were more accurate (Q.12). The women's sources
described work as it was, while half the men were not prepared for the filthy and boring nature of the job.

Replicating the Ryton Studies, workers were asked to list the most important sources of information about the future of the plant (Q.17). All 47 mentioned rumour and over half saw it as the most important source. As with the previously reported studies, those results indicate that workers were given insufficient information and had to seek it out. The next major source was the Shop Stewards - 29 responses from 47 subjects; no other source scored 10 responses.

The men had more sources (84 sources among 25 men) than the women (53 among 22). The men relied on workmates in the area, workmates in other areas, notice boards, and higher management, as well as on the two major sources. The women relied on rumour, the Shop Stewards, the Forelady, if the Shop Steward was doubted, and a few relied on the 'Coventry Evening Telegraph'. The results are consistent with other data as the men stressed that they continually made contacts in search of information while the women relied on rumour and relatives. The major groups of sources are listed below in Table 3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Sources of Information in the Plant</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumour</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Stewards and Unions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen and Higher Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequently mentioned sources were not necessarily the most trusted ones (Q.18). Although all subjects nominated one or more sources which they used, nine said they trusted none of the sources. Of the remaining 38, 29 gave Shop Stewards as their most trusted source, and the Foreman/Forelady scored 9 responses. The mass media were not trusted by anybody.

The above results are similar to those of the Ryton research, and in the Special Products research the subjects were asked additional questions (Q.18) concerning their trust of particular sources. Sources were trusted because of their position and not necessarily because of their personal characteristics. Stewards and supervisors were trusted because they were perceived as having the responsibility to inform the workers of events even though their motivation for doing so could not be determined. Individuals were trusted if they had a reputation for accuracy; rumour was distrusted because it was inaccurate, on average, on half the occasions (Q.19). These results suggest that the selection of the stewards is seen by the workers as evidence of the former's credibility. The question as to the major reference points for checking worrying information (Q.20) provided initially surprising results - the management was asked as much as the trade unions representatives. The subjects explained that they checked the Stewards' material with the management and asked for union clarification if they heard worrying rumours.

The sample was then asked to nominate the percentage of rumours they thought to be accurate (Q.17). The results were:
i.e. half the rumours were seen as reliable, the response clearly illustrating one reason behind the serious industrial problems in C.U.K. in 1975. There was a continual flow of frightening rumours, and if one believed that just a quarter or more were true (80% did), then most subjects must have believed a number of fresh rumours every day. As in the second Ryton study, all the Stewards reported that they protested to management whenever a threatening rumour was heard in case it was started by management; one Steward spent most of his day protesting at fresh rumours, thus illustrating the very low level of trust in the Industrial relations within the plant.

The major sources of information regarding the company (Q.63) and the unions (Q.64), show how poorly C.U.K. communicated with the workers, and that the Stewards did contact every worker in the sample - see Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR C.U.K.</th>
<th>FOR TRADE UNIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Workmates 41</td>
<td>1 Shop Stewards 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(a) Shop Stewards 36</td>
<td>2 Workmates 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(b) Shopfloor Meetings 12</td>
<td>3 Branch Official 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Coventry Evening Telegraph 35</td>
<td>4 Coventry Evening Telegraph 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Television 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coventry Gossip 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Management 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The six people who used the newspaper to check information on the unions were Irish women who distrusted all forms of unionism. Besides the sources within the plant, the workers used sources outside the work environment. This became apparent in the Ryton studies, so a series of questions were included to seek out the importance of information collected outside working hours. More men than women saw their workmates outside work (Q.21b) \((p < .05)\); the men usually met at the local pub or at the Workingmen's Club. A few women went to the club, but most of their social contact occurred at social outings, e.g. bingo, the picture theatre.

As the men also met workers from other car plants, the social gathering became an important information exchanging time. Knowledge of the number of dashboards being produced indicated how many cars would be built in the next month at the assembly plant. The workers were asked if they visited each other's homes (Q.21c). A quarter of the men and women did visit each other. When asked what was discussed (Q.21c) there was a significant difference in subject matter covered \((p < .05)\); the men discussed trade union affairs or sporting arrangements, while the women called for family contact. The family contact was important for the diffusion of information, especially if one's relatives worked in C.U.K., as the example below dramatically illustrates.

A woman on a Monday mentioned that she had relatives working in C.U.K. and 4 others working in motor car associated industries in Coventry. Questioned about visiting workmates outside work, she mentioned that all 9 relatives, plus non-working wives usually ate Sunday lunch at her place. She said that her oldest brother had told the family gathering the previous day that the Purchasing Department at C.U.K., Whitley, had rung him on Friday at Lucas to cancel the C.U.K. forward order for headlights in 8 weeks time. As all Chrysler plants work on a 2 day component stock in the plant, the suppliers have to supply the plants about three times a
week and stocks are ordered eight weeks ahead. The woman's husband was a Shop Steward at the Ryton Assembly Plant. Next day, Tuesday, the author on returning to Ryton found the plant on strike. The men had demanded that the plant not be closed down or put on half time working in eight weeks time. The plant Senior Management accused the Convenors of provocation. The matter simmered for the next 7 weeks and the management totally denied the story. The researcher visited the plant Manager at Ryton on the Friday afternoon of the seventh week to discuss research results and to watch the events at close range. During the meeting the Midlands Manufacturing Manager at Whitley rang and instructed the plant Manager to work an alternating 2 and 3 day week for the next month. The workers believed the plant management had lied from the first day of the rumours. The management in turn marvelled at the "union spy-system" which did not exist - the information came from a chance comment at a dinner table during a family meal.

Then followed a series of questions concerning trade union activities. Asked if they attended union branch meetings (Q.22a) 6 men and one woman answered "yes". The seven included four Shop Stewards, two former Senior Stewards and the wife of the local Branch Secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union. As the union branches were area branches, e.g. Coventry and not plant or company, Stewards were expected to attend branch meetings to act as the workers' representative and report back on the agenda after each meeting. Nearly one quarter of the sample saw themselves as "active trade unionists" (Q.22c) but this was only in the context of the Special Products plant and not in the general union movement. As all the sample daily discussed union matters at work (Q.22e), it would be very easy for ideas and rumours to spread quickly throughout the plant.

When asked about the state of Industrial Relations in Britain in 1975 (Q.23), the men and women gave significantly different answers (p<.05). The women saw the situation as "very good" to "average" on a five point scale, while the majority of men saw the position as "poor" to "very poor". Both groups identified the same causes, used the
same sources, personal experience (Q.24b), and the television news (Q.31a), but the women were more optimistic. The 75 responses given as reasons for the industrial relations position can be separated into three broad categories.

(a) Understandable conflict, e.g. poor communications, salary negotiations;

(b) Management created conflict, e.g. Management induced strikes;

(c) Union created conflict, e.g. greedy pay claims

See Table 5 for the full details.

The results on responsibility for conflict are consistent with the responses to the questions on Rumour (Q.24a) and Sources of Information (Q.24b) where some subjects expressed the belief that management started rumours to ascertain whether they could try new tactics on the workforce. In total, management was seen as responsible, or partly responsible, for 76% (41% + 35%) of the industrial problems and the unions responsible for 59% (24% + 35%). The use of personal experience in making these judgements indicate how the workers apportioned the causes of industrial strife in Special Products in particular and C.U.K. in general.

The interviewees were asked to rate the importance of each source for Industrial Relations data (Q.32) on a four point scale. The results are shown in Table 6. Television and the newspapers were the two major sources, each was seen as at least 'Fairly Important' by 60% of the sample. Next in numerical importance were the unions with 21 responses (45%) in the 'Fairly Important' category or better. It is important to note that while not as numerous as the other two, the union category received the highest number of 'Very Important' responses. Relatives
Table 5

MAJOR CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. UNDERSTANDABLE CONFLICT</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Lack of information</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Understandable conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Pay claims</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 External pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. MANAGEMENT CREATED CONFLICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Unfair management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Maintenance of class distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Poor conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Non communication to workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Management attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Attacking workers' rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Unfair manning of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Poor management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. UNION INDUCED CONFLICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Greedy payclaims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Militant unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Shop Stewards do not consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSIBILITY/PARTIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONFLICT

| Management | 26 + 31 = 57 | (76%) |
| Unions     | 26 + 18 = 44 | (59%) |

* Several categories, e.g. 2.2 and 2.6, may measure the same feature but as the workers were not asked in detail to explain their comments, the titles given by the men and women were used and no amalgamation of categories was attempted.
### Table 6

**IMPORTANCE OF INFORMATION SOURCES FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Fairly Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Quite Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TELEVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWSPAPERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RADIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIENDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and friends received very low scores compared with the other categories.

Overall, the results suggest that the media are more important than the union structure for generally spreading ideas and information. Those committed to the union source show a greater acceptance of its message. This group includes all the Shop Stewards, the most information trusted source, so the eventual impact of the union information is probably much greater than that of the television or newspapers. The 47 workers were then asked what they thought of the "Social Contract" (Q.25a), how successful it had been, and up to five sources of their opinions (Q.25b). Again, the differences in responses between the men and women were significant \( (p < 0.01) \) - the women saw the policy as effective, while the men believed the 'Social Contract' had failed. The single most important source was again personal experience (41%) i.e. shopping and living in the community. The men felt that their wives bought less with the same amount of money; the women thought that without the policy the money would have bought even less. The next most important sources were television (28%), newspapers (26%) and unions (3%). If all five source categories are aggregated, the most used source is newspapers, which are used by nearly men to check the other sources \( (p < 0.01) \). All four single Irish women stated they had no beliefs on the 'Social Contract' or other issues e.g. pay policy; they all said that such issues were the concern of their brothers or brothers-in-law who were the male heads of their family units in England. Seventyfive percent of the women felt that the pay policy was effective and fair (Q.25a) whereas the men were evenly divided \( (p < 0.05) \). Overall, this meant that the respondents thought the policy was effective by a margin of 2:1. The main sources (Q.25b) were newspapers (34) and television (30). Unlike
the previously discussed questions, the sample felt their personal experiences were of little use as the issue was beyond their comprehension. Television had the highest number of first responses, followed by the newspapers. Those who used personal experience as their main source (8) thought the policy had failed.

As the central purpose of the thesis was to study the diffusion of the concept of Industrial Democracy/Worker Participation, a series of questions was included in the study. The initial question (Q.28) asked what work would be like in the next ten year period, i.e. 1975-1985. Overall the beliefs were pessimistic, 18 of the 22 women and 13 of the 25 men thought the economic state of the country would deteriorate further; the women were significantly more pessimistic ($p < .01$) as they feared for the future of their children at school. The major source (Q.30b) was personal experience (26), then television (15). Newspapers were mentioned by nearly everyone as the most common means of checking on their main sources. The women relied on the local union more than the men, and so accepted their union official's predictions of economic gloom and doom. The men felt the media often conflicted with union predictions and were more accurate, so they relied less on their representatives' scenarios.

When asked about the future of work in the last quarter of the twentieth century (1975-2000) all believed conditions would alter (Q.31a). The men were significantly more optimistic than the women ($p < .01$), believing the mass media predictions of economic recovery by the late 1980s - the major source quoted was economic articles in the newspapers. When asked why they believed the papers on this issue and
not others, the respondents explained that the television was excellent for immediate information, but the newspaper was still best for long term issues. The women again relied on the gloomy predictions of their unions. Only two of the 47 in the sample mentioned Industrial Democracy in their discussion of the future of work, both medium and long term. At the time of the study, representatives from the plant together with representatives from all other C.U.K. plants, were negotiating a company inspired proposal for Industrial Democracy in C.U.K. The company proposal entailed worker representatives on the C.U.K. Board and joint planning committees in each plant; not one person mentioned the plan.

When asked directly of the likelihood of Worker Participation/Industrial Democracy taking place in Britain (Q.30c), the respondents by a majority of 2:1 felt it would happen. The women were more confident than the men that workers would participate (16:5), but not themselves, as they did not foresee working until they reached pension age. Men (14:10) tended to be cynical, seeing the movement as an attempt to by-pass the unions, but some of the same men saw Industrial Democracy as Labour Government policy, and therefore eventually to be legislated. The major sources (Q.30b) were personal experiences (40 responses) and trade union sources (15). Only a few interviewees mentioned any of the mass media as a source which was a surprise, as the newspapers and television had recently presented a number of articles on the topic.

Questions regarding the use of mass media formed the next major issue of the survey. The questions concerned the use of the mass media and the way each of five forms - television, newspapers, radio, magazines,
and books was perceived. It was hoped by this means to indicate how the workers used the media for searching out information, and how ideas diffused from the media.

Across all the questions of source, a consistent response was found; television was the major initial media source, which was then checked in the newspapers. Television was seen as more immediate and less likely to be biased than the other sources. Television was seen as unbiased by two in three respondents (Q.s 34-36), whilst the papers were seen as unbiased by only one in three. The men saw both media as significantly more biased than the women \((p < .05)\). The highest 'unbiased' score was that for Radio (11 out of 12), but only half the sample listened to it. Radio was perceived as reporting events quickly and leaving comment to television and newspapers. Although men felt that the sources were biased, they used them more than the women who often claimed that cooking meals and housework prevented them from reading or watching.

Television was seen in all the homes of the sample (Q.37) and all the sample but three women watched at least one television news service daily (Q.38); 30 people watched at least two news sessions each day. The first nightly news service, the 5.45 pm news on B.B.C.1, was seen by 13 men but no women (Q.39). The most viewed service was the 9.00 pm news (Q.39) which was seen by 33 of the 47 in the sample. The 10.00 pm A.T.V. news was next in popularity with 26. Both the 9.00 pm and the 10.00 pm newscasts were seen equally by men and women. The reason women gave for watching later news services was that they still had to prepare meals as well as work and did not finish until after 7 pm.
This conflicts with Klein's research, where the women were helped by their husbands.

News discussion programmes, e.g. News Week, and Mid Week, were not watched at all.

Between 5 pm and 8 pm viewing was evenly divided between B.B.C.1 and A.T.V.O., however after 8 pm the pattern became nearly entirely A.T.V.O. except for the 9.00 pm B.B.C.1 news, which was seen as unbiased by both sexes (Q.39). The A.T.V.O. news was perceived as biased towards C.U.K. by half the men.

When asked why they viewed television the women and men gave significantly different reasons (Q.40) (p<.05). The women claimed they watched for entertainment, while the men saw T.V. as a source of information and knowledge. Thirtyfive watched at least two hours of television a night, and all watched at least one hour nightly (Q.41). The women mainly watched after tea, yet claimed to view as much television as the men; the women probably watched more than the men after 8 pm when some men mentioned seeing friends at the pub or Workingman's Club. This is inferential, however, as there was no question designed specifically to check this in the questionnaire.

All watched at least one documentary a fortnight, and 35 watched a documentary at least once a week (Q.42); during the interview two very recent documentaries were mentioned, one in the "Panorama" series on Portugal, and the other in the "Man Alive" series which investigated the E.E.C. farming policy.
All read a daily newspaper, however the papers differed according to the job status of the person. The plant management received a free personal copy of the "Daily Express" from C.U.K., and Foremen bought a copy to talk to their seniors about the news. The workers and Stewards bought the "Daily Mail" and the "Sun". No one read any of the "quality newspapers", the "Times" or "Guardian", or "Telegraph" or "Financial Times". Fortytwo read at least three newspapers each day (Q.42) - the "Sun", "Daily Mirror" and "Coventry Evening Telegraph". Hardly anyone purchased all three, as they read them at work in the rest areas where copies were left by the purchasers to be read by the next group.

The men read the paper for twice as long as the women (Q.46) (p<.05), as most men read all the paper, while half the women read only certain sections (Q.47) (p<.05) e.g. headlines, general news, entertainment.

The most read Sunday newspapers were the "News of the World" (26), "People" (23) "Sunday Mirror" (13), "Sunday Times" (8), "Sunday Express" (6), and "Scottish Mail" (5) (Q.48). Twelve of the sample received three Sunday papers and 29 received two papers. The average time taken to read the Sunday papers was over an hour, with the men again reading the papers for twice as long as the women (Q.49) (p<.01) - 2 hours against 1 hour - and the men read more of the paper (Q.50) (p<.05).

People who read all of the daily paper also read all of the larger Sunday newspaper. Respondents were asked if they received any other newspapers or periodicals which they read (Q.53a). Only 8 received and read trade union papers and most of the eight were members of the Electrical Trades Union (E.T.U.) and the Association of Electrical Unions (A.E.U.) which supplied all members with a regular paper (Q.51a). Only one woman received a trade union paper and this was due to her role as a Shop Steward.
The radio was heard by only half the sample (Q.55) and most of the listening took place in the early morning before work (Q.57). The main programme was the 6.30 am News on Radio 1, heard while preparing breakfasts and lunches. Women listened to significantly more radio than the men (Q.55) \( (p < .05) \), and they listened to Radio 1, while the few men listened to Radio 2 (Q.57) \( (p < .05) \).

Papers, T.V. and Radio were the only significant mass media used by the sample. Only 4 of the 47 read magazines (Q.61) and all were women's magazines (Q.61); no one read current affairs publications such as "Time" or "Newsweek". Six claimed to have read a book recently (Q.62), but no one could remember reading a book which influenced their behaviour towards work, or the world in general. The results of this study clearly supported the Ryton findings on the importance of rumour, in fact the belief in the accuracy of rumour was higher in the Special Products Plant. The Ryton evidence was not strongly supported. A couple of men were found who approximated the 'Validator' model and function; however the plant is one twentieth the size of Ryton, and any worker can walk from his or her workplace to the farthest part of the site and back in 15 minutes. In the manufacturing areas there were always some men on a rotating rest break, so if a worrying rumour was heard, one of the men on the rest break would visit the particular area and report back. These results suggest that the 'Validator' phenomenon is found in very large work sites where there is little communication, where men are tied to their workplace, and when rumours are not believed.

The shopfloor control mechanism of 'isolation' was mentioned as occasionally happening. In the previous year the plant had seen a large number of shop work meetings and steward consultation with the
membership. Most workers wanted their stewards to make more decisions and spend less time talking to them. Many of the workers were related to senior union representatives in other plants, so the stewards sought information from the workers rather than trying to hide facts from them.
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Dear Mr. Aitken,
Director of Education,
COVENTRY

Dear Sir,

I am writing to ask for permission to approach a number of schools in your Educational Authority.

I am doing research into how people see work and where they learn their ideas from; some of my research is taking place in Coventry in the car industry. I am interested in what sources children use for their ideas of work and from what age these ideas can be seen as "realistic" according to the child's background. I have already such completed research in Loughborough but ideally I would like to do the same in the area where I am talking to adult workers.

If I was given permission, the most I would require would be:

1. Two schools in each of the categories, Primary (Grades 1-4), Secondary (Forms 1-3) and Community College (Forms 4-6).
2. The schools to be in working class areas - say, Willenhall, Ryton.
3. A minimum of 100 students per school.
4. A mutually convenient time for me to explain the questionnaire to the pupils. In one school I did this by classes, in another at assembly.
5. A total time of 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire for each group.
6. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed.

I am in Coventry about twice a week and I would be happy to call in and discuss any queries you may have.

A few personal details of myself include:

1. Name: George Wittingslow
2. Position: Senior Lecturer, Behavioural Science, Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, Australia.
3. **Qualifications**: M.A. (in Reading Difficulties)  
B.A., B.Comm., B.Ed.

I have taught in schools, worked in industry, and now I teach Educational Psychology to undergraduate education students in Australia.

I am on 12 months study leave and this research will form part of a larger research project I am doing for a Ph.D. at Loughborough.

I hope the above request will be met and the personal details are sufficient for your information.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed)  
George Wittingslow.
BURLEIGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WORK SURVEY

Wednesday, 12th March 1975

(1) Where did/do you gain your ideas of work?

(ii) What job would you ideally like to do?

(iii) What job do you think you will finally accept?

(iv) Will work be better/worse than school? Why?
APPENDIX 10

DETAILS OF THE SAMPLE OF SCHOOL CHILDREN TESTED IN COVENTRY AND LOUGHBOROUGH

The test instrument (Appendix 9) was a simple four item questionnaire. The researcher explained the meaning of the questions to each class, answered any questions and supervised the students while they completed the questionnaire. The total time spent on any one class varied between 15 and 25 minutes, except for the Boothfield Primary School where 24 were too illiterate to fill in the questionnaire. At Boothfield the researcher individually interviewed each of the 79 children in an office where it was possible to watch the rest of the three classes in an open classroom environment. The other children did not appear to talk more to the most recent interviewee than to any other student. The Boothfield subjects were told each question and the researcher recorded the responses. The subjects appeared to have a good understanding of the questions and their answers were given freely and spontaneously. The responses were quite similar to the other studies where the questionnaire was answered en masse. The differences between Boothfield and other primary schools could be reasonably explained by external circumstances, e.g. the other primary school children relied heavily on their parents for information on work but as the Boothfield children came mainly from deserted families, the children relied more on the school, on themselves and on their mothers for similar information.

In using a questionnaire it is necessary to assure that the students did really understand the questions and that they were capable of answering them. These conditions were met on two grounds. Firstly,
the behaviour of the illiterate Boothfield 10-11 year old children showed that they could understand the questions and answer them in a meaningful way; it is reasonable to assume that the other children possessed at least the same level of competence and understanding. Secondly, it is not important that the children's beliefs be an accurate representation of the world of work as long as they correctly recall their sources of work information. In the Boothfield study the researcher asked checking questions, e.g., where television was given as the major source, what programme(s) on television told you about work? In all cases actual programmes and episodes were mentioned by the students.

Three age groups of students were sampled:

(i) Age 10-11 years of age:

Grade 4 at Primary school - the student was about to leave this school and enter Secondary or Grammar schooling. The child's choice of school was partially determined by the belief of parents and child about the work the child would do in the future.

(ii) Age 12-13 years of age:

Form 2 in the Secondary school - the student has by then established whether he or she is likely to continue at school after leaving age.

(iii) Age 15-16 years of age:

First year of Community College - the questionnaire was given just before Easter when the 15 year olds could leave school if they so desired.

The schools, number of students, and the social class of the parents are listed below in Table 1; Table 2 outlines the number of students from Coventry and Loughborough in each of the three groups.
Table 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS TESTED IN THE RESEARCH ON THEIR IDEAS OF THE WORLD OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TOWN/CITY</th>
<th>PREDOMINANT SOCIAL CLASS</th>
<th>SIZE OF SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Mountfields</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Middle/Upper</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boothfield**</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willenhall Wood</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chace</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Garendon</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Working/Middle</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesford</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working/Middle</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Burleigh</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Working/Middle</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Ernesford</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Working/Middle</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote:

* The size of the sample in the respective schools was determined by the size of the form - in all cases every student in the form who attended school on that day was tested.

** Boothfield School is situated in a special housing estate for deserted wives - many of the children arrive from other towns nearly illiterate.
Table 2

SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE OF SCHOOLCHILDREN FROM LOUGHBOROUGH AND COVENTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWN/CITY</th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

RESULTS OF THE SCHOOLS TESTED REGARDING CHILDREN'S IDEAS OF WORK

PRIMARY SCHOOL RESULTS

The two Coventry primary schools, Willenhall Wood and Chace, were compared with the two Loughborough primary schools and the overall results to see if any significant differences were revealed. See Table 1 for a summary of the results.

The two Coventry primary schools varied markedly on the main sources of the world of work. The Chace children relied on their parents jointly, father, mother, school and mass media in that order, while the Willenhall Wood children hardly mentioned their fathers or the joint parents as a source. The Willenhall Wood results are similar to the Boothfield ones in Loughborough, which mentioned the same three sources plus an extra one, school. In the predominantly middle and upper class area of Mountfields, television was the main source, followed by both parents, father and personal observation.

When aggregated, the primary school responses reveal that the children have no more than two sources on work, and most have only one. The more frequently mentioned sources in this grouping are more influential than sources in the older age categories, who use more references and often check one against the other. The most important source was television, followed by both parents, mother, father, school and self in that order. The impact of television was most clearly shown in the Boothfield sample; a quarter of the sample was illiterate, so the researcher asked the questions individually and recorded each child's reply. The television replies mentioned characters in programmes which the children hoped to emulate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>COVENTRY SCHOOLS</th>
<th>LOUGHBOURGH SCHOOLS</th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willenhall Wood</td>
<td>Chace</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MAJOR WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NUMBER OF WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDEAL JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td>Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Sports</td>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EXPECTED JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiprof.</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WORK OR SCHOOL BETTER</td>
<td>Work (80%)</td>
<td>Work (80%)</td>
<td>Work (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WHY</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School boring</td>
<td>More interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WORK IN CUK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to describe their 'ideal' job, the Willenhall Wood students, 29 of the 58 listed positions which required tertiary qualifications, e.g. doctor, special sporting skills, e.g. goal keeper for England or musical training, e.g. playing in the Bay City Rollers. Twenty-one of the 58 felt their ideal job was a realistic possibility. At Chace School the most popular 'ideal' category was semi-skilled blue collar, e.g. machinist, followed by special sporting skills and musical training. Nearly half, 27:33, thought their 'ideal' job was possible. These results were similar to the Loughborough schools - Boothfield 37:42 and Mountfields 50:61.

When asked what job they would finally accept, the Willenhall Wood children chose significantly different (p<.02) types of positions against the 'ideal' position. Skilled blue collar was highest, followed by semi-skilled blue collar and semi-professional occupations, e.g. nursing. The Chace children hardly changed their responses between the two questions, semi-skilled blue and white collar positions rose marginally at the expense of sporting skills and musical training. Unlike the significant change of Willenhall Wood (21:37 to 38:18) towards more realistic jobs as their final job destination, the Chace responses showed little change (27:33 to 33:27).

The Boothfield results indicate the same pattern as Chace, and the realism score was also very similar (37:42). Mountfields results, similarly to the other three primary schools on the question, sport, and musical ability rated highly (50:61). On the question regarding likely jobs, the Mountfields child would accept, the results were very different. The jobs listed were significantly higher (p<.01) on tertiary qualified position and on semi-professional occupations.
The Mountfields children were also most likely to think that their choices were realistic (80;31).

Eighty per cent of both Coventry groups of primary school children looked forward to work. Most of the reasons for wanting to work were positive, e.g. 'earn money to spend', 'work is more interesting'. However, some reasons given were the rejection of school rather than any love of work, e.g. 'school is boring', 'the school lunches are monotonous', 'teachers give the strap'. The 20% who chose school as better than work did so in the belief that work would be even more demanding, as people are paid to work, and they must produce satisfactory results while at work.

Finally, they were asked to write the name of the place where they thought they might work - three mentioned a Chrysler plant, two at Willenhall and one at Chace.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

In this category two Coventry secondary schools were compared with a Loughborough secondary school: Ernesford and Whitley Abbey form 2 classes with Garendon Secondary form 2 class. See Table 2 for a summary of the results.

Like the Coventry primary schools, there was a marked difference in sources on the world of work. Ernesford Secondary was the only group to use Books as their major source, this source was more used than the two major sources, Both Parents and Television. On the other hand,
### Table 2

**Frequency of Responses by Secondary School Children to Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>COVENTRY SCHOOLS</th>
<th>Loughborough</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesford</td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MAJOR WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NUMBER OF WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDEAL JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-prof.</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EXPECTED JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiskilled BC</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WORK OR SCHOOL BETTER</td>
<td>Work 78%</td>
<td>Work 60%</td>
<td>Work 69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WHY</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn more</td>
<td>Freedom but</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>Want to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WORK IN CID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table includes responses from different secondary schools and provides a summary of the frequency of responses to various survey questions.
the Whitley Abbey Secondary class relied on Both Parents and their Fathers as their major sources with their own observations and Information at school as a check on what they were told at home.

The Loughborough Secondary students used Television as their major source, and verified the information from the Media, with their Fathers, Both Parents, and what they saw themselves.

The two major sources, Television and Both Parents, again received the highest aggregate of responses to the survey of sources of work knowledge. Each of the three schools showed different patterns of source usage. Ernesford, a new school, has placed great emphasis on their Material Resources Centre (Library), and this was reflected in the results, while Whitley Abbey has no programme for informing the students about work. Garendon has been held as a model for other schools in the Midlands and has developed an active work placement scheme, and has audio-visual resources available, yet Television was the most quotes source, followed by Father, Parents, and then their own experience from the work schemes.

The work scheme did have an effect on the number of sources used by the students, the Garendon students used less sources. When later asked why some only mentioned one source, a number of students replied that they could find out about any local job from one of their school-mates if they became interested in a particular job. The Coventry students used the most sources, on average, for any category of students. Some secondary students gave five sources, and all used at least two sources.
The three secondary school samples gave a skilled tradesman's job as their 'ideal' job, with a professional position requiring a degree as the next most frequent response; the semiskilled blue collar category was the only other one with a large response. Realism appeared to have affected the selection of the 'ideal' job and the 'day dream' categories as sporting prowess and entertainment were much smaller than in the Primary School samples. Approximately two-thirds of the Secondary School samples thought their 'ideal job' was a realistic possibility for them.

The same three categories, skilled blue collar, graduate and semi-skilled blue collar again appeared in the expected job categories except that semi-skilled blue collar jobs scored higher than graduate jobs. Over 80% felt these jobs were realistic; this was the highest score on realism in any category.

Unlike the primary and community college categories, the secondary students were not as sure that work would be better than school. Work scored higher than school in all three schools, but while the students looked forward to the money and the financial independence it brought, they all recognized that employers expected results and might demand more than they were capable of performing. If this happened, then the Whitley Abbey students feared unemployment, which they saw as a major possibility when they left school; school was compelled to take them but this was not the case with an employer.

Two students from Ernesford, which is situated between the Ryton and Stoke plants, mentioned working for CUK; no-one from Whitley Abbey mentioned such a job, yet their school is next door to the Whitley
plant, the UK headquarters of Chrysler.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This term has been used although it is not strictly accurate in Coventry. The Coventry Education Authority plan to follow the Leicestershire development of community colleges but had not actually done so in 1975; the Ernesford and Whitley Abbey students were in the senior part of their school and could leave school at Easter 1975. The Loughborough sample was taken from similar aged students at the Burleigh Community College. The results of this category are summarised in Table 3.

Both Parents was the major source of work information for the senior students in both the Coventry schools and Loughborough - the only occasion on which all students from one age grouping gave the same response. Television was again the next most important source, except at Ernesford where Books again performed surprisingly well. Then followed the students own observations, with the School as the next important sources of information about work.

The Community College students had, on average, slightly fewer work sources than the secondary students. Often, the senior students had only one or two major sources which they believed, and were happier with, than the Secondary students. Four out of five of the senior students were looking forward to work as better than school.

Ideally, the Community College students, in the main, preferred skilled tradesmen type occupations, although at Ernesford the highest scoring
### Table 3

**FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS TO SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>COVENTRY SCHOOLS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Loughborough</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY COLLEGES TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesford</td>
<td>Whitley Abbey</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Burleigh</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MAJOR WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>(Television)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NUMBER OF WORK SOURCES</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDEAL JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiskilled WC</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-prof.</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EXPECTED JOB CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiskilled WC</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-prof.</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td>Skilled BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HOW REALISTIC</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WORK OR SCHOOL BETTER</td>
<td>Work 93%</td>
<td>Work 75%</td>
<td>Work 85%</td>
<td>Work 74%</td>
<td>Work 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WHY</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longer hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WORK IN CUK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category was Graduate. Overall, this category was next in priority behind the skilled blue collar type of job, about half of the students felt their 'ideal' position was a realistic possibility. Skilled blue collar positions were also the highest scoring category in the expected job after leaving school, followed by semi-skilled white collar positions, e.g. accounts clerk, semi-skilled blue collar positions, e.g. machinist, and graduate positions in that order. Eighty per cent of the age group felt the positions were realistic.

Whitley Abbey was different from the other schools in that unemployment worried a few of the students and they felt the shortage of jobs allowed employers to be more demanding; consequently they were less sure than Ernesford that work would be better than school.
Worker participation is of increasing current interest both within the United Kingdom and the European Community. It was mentioned in the recent election manifestos of the three major parties and is included in draft legislation on Company Law Reform, in the projected Industry Bill, and a private members bill. Within the European Community, it is included as part of the "social partnership" in the draft Fifth Directive and the draft Statute for a European Company.

I am conducting a multinational study on the sources and progress of the above ideas and hope that you will complete the attached questionnaire. It investigates how the various types of management training have viewed the movement and what you have personally learned about the area in Parts A and B; Part C invites your personal opinions on particular instances of possible worker involvement.

I hope you will take the time to complete the questionnaire which has been designed to take NO MORE THAN 15 MINUTES. Data collected will be confidential and each questionnaire is unmarked; there will be no follow-up.

Thanking you in anticipation of your co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)
George E. Wittingslow
QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY
RING THE ANSWER YOU FEEL IS CORRECT

CLASSIFICATION OF RECIPIENT

Q1 Undergraduate - Management Course ... ... ... 1
Undergraduate - Technologist Course ... ... ... 2
Participant - Management Course ... ... ... 3
Participant - Company Training ... ... ... 4
Participant - Trade Union Training ... ... ... 5
Lecturer - University course ... ... ... 6
Lecturer - Polytechnic course ... ... ... 7
Lecturer - Management college ... ... ... 8
Lecturer - Company Training ... ... ... 9
Lecturer - Trade Union College ... ... ... 10

PART A KNOWLEDGE OF THE AREA

Q2 In your course were any of the following terms used:
   Industrial Democracy ... ... ... Yes/No
   Worker Control ... ... ... Yes/No
   Employee/Industrial Participation ... ... ... Yes/No
   Quality of Working Life Movement ... ... ... Yes/No
   Work Restructuring ... ... ... Yes/No
   Socio-Technical Systems ... ... ... Yes/No
   Job Enrichment ... ... ... Yes/No
   Job Enlargement ... ... ... Yes/No

If you answered (No) to all of the terms in Q2, please move to Part C - OPINIONS - and commence at Q11.

If you answered (Yes) to any of the 8 terms please turn to Part B and answer the sheet relevant to the term you are acquainted with. For example, if you know B5 Work Restructuring, turn to the sheet headed B5 WORK RESTRUCTURING, answer the questions, and then go to Part C - OPINIONS; if you know say 3 terms then you should answer 3 sheets before going to Part C.
RESULTS OF THE TERTIARY STUDENT SURVEY

PART B

B.1 INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY  See Table 1

Of the 70 who claimed to know the concept, 14 described it incorrectly. Only the Lanchester Polytechnic Personnel Management participants felt the concept had been described positively, the rest felt the idea was described neutrally by the lecturer.

Of the 78, 50 mentioned the concept to people outside the course. The main areas of diffusion were at work, home, to relatives and at professional managerial organization meetings. One Aston student claimed to have mentioned the concept at all 11 settings. All but two mentioned the term positively, but felt their audiences rejected the idea - the difference in the tone of the description and reception was significant at the .0001 level. Aston students claimed their audiences accepted the idea positively.

After the rejection of the concept, most participants did not argue for the implementation of industrial democracy; only students from Aston and the Lanchester Personnel Management Course had done so, and all felt they had positively changed the thoughts of their fellow workers although not all these workers wanted industrial democracy to take place.
How was Industrial Democracy described in the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... Positively/Neutral/Negatively

Please write a brief explanation of Industrial Democracy as it was described on the course:

56 right 14 wrong

Have you mentioned the concept of Industrial Democracy to anyone else?

50 22

If No to Q5, proceed to Q9.

If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Industrial Democracy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you describe the concept of Industrial Democracy?

$\chi^2$ of differences is 13.568

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How were the ideas received? with 2 df

$P < .0001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Industrial Democracy?

... Yes/No

38 32
10.1 If (Yes) where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.2 WORKER CONTROL  See Table 2.

Twelve of the 58 felt that worker control was described positively, and none felt it was described negatively. However, 22 of the descriptions were incorrect - most of the incorrect descriptions confused the term with employee participation. Thirty-two mentioned the concept, mainly at work, within the family, and at professional managerial organization meetings. Twelve mentioned the idea positively, but only two felt their description had been received positively (sig. at .005 level). The 10 rejections included 2 students who confused worker control. As a result of the rejection only ten attempted to argue for the implementation of worker control and did so mainly at work, where 4 felt they eventually changed their fellow workers attitudes to the concept. Interestingly, two people mentioned the idea at trade union meetings, and both felt they were unsuccessful in convincing the members that the idea had any merit.

B.3 INDUSTRIAL OR EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION  See Table 3.

Just over 200 of the sample claimed to have been told of the idea, 42 wrongly described the concept as a mild form of consultation. Most of the misconceptions came from undergraduate students who clearly saw the concept as one where the manager told the workers what he wanted them to know, and the workers agreed to do what they were told. Not surprisingly, all 42 felt the idea was described positively by the lecturer as a manipulation technique, another 90, who correctly described the concept, felt their lecturer positively described the principle. No one felt the idea was described
### Table 2: Diffusion of Worker Control Among Tertiary Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>W, LNP, LNPG</th>
<th>LNP, LNUG</th>
<th>A, LNUG, W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.1 How was Worker Control described in the course?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2 Please write a brief explanation of Worker Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2 Have you mentioned the concept of Worker Control to anyone else?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2 If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Worker Control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNUG</td>
<td>A, LNUG, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNUG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNDG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers Organizations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNDG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial Organization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNDG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNDG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>LNP, LNDG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 \text{ of differences is } 10.56 \] with 2 d.f., P < .01

| 19.2 Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Worker Control?| Yes/No | 10  | 58     | A, LNUG, W |
10.2 If \( \square \) where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11.2 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDUSTRIAL PARTICIPATION

### AMONG TERTIARY STUDENTS

1. How was Industrial Participation described in the course:-
   
   | 132 | 64 |
   | Positively/Neutral/Negatively |

2. Please write a brief explanation of Industrial Participation as it was described on the course:

   154 Right, 42 Wrong

3. Have you mentioned the concept of Industrial Participation to anyone else?

   138 Yes, 54 No

   If No to Q5, proceed to Q.9

4. If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Industrial Participation?

   1. At work
   2. At the university
   3. Family/relatives
   4. Community activities
   5. Lecturing/teaching
   6. Media
   7. Trade Union meetings
   8. Employers Organizations
   9. Managerial Organization
   10. Political Meetings
   11. Sporting Administration

   Yes | No
   --- | ---
   70 68
   94 44
   90 48
   20 118
   10 128
   138
   2 136
   6 132
   26 112
   138
   138

   If Yes to Q5, proceed to Q.9

5. How did you describe the concept of Industrial Participation?

   $\chi^2$ of differences is 70.386 with 2 d.f. $p < .0001$

   | 100 | 26 | 8 |
   | Positively/Neutral/Negatively |

6. How were the ideas received?

   | 32 | 88 | 14 |
   | Positively/Neutral/Negatively |

7. Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Industrial Participation?

   Yes/No
   58 134
10.3 If \( \textbf{Yes} \) were?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. At work</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
negatively.

All those who felt the idea was described positively mentioned the concept in a variety of settings, the major ones being work, at the educational institution and in the family. Ten of the participants, who correctly understood employee participation, mentioned the idea in their own lectures and at employer meetings; 26 claimed to mention the idea at professional managerial organization meetings. All mentioned the concept positively except 2 undergraduates who mentioned the principles as they understood them (incorrectly) to trade union meetings where they described the idea as a new managerial ploy. All 8 who misunderstood the concept and mentioned it reported that their audience rejected the idea being propagated. Although mentioned positively, most who mentioned the concept felt they did not influence people to feel positively or negatively towards the idea. Discouraged by the response, few argued for the concept of industrial participation outside the confines of the family and among fellow students. These people felt they were successful in influencing others in their close circle of acquaintances and family to accept the idea.

B.4 QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE (QWL) See Table 4.

Twentysix people claimed to have been informed about the QWL movement, and 14 felt it was described positively. The remainder believed their lecturer presented the concept in a neutral manner. Ten of those who claimed to know the concept incorrectly described the movement, even with the most generous assessment of the responses. These people did not mention QWL. Those who correctly knew of the idea (Aston and a few from Warwick University) were
### TABLE 4.

**DIFFUSION OF QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE AMONG TERTIARY STUDENTS**

### 3.4

How was Quality of Working Life described in the course:

- Positively/Neutral/Negatively

### 4.4

Please write a brief explanation of Quality of Working Life as it was described on the course:

16 Right, 10 Wrong

### 5.4

Have you mentioned the concept of Quality of Working Life to anyone else?

If (No) to Q5, proceed to Q9

If (Yes) to Q5, where did you mention Quality of Working Life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/Frequently</th>
<th>No/Seldom</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community activities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union meetings</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers Organizations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial Organization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Meetings</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4

How did you describe the concept of Quality of Working Life

- Difference not sig.

### 7.4

How were the ideas received?

- Positively/Neutral/Negatively

### 8.4

Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Quality of Working Life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0.4 If [Yes] where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positively informed of the concept but 1 of the 16 negatively described the idea to others. QWL was only mentioned at work where four of their acquaintances had become strong supporters of the principles of QWL.

B.5 WORK RESTRUCTURING See Table 5

Only twentyfour of the 48 who claimed to know of this concept were correct; those in error described the term as involving the financial structures of companies through takeovers and nationalization of particular industries. All felt the idea was described in a neutral or positive manner. Among the 24 who were correct, 16 claimed to have mentioned the principles to others at work, at home, to fellow students, and to fellow personnel professionals. All felt their explanations were at least neutral, if not positive, and they felt the idea was accepted in the same manner as it was explained. As a result, 9 argued for implementation of work restructuring. Aston students were trained in techniques to carry out work restructuring, and had to be enrolled by their employers so nearly all of the 10 felt they would apply the concept when they returned overseas to their employer.

B.6 SOCIO-TECHNICAL SYSTEMS See Table 6

Sixtytwo of the 116 who claimed they knew about socio-technical systems gave an accurate description of the concept. Those who knew of the idea came from four institutions, Aston, Warwick, Birmingham and Loughborough Universities, where in each instance a significant part of a year's work in one subject dealt with the notion. Unlike other concepts, the principles of socio-technical systems were very
### TABLE 5

**PART B**

**DIFFUSION OF WORK RESTRUCTURING AMONG TERTIARY STUDENTS**

### Q3.5
How was Work Restructuring described in the course:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q4.5
Please write a brief explanation of Work Restructuring as it was described on the course:

24 Right 24 Wrong

---

### Q5.5
Have you mentioned the concept of Work Restructuring to anyone else?

If **No** to Q5, proceed to Q9

If **Yes** to Q5, where did you mention Work Restructuring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q6.5
If **Yes** to Q5, where did you mention Work Restructuring?

1. At work
2. At the university
3. Family/relatives
4. Community activities
5. Lecturing/teaching
6. Media
7. Trade Union meetings
8. Employers Organizations
9. Managerial Organization
10. Political Meetings
11. Sporting Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q7.5
How did you describe the concept of Work Restructuring?

Difference not significant — Positively/Neutral/Negatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q8.5
How were the ideas received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q9.5
Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Work Restructuring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
11.5 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows the number of responses for each category, with 'Yes' and 'No' options.
Diffusion of Socio Technical Systems Among Tertiary Students

Q3.6 How was Socio Technical Systems described in the course:

\[
\text{Positively/Neutral/Negatively}
\]

\[50 \quad 66\]

Q4.6 Please write a brief explanation of Socio Technical Systems as it was described on the course:

62 Right 54 Wrong

Q5.6 Have you mentioned the concept of Socio Technical Systems to anyone else?

\[\text{Yes/No}\]

If No to Q5, proceed to Q9

Q6.6 If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Socio Technical Systems:

1. At work
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8 \quad 8\]

2. At the university
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[4 \quad 4\]

3. Family/relatives
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

4. Community activities
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

5. Lecturing/teaching
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

6. Media
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

7. Trade Union meetings
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

8. Employers Organizations
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

9. Managerial Organization
   \[\text{Yes/No}\]
   \[8\]

10. Political Meetings
    \[\text{Yes/No}\]
    \[8\]

11. Sporting Administration
    \[\text{Yes/No}\]
    \[8\]

Q7.6 How did you describe the concept of Socio Technical Systems:

\[\text{Difference not significant}\]

\[\text{Positively/Neutral/Negatively}\]

\[4 \quad 4\]

Q8.6 How were the ideas received?

\[\text{Positively/Neutral/Negatively}\]

\[4 \quad 4\]

Q9.6 Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Socio Technical Systems?

\[\text{Yes/No}\]

\[4 \quad 4\]
0.6 If (Yes) where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rarely mentioned to others – only 8 who understood the term correctly mentioned it to others. The term was mentioned in discussion with other students (8) and at university (4). The idea was presented to the students in neutral terms, and they felt they, in turn, presented neutrally to others who accepted the concept as it was described. Only four of the 116 who knew the term argued for its application to any setting or group in which they were involved. It would appear the sample did not see the concept as useful enough to justify the propagation of the application of the principle to the "real" world.

B.7 JOB ENRICHMENT  See Table 7

The term was the best known of all – 87.5% or 224 subjects answered affirmatively. However, 96 of the affirmative answers did not correctly know the meaning of the term. Nearly all the incorrect replies confused job enlargement with job enrichment. All the classes except one had been taught the term during their academic training; only the Lanchester Polytechnic undergraduate class had not been instructed in this regard. Only two subjects felt the term had been presented by the lecturer in a negative manner, the majority reported that their lecturer had been enthusiastic about the application of the notion. More than half, (132) mentioned job enrichment to others outside the course. The most commonly reported place where the term was discussed was the university, with 80 positive answers, then followed in order, family (74), at work (72), managerial organizations (18), the community (18), employer meetings (18), in lectures (6), sporting bodies (4) and trade union meetings (2). Job enrichment was easily the most discussed and diffused
Table 7: Diffusion of Job Enrichment among Tertiary Students

Q3.7 How was Job Enrichment described in the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4.7 Please write a brief explanation of as it was described on the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112 Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5.7 Have you mentioned the concept of Job Enrichment to anyone else?

If No to Q5, proceed to Q.9

Q6.7 If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Job Enrichment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>At work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Family/relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lecturing/teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Trade Union meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Employers Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Managerial Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Political Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sporting Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7.7 How did you describe the concept of Job Enrichment

\[ \chi^2 \text{ of differences} = 23.559 \]

with 2 d.f. \( p < .0001 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110/16/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8.7 How were the ideas received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively/Neutral/Negatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74/46/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9.7 Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Job Enrichment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62/154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If (Yes) where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the phrases, and nearly all workers who were studying mentioned it at work. All the students who held managerial positions mentioned it, as did the lecturers. The main place where fulltime students mentioned the concept was the tertiary institution at which they were studying.

All but six felt they argued the term in a neutral or positive manner, and believed the recipients responded to the message in a similar way, most people who learned of the term from subjects in the survey did not reject it. However, there was a significant shift \( p < .001 \) from a positive explanation to a neutral acceptance. The 3 students who misunderstood the term and mentioned it, reported that their audiences at work, home and university were as accepting as those who reported the term correctly to others.

Less than a third of those who claimed to know of the concept positively argued that job enrichment should take place in a particular instance. Work, with 46 responses, was the highest, then followed university and family with 20, community 14, managerial organizations 12, lectures 6, and employer groups and sporting organizations 2. Obviously the term was argued most strongly in work (work) or situations where one spoke to workers (lectures), but not in trade union meetings.

B.8 JOB ENLARGEMENT  See Table 8

The third most known term (174 positive responses), job enlargement, was taught to the students with a predominantly negative emphasis as only 66 of the 174 could remember the term being presented to them
PART B - DIFFUSION
OF
JOB ENLARGEMENT
AMONG TERTIARY STUDENTS

Q3.8 How was Job Enlargement described in the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... Positively/Neutral/Negatively

Q4.8 Please write a brief explanation of Job Enlargement as it was described on the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>114 Right</th>
<th>60 Wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A, W, B, LUT2
LNP

Q5.8 Have you mentioned the concept of Job Enlargement to anyone else?

If No to Q5, proceed to Q.9

Q6.8 If Yes to Q5, where did you mention Job Enlargement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At work
2. At the university
3. Family/relatives
4. Community activities
5. Lecturing/teaching
6. Media
7. Trade Union meetings
8. Employers Organizations
9. Managerial Organization
10. Political Meetings
11. Sporting Administration

Q7.8 How did you describe the concept of Job Enlargement?

\[ \chi^2 \text{ of differences } = 2.963 \text{ with } 2 \text{ d.f. } p > .10 \]

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Positively/Neutral/Negatively} \\
30 & 44 & 24 \\
\end{array} \]

Q8.8 How were the ideas received?

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Positively/Neutral/Negatively} \\
24 & 56 & 18 \\
\end{array} \]

Q9.8 Have you taken any action to implement, or argue for, Job Enlargement?

... ... ... 26 72
10.8 If (Yes) where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. At work</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. At the university</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family/relatives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your community activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trade Union activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employers' Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial/Professional Organization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.8 Have you been successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Un成功的</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 At work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 At the university</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Family/relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 In your community activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lecturing/teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Media</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Trade Union activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Employers' organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Managerial/Professional organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Political Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sporting Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other circumstances not listed above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a positive manner. Nearly two thirds of those who claimed to know the term were correct in accurately recalling a description of the phrase. Just over half of the 174 (98) told others of job enlargement, the major places being the tertiary institution (64), work (52) and family (40), and a quarter of the descriptions (24 in 98) were negative regarding the phrase. All of those who spoke positively also argued that job enlargement should occur in a particular setting; the educational institution and the family were the only two settings of any consequence mentioned. Nearly all the supporters of the term felt they were successful in their pleading for job enlargement. This result includes the 16 who misunderstood the term and told their interpretation to others. Fourteen felt their audiences accepted the term neutrally while 2 felt they convinced their listeners that the concept was a good technique.

PART C

STUDENT ATTITUDES TO INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN BRITAIN

The students were asked to comment on how much the workers should participate in the decisions made in the workplace (See Table 9). The students' replies were almost identical with the special products results. Just over a third (37%) felt that workers should participate on all decisions within the plant, and 53% felt the workers should participate in all decisions that immediately affect them - 90% felt that workers should be involved in decisions in their area. The special products result was 97% for the same level of participation. This answer by the students is inconsistent with their concern with maintaining managerial prerogatives, but their apparent inconsistency
Table 9

TERTIARY STUDENTS' BELIEFS ON HOW MUCH WORKERS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN COMPANY DECISION MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Workers should have the opportunity to participate in making decisions on all matters affecting the plant</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Workers should have the opportunity to participate in making decisions only on problems affecting their work</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Workers should have the opportunity to participate in decisions only when management asks them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Workers need not have the opportunity to participate in decision making</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appears to be rationalized by the next question - "how willing are the workers to participate?" (See Table 10). Twenty-three percent of the students (60) felt that workers did not wish to participate - that they accepted the status quo of the present power relations within the work situation. Of the remaining 77%, 53% (135) felt the workers were willing to participate in the decisions directly impinging on their job, but not in any scheme of employee participation at the senior level of management of the firm. In other words, the students accept that workers should "participate", whatever that term means to the subject, but this is impossible as workers do not wish to accept the responsibility; managerial prerogatives protect the management's right to look after the workers and their welfare - shades of the moral responsibility of elites mentioned earlier in Part A of this chapter.

This belief is not supported by the special products results where 60% (28) felt they, and other workers, are willing to participate in the running of the firm in which they work. The remaining 19 believed all workers would participate in any decision which directly affected their job. The perception of the willingness of workers to take part is significantly different for the students and the CUK workers.

The students gave an interesting series of answers concerning the way the workers should influence the decisions of plant management. (See Table 11.) The workers again differed significantly from the students as they believed workers should use their shop stewards to pressure the management, whilst the students believed the workers should protest to the local branch of their union, who in turn would negotiate with the plant management. The workers rejected such an
Table 10

TERTIARY STUDENTS' BELIEFS ON HOW MUCH WORKERS WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN COMPANY DECISION MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The worker is willing to take part in most decisions affecting his plant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) He is willing to take part in decisions only on questions affecting his job</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) He is willing to take part in decisions only when management asks him</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) He is not willing to take part in decision making</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION 'DO YOU BELIEVE WORKERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE MANAGERIAL DECISIONS IN EACH OF THESE WAYS?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>TERTIARY STUDENTS</th>
<th>SPECIAL PRODUCTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Participation in the meeting of workers' organisation away from the plant (e.g. trade union meetings, branch meetings, workers' meetings)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Participation in the work of committees at the plant (e.g. trade union, workers' council, self-management committees, joint union-management committee)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Expressing his ideas to his immediate supervisor or to management</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Giving his ideas to his shop steward</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Contacting T.U. official, area or district official away from the plant (i.e. someone at a higher level in the union)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Arousing public attention (e.g. organising demonstrations, distributing leaflets or newspapers)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Contacting the Government (e.g. writing to his M.P.)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) Methods of collective pressure (e.g. refusal to work overtime, slowdown, work to rule, strikes)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) Direct action - sit-ins/work-ins on the Meriden Motor Cycle model</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approach. The local branch would contain workers from many plants and employers and the workers believed the whole branch would not carry out strong industrial action because one particular plant had industrial relations problems.

All the students believed there should be workers councils within the plant to consult on changes with the top management. The workers rejected such an approach as being inefficient and ineffectual. The difference between the two positions on work councils was significant. This would indicate that suggestions that Britain should adopt the West German laws on co-determination could be rejected by the British workers.

The students perceived the foreman as a powerful person who could influence the work situation in his area. The students believed that if workers raised problems with the foreman he would listen and effectively help if he believed the workers' case warranted his assistance. The majority of the special products workers saw the foreman as powerless in the work situation, and believed it was a waste of time to speak to him about problems. The significant difference of belief has more than just academic interest as most undergraduates hope to be employed on graduation as foremen/supervisors within plants such as the special products plant. These results suggest that the potential supervisors will be greatly disillusioned when they start work.

If the foreman/supervisor is powerless in the work setting, then to whom does one turn for help? The workers rely on the shop steward in their area, and the joint shop stewards' committee within the plant.
Because of their belief that the supervisor/foreman has power, and that workers should protest through their union branch meeting, most students did not see the shop steward as having any importance in the running of his section. This difference in the belief in the power of the shop steward is highly significant.

Then follow two interesting results regarding the use of public and governmental pressure by the workers on the plant management. The students saw it as reasonable for the workers to use these two sources of pressure if the union was unsuccessful in its attempts to protect the interest of the workers. The workers regarded both sources as wrong and improper to use for industrial matters. The special products employees believed that industrial matters should be resolved within the confines of the workplace and that outside groups should be kept out as they only further complicate an already difficult situation. These responses were given during a time when much was written about the Labour Party's Industrial Bill which many Conservatives saw as nationalization with a different face. The students (potential managers) appeared to accept the risk that the government could use the bill eventually to control the company; the workers rejected outside interference from any sources except their own particular union executive, if help was needed. The difference on both measures was highly significant.

The two samples did agree on the use of the technique called "work to rule"; they both believed it was a legitimate tactic to use if the management would not listen to, and discuss, the workers concerns. They also saw the use of direct action, such as "sit-ins" and "work-ins" as a reasonable way in which to influence managerial decisions.
Finally, the students were asked a series of questions concerning their thoughts whether the workers and/or their elected representatives should participate in a variety of particular decisions which are made within the firm—these questions were asked to explore what the students had meant previously when they had discussed the workers' capability and willingness to participate within the organization. (See Table 12 for details). The majority of tertiary students believed that workers should directly participate in two areas— their own work organization and conditions and the transfer of workers to and from their work group. The majority of students did not believe that these two fields should be the limit of direct participation but believed that the workers do not wish to participate, they would rather rely on their elected representative, the shop steward. The points involved included bonus rate setting, selection of workers for training courses, allocation of overtime, allocation of work in the section and appointment of directions. In all but the last case the workers were perceived as wanting their steward to participate; in the last one the workers and their representatives were seen as not wishing to participate in selection of directors.

It was seen that the stewards should be participating in 12 of the 19 examples of organizational decision listed in the study. The remaining five examples were seen as decisions for the management alone—hiring of workers, and promotions within the plant, investment decisions, takeovers and mergers and the appointment of directors.

The results of the last part of the survey clearly indicated that the students believed the steward has an important role within the framework of decision-making within the firm. The steward, as the workers
Table 12
RESPONSES TO WHETHER WORKERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE DIRECTLY, THROUGH THEIR SHOP STEWARDS, OR NOT AT ALL IN A SERIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Directly %</th>
<th>Through Steward %</th>
<th>Not At All %</th>
<th>Agree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of long range production plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduction of new machinery and equipment</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work organization and conditions</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manpower planning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Basis and methods of wage payment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job classification and pay scales</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Determination of bonuses and other incentives</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hiring of workers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotion of workers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Selection of workers for training courses</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transfer of workers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Allocation of overtime work</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Disciplinary measures</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Layoff and discharge of workers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Production cut-backs and closures</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Job allocation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Investment decisions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Takeovers and mergers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Appointment of directors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Agree according to this column means that columns 1 & 2 total more than 50% of the responses, i.e. the students feel that workers should participate by some means.
elected representative, was seen as having the right to negotiate most work related issues on behalf of the workers with the management. The overall impression of the survey is one of confusion in the minds of the potential managers regarding participation. The students believed both parties create the majority of strikes through allowable clashes within the industrial relations framework and that the stewards are more likely to create problems than the workers or the management. They state, however, that the stewards should participate in most work related matters. Most students do not know of the moves towards worker participation, industrial democracy or work restructuring - news of the moves has not reached the lecturers and students in the general managerial undergraduate subjects. Such is not the case with the postgraduate and specialist students - they know of the moves and on the whole appear at least neutral, if not positive, towards the development.
Dear Sir,

You will be aware of the recent upsurge in interest in the field of Employee Participation/Worker Involvement/Industrial Democracy with the EEC Fifth Directive, the projected Industry Bill, and recent documents by the CBI, TUC, and the Engineering Employers Federation.

I am conducting a multinational study on the source and progress of the above ideas and hope you will complete the enclosed managerial questionnaire. Data collected will be confidential and each questionnaire is unmarked; there will be no follow up nor reminder to reply.

I hope that you will take the time to complete the questionnaire which has been designed to take no more than 10 minutes. If you have any worries or queries I would be pleased to answer them at the above address.

For your information I am a Senior Lecturer in Behavioural Science at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education at Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia, and currently spending a year at the Loughborough University of Technology with Professor Albert Cherns.

Thanking you in anticipation of your co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)
George Wittingslow, AASA, MAPS
INSTRUCTIONS:

PLEASE RING THE ANSWER YOU FEEL IS CORRECT, e.g. (YES)/NO

PLEASE READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY.

Q1. WORK POSITION ________________________________

Q2. TYPE OF INDUSTRY YOUR ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN _________

Q3. (a) SIZE OF YOUR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT
     i.e. number of workers employed where you work
(b) DO YOU BELONG TO A GROUP OF ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS YES/NO
(c) YES TO Q3(b), WHAT IS THE TOTAL SIZE __________
     i.e. employees in your organization

Q4. COMMUNITY POSITIONS YOU HOLD
     e.g. Local Government, Community Organizations, Political
         Party, Sporting Administration, Part-time Lecturing,
         Managerial Organizations:
     (i) __________________________________________
     (ii) __________________________________________
     (iii) __________________________________________
     (iv) __________________________________________

Q5. DO YOU BELIEVE IN WORKERS PARTICIPATION AS A PRINCIPLE? YES/NO

Q6. DID YOU RECEIVE THE PAMPHLET "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION"? YES/NO
    If NO to Q6 do not proceed any further. Please return the
    questionnaire.

Q7. (a) DID YOU READ THE PAMPHLET? YES/NO
    (b) IF NO, WHY?

Q8. HOW DID "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION" RATE AGAINST OTHER CBI
     PAMPHLETS? BETTER/AS GOOD/WORSE

Q9. WHAT DO YOU REMEMBER AS "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION'S" MAIN
     MESSAGE?

Q10. DID READING THE PAMPHLET ALTER YOUR PREVIOUS POSITION ON
     EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION? POSITIVELY/NO EFFECT/NEGATIVELY
Q11. DID YOU MENTION "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION" TO OTHER PEOPLE? YES/NO

Q12. IF YES TO Q11, WHERE DID YOU MENTION "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION"?

1. AT WORK ___________________________ YES/NO
2. FAMILY/RELATIVES __________________ YES/NO
3. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES ________________ YES/NO
4. TEACHING/LECTURING ________________ YES/NO
5. MEDIA ______________________________ YES/NO
6. POLITICAL MEETINGS _________________ YES/NO
7. SPORTING ADMINISTRATION ____________ YES/NO
8. EMPLOYERS ORGANIZATIONS ___________ YES/NO

Q13. HOW DID YOU DESCRIBE "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION"?

POSITIVELY/NEUTRAL/NEGATIVELY

Q14. HAD YOU TAKEN ACTION TO IMPLEMENT, OR ARGUE FOR, EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION?

(a) BEFORE READING "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION" YES/NO
(b) SINCE READING "EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION" YES/NO

Q15. IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO Q14(b), WHERE DID YOU IMPLEMENT/ARGUE FOR EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION?

1. IN YOUR WORK-PLACE _________________ YES/NO
2. IN YOUR COMMUNITY SERVICE ____________ YES/NO
3. TEACHING OTHERS ____________________ YES/NO
4. DEBATE ______________________________ YES/NO
5. POLITICAL MEETING ____________________ YES/NO
6. GENERAL DISCUSSION __________________ YES/NO
7. FAMILY CIRCLES ______________________ YES/NO
8. MANAGERIAL ORGANIZATIONS _____________ YES/NO
9. ANY OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES NOT LISTED _____ YES/NO
   (List the circumstances below)
   (a) ____________________________________
   (b) ____________________________________
   (c) ____________________________________
   (d) ____________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED ENVELOPE
RESULTS OF THE CBI SURVEY OF MANAGERS

Of the 87 respondents 77 worked in engineering concerns, (Q.2), the remaining 10 worked in a variety of industries; the responses came from the same type of industry, i.e. engineering, as the CUK Group. (Table 1 below sets out the job classifications and size of organizations of the respondents.)

The largest single classification of respondents, by work position, (Q.1), was Managing Director with 31 responses (36%) followed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>&lt; 100 Workers</th>
<th>100-500 Workers</th>
<th>501-1000 Workers</th>
<th>&lt; 1000 Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Director 16 (13%), and Personnel Director 11 (13%); no other job classification received a score equal to 10% of the sample or better.

Nearly half (42 responses or 48%) of the respondents worked in organizational units with less than 100 workers. The next largest grouping was 100 to 500 workers with 24 responses or 28%, then followed 501 to 1,000 workers with 12 responses or 14%, and the lowest response came from plants with more than 1,000 workers (9 responses or 10%). The result is reasonable and to be expected as the smaller the organizational unit, the higher the number of units in operation in Britain.

If, however, one totals the number of workers employed by the respondents' organizational units, then the lowest scoring category, more than 1,000 workers, employed more workers than the other three groups combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Workers Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 1,000 workers</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 workers</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 500 workers</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 1,000 workers</td>
<td>8,000 18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total workers employed in participants' units:</td>
<td>44,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty (58%) of sample work units belong to a larger organization (Q.3b). See Table 2 for details.

Over half of the respondents in five of the eight job categories - Personnel Manager, Sales Director, General Manager, Managing Director and Company Secretary - worked in organizational units which were part of larger organizations. The "specialist" managers, e.g. Personnel,
Table 2

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MANAGERS IN EACH GROUPING
WHO WORKED FOR LARGER ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Worked in Larger Units</th>
<th>Did not work in Larger Units</th>
<th>% in Larger Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sales, Works, Technical and Company Secretary, tended to work in units which were part of a larger conglomerate, while the more "general" managers, e.g. Director, General Manager and Works Manager, tended to work in smaller independent units.

When the size of the total organization is considered (Q.3c) 21 of the 50 who worked in larger conglomerates belonged to an organization with 1000 to 10,000 employees; 15 of the remaining 29 worked in organizations which employed over 10,000 workers. It would appear from the returns that three of the four car manufacturers were included as well as the very large automobile suppliers, e.g. Dunlop and Lucas. (Table 3 below sets out the job classifications of the respondents who belonged to larger organizational groups).

In summary the majority of the respondents worked in an organizational unit which in turn belonged to a larger organization; most of the larger organizations employed over 1000 workers. One would therefore expect a greater interest and knowledge of worker participation among the respondents than in a sample of randomly selected managers in the West Midlands region.

Rogers hypothesized that 'opinion leaders' are the critical group in the spread of a new idea; unless the 'opinion leaders' accept and try the new concept from the 'change agent', the 'early majority' and 'later majority' will not seriously consider the idea. The respondents in the survey are likely to be among the 'opinion leaders' or 'early majority' to the rest of managers and the community at large; the sample's support or rejection is likely to be important to the spread of the idea within the community.
Table 3

JOB CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS IN OPERATING INTO LARGER ORGANIZATIONS COMPARED TO THE TOTAL SIZE OF THE ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>100-499 Workers</th>
<th>500-1000 Workers</th>
<th>1001-10,000 Workers</th>
<th>More than 10,000 Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides the job title of each respondent, it is also important to ascertain the outside contacts of the managers when they could positively or negatively affect the diffusion of worker participation - this was done through Q.4. See table 8.4 for the full details.

The two categories with the greatest number of outside interests were Sales Director (12 interests for 6 men) and Personnel Manager (18 interests between 11 men). Most of the other categories did not average a score of one outside interest per person. The two most 'person' orientated categories had the highest number of outside interests.

The Personnel Manager and Managing Director categories both had the widest range of community involvement - seven out of the nine activity groupings.

The particular activity grouping was generally dominated by one or two types of managers. The Managing Directors of very large conglomerates belonged to the Conservative Party which opposed Worker Participation. Sales Directors provided three of the six Local Government representatives, active membership of professional associations was dominated by the Sales Directors and Personnel Managers, while acting as a leader in one's discipline was clearly led by the Personnel Managers. Leisure activities, e.g. golf, were the main activity for Managing Directors, Directors and Company Secretaries.

When asked if they believed in Worker Participation 35 (40%) replied in the affirmative. The only two groups generally in favour of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Managerial Leader</th>
<th>Local Govt.</th>
<th>Community Groups</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Professional Organizations</th>
<th>Justice Peace</th>
<th>Conservative Party</th>
<th>Magistrate</th>
<th>Part-time Lecturer</th>
<th>Total No. of Positions</th>
<th>No. i Sampl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
worker participation were the Personnel Managers and Sales Directors - the 'people' orientated managers. The more technical orientated the position, e.g. Technical Director, Works Manager, the more likely the person opposed to the concept of participation.

See Table 5 for full details.

If one compares the results of the managers who work in conglomerates with those who are employed in single unit organizations a different picture arises. The different in attitudes between the two groups is highly significant ($p < .0001$) - 30 of the 50 in the conglomerate sub-grouping are in favour while only 5 in 37 in single unit organizations are in favour.

See Table 6 for full details.
Table 5

BELIEF IN WORKER PARTICIPATION BY THE TYPE OF MANAGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>IN FAVOUR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

COMPARISON OF THE BELIEF IN WORKER PARTICIPATION BETWEEN CONGLOMERATE ORGANIZATIONS' MANAGERS AND SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>CONGLOMERATE</th>
<th>SINGLE UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN FAVOUR</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>IN FAVOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the CBI Regional office records, all managers received a copy of the pamphlet "Employee Participation", yet only 41 of the 87 remembered receiving a copy (Q.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>RECEIVED</th>
<th>NOT RECEIVED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 41 who received the pamphlet, only 21 read the document (Q.7a), i.e. only 1 in 4 of the pamphlets was read by the sample. The 'person' orientated managers, Personnel and Sales, were again the only categories where all members read the document, while none of the Directors or Company Secretaries bothered to read the pamphlet. All those who did not read the document said they were not interested in reading the material (Q.7b). The effect of the pamphlet on the 21 readers was minuscule (Q.8) - 19 found the document as good as others previously read, while one Managing Director found it 'better' and another Managing Director found it 'worse'.
Of the 41, only 26 managers attempted to recall the message of "Employee Participation" (Q.9), and only 7 of the 26 could accurately recall the message; all of the accurate "recallers" worked in conglomerate groups and four of the seven were Personnel Managers, the others were Managing Directors.

Some of the 41 claimed to be affected by the pamphlet (Q.10), all towards accepting greater worker participation. Those affected included two Sales Directors, two Directors, one Works Manager and a Managing Director.

When asked if they had mentioned "Employee Participation" to others (Q.11), the sample gave 60 affirmative answers. The job classification of the messengers and their places of dissemination are set out below in Table 8. The major places where the document was discussed were at work, within the family, and at employers meetings. The comments were not strongly in favour of the concept, only 10 of the 29 spoke in favour, 14 were neutral when mentioning the idea of participation, and five spoke negatively.

Five of the 10 in favour were Managing Directors of companies belonging to a larger group, two were Managers in larger groups, and the remaining three were Personnel Managers.
Table 8

PLACES WHERE WORKER PARTICIPATION WAS MENTIONED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>MEDIA</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
<th>SPORTING</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS' ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Director</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January, 1975

Dear Member,

Survey on readership of a Fabian pamphlet

Enclosed with this letter you will find a questionnaire and an explanatory note from George Wittinglows who is currently undertaking research at Loughborough University.

As part of this, he is asking a sample of Fabian members who received our September 74 tract "Working Power", by Giles Radice, various questions on their reaction to it. Whilst this is, of course, for his own research purposes, the findings will naturally be of interest to us and may help us understand more about your views of our publications.

I therefore do hope you will manage to complete the questionnaire and return it to George Wittinglows. Each questionnaire is unmarked and will remain completely anonymous. Furthermore, no record has been kept of who has received a questionnaire so there will be no follow up nor reminder to reply.

For information, George Wittinglows is Senior Lecturer in Behavioural Science at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education at Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia. He is currently spending a year at Loughborough in the Social Science Department. The enclosed questionnaire and related research is part of a larger project aimed at developing a "diffusion" model for explaining how ideas spread in the community.

Thanking you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Dianne Hayter
Assistant General Secretary
Dear Subscriber,

I am asking for your assistance in my research on how information is diffused, in particular Industrial Democracy within the community.

As a current subscriber you should have received a copy of Working Power by Giles Radice and distributed in September 1974. I am trying to see if the document had any effect on the interest in Industrial Democracy.

I would appreciate it if you could take a few minutes to fill in the attached questionnaire and post it back in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope. This piece of research may hopefully help to untangle the continuing mystery of why ideas have different chances of success in influencing public opinion.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)
George S. Wittingslow.
INSTRUCTIONS

Please ring the answer you feel is correct, e.g. YES/NO
Please read each question carefully.

Q1. OCCUPATION

Q2. OTHER POSITIONS HELD
   e.g. Trade Union Lecturer/Leader, Local Government, Various Community Groups, Part-time Lecturing, Leisure-time Club Activities.

   (i) 

   (ii) 

   (iii) 

   (iv) 

Q3. DO YOU BELIEVE IN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AS A PRINCIPLE? YES/NO

Q4. (a) DID YOU READ THE PAMPHLET? YES/NO
   (b) IF NO, WHY?

Q5. HOW DID "WORKING POWER" RATE AGAINST OTHER FABIAN PAMPHLETS? BETTER/AS GOOD/WORSE

Q6. WHAT DO YOU REMEMBER AS "WORKING POWER"'S MAIN MESSAGE?

Q7. DID READING THE PAMPHLET ALTER YOUR PREVIOUS POSITION ON INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY? POSITIVELY/NO EFFECT/NEGATIVELY

Q8. DID YOU MENTION "WORKING POWER" TO OTHER PEOPLE? YES/NO
Q9. IF YES TO Q8, WHERE DID YOU MENTION "WORKING POWER"?

(1) At work ---------------------------------- YES
(11) Family/Relatives ------------------------- YES
(111) Local activities ------------------------ YES
(iv) Teaching/Lecturing ---------------------- YES
(v) In class ---------------------------------- YES
(vi) Media ------------------------------------ YES
(vii) Fabian meeting ------------------------- YES

Q10. HOW DID YOU DESCRIBE "WORKING POWER"?

POSITIVELY/NEUTRAL/NEGATIVELY

Q11. HAD YOU TAKEN ACTION TO IMPLEMENT, OR ARGUE FOR, INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

(a) BEFORE READING "WORKING POWER"? YES/NO
(b) SINCE READING "WORKING POWER"? YES/NO

Q12. IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO Q11(b), WHERE DID YOU IMPLEMENT/ARGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY?

(i) In your workplace ------------------------ YES/NO
(ii) In your local activities ----------------- YES/NO
(iii) In teaching others ---------------------- YES/NO
(iv) During courses -------------------------- YES/NO
(v) General discussion/debate ---------------- YES/NO
(vi) Family circles -------------------------- YES/NO
(vii) Any other circumstances not listed ---- YES/NO
(List the circumstances below)

(a) ________________________________________
(b) ________________________________________
(c) ________________________________________
(d) ________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.
RESULTS OF THE FABIAN SURVEY ON 'WORKING POWER'

RESULTS

The majority (58% or 49 in 84) claimed to hold positions within the community outside the normal responsibilities of their job. The position most frequently held was that of Labour Party official - 21 or a quarter of the respondents were officials of the Party in government in Britain. The next highest scoring category was that of Trade Union official with 16 responses. When it is also noted that 14 of the respondents were lecturers on trade union run courses, it is quite apparent that the selected sample has a very high potential influence on the thinking of many people within, and others that come in contact with, the Labour Movement. The sample certainly met the criterion that they represent an important group of 'opinion leaders' within the Labour Party and the Labour Movement at large.

Other frequently held positions were Community Affairs involvement (16 responses) and elected Local Government representatives (13 responses). These two groups have a potentially large civic influence; they can introduce an idea into other settings beside that of work and within the Labour Party. To be successful, a movement must have a large social base and those people are the obvious agents to carry the concept of industrial democracy to their local areas.

Two other interesting smaller groups were 5 Justices of the Peace and 3 writers.
Overall, the type and variety of outside interests (88 other positions among 44 respondents), indicate that the sample would be very influential in spreading, or stopping the development of, a particular idea or concept. The positions listed indicate a high level of influence in the Labour Movement and a large potential influence on the local community affairs.

Nearly all (93% or 77) believe in industrial democracy as a worthwhile aim of the Labour Party and one in which they should help and assist the growth of awareness in the country (Q.3). Not all agree with the principle, seven of the 84 (8%) believe the concept would lead to problems. One anti-response claimed that "democracy is a highly desirable aim but can be very dangerous as it gives power to the people who are not capable of using it". The person who wrote this reply listed his occupation as a Member of Parliament.

All the respondents claimed to receive the document 'Working Power' (Q.3) in September 1974 but not all read the pamphlet (Q.4a) - 36 out of 84 did not read 'Working Power'. The major reason given for not reading the pamphlet was lack of time (Q.4b) - this response was given by 19% or 16 of the participating sample. Eight did not read the pamphlet as they did not trust the writer of the document; no justification was given for the highly critical statement of the author, Giles Radice, MP. At the time of the study he was Honorary Treasurer of the Society. The other reason given (8 responses) was the claim that all Fabian documents are dull and turgid, therefore one did not read the pamphlets.

The only other reason for not reading 'Working Power' was that the
respondent did not believe in any form of worker involvement; four people gave this response.

Forty-three per cent of the respondents did not even open the document. Twenty of the 36 who did not read the document gave strongly negative reasons for not reading Radice's work, which would suggest that 14% (12) would not read any document sent by the Society. The remaining 16 of the 36 claimed to lack the time to read the work - this response was given five months after receiving it.

Of the 48 who read the work nine felt the document was better than other Fabian pamphlets (Q.5). The remaining 39 felt the pamphlet was 'as good' as other works sent to them by the Fabian Society. 'Working Power' was seen as a typical Fabian document, no better and no worse than other writings.

When asked to recall the major theme of 'Working Power' only 16 of the 48 were correct, 22 were wrong and 10 did not answer the question (Q.6). This result is disconcerting as it suggests that only 19% (16) of the sample accurately read and understood its message.

Not reading the document correctly was no impediment to informing others of the pamphlet. Forty-two of the 84, half of the respondents, mentioned 'Working Power' to people at work and nearly all of the respondents (35 out of 42) positively described the work (Q.8). Unlike the CBI sample, not one of the Fabians mentioned the pamphlet outside the work context - they did not tell people in their community and Labour Movement activities about the document. 'Working Power' had no effect outside the work setting. Radice's work had not activated
people to argue more strongly for the implementation of industrial democracy. Twenty-nine had argued for workers participating in the running of their workplace before September 1974 and the arrival of 'Working Power' (Q.11a). In the following half year by March 1975 only 14 people argued for greater worker participation through industrial democracy (Q.11b).
APPENDIX 19

BLUMLER AND EW BANK'S RESEARCH FINDINGS

In 1968 the researchers surveyed a sample of trade unionists regarding the sources they used in seeking information from the media. The research concentrated on the availability of information, rather than the impact the information may have had on the audience. The sample was drawn "from four trade unions, three blue-collar and one white-collar. The four unions were chosen to represent as fully as possible the right-left political dimension". The sample was structured into four groups, by rank and file, shop stewards, branch officials and full-time paid officials.

Blumer and Ewbank timed the study to coincide with the release of the Report of the Donovan Commission. The researchers kept a detailed log of references to the report in the various media, and then questioned the sample on their level of knowledge on the report and their sources. Some 60% said that they had heard of the report and gave an average of three sources. The average number of mass media sources used by the four groups were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank and File</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Stewards</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Officials</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Officials</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 lists the rank order of the sources given by the four groups of unionists questioned.
Table 1
RANK ORDER OF MASS MEDIA USED BY UNIONISTS IN THE BLUMLER EWANK RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Source</th>
<th>Rank and File</th>
<th>Shop Stewards</th>
<th>Branch Officials</th>
<th>Paid Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Journals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all sources of information beside the mass media are included the newspapers are still first for all sources, and television is second for all groups except the paid union officials, where "other union officials" come second just ahead of television.

When the mass media sources were ranked in order of importance to the respondents the positions were hardly changed - see Table 2 for the details.

As Blumler and Ewbank point out, not all papers or television channels are used equally by the population at large, and not all sections of the papers and television programmes are equally studied, e.g. the second most popular newspaper source - the Daily Mirror. Although it presented perhaps the best and most interestingly written report on the Royal Commission findings, no one could remember the article, while the few readers who read the "Quality" press could recall the first article in their newspaper which mentioned the Royal Commission. The researchers concluded that the readers did not buy the Daily Mirror to read about industrial relations.
Table 2

RANK ORDER OF MASS MEDIA SOURCES IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE
USED BY UNIONISTS IN THE BLUMLER AND EW BANK RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Source</th>
<th>Rank and File</th>
<th>Shop Stewards</th>
<th>Branch Officials</th>
<th>Paid Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>=1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>=1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Journals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WITTINGSWORTH CONTENT STUDY OF TELEVISION PROGRAMMES DEALING WITH INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 1974 AND DECEMBER 1975

PROGRAMME 1: "PANORAMA": 3rd February 1975

The 50 minute programme had as its stated aim, according to David Dimbleby, to "examine the effects of the biggest potential change in British industry since the last war". He referred to the Industry Bill, which had just been introduced into the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, MP.

Dimbleby stated that he would interview the Secretary for Industry to discuss the Bill and its effects after first presenting background information. The opening shot in the programme was one of a dirty factory in the West Midlands region, with the Chairman of Guest, Keen and Nettlefold, Sir Ray Brooks, claiming that this was the image of British industry presented by the Government, when really most industry was in a much better position and worked in much more hygienic conditions. For the next 30 minutes the programme swung between Brooks speaking to Dimbleby, Brooks commenting on film taken in a variety of industrial settings, a discussion with Richard Marsh, Chairman of British Rail, and discussions with Michael Heseltine, MP, the shadow Minister for Trade. Brooks spoke frequently of British industry's effectiveness being spoiled by various governments' "messing about", "Incompetence", and the present Government's "unique objection to profit in a free enterprise system and the pursuit of excellence".
Brooks presented his case, colourfully and fluently, that British industry was resilient but would be destroyed by the Industry Bill. In the questioning, Dimbleby initially took the "adversary" role, e.g. "Aren't you really speaking on behalf of your company, i.e., the effects of the Bill on GKN?" After eight minutes the terminology of Dimbleby's questions changed to how the Bill would affect "us" and what effects the Bill would generally have on Britain.

Dimbleby then interviewed Richard Marsh, Chairman of British Rail. Marsh said he was in favour of the joint planning sections of the Bill if it meant that governments would allow British Rail to plan in the long and medium term.

The next series of images and interview material returned to Sir Ray Brooks. Immediately after Richard Marsh stated that the success or failure of the Bill would depend on the co-operation of the trade unions, the film switched back to Brooks stating that the Labour Party had serious worries as extreme groups, e.g. communists and international socialists, had taken over the trade unions. Brooks said that the extremists would ruin the effect of the Bill, but that the provisions could have worked if the individual trade unionists in their workforce were not acted upon by union officials.

The next section of the film was an interview with Mr. Michael Heseltine, MP, shadow Minister for Trade in the Conservative Party. Mr. Heseltine also referred to the communists. He stated the disclosure of information to such people would give them the tools to destroy British industry and the free enterprise system. Heseltine agreed with Dimbleby that the Industry Bill would radically alter British society.
Until the end of the Heseltine interview, the television presenter (Dimbleby) had not once interrupted the statements of the Interviewee.

The camera then moved to an "on camera" interview with the Secretary of State, and the interview took the last 15 minutes of the programme. Dimbleby immediately led questions which assumed that the contentious statements, e.g. "destroy British society", "communist control of trade unions" and "leaking of information", were accepted facts. The Secretary of State disagreed and spoke of "a general yearning for discussion and participation". After five minutes had elapsed (40 minute mark), Dimbleby spoke of the "cruel constraints on British Industry" brought about by the intended Bill. This was refuted by the Interviewee who pointed out that the provisions referred to come from the previous Conservative Bill of Mr. Heath's government, the Labour Party had only incorporated the same provisions in their intended Bill.

Dimbleby did not ask another direct question for 9½ minutes, in which Benn replied to many statements made earlier in the programme. In the last 30 seconds, the interviewer asked, "But why has the Labour Government decided to intervene in British industry?". a curious question after the preceding answers. As the Secretary started to answer the question, Dimbleby interrupted to thank him for his attendance and state the programme had run its allocated time.

The presentation of the programme has been described in some detail to illustrate the use of imagery, selected cutting and questions to create an overall image that the Industry Bill would radically alter British society, and possibly help the communists and far-left socialists to destroy the country.
The programme had an effect and was remembered when the next two BBC programmes were made.

PROGRAMME 2: "YOUR POINT OF VIEW": 6th June 1975

This 30 minute religious programme discussed a new topic each week - the topic on the 6th June 1975 was "Are There Such Things As Ethics In The World Of Business?".

A panel of three men briefly outlined their points of view and then viewers from all over the British Isles were asked to ring the programme and ask their questions. The three speakers were Jerome O'Hea, Chairman of the Christian Association of Business Executives - a group supported by all the churches in England, Robert Heller, Editor of Management Today, and Robert Ingamy, who was identified as a shop steward from the Midlands.

Each of the three presented different points of view on the topic. Jerome O'Hea argued that management over the previous 10 years had changed its emphasis from that of cash-flow and financial management to one more interested in people as human resources. Robert Heller, on the other hand, argued there was no such thing as "business ethics", only general ethics. He argued that ethics had nothing to do with business decisions and that profit was the only acceptable motive as in the end it benefited the greatest number of people. Ingamy argued that ethics meant that people had to be developed and helped to grow personally; Ingamy spoke of job enrichment, job enlargement and worker participation as means by which people could grow.

A series of questions were given to the panel members by people watching
the programme. The second last question concerned workers' right to participate. Heller, who was asked the question, answered in the negative. Then O'Hea and Ingam both answered in the affirmative. They proposed that Christianity meant participation in life and control over one's environment - the choice of good or evil - and this was also true in the workplace: a practising Christian would want to participate in his workplace to see that organizational decisions did not contravene his ethics. O'Hea suggested that to profess a point of view as a Christian and then work in a place which acted against that ethical standard was to be hypocritical.

At the end of the programme, when asked to sum up their position, both Ingam and O'Hea stated that the church was ethically in favour of worker participation and should support the demands for it within the community. Heller reiterated his point that ethics had nothing to do with business.

The majority point of view was consistent with the beliefs, policies and practices of the Coventry Industrial Mission. There appears to be a fairly consistent Christian point of view regarding industrial democracy/worker participation.

PROGRAMME 3: "PANORAMA": 9th September 1975

The whole 50 minute programme dealt with the move towards worker participation. Again, as in Programme 1, the case against worker participation was given the first 30 minutes (60% of the programme time). However, this time the images were mainly "talking heads". The spokesmen against a law enforcing industrial democracy or worker participation included Sir Ralph Bateman, Chairman of the CBI, and
Mr. Robert Heller, Editor of *Management Today*. The speakers stressed that the concepts were not British in nature and were being forced on British Industry. Michael Heseltine, MP, again spoke, and on this occasion he was supported by fellow Conservative, Mr. Eldon Griffiths, MP. Both particularly attacked the Industry Bill which they saw as the way in which industrial democracy would be introduced. Mr. Richard Wainwright, the Liberal Party spokesman on Industry, Trade and Prices, generally supported the Industry Bill except that he felt it did not go far enough in supplying the means to retrain redundant workers.

In the last 20 minutes Mr. Tony Benn, MP, was interviewed for 18 minutes and 2 minutes were spent reviewing the ideas. When Dimbleby asked the Secretary of State questions, he very carefully defined the questions and answered them. When Dimbleby again asked a very aggressive question at the end of the programme, the Minister firmly requested the time to answer the question with the detail it deserved. This was given.

The presenter summarized the statements and finished the programme by asking the rhetorical question, "Will the move towards industrial democracy save British industry or prove to be another government blunder in the field of industry?".

**PROGRAMME 4: "THE RIGHT TO MANAGE": 12th September 1975**

This long 90 minute programme was claimed by the BBC to have been seen by an audience of 750,000. It was designed to be an in-depth enquiry into worker participation. In the week starting the 9th September 1975 the Secretary of State for Trade, Mr. Peter Shore, announced that an investigation into the implementation of
Industrial democracy in Britain would be carried out but did not name the members of the enquiry at that stage.

The joint presenters were Robert McKenzie and Bill Kerr Elliott. The programme began by McKenzie stating that a concept called worker participation, industrial democracy, or worker control, depending on one's political persuasion, was about to become a reality. The three major political parties were pressing for the implementation of some form of worker involvement. McKenzie noted that "worker participation means all things to all men", so he would ask a panel of interested people to discuss the concept.

The programme then moved to a 30 minute film clip on the role of the typical shop steward. The example, Jim Murray, was Works Convenor at Vickers Elswick in Newcastle. A self-professed socialist and worker control supporter, Murray was presented as a typical plant union leader. Film showed Murray at a football match, in a pub watching a plant commissioned pub show*, at a dinner for shop stewards, a trade union branch meeting and some of his work negotiations with the management.

The film presented the image that the typical Convenor was a poorly educated but highly intelligent, articulate, politically aware person. The final destruction of the capitalist system was referred to on three occasions in the film clip. The effect of the segment was to build a picture of an industrial force ready

---

*"The Front Line" was the first professional show commissioned to illustrate the struggle of shop stewards in a particular plant - Vickers (Elswick) Works.
to radically alter the country. The segment was not typical and was clearly anti-trade union in emphasis.

The programme then returned to the set with the 18 people assembled to discuss industrial democracy. Bill Kerr interviewed two participants who were Worker Directors at the time the programme was made. Kerr asked objective questions on the problems of being a Worker Director; the segment was very fair and balanced.

The last 50-55 minutes was spent with the panel discussing the topic. Both the management representatives, of which Sir Ralph Bateman was one, and the trade union spokesmen, of which Mr. Jack Jones was one, rejected the film of Murray as biased, exaggerated and a waste of time in the discussion. Various people put forward their views on a series of issues. All questions were asked in a non-confronting manner and all members gave reasonable answers to the questions. The discussion was always courteous and great stress was laid by McKenzie on equal opportunities for both groups to give their answers and examples. On two occasions members from both groups commented on the difference between the presentation of their programme and the "Panorama" programme shown earlier in the week. Both groups praised the unbiased presentation of the latter part of "The Right to Manage".

The programme had two distinct sections - the first was anti-trade union and was rejected by the panel in the second section. The participants saw the second section as unbiased and balanced as possible under the conditions.
All the people in the programme discussion supported some form of participation, but differed on the level and form of involvement.

PROGRAMME 5: "PANORAMA": 25th November 1975

The third and last "Panorama" programme to mention industrial democracy discussed the fate of CUK. On November 3rd CUK, through its Chairman, Mr. Don Lander, announced that unless the British government was prepared to arrange funds the company would stop manufacturing motor vehicles in Britain. Between that date and the 16th December, CUK, the Government and the Trade Union Congress negotiated a loan arrangement and the level of support that the Government was prepared to give CUK in the following four years.

On 25th November the "Panorama" programme began by discussing the so-called "Nestle Baby Food Scandal" in the developing countries for 30 minutes. The programme then reported on the future of CUK. The 20 minute report began with interviews of ex-CUK managers who emphasized the lack of planning and cohesion in the company. Then the reporter showed film clips of previous Ryton Assembly Plant and Stoke Engine Plant strikes. Much of the company's problems was laid at the feet of the unionists, although the ex-managers had not mentioned industrial relations as a serious problem. The reporter mentioned the offer of employee participation by CUK in May 1975 and discussed whether participation by the workers would reduce strikes and so increase the efficiency of the
company. There was no mention that the workers might be capable of actively contributing to the better running of CUK; the only mention of worker involvement in management decision making showed a manager at Whitby, the headquarters of CUK, claiming that employee participation would need to radically reduce the hours lost by strikes to compensate for the decrease in managerial effectiveness brought about by worker participation in the decision making process.

The third and last "Panorama" programme mentioning industrial democracy did not present the concept in a positive manner.
DIGRAPH THEORY

The basis of the explanation is structural models by Harary, Norman and Cartwright, whose work is used as the basic text by social anthropologists.

Digraph or directed graph theory deals with "structure". The originators believed that the knowledge of the mathematics of abstract structures would be of value to investigators interested in empirical structures. Digraphs are abstract configurations which consist of "points" and "directed lines" which, when given concrete referents, serve as mathematical models of the empirical world. The most famous use of digraphs in the social sciences is that of Moreno's sociometric research through sociograms.

Digraphs are claimed to have three major advantages:
(a) "precise definitions can be given about such ideas as the degree of connectedness of a structure, its diameter, its vulnerability and its stratification at levels".
(b) the theory provides techniques for computation and formulas for calculating certain quantitative features of empirical structures. Matrix algebra has a close relationship to graph theory.
(c) Theorems can be derived from the theory. These theorems in turn lead to an extensive body of logically derived statements.

PRINCIPLES OF DIGRAPH THEORY

(i) Nets and Relations

\[ N: \begin{array}{c}
  \text{fx}_1 \\
  \text{ox}_2
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{fx}_1 \\
  \text{ox}_2
\end{array} \]

Figure 1

Diagram of a Very Simple Net
The simple net, N, consists of two points and a directed line. The points are conventionally depicted by dots labelled \( v_1, v_2, v_3 \ldots, v_p \) and the directed lines are arcs labelled \( x_1, x_2, x_3 \ldots, x_q \). The direction of each line is indicated by the arrowhead. In Figure 1 the direction of the line \( x_1 \) can be described by saying that its first point, denoted \( f_{x_1} \) is \( v_1 \) and its second point, \( s_{x_1} \) is \( v_2 \) or that \( x_1 \) is "directed" from \( v_1 \) to \( v_2 \) as every line of a net is directed from its first point to its second point.

The axioms for a net are:

1. The set \( V \) is finite and not empty.
2. The set \( X \) is finite.

The first axiom excludes an empty net (i.e. with no points) and a net with an infinite number of points. The second axiom excludes nets with an infinite number of lines.

A loop occurs if the line of a net has the same first and second point (see Figure 2) and the two lines are parallel if they have the same starting and ending points (see Figure 2).

A relation is a net which has no two distinct lines parallel. The relation is determined by the first point and the following points and the finite number of lines that join the points together.

Figure 2

Lines which are not Relations

\( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) are parallel lines
\( x_3 \) is a loop
(ii) Property of Relation

(a) A relation \( R \) is **reflexive** if every point of \( R \) is on a loop (see Figure 3(a)).

(b) Relation \( R \) is **symmetric** if whenever \( uRv \), then \( vRu \) (see Figure 3(b)).

(c) A relation is **transitive** if for any three distinct points, \( u, v, w \) or \( R \), whenever \( uRv \) and \( vRw \), then \( uRw \) (see Figure 3(c)).

(d) Figure 3(c) is **irreflexive** as there is no loop.

(e) Relation \( R \) is complete if for every pair of distinct points \( u \) and \( v \) or \( R \), at least one of the ordered pairs \( (u, v) \) or \( (v, u) \) is in \( R \).

(f) If the Relation \( R \) is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, then it is described as being an **equivalence relation**.

The above examples of the properties of the relations does not exhaust the types of relations possible but the above ones include most of the important types. Also the relations are usually a combination of many properties.

(iii) Digraphs

Digraphs are based on the principles above but they are a special type of net - there are no loops or parallel lines. Therefore the axioms for digraphs are:

1. The set of \( v \) is finite and not empty.
2. The set \( x \) is finite.
3. No two distinct lines are parallel.
4. There are no loops.

A digraph is an irreflexive relation.

A digraph may have no lines at all - then it is called totally disconnected and shows that no relations exist between the points (see Figure 4).

The digraph can be seen as a matrix (see Figure 5) and the relations can be interpreted. The rows and columns of the matrix indicate the lines originating and terminating at each point of the digraph. The lines from each point of the digraph are called the outdegree of the point, and lines terminating at the point are called the indegree.

The sums of the indegrees and of the outdegrees are equal in any digraph matrix.

An isolate is a point with no indegree or outdegree; a transmitter has a positive outdegree and no indegree; a receiver has a positive indegree and no outdegree; a carrier has an indegree and outdegree of 1; an ordinary point is any other combination of indegree and outdegree.

(iv) Isomorphisms of Digraphs

It is possible for two different communication networks to have the same structure; the people may be different in each
Figure 4
A Totally Disconnected Digraph

Figure 5
A Digraph as a Matrix

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{v}_1 & \text{v}_2 & \text{v}_3 & \text{v}_4 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Row Sum: 0, 3, 1, 1
Column Sum: 2, 0, 2, 1
network but if they communicate the same way then their pattern is similar. Also if the communication pattern of two groups is the opposite then they have the same structure. Therefore, when using digraph matrixes, it is necessary to know the direction of the lines (see Figure 6).

(v) **Semipaths and Paths**

A *semipath* joining, say, $v_1$ and $v_4$, is a collection of distinct points with $n-1$ lines.

A *(directed)* *path* is a collection of distinct points and lines with the same directionality. Therefore a semipath and path could be the same but often are not. In Figure 7 there is a path from $v_1$ to $v_3$ but a semipath from $v_1$ to $v_4$ as $v_1$ cannot reach $v_4$.

The number of lines in a path is called its **length**.

(vi) **Reachability**

$v$ is **reachable** from $u$ in a digraph $D$ if, and only if, there is a sequence from $u$ to $v$.

(vii) **Joining**

It is the same as Reachability except the direction of the lines are ignored. $v_1$ to $v_3$ in Figure 7 shows that $v_1$ can
Figure 6
Two Groups with the Same Matrix But with the Opposite Communication Patterns

\[
A(D_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad A(D_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Figure 7
Example of a Semipath and Path
reach $v_3$ and the same figure also shows that $v_1$ joins $v_4$.

Therefore **Joining** means "being in the same piece of the network" and is weaker as a statement than reachability.

A network is **"strong"** if once a rumour is started it will reach all others in the network.

A network is **"weak"** if an idea cannot reach all of network.

Therefore a weak network has less lines than a strong network.

(viii) **Condensation**

The myriad of lines and points can burden the researcher. However, one can condense complicated digraph by joining the sub-systems together as a simple digraph, (see Figure 8) as long as the digraph is not cyclic (i.e. the condensed digraph is a cycle).

(ix) **Conclusion**

The principles above cover some of the major ones necessary to understand Digraphs and Network. They provide the reader with the analytic tools to study the research using network theory.
Figure 8
Example of a Condensed Digraph

DIGRAPH D

CONDENSED DIGRAPH D (D*)