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INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Over the past few years, there has been increasing concern about, and research*into, the problems of the low quality of working life of the work force in the U.K. This has found expression in the establishment of the Work Research Unit at the Department of Employment, the Work Research Group at Henley Staff College, the Computer Research Unit at Manchester Business School, the work of the Tavistock Institute, the U.K. links with the International Council for the Quality of Working Life, and the research and consultancy activities of many Universities, Polytechnics and professional bodies.

In addition, writers have noted the difficulties that managers are experiencing in the work situation - lack of intrinsic job satisfaction, the problems of stress, the difficulties of managing complexity and uncertainty - all challenges to the quality of working life of the manager and to his effectiveness.

A number of overlapping approaches have been developed, aimed at improving the quality of working life for the work force. These have included human relations approaches, the application of job enlargement and job enrichment principles, work restructuring, an emphasis on job design, on a socio-technical systems approach, on the development of autonomous work groups. Such strategies tend to be directed towards changing the manner in which work, tasks and people are organised - an emphasis on organisational changes. At the same time, the efforts of the organisation to gain the acceptance of their policies and adherence to their norms and values, through the processes of social-

*The studies to which general reference is made in this introduction will be identified and discussed in Chapter One "The Review of the Literature."
isation have also been extensively explored. All these can be viewed as attempts to achieve organisational objectives at the same time as satisfying the needs of the employees - organisational steps to integrate the individual into the organisation. But members of the organisation are not "passive elements" in these relationships to the organisation. A limited number of research studies have commented upon the responses of the individual and of the work group to adverse organisational conditions. These have tended to be concerned with the world of the shop-floor or office worker and have left a number of gaps in the research, particularly about the reactions of the manager and the technical specialist to the demands of the organisation.

Over the years, attention has been drawn by a number of writers to these gaps. Argyris (1957) talked of actual empirical studies about employees' (managers' or workers') reactions as "meagre" (p. 86). Sayles (1963) noted "the reluctance of management to encourage research at its own level" (p. 3). Brim (1968) submitted that "little attention has been given to self-initiated socialisation ... no-one has systematically asked adults about this" (p. 189). Riley et al. (1969) likewise observed that "reciprocal socialisation has received little attention" (p. 961). Barrett (1970) concluded his own research project into the activities of the organisation to integrate the individual with the submission that the question of goal integration from the point of view of the individual was "an important one" and that it "might be profitably followed up in future investigations" (p. 95). Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) noted similarly that compared with the processes of organisational socialisation, the process of individualisation "has received much less specific attention" (p. 170).

Against the backcloth of this shortage of actual empirical studies, the aim of this research project was to explore how managers
and technical specialists sought to adjust or "manage" their environment, or their perception of their environment, in order to improve or maintain the quality of their working lives. The research is what Barrett (1972) termed "opportunistic" (p. 8) in the sense that the researcher took advantage of a close relationship with one large organisation and with some fifty managers and technical specialists within that organisation to persuade them to complete two main questionnaires and to talk frankly with him at at least two focussed interviews per respondent about their world of work. From this information, the researcher has sought to develop a typology of personalising strategies which managers and technical specialists employed in their efforts to handle adverse conditions in their quality of working life. The implications of this research for management development were felt to be particularly important and although this aspect does not form a significant part of this thesis, the researcher intends to develop this assertion more fully in later writings.

**Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis is broadly divided into three parts as below:

**Part One - The Literature and the Research Design**

Chapter One contains the review of the literature concerned with the relationships of the individual to the organisation and it explores the processes of organisational socialisation and the reactions of individuals to the demands and constraints of the organisation. The literature on the concepts and measures of job satisfaction and the quality of working life is also set out and throughout, special reference is made to those studies specifically concerned with managers and technical specialists. Chapter Two concentrates on research design and methods. In addition to describing the actual methods adopted in this
study, it incorporates the arguments of a number of research methodologists on these methods.

Part Two - Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses

The three chapters that follow contain a description of the research data. Chapter Three describes the respondents' need deficiencies as identified by the 'Porter' questionnaire and their responses to these as discussed at the interviews. In Chapter Four, the respondents' concerns about the quality of their working life are analysed, together with their reported strategies for handling these. The third chapter of findings contains supplementary data gained from other questions. This includes a discussion on the respondents' quality of working life, on reported incidents of pressure and their methods of response, together with their views on organisational policies, procedures and authority.

Part Three - Research Model and Conclusions

In Chapter Six, these data are drawn together into a typology of personalising strategies, this framework being concerned with the respondents' efforts to restructure and redefine their work situation and its relationship to non-work activity and with their attempts to change jobs within the organisation or to move to another organisation. The final chapter presents the individual as striving to maintain, or attain, a condition of equilibrium under conditions of change and uncertainty, illustrating this process with examples from the case histories of respondents. It concludes with a discussion of some of the limitations of the present study, with proposals for future research and some observations about the implications of this research for management development.
PART I

THE LITERATURE

AND THE RESEARCH DESIGN
CHAPTER ONE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature on the relationship between the individual and the organisation proved to be extensive and therefore the chapter reviewing this work forms a significant part of this thesis. The review is initially concerned with an overview of the relationship between organisational demands and individual needs, together with an exploration of the research into organisational attempts to achieve control and integration. This is followed by an examination of the responses of the individual to the demands and constraints of the organisation.

Since the study is concerned with the behaviour of managers and technical specialists, research projects into their motivation, job satisfaction and their problems of stress are reviewed and various typologies of the manager are also reported as part of the process of gaining insight into their orientations and adaptations to work. The relationships of the individual to the work situation in terms of job satisfaction and the quality of working life are examined in the search for measures to be used in this study.

The literature on those research methods which might be appropriate for this study is analysed in Chapter Two, which is concerned with research design and research methods. Other reviews were conducted after the empirical study to follow up some of the insights gained. This material is referred to in the chapters which set out the research findings.
This chapter is therefore divided into the following sections:

a) The Organisation and the Individual
b) The Individual and the Organisation
c) The Manager and the Organisation
d) Job Satisfaction and the Quality of Working Life - definition and measurement.

a) The Organisation and the Individual

A controversy has raged about the potential harmful effects of organisational membership upon the individual. The demands and constraints of the organisation have been presented by a number of writers as incompatible with the needs of the individual.

C. Wright Mills (1951) had suggested that "on every hand the individual is confronted by seemingly remote organisations; he feels dwarfed and hopeless before the managerial cadres and their manipulative minions" (p. 111). "He is pushed by forces beyond his control, pulled into movements he does not understand, he gets into situations in which his is the most helpless position" (xii). Moore (1962) had observed that "the degree of supremacy of the organisation over the individual, although not total, is impressive" (p. 39). Whyte, in "The Organisation Man", (1961) had expressed fear at the stultifying effects of the pressures towards conformity, exerted by large organisations on the individuals within it, a view very similar to that of Simmel, in his discussion on the relationship of society to the individual. Simmel had observed that "the individual strives to be rounded out in himself, not merely to help to round out society. He strives to develop his full capacity, irrespective of the shifts among them that the interest of society may ask of him ..... No house can be built of houses, but
only of specially formed stones" (Wolff, 1950; p. 59).

Argyris (1957) developed this theme in the context of organisational membership. He argued that the organisational conditions that underpin the formal organisation, ran counter to the demands of the healthy personality. The principles of task specialisation, the chain of command, unity of direction, limited span of control were not congruent with the development for the healthy personality. His view of a healthy personality, for which he depended heavily on the work of Erikson (1950), involved a growth from being passive to becoming active, from being in a state of dependence to movement towards one of relative independence. It involved extending the range of ways of behaving, deepening the range of interests, extending the time perspective. It included a movement from a subordinate position to occupying a position of at least equality, from a lack of awareness of self to a greater self-awareness and self-control (p. 50).

Sayles (1963), reviewing the literature on the impact of the large organisations on human relationships, summarised the views of the critics on the sources of human problems in the large organisation as being "its very size ..... its emphasis on hierarchy and extreme specialisation ..... its emphasis on loyalty, on total commitment ..... its use of techniques to hold the individual tightly, ..... its efforts to exclude 'strong' individuals or people who differ from some modal patterns ....." (p. 5).

It is not intended within this section to consider the extensive literature on the impact of large-scale organisation, of automation and technology, of bureaucracy, work simplification and specialisation upon the individual, or to explore the concern of writers about alienation, anomie, decreased psychological well-being in modern industrial
The references already quoted sum up the views of the critics of large-scale organisations. But there are opposing views - from those who see organisation membership as an opportunity.

Cleveland (1963) argued that the "tensions within the system are many and so therefore are the opportunities for leadership ..... It is those individuals who learn to work within large-scale organisations who will have a rational base for feeling free ..... I suspect that those individuals will feel independent and self-confident who have learned to survive and grow within large organisations" (p. 16). Brown (1956) has asserted that, in modern society, there was far greater scope for skill and craftsmanship than in any previous society (p. 276 ff.). Strauss (1963) believed that many of the writers, such as Argyris, Herzberg, Maier, Maslow, McGregor, had over-emphasised the uniqueness of the personality-organisation conflict. He argued that this conflict was merely one aspect of "what has been variously characterised as the conflict between the individual and society, the individual and environment, desire and reality, id and super ego" (p. 72). Although he did not deny the existence of conflict, he questioned the importance of the job (as opposed to the community or the home) as a source of need satisfaction. Chapple & Sayles (1963) saw the diverse and complex responsibilities of the modern business as "offering a challenge, exciting to human abilities" (p. 184). Levinson (1964) concluded that "while some people deplore the fact that the organisation to some extent shapes the man, ..... the shaping can contribute to his growth. Moreover, the man is not merely a Pygmalion in the hands of an industrial behemoth: reciprocally he makes demands too" (p. 389).

Irrespective of whether the organisation is a threat or an opportunity, a number of approaches have been advocated to integrate the needs of the individual with those of the organisation. McGregor
(1960), discussing the problems of organisational and individual needs, stated that traditionally managerial literature had "assumed almost without question that organisational requirements take precedence over the needs of individual members" (p. 50). He argued for "the principle of integration", for "theory y", which required that "both the organisation's and the individual's needs be recognised" (p. 51). Although he accepted that perfect integration was not a "realistic objective", he saw some integration as an alternative to indifference, irresponsibility, minimal compliance, hostility and sabotage.

The actual prescriptions of writers in this field have been many. Some examples are included below. Mayo (1945) emphasised the role of morale in achieving performance; Likert (1961, 1967), advocated an employee-centred style of leadership - "System 4" to deal with human problems in organisations. Blake & Mouton (1964) suggested that integration came from frank debate and a joint problem-solving approach, within a team management framework. To Humble (1967), a system of "management by objectives" would contribute to integrating the needs of the organisation for business results and those of the individual managers. Lawler (1974), more recently, has urged management to recognise the differences between people and thus create "an individualised organisation". He talked of the "effective individualisation of organisations" as the challenge of the future (p. 39). Various methods of changing work to make it more compatible with individual needs have been advocated. These include job enlargement (Hulin & Blood, 1968), job enrichment (Paul, Robertson & Herzberg, 1968), socio-technical design (Thorsrud, 1968; Gulowsen, 1973), autonomous work groups, (Blake & Ross, 1976), job restructuring (Birchall & Wild, 1975), job redesign (Lawler, Hackman & Kaufman, 1973). There is now an extensive bibliography on approaches to humanising work and this has
been set out in an annotated statement (I.L.O. 1977). The research in these areas has also been reviewed in a number of reports (Work Research Unit, 1974, 1975; S.S.R.C., 1978).

Less concerned with advising than with describing, a number of researchers* have developed the concept of organisational socialisation to assist in understanding the processes whereby the organisation sought to integrate its individual members. Presthus (1962) argued that the organisation socialised its members by methods similar to those of society. "Big organisations therefore become instruments of socialisation, providing physical and moral sustenance for their members and shaping their thought and behaviour in countless ways" (p. 16).

Denhardt (1968) submitted that the internalisation of organisational values through bureaucratic socialisation was basic to organisational survival and that the basic indicator of this socialisation was the person's deference to authority. By this he meant a respect for legitimate authority and a propensity to submit to this authority.

Berlew & Hall (1966) sought to develop a model of the organisational socialisation of the young manager - how he learned what was expected of him and internalised job attitudes. They emphasised the importance of the first year of service as a critical period for learning, for this was "a time when the trainee is uniquely ready to develop or change in the direction of the company's expectations" (p. 222). They were concerned with the impact of the organisation upon the individual in terms of performance standards and stressed the importance of the expectations of the company during this early period.

* In addition to authors referred to in more detail, there could be included Moore (1969), Wanous (1973), Buchanan (1974), Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975), Van Maanen (1975).
Barrett (1970) developed a framework for analysing the approaches used in organisations to integrate the goals of the organisation with the objectives of the individual. This was based on three "goal integration models". The first he termed the "exchange" model, according to which the organisation offered incentives in return for which the individual devoted some of his time and energy. To describe the second integration model, Barrett adopted the term "socialisation". Here goal integration was achieved through influence processes, encouraging the individual to adopt some of the organisation's goals as his own. These influence processes, particularly the role of leadership style, communications, induction and training, he noted, had been researched by a number of writers - Likert (1961), Schein (1968, 1971). The third model was the "accommodation model", whereby the organisation took into account individual goals when determining objectives and procedures. He identified job design and participation as two main mechanisms of accommodation. The organisation made certain assumptions about individual goals and sought to produce roles and procedures within the organisation to help the individual to achieve these. In his study, Barrett took as his orientation the processes and strategies adopted by the organisation. He was not concerned with the efforts of the individual to influence the organisation to change its objectives and its procedures. He acknowledged however that the individual was not passive in this relationship and felt that the processes of goal integration adopted by the individual should be studied in future investigations.

Feldman (1976, a, b) developed a "contingency theory of socialisation" within organisations. This he saw as a three stage process. He termed the first stage "anticipatory socialisation", involving the learning that occurred before the employee entered an organisation. The second stage, Feldman referred to as "accommodation", a period in which
the individual actually experienced the organisation and attempted to become a participating member. The third stage he termed "role management". In this last stage he argued that there were two types of conflict that the individual must manage - the conflict between work life and home life and the conflict between their work groups and other groups in the organisation. Unfortunately, Feldman took a narrow view of the conflicting aspects of the work situation and his study provided little insight into the actual activities of individuals in the face of conflict.

Etzioni (1961) earlier had seen the problem of directing an individual's efforts towards organisational goals as a function of achieving compliance by the application of three types of power. He described these as "coercive" power, which rested on the application, or threat of application, of physical sanctions such as the inflicting of pain, deformity or death; on the generation of frustration through restriction of movement; or controlling through force the satisfaction of needs such as those for food, sex, comfort etc. The second type of power he presented as "remunerative" power, based upon the control over material resources and rewards, through the allocation of salaries and wages, commissions and contributions, fringe benefits, services and commodities. The third type he termed "normative" power which rested on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations, through the employment of leaders, manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, the administration of ritual. He suggested that more eloquent names for this type of power could be "persuasive" or "manipulative" or "suggestive", although he discarded these terms because of the negative value connotations.

He added to this framework the concept of involvement which he
saw as ranging from high to low and in directional terms as either positive or negative. He referred to positive involvement as "commitment" and to negative as "alienation". Along the involvement continuum, he used the term "alienative" for the high alienation zone, "moral" for the high commitment zone and "calculative" for the central mild zones. This approximated to the framework presented by Barrett (1970) in the sense that what he called "utilitarian compliant" resembled the relationships that came from an exchange process. "Normative compliant" approximated to that which stemmed from an organisation's attempt to accommodate to the needs of the individual and "coercive compliant" arose from the organisation's attempts to control and influence.

The integration of individual needs and organisational objectives was viewed by Tannenbaum (1968) as a process of inclusion - the organisation seeking to increase the identification of the individual with the organisation, thereby resulting in greater inclusion and greater control. But he acknowledged that organisational behaviour involved only a limited segment of the many needs and potential repertory of behaviour that defined the total make-up of members as individuals. "In their role as organisation members individuals do not express the full range of their personalities; they are thus only partially included in the organisation" (p. 16). He went on to point out that the organisation could increase its influence over members by in turn extending the individual member's influence over the organisation. By this process of extending the influence of the individual, there was developed an increased identification with the organisation and thereby an increased contribution to the organisation. What he did not emphasise was that the individuals could themselves set limits to their contribution; they could remain aloof from the organisation and could influence consciously the "centrality" of work in their total life space.
Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos (1968) devised an instrument for measuring control and influence in an organisation. Individuals were asked "how much say or influence" they or other levels had over aspects of the work of the organisation. The respondent could answer in terms of a five point scale ranging "from little or no influence" to a "very great deal". This type of instrument was used by the researchers to measure the amount of control and influence in different plants. Tosi (1971) used a similar instrument to relate control and influence to job satisfaction, job threat and anxiety. He recorded that "those who report higher levels of influence were more satisfied, less anxious about job outcomes and experienced lower levels of job strain" (p. 18). Thus he argued that if influence was assumed to be an independent variable, increasing the influence of individuals would increase their job satisfaction. He recognised however, that the causal relations were probably much more complex and that influence was therefore not an independent variable.

b) The Individual and the Organisation

Rather than advising management to seek to integrate organisation and individual needs, some writers have urged the individuals themselves to act. Whyte (1961), for example, concluded that "the organisation man is not in the grip of vast social forces about which it is impossible for him to do anything: options are there .... he must fight the organisation" (p. 372). Culbert (1974) advocated a strategy for gaining greater control of our organisational life, a strategy that entailed a process of "consciousness-raising" and "self-directed resocialisation". Chinoy (1955) suggested that in any case the individual worker "may try to squeeze out some sense of personal significance" (p. 130) from the work situation. Seeman (1967) concluded that "workers
simply come to terms, more easily than our theories imply, with the only work life they know and can reasonably expect for themselves" (p. 284) ..... "people can work out fairly effective adjustments to varied kinds of work" (p. 285).

Argyris (1957) stressed that the individual would react to the experience of frustration, conflict and failure by behaving in any one, or combination, of the following ways: "(a) He may leave the organisation ....; (b) He may work hard to climb the ladder .....; (c) He may defend his self concept and adapt through the use of defence mechanisms; (d) He may 'pressure' himself to stay and in spite of the conflict, simultaneously adapt as much as possible by lowering his work standards and becoming apathetic and uninterested; (e) This apathy and disinterest may lead him to place more value on material rewards and to depreciate the value of human or non material rewards; (f) ..... the employee may teach his children not to expect satisfaction on the job; to expect rather to earn good wages and 'live' outside the plant" (ps. 78, 79). Hill & Trist (1962) differentiated between the "leavers", those who acted out a bad relation with their super-ego and their firm "through a more or less violent break in the employment contract" (p. 53) and the "stayers", who had to find other ways of acting out their bad relations. This latter group, they suggested, might make their more or less permanent relations with their employing authority, "tolerable to them through resort to unsanctioned means of withdrawal and accidents" (p. 54).

Seashore (1973a) similarly indicated that the experience of dissatisfaction at work led to pressures to find some form of accommodation. He went on to develop a framework of the accommodative processes adopted by the individual, including changing the work environment, goal reduction, cognitive distortion, resignation, aggression and withdrawal. On
the theme of changing the work environment, he included "changing his work situation", as mentioned by Argyris, as well as "changing the environment at work," "exploiting the ever present latitude for altering the 'same' job within limits allowed by his employer and by his own resources and ingenuity" (p. 35). He suggested that the devices evoked by people to make their jobs more interesting had been "richly documented" and quoted as evidence the work of Whyte (1955). This, however, referred solely to the behaviour of the shop floor or office worker and made no reference to the supervisors' or managers' activities, aimed at altering their work situation.

Thus the relationship between the individual and the organisation was not presented as entirely one-sided. Bakke (1953) talked of the "fusion process" — give-and-take relationship. "The organisation to some degree remakes the individual and the individual to some degree remakes the organisation" (pp. 12-13). Brim (1968) talked of "self-initiated socialisation" whereby the individual sought to change and improve his performance of certain roles in his life (p. 189). Riley et al. (1969) referred to this as "reciprocal socialisation" and "suggested it had received little attention" (p. 961). Goslin (1969) likewise saw the term "socialisation" as including the two-way process — the individual and the organisation negotiating with each other, changing expectations and behaviour to achieve congruence.

March & Simon (1963) represented the relationship of the individual and the organisation as one of equilibrium, according to which each person "receives from the organisation inducements in return for which he makes to the organisation contributions." They went on to submit that "each participant will continue his participation in an organisation only so long as the inducements offered to him are as great or greater ... than the contributions he is asked to make" (p. 84). Lorsch & Morse (1974) saw this relationship as "essentially one of exchange. The
organisation obtains members' efforts towards its goals in return for which members are given, not only economic rewards, but also psychological reward from their group membership and the work itself" (p. 15).

Developing this idea of interaction, Thomas (1976) talked of "reciprocation" in the development of a "psychological contract" (p. 466). He argued that if conditions fell below the minimum acceptable level of fulfilment, individuals viewed the contract as having been violated. This might stimulate an attempt to renegotiate the contract; it might mean continuing the relationship in an alienated frame of mind; or it might involve the total severing of the relationship. Schein (1965) saw the psychological contract in terms of "authority" on the part of the organisation and "influence" from the point of view of the employee. He argued that the individual employee needed to possess some sense of being able to influence the situation, either individually or collectively, if he was to feel reasonably satisfied with his "contract" (p. 11). Kotter (1973), acknowledging the importance of psychological contracts, saw them primarily in terms of matches in expectations and emphasised the care that management should take in creating and fulfilling expectations.

Various frameworks have been developed to model the relationship of the individual and the organisation. Particularly significant in terms of its impact on the thinking of others was the work of Merton (1968). He developed a typology of modes of individual adaptation to the pressures of society. His framework was based to a great extent on the degree of acceptance or rejection of cultural goals and institutional means of achieving these goals (p. 194). He suggested that adaptation type one would be conformity to both goals and means: type two, innovation, involved an acceptance of goals but a rejection of
institutional means: **type three**, he saw as ritualism, where cultural goals were abandoned or scaled down, yet the mores persisted: **type four**, retreatism, to Merton the least common, covered the aliens, those who rejected society - both its goals and its means: the **fifth type**, rebellion, again involved rejection but also involved the desire to bring in a modified social structure (p. 20).

It was this framework that Schein (1968) adapted in the development of his conformity model. He was concerned with the process whereby the individual "learns the ropes", how he was taught what was important in an organisation. He defined socialisation as "the process by which a new member learned the value system, the norms, and the required behaviour patterns of the society, organisation or group which he is entering" (p. 3). He proposed a model consisting of three basic responses to the process of organisational socialisation. The first was a "rebellion" - a rejection of all the values and norms; the second was what he termed "creative individualism", which was the acceptance of only pivotal values and norms and the rejection of all others; the third response was "conformity" - the acceptance of all values and norms (p. 10). Using this model he suggested that the major aim of an effective organisation was to create conditions for creative individualism, whereby the individual was able to challenge and innovate to enable the organisation to develop effectively.

Fox (1971) similarly developed Merton's framework. He considered "acceptance" to be a better term than "conformity" and he went on to distinguish between "convergent" and "divergent" innovation. "Convergent innovation refers to covert or overt individual initiation of change in organisational norms which benefit top management goals as well as the individuals" (p. 82). To Fox, divergent innovation was the initiation of change which furthered individual goals rather than
those of top management. 'Ritualism', Fox saw as a situation where the individual interpreted it to be in his best interests to invoke certain norms as a form of pressure on management, the extreme form of which was 'working to rule'. 'Retreatism' was a form of withdrawal, whereas "rebellion constitutes an overt challenge to top management goals" (p. 83). He also distinguished between collective and individual adaptive responses. In using Merton's framework, Fox was concerned to develop a pattern of responses applicable to industrial relations situations, although he did seek to differentiate between patterns of responses of organised labour, middle management and supervision and top management. Figure 1.1 sets out a summary of the Merton, Schein & Fox models.

Schein, in a later paper in 1971, seemed to move away from the concept of individualism, preferring to use, as did Fox, the term "innovation". He differentiated between two types of processes interacting between the individual and the organisation - the process of "socialisation", the influence of the organisation on the individual and the influence of the individual on the organisation, which he termed "innovation". Implicitly he used the term "innovation" to refer to the impact of the individual on the organisation in terms of organisational effectiveness, rather than as a means of satisfying individual needs.

Porter, Lawler & Hackman (1975), discussing this framework, instead of "innovation" or "individualism", used the word "individualization" to describe the reciprocal process, whereby an employee "will be attempting to exert influence on the organisation in order to gain additional personal satisfaction" (p. 170). They argued that this concept had received much less specific attention than that of the processes of socialisation, yet it was no less important. They portrayed the indi-
### Merton (1968)

- **Conformity** - acceptance both of cultural goals and the institutional means of achieving these.
- **Innovation** - an acceptance of goals but a rejection of institutional means.
- **Ritualism** - where cultural goals are abandoned or scaled down but the mores persist.
- **Retreatism** - rejection of society, both of its means and its goals.
- **Rebellion** - a rejection of means and goals but involving a desire to introduce a new system.

### Schein (1968)

- **Conformity** - acceptance of all values and norms.
- **Creative Individualism** - Acceptance only of pivotal values and norms; rejection of all others.

### Fox (1971)

- **Acceptance** - full acceptance of one's location in the normative system.
- **Innovation - Convergent** - covert or overt individual initiation of change in organisational norms which benefits top management goals as well as individual.
- **Innovation - Divergent** - creating a divergence between the individual's goals and behaviours prescribed by the organisational norms.
- **Ritualism** - invoking certain norms as a form of pressure.
- **Retreatism** - withdrawal.
- **Rebellion** - an overt challenge to top management's goals (perhaps against some norms or aimed at the overthrow of the whole normative system.)

**NB Distinction between Overt/Covert: Individual/Collective.**
individual as striving to influence the organisation so that it could better satisfy his own needs and his own ideas about how it could best operate. But they also pointed out that "individualization, aside from its functional properties for the psychological well-being of employees, has potential survival value for the organization" (p. 170), in the sense that it was this individual pressure for change that enabled an organization to be dynamic, rather than locked into an unchanging set of beliefs and laws.

A number of writers have focussed upon the individual as the variable, developing the concept - "the locus of control" (Evans, 1973; Organ and Greene, 1974; Mitchell, Smyser & Weed 1975). They differentiated between the individual, labelled "internal", who believed he could control his own outcomes or fate and the individual, labelled "external", who felt that much of what happened to him was controlled by external forces. Organ and Greene (1974) recorded a significant correlation between "internal control" and job satisfaction in a study of scientists and engineers. Mitchell, Smyser & Weed, (1975), similarly noted "internally controlled employees generally are more satisfied with their jobs and are more likely to be in managerial positions" (p. 629). They concluded that "the internally controlled person may be better able to adapt to the more personally demanding, fluctuating environment which may characterise a future organisational setting" (p. 630).

(c) The Manager & the Organisation

The theme of the individual exercising influence on, and choice within, the organisation, has been taken up by a number of writers, all of whom add something to the understanding of these processes. Much of the earlier work, however, was directed towards the activities
of shop floor workers, who were identified as exerting an influence that might be disruptive and collective. (For discussion, see Fox, 1971). More recently, attention has been paid to the choices and activities of individual managers. Elliott Jaques (1967) sought to differentiate between the prescribed element of the job and the discretionary element of the job. He felt that the prescribed limits existed in an external reality. They could be observed independently by any numbers of observers. On the other hand a whole area of the work of the individual could not be so prescribed and this he termed discretionary. These choices could not be seen externally and had to do with "thought, judgement, sense, feel, discrimination, comparing, wondering, foreseeing and other contents of mental work - both conscious and unconscious" (p. 83). Later Stewart (1976) submitted that the manager had four areas of choice, concerned with content, method, timing, and contact. As to the content of the job, the managers could choose what he did, what he delegated or avoided. She pointed out that there was an opportunity to emphasise different aspects of the work, as well as choices open to the individual to reduce the constraints and thereby extend the range of the job. He also had choice as to the methods he adopted to do his work, the style, the acceptance or rejection of prescribed procedures. Dr. Stewart observed in respect of timing, that "most managerial jobs offer little freedom about the hours of work, though flexitime, officially or unofficially, may provide a choice of starting and finishing times" (p. 91). In addition there might be some choice on additional hours or evening activities. The fourth area was that of contacts - how long they should be, their nature, whether they should be written or verbal. An important observation, from her interviews with managers, was that they tended to exaggerate the amount of choice they actually had. She considered that they internalised the constraints so that
they were forgotten or underestimated (p. 85).

Jaques and Stewart were focussing upon the discretionary, the "choice" aspects of the actual formal managerial job. The informal world of the manager is under-researched, a most important study being that of Dalton (1959). In a study of managers in four firms, he "sought to get as close as possible" to their world in an attempt to discover how they managed (p. 1). He was able to identify the informal cliques in the organisations "as fountain heads of action" and he also documented the covert behaviour of managers as they managed the ambiguities and pressures of their work situation. He was impressed by the inconsistent burdens carried by the middle manager, whom he dubbed the claims adjustor, the person who translated the irregularities below him into decorous reports for his chiefs and interpreted their directives to his subordinates. Dalton's study was rich in material, providing a range of insights into the relationships between line and staff functions, between routinisers and the adaptors, between the formal and the informal, the overt and the covert. As the result of this study, he argued "against total submergence of the individual ... there is for many in the organisation a kind of unsought freedom that imposes suffering. This is the freedom to choose alternative courses of action, to create new means, official or not, for winning ends, and to devise ways of appearing to conform when practice forbids it" (p. 243).

Strauss (1962) concentrated upon one functional group - purchasing and was able to provide information on office politics and what he "bureaucratic gamesmanship" (p. 161). He indicated how the purchasing agent, by a range of tactics, was able to develop "political power". These tactics he classified as (1) "rule oriented", a form of working-to-rule, (2) "rule evading", bending the rules or surface compliance, (3) "personal politics", working through friendships and political
allies, (4) "educational", indirect and direct persuasion, (5) "organisational-interactional", involving perhaps empire-building or work flow changes (ps. 167, 168).

Thus the manager has been portrayed as an individual who put his unique stamp upon the way he handled his role in the organisation, rather than as a person bounded by his job description, his stated responsibilities and authority. Sayles (1964) emphatically made this point when he recorded that "the individual manager does not have a clearly bounded job with neatly defined authorities and responsibilities. Rather, he is placed in the middle of a system of relationships, out of which he must fashion an organisation that will accomplish his objectives" (p. 27). He went on to emphasise the function of "trading" in the life of the manager, a theme taken up by Knibbs (1975).

Morris (1975) elaborated on the model of the manager at the centre of a system of relationships. He talked of this position as being at "the centre of a cross of relationships" (p. 54) and diagrammatically presented this as below:

Fig. 1.2 The Cross of Relationships (Morris, 1975)
Each of the four groups made demands upon him and he "must balance between the claims of each" (p. 63).

Sofer (1970) recorded the intensive studies conducted by the Cambridge University Management Studies Group into the work preoccupations of managers and technical specialists. A great deal of research time and energy was directed towards this programme and a number of important conclusions were reached. Sofer was, for example, "struck by the amount of reward, satisfaction and concern for themselves, the men seemed to want from their jobs" (p. 9). They wanted to be more actively used by their organisations and he identified the preoccupations of the men with their promotion chances. He recorded that "one of the central conclusions to which our study leads us is that the company plays a crucial role in the psychological life-space of the executives and technical specialists whom it employs. The company matters to most of them deeply" (p. 338). He was also impressed by the extent to which individual managers and technical specialists could mould their environments (p. 348). He noted that their "interaction is with other people. Roles and role relationships are adaptable and subject to personal and group negotiation and redefinition ... He acts on his environment". Although he did not go on to identify the range of strategies adopted by the individual "to act on his environment", he did emphasise the crucial role that job change might play in aiding the individual to "work his way towards those parts of the organisation that he finds most congenial in the way of colleagues and tasks and that fit best with his own view of his world" (p. 349).

Concern about the negative aspects of the manager's world - the stress and tension - has in turn stimulated a great deal of research effort, which has added to the understanding of his job and coping responses. This concern has been expressed by Dr. Beric Wright (1975),
who submitted that "the manager's way of life, as determined by
fashion and behaviour of his peers, is not conducive to longevity"
(p. 6). He talked of the manager's need to learn how to survive in
this difficult climate. Klemme (1975) has observed that "the promise
of the future for any person in a leadership role is a life of increased
stress" (p. 2). Kearns (1973) suggested that "in the management of a
large complex organisation, stress is inevitable" (p. 50). The identi-
fication of causes and the prescriptions against the harmful effects
of stress have been well documented. Typical of this work are Kahn

Cooper and Marshall (1975a) reviewed this body of theory and
research and identified what they called "a formidable list of over
40 interacting factors which might be sources of stress at work" (p. 293).
They structured these into seven major categories and their framework,
which is set out in Fig. 1.3 contributed to the development of
the research approaches for this study. (See Chapter Two on Research
Design). They concluded with the assertion that "more basic research
must be done in the various factors outlined above" (p. 303).

Molander (1976) has drawn attention to another factor - "mid-life
crisis"; "a powerful element in stress which has little to do with the
organisation structure in which the stressed individual works. Life-
cycle stress stems from the universal problem of the ageing process"
(p. 29). The concepts of life cycle and life stages have been develope-
d for example by Erikson (1950) and Lidz (1968). A most signifi-
cant life stage was identified as occurring at mid-life, so significant
that it has been termed by some as the "mid-life crisis" (Jaques, 1970;
Molander, 1976; Brim, 1976).* This stage, around the ages of 35 years -

* For a critical review of the literature, see Collin (1977).
Fig. 1.3: Sources of Stress at Work (Cooper & Marshall, 1975a)

1. INTRINSIC TO JOB

Too much work  Qualitative
Qualitative
Quantitative

Too little work
Time pressures/deadlines
Poor physical working conditions
Mistakes
Too many decisions

2. ROLE IN ORGANISATION

Role ambiguity
Role conflict
Too little responsibility
No participation in decision-making
Responsibility for people
Responsibility for things
Lack of managerial support
Increasing standards of acceptable performance
Organisational boundaries
(internal and external)

3. RELATIONS WITHIN ORGANISATION

Poor relations with boss
Poor relations with colleagues and subordinates
Difficulties in delegating responsibility
Personality conflicts

4. CAREER DEVELOPMENT IN ORGANISATION

Over promotion
Under promotion
Lack of job security
Fear of redundancy/retirement
Fear of obsolescence
Thwarted ambition
Sense of being trapped

5. BEING IN ORGANISATION

Restrictions on behaviour (e.g. budgets)
Lack of effective consultation and communication
Uncertainty, about what is happening
No sense of belonging
Loss of identity
Office politics

6. ORGANISATION INTERFACE WITH OUTSIDE

Divided loyalties (Co. vs. own interests)
Conflicts with family demands

7. INTRINSIC TO INDIVIDUAL

Personality (tolerance for ambiguity, stable self-concept etc)
Inability to cope with change
Declining abilities
Lack of insight into own motivation and stress
Ill equipped to deal with interpersonal problems
Fear of moving out of area of expertise.
45 years, involved a period of reappraisal, a time of taking stock of achievements, or working through many unresolved problems from earlier stages of development. To Jaques (1970), it was at this stage that the individual had to face up to the dilemma of growing old and had to come to terms with the certainty of death. This period also often coincided with crucial events in the career of the individual and Sofer (1970) talked of it as a "mid-career" stage. A number of respondents were in this age category and as will be noted seemed to be conducting a personal reappraisal of their career. The individual is therefore presented as not only having to cope with a changing external environment but also with a dynamic internal world with changing values, goals and fears.

The problems of coping with tensions have been the theme of other research projects. Wolfe and Snoek (1962), reporting on their study of tension and adjustment to role conflict, used the concept of "coping responses", which they defined as "behaviours directed at regaining or maintaining an adequately gratifying experience at the work situation" (p. 107). They concluded, however, that "a detailed analysis of the ways various people cope with tensions and stresses of role conflict is not possible at present" (p. 118).

Burke, (1971) sought to overcome this shortcoming by identifying the specific things people did to deal with their tension. Individuals were asked to identify ways they found particularly useful in handling the tensions and pressures of their job - their "coping techniques" - and this material was then categorised under the following headings:

1. Change to engrossing non-work or play activity
2. Analyse situation and change strategy of attack
3. Withdraw physically from the situation temporarily
4. Engage in physical exercise
5. Work harder and take work home
6. Talk through with others on the job
7. Compartmentalisation of work and home life
8. Change to a different work task or job activity
9. Talk through with spouses
10. Build resistance to frustration by regular sleep and exercise

Burke concluded by saying how impressed he was by the supervisors' understanding of themselves and of how to manage feelings of tension arising from their jobs (p. 30).

In a later study, Burke and Belcourt (1974) attempted to relate these particular coping techniques to specific areas of role ambiguity and role overload and to differentiate between effective and ineffective coping mechanisms. The distinction between effective and ineffective was not, however, based on objective criteria but on the individual's perception of effectiveness. The authors acknowledged that their investigation was limited by the fact that a number of variables were not assessed and submitted that a more complete study would have to consider the type of conflict or stress involved, the organisational conditions causing the conflict, the personality of the individual, the state of the interpersonal relationships within the organisation, the way in which individuals learn to cope with techniques and the extent of the success of these techniques in coping (p. 67). The reported coping responses in both of these studies appeared to be "socially desirable" or "managerially acceptable" and consciously contrived. The only item in their list that might be criticised by one's superiors seemed to be "accepting less perfection and excellence in the work I do." The research of Dalton (1959) and the
observations of Strauss (1962) would suggest that other coping techniques and political manoeuvrings, covert and perhaps running counter to organisational interests, would also be adopted.

Howard, Rechnitzer & Cunningham (1975) recognised the problems of differentiating between effective and ineffective methods of coping. They therefore gathered data as indicators of the individual manager's health—blood pressure, cholesterol, triglyceride and uric acid levels and using Burke's coping techniques sought to relate these to the health variables. They concluded that "in general, the successful and unsuccessful coping with job tension seems to be characterised by the difference between working smarter and working harder." They argued that successful copers had a greater awareness of the type of job situations that had the capacity to produce stress and that they in turn made use of a broader repertoire of alternate responses (p. 325).

Hall (1972) developed a model of coping with role conflict, based upon the three levels of the role process, described by Levinson (1959)—structurally imposed demands, personal role conception and role behaviour. Although the framework was examined in terms of the way working wives managed their "subidentities", it was found to be most helpful to the researcher in his analysis of the behaviour of managers. Hall identified three types of role conflict coping behaviour. Type one, he termed "Structural Role Redefinition," which involved changing the expectations of others as far as one's own role performance was concerned. The second type he termed "Personal Role Redefinition," which involved changing one's own expectations about one's own role performance. The third type, he termed "Reactive Role Performance" and this consisted in actually changing one's behaviour in an attempt to meet all the expectations, increasing
the amount of effort put into the role behaviour. As might be pre-
dicted, it was the "type one" coping responses that were significantly
and positively related to satisfaction.

As has been stated, this was a particularly valuable study
from the standpoint of this research, in that it provided case mat-
terial about the specific activities that individual wives used to
handle the difficulties. Hall was able to illustrate how the wife
might interact with others to bring about a redefinition of the
expectations, particularly of her husband, or employer (structural
role definition): he noted the way individuals changed their own
perception of their roles to minimise conflict (personal role redef-
ingen) by determining personal priorities, by some perceptual change
or distortion, such as denying role demands: he also identified
examples of reactive role behaviour, according to which the wife
would assume that all expectations must and would be met and strive
to do this by better planning, working harder, or with no conscious
strategy at all (p. 176 ff.).

Gowler and Legge (1972), instead of "personal role redefinition",
used the terms "occupational role integration" to refer to the fusion
of an employee's experience and his expectations. By such a means,
his retrospective thoughts, feelings and evaluations about his job
performance became consonant with his current experiences. Thus,
they argued that the individual became less willing to change or
modify his role and consequently less likely to leave it. They
quoted Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance to explain this
process, arguing that there was a predisposition for the role incum-
bent to develop a set of consonant perceptions of the match between
job requirements, job expectations, job performance and job exper-
ience (p. 22).
Hall, Schneider & Nygren (1970) saw the process of achieving consonance in terms of "organisational identification", defining this as the "process by which the goals of the organisation and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent" (p. 177). They went on to suggest that there could be two different types of identification "in one, the individual's higher-order needs, esteem, autonomy and self-fulfilment, are in accord with the goals of the organisation. This is probably what most theorists mean when they use the term integration. In a second type of identification, the individual's lower-level needs, security, dependency, avoidance of threat and growth, are in accordance with the organisation's need to direct and control its members .... one might term these two concepts - growth-oriented and deficiency-oriented identification" (p. 187). They concluded that "identification grows as a function of length of service and is affected by length of service rather than position" and that "it is in turn related to the satisfaction of ..... higher order needs" (p. 187). Unfortunately, no insights were provided by this study into the processes by which organisational and individual needs become integrated. The study was conducted solely by questionnaire and raised a number of doubts about the actual reported congruence between individual and organisational goals. In a more intensive study, Patchen (1970) concluded that "greater length of service does not lead to stronger feelings of common purpose" (p. 210). He went on to report that where the members of a work group felt solidarity with their co-workers, the greater was their identification with the organisation (p. 213).

Cummings & El Sami (1968), in their literature review of research into managerial motivation, categorised recent research into "two basic streams of thought" (p. 128) - the first, based on the "need hierarchy"
studies and the other on the "motivation - hygiene" concepts. The "need hierarchy" studies were developed from the work of Maslow (1954). According to his theory of human motivation, human needs organised themselves in a hierarchy of prepotency from the basic physiological needs through safety, social, ego needs to those of self-actualisation. The need hierarchy was the framework upon which Porter (1961) developed his questionnaire. He adopted the need categories of security, social, esteem, autonomy and self-actualisation and from them developed thirteen need items. For each need item, respondents were asked to give, on a seven-point scale, the following ratings (a) How much is there now? (b) How much should there be? (c) How important is this to me? Need deficiencies were considered to be the differences between the responses to parts a and b above. His assumption was that the larger the difference, the greater the deficiency, or the less the satisfaction. The research instrument has been frequently used both by Porter and others in studies of managers and it was a modified version of this questionnaire that was adopted in this research. A discussion of its use and limitations will be set out later in Chapter Three.

The second major area of research into the motivation of managers was that concerned with the "motivation - hygiene" approach of Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959). Herzberg's theory stated that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were not the obverse of each other. Job satisfaction he saw as stemming from the feelings a person had about the content of his job, whereas job dissatisfaction was determined by the context of the job. The former group, which included task achievement, recognition, intrinsic interest in job, increased responsibility and opportunities for growth, he termed "motivators." The latter group, covering company policies, super-
vision, working conditions, pay, status, relationships and job security, he termed "hygiene factors". This theory gave rise to an upsurge of research activity to test its validity and it has been subjected to a great deal of criticism, (for review, see Cummings and El Sami, 1968, p. 133 ff.). Unfortunately this research added little to the development of a theory on managerial motivation or to an understanding of his behaviour at work.

Other studies into managerial motivation have been based upon McClelland's (1961) theory of achievement motivation. McClelland distinguished three types of motivation. The first arose from the need for achievement, to optimise one's performance and attain a standard of excellence: the second he saw as stemming from the need for affiliation, for warm and supportive relationships: the third was the need for power, involving the need to control or influence others.

Apart from the academically based research into management, concern about managers, their careers, values, motivation and morale has led to a number of broad-based surveys. In the U.S.A., the American Management Associations published in 1974 an important survey into managerial values. (Flowers et al., 1974). They observed "in today's organisations we find an increasing heterogeneity of values. The Protestant ethic which characterised early America, though still influential today, is no longer the major value expressed" (p. 5). They also reported on the factors, influential in holding managers in the organisations or pushing them out of them - "job satisfaction, hygiene needs, perceived opportunities for advancement in the present organisation and in other organisations and non-work factors such as financial responsibilities, family ties, friendships, and community relations" (p. 30).

In the U.K., in the 1970's, the British Institute of Management
and the Opinion Research Centre conducted important surveys into aspects of the life of the Manager. The B.I.M., from surveys of their members, reported in 1971 and 1978 on the career movements of managers and on their attitudes to job change. Also in 1978, the B.I.M. produced a profile of the British Manager in terms of his educational and job background (Melrose-Woodman, 1978). The Opinion Research Centre in the U.K. in 1977 published their survey of approximately 2000 respondents into the motivation of managers. They presented a somewhat gloomy picture, recording that his standard of living had "seriously" fallen, that morale was "badly down", that a large minority were "demoralised" (p. 6 ff.). They did conclude however that there was "still time to rekindle the enthusiasm and dedication of managers" (p. 9). Information from these surveys will be referred to in the thesis when it provides comparative data.

Writers have sought to develop typologies within which to set the various orientations that managers adopted towards their organisation. For example Mant (1969), within the context of the contribution of management education, produced a framework encompassing seven types of manager. The "mobile manager (internal)" was looking for promotion from within the company and was likely to be deeply committed, politically sensitive and trusted in high places. The next was the "mobile manager (external)", who was very much a wheeler-dealer, with the loyalty primarily to himself, avoiding all forms of organisational indoctrination. The next identified by Mant, was the "thwarted manager", who, because of reduced promotion opportunities in a declining industry, no longer had outlets for his ambition and, although he was basically loyal and had a good standing in the company, his promotion was blocked. The next was the "specialist/technocrat manager", who was torn between a technical career in which he gained his main satis-
factions from displaying technical expertise and a career in management. The fifth was termed "recessional manager" (the hidden redundant). According to Mant, he did just enough to get by and was cynical about promotion and getting on. He might have reached this apathetic position, either because of bad luck, or career blockage, or indeed because he was less talented. The sixth manager in Mant's typology was the "old boy manager." He came from the rather slow, friendly companies, operating in gentle market conditions and tended not to be a particularly energetic individual, who some felt should receive a jolt. The last manager was the "backbone manager," in his forties and passed the first flush of ambition. He was a responsible, willing individual, beginning to make a rational accommodation to limited prospects.

From the standpoint of patterns of management development, Rapoport (1970) talked of three types of manager. He identified the first type of manager as displaying a developmental pattern which he termed "metamorphic" - "ambitious, creative, little concerned with security, willing to take risks" (p. 216). He was very energetic, conveying a sense of competence and leadership and thus moving outwards and upwards - a spiralist. The second type, he termed, "incremental"; here development was by cumulative steps. The manager was orientated towards the organisation, advancing within its structure. This person was more prepared to conform, to change himself than to seek to change the organisation. Rapoport observed that this type of career pattern, when associated with competence, was "characterised by steady advancement, accompanied by a good deal of personal satisfaction and happiness" (p. 217). The third type - the "tangential developer" was characterised by the manager tending to take up a position of dissent within the organisation. He was dissatisfied, frustrated,
but sometimes this rebelliousness and protest was functional to the organisation and the individual might be recruited into a responsible position to express this challenge. Rapoport summed up these three types by noting that "for the incremental developer, the central issue seems to be 'how to get ahead within the organisation'. For the metamorphic developer, the central issue seems to be 'how to make things work better'. For the tangential developer, it is 'how to develop more or less in spite of the organisation'" (p. 234).

Other typologies of managers have been developed from different orientations. For example, Presthus (1962) produced a framework of personality types in relation to their orientation towards career. He argued that organisations moulded individual personality and behaviour in much the same way as societies and they therefore fostered the growth of certain personality types whose skill and behaviour met the demands of organisational society. He termed these the "upward mobiles", the "indifferents", and the "ambivalents". According to Presthus, the upward mobile had the capacity to identify strongly with the organisation and possessed a deep respect for authority "with superiors being viewed as non-threatening models for his conduct" (p. 203). The indifferents had come to terms with their work environment by withdrawal and by a redirection of their interests towards off-the-job satisfactions. "Escaping the commitments of the true believer and the anxiety of the neurotic striver, he receives big dividends in privacy, tranquillity, and self-realisation through his extra vocational orientation" (p. 218). It was the indifferent who neither expected nor wanted anything from the organisation and therefore was immune to its discipline. The typical ambivalent found it difficult to accept the legitimacy of authority in that he could not believe that those who had greater authority really merited it either
in terms of talent, wisdom or morality. He tended to view authority figures as threatening and this distorted his interpersonal relationships. Presthus believed that reactions to authority, which he defined as "the ability to evoke compliance", constituted the most critical variable in organisational accommodation (p. 140). He concluded with the view that the indifferent was becoming a more likely pattern of accommodation, both for white and blue collar workers and that this raised serious problems for the organisation.

Maccoby (1977), from extensive psychoanalytical interviews with 250 managers in the United States, suggested that four types of social character could be identified - the "craftsman", the "jungle fighter", the "company man" and the "gamesman". The craftsmen were those interested in the process of making something - identifying others either as those who hindered or helped in this. He was self-contained, quiet, modest, sincere and practical. He tended "to do his own thing" whether as a scientist, an engineer, or a project leader. The jungle fighter, on the other hand, was seeking after power. Colleagues were seen as either accomplices or enemies, subordinates as someone to be used in empire building or politicking. The company man was the organisation man (Whyte, 1961), linked to the company's development and to its success. He tended to rise to middle-management but "lacks the toughness, risk-taking, detachment, self-control and energy to reach the top" (p. 89). To Maccoby, the gamesman was the most vital to organisational success - his main interest was in the challenge and competition of industry, seeing work and life as a game in which he was determined to be the winner. He commented however, that "many gamesmen operate well while young managers, but fail to resolve middle age and middle management crises" (p. 107).

His view was not that organisations shape personality; rather
select and channel particular types into particular jobs within organisations. Thus he talked of a "psychostructure that selects and moulds character," involving processes "whereby those traits that are useful to the work are stimulated and reinforced, while others that are unnecessary or that impede work are frustrated, suppressed or unused and gradually weaken" (p. 173). The various types of managers, outlined above, are set out in Fig. 1.4, showing the approximate interrelationships between the different typologies.

A simpler, but none the less important, distinction between a "Type A" and a "Type B" person has come from various studies of stress (Rosenman et al. 1966; Jenkins, Rosenman & Friedman, 1967; Sales, 1969; Howard, Rechnitzer & Cunningham, 1975; Caplan & Jones, 1975). The Type A person has been characterised "primarily by excessive drive, aggressiveness, ambition, involvement in competitive activities, frequent vocational deadlines, pressure for vocational productivity, an enhanced sense of time urgency ..... The converse ... pattern, called Type B, is more relaxed and more easy going, seldom becomes impatient and takes more time to enjoy vocational pursuits. He is not easily irritated and works steadily, but without a feeling of being driven by a lack of time" (Jenkins, Rosenman, & Friedman, 1967, p. 371). The general conclusion of the various research studies using this typology was that the Type A person was more likely to overload himself in the course of work. This was well summed up by Caplan & Jones (1975), who concluded that "stress had its greatest effects on strain in the hard driving, Type A person ..." Thus the individuals who contributed highly to the organisation did so" at some cost to their own mental and physical health" (p. 719).

Bray et al. (1974) differentiated between two types of person, according to their life style. These they termed the "enlarger" and
Fig. 1.4: TYPOLOGIES OF MANAGERS

|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1) Mobile Manager (Internal)  
Committed to Organisation | Upward Mobile - identifies with organisation: respects authority | Incremental - steady, conformist, loyal to organisation | Company Man - organisation man, loyal, committed. |
| 2) Mobile Manager (External)  
| 3) Thwarted Manager  
No outlets for ambition: promotion blocked | Ambivalent: challenges authority: discontented | Tangential - frustrated, dissatisfied, dissenting |
| 4) Specialist/Technocrat Manager - wants satisfaction from technical expertise | | | Craftsman - practical, making things, self-contained. |
| 5) Recessional Manager  
Apathetic, Doing the minimum | Indifferents - withdrawn to off-the-job satisfaction |
| 6) Old Boy Manager  
Steady: in a routine: friendly | | |
| 7) Back Bone Manager  
Responsible; adjusted to limited promotion | Incremental - (see above) | Company Man (see above) | Gamesman - challenging, competitive, striving to win. |
the "enfolder". They had conducted a longitudinal study into the career progress of college recruits in one large company. This study spanned some eight years. The recruits were interviewed annually and over the period of the study completed a number of questionnaires to assess their ability, attitudes and expectations. In addition, their bosses and members of the Personnel Department were interviewed to obtain career progress data. From the interviews, the researchers noted what they termed nine life themes, which recurred throughout the interviews to a greater or lesser degree (p. 82 ff.). These themes were:

1. **Occupational** - concerned with work life, promotion and attitudes to the company;
2. **Ego-functional** - concerned with the mind and body, personal development, health etc.;
3. **Financial-acquisitive** - related to the accumulation of wealth and possessions;
4. **Locale-residential** - commenting on type of location and housing;
5. **Marital-familial**;
6. **Parental-familial**;
7. **Recreational-social** - focussing on leisure, sports, etc.;
8. **Religious-humanism** - concerned with ethical and religious involvement;
9. **Service** - centering around community service.

The analysis of these life themes led them to postulate their two types of life styles. The enlarger was seen as "the one who places emphasis on the extension of influence outward into the work and community's spheres, seeking expanding responsibilities and is not strongly attached to past ties. The enfolder is not greatly concerned with extending himself into new involvements and responsibilities: he values old ties and tends to deepen them rather than breaking with the past" (p. 181). The writers believed that the enlarger tended to be more successful within the organisation for he demanded more and had what they termed "a thrust of expectation".
They recognised however that although the study covered eight years in the life of the individuals, this did not encompass the total career and they therefore considered that changes in life pattern would occur in middle life. They were also interested in the role of personality in the progress of life themes, but had to leave this as an unresolved issue.

d) Job Satisfaction and the Quality of Working Life - Definition and Measurement.

The relationship of the individual to the organisation has been evaluated in terms of the extent to which the individual experienced job satisfaction. This particular field has been well researched and documented. Writing in 1969, Edwin Locke estimated that the number of articles on job satisfaction "may exceed 4,000" (p. 309). Since that date the writings and research have continued to multiply and the term has been variously defined. Porter (1961) viewed it as the extent to which needs were perceived as being fulfilled on the job (p. 1 ff.). Locke (1969) saw job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing" (p. 316). Vroom (1964) considered it as "the positive orientation of the individual towards the work role which he is presently occupying" (p. 99). Cherns (1975) argued that "job satisfaction must be to a considerable extent a measure of the congruence between expectations and experience; dissatisfaction is expressed when reality fails to match anticipation or the feeling of what is due" (p. 160). French (1973) saw job satisfaction in terms of "person role fit." He differentiated between two types of fit between a man and his job environment - the first was the degree to which his skills and abilities matched the demands and requirements of the job; the other was the
degree to which the needs of the man were supplied in his job environment. Mumford (1970) defined it in terms of the degree of fit between what an organisation required of its employees and what the employees were seeking of the firm. She analysed this "fit" in terms of what the individual asked and wanted from his job—personal job requirements, self-interest, individuality, personal quality and work flexibility as against company job requirements, company interest, uniformity, performance, and work specificity (p. 77).

But the concept and the approaches to measuring it have been subjected to considerable criticism. Portigal (1973) for example observed that "most people report themselves as being 'fairly satisfied' with their job" (p. 12), even though there might be objective criteria to show that the work situation was shortening their working life. In similar vein, Seashore (1973a) noted that the individual's report of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction "contains elements of expediency, self deception, ignorance, social pressure, and false beliefs about the work in which he lives. Hence in our studies of the quality of working life, individuals can and do report satisfaction with work situations that we know (from information not accessible to the respondents) are abbreviating their lives, threatening their family relationships and unnecessarily narrowing their future life options" (p. 6). Wilensky (1964) sought to explain this by reference to a "social desirability" bias operating in job satisfaction studies—that it might be more socially respectable to be reasonably contented with one's lot. Blauner (1964) considered that ego defence mechanisms might be at work in responses to job satisfaction questionnaires. He put forward the view that a worker's whole identity was so bound up with his job and field of work that to complain about it might be to call into question everything that he stood
for (ps. 29, 30). Molander (1977) argued that "since most research projects concerned with job satisfaction involve data collection from individuals currently employed in organisations, rather than from those who have left, it is perhaps not surprising that a majority of respondents claim what is often considered by the researchers to be an unexpectedly high degree of satisfaction" (p. 15).

Seashore (1975), from the proposition that the "normal" worker will seek to avoid experiencing dissatisfaction, suggested "that dissatisfaction is generally an unstable and transitional state" (p. 115), which sets into motion accommodative processes to achieve satisfaction. In similar vein, Davis and Cherns (1975a) stressed that "job satisfaction, not alone amongst attitudinal measures, has a flavour of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Most of us can react only to what we know. If our expectations at work are realistically adapted to what work provides, we will be 'satisfied' because our expectations are met" (p. 89). They adopted the concept "quality of working life" and suggested "all authors agree that quality of working life is not just job satisfaction, which is only one amongst its many aspects. Job satisfaction has far too long stood surrogate for true measure of the quality of working life. Nor is it a unitary factor, requiring a considerable amount of disaggregation before its components can be used in a wider framework" (ps. 88, 89).

Lawler (1975) similarly argued that a distinction should be made between job satisfaction and quality of working life. He said that "despite the fact that satisfaction is an important part in a high quality of working life, other elements must be considered too" (p. 125). But the problem of how to measure a person's quality of working life still remained and the debate centred around whether it was possible to develop objective criteria or whether self-report measures should
be adopted.

The opponents of the self-report approach have commented as follows:— "When you ask people about their jobs, they can tell you what bugs them and what pleases them along the dimensions of their actual experience. It is a far more risky matter when we ask people to evaluate what they have not experienced or have only experienced in a very small degree" (Cherns, 1974, p. 5). "The perspective of the individual worker is too narrow, his information too limited and his capacity for self-deception too great to rely on him completely for an adequate account of his quality of working life" (Portigal, 1973, p. 8). Seashore (1973a) observed that "while high importance, if not primacy, must be given to the individual's own personal values in assessing the quality of his own experience of working life, it can be taken for granted that they are not sufficient. The individual is in many ways incapable of an adequate assessment of his own experiences, and there are other value perspectives to be involved" (p. 5).

Spink (1975) took another position when he observed that the individual, his needs, his values, expectations, was fundamental to the study of his quality of working life. He argued that "in the end it is the people with whom we are wishing to work that own the experience of their work, just as we own the experience in ours. We can talk with them, write to them, observe them; but above all we must learn to listen, perhaps in a different direction" (p. 184). Ackoff (1976), from a different standpoint, doubted the need to be able to measure the quality of working life. He observed that "it is so desperately poor in some segments of our societies that qualitative judgements are said to be good enough to identify it" (p. 297). Lawler (1975) therefore concluded that "whilst always desirable,
objective measures may be less useful than subjective self-report
measures of the psychological quality of working life" (p. 126),
in the sense that it was necessary to make do with what was practicable
and operationally available.

Although there might be a lack of objective criteria for the
analysis of the quality of a manager's working life, a number of
research studies have identified the variables in the environment
that might impact upon the individual. Rosen and Weaver (1960)
in an attempt to determine the relative importance attached by manage-
ment to aspects of their work, structured their analysis into four
major areas - "relations with superior, company policies and practices,
peer relationships, and opportunities for self-expression" (p. 386 ff.).

Twery, Schmid, and Wrigley (1958) in designing their job satisfaction
inventory had divided this into seven dimensions - general attitudes
to the job, the supervisor as a technician, the supervisor in a social
rose, co-workers, higher echelon, job duties and living conditions.
Zander & Quinn (1962), from their review of studies of satisfaction,
concluded that the following conditions were typically present when
satisfaction with the situation was greater - where the job permitted
full use of abilities, where the boss displayed interest and gave
clear instructions support and recognition, where the pay and status
associated with the job were good, where the individual has freedom
and autonomy and able to share in decision-making. Smith, Kendall
& Hulin (1969) in developing their Job Description Index (J.D.I.) used
five sets of variables - work, pay, supervision, promotions and co-
workers.

Building on this and on other work, Warr and Routledge (1969)
came to the conclusion that, because of the extent to which job satis-
faction had already been studied, the "major factors could fairly
readily be isolated" (p. 98). They saw these as pay, prospects of promotion, the job itself, the immediate superior, managers at the same level, subordinates and the firm. Cooper and Marshall (1975a) developed a somewhat different framework. Their starting point was not the study of the manager's quality of working life but rather the analysis of the factors that might be sources of stress to him. They proposed "seven major categories of stress" (p. 293)* - factors intrinsic to the job, the role in the organisation, career development, being in the organisation, the organisation interface with the outside, and factors intrinsic to the individual. (See fig. 1.3). Rogers (1977), in an analysis of the components of organisational stress amongst Canadian managers, identified four major factors - organisation structure and design, management responsibility, work load and communication and interpersonal interaction.

Two somewhat more complex models also proved helpful in this study. Earlier, French and Kahn (1962) had presented a framework for their research programme into mental health. They had set out what they termed four main panels of variables." This is reproduced in the figure below.

* In a later work, impressed by the arguments of Lazarus (1967), Cooper and Marshall (1975b) retitled this as a list of potential stresses. Lazarus had argued that "cognitive appraisal" was the most important determinant of stress and that no objective criteria were available to define a situation as stressful.
It will be noted that they distinguished between the objective social environment and the psychological environment. They argued that this distinction was "especially relevant to the study of mental health", since one criteria of mental health is "contact with reality", as indicated by the degree of correspondence of the psychological environment to the objective environment" (p. 3). In their paper they concentrated particularly on illuminating the variables associated with the "objective social environment" and with the "person." Unfortunately, they did not enlarge on the panel related to "behaviour."

The second model was that of Walton (1973) who suggested that there were three levels on which quality of working life could be
analysed, namely: "organisational conditions, employee attitudes, and behavioural symptoms" (p. 1). Under the heading of organisational conditions, he was concerned with the attributes of work organisations that could affect the human experience of its members - adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, future opportunities for continued growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism at work, a balance of work relative to the total life space and its relevance to the larger society.

The second level was that of the psychological consequences of these conditions, or the extent to which psychological needs were met, the attitudes and feelings generated by them. He listed security versus insecurity, adequacy versus inadequacy, safe versus vulnerable, stimulated versus apathetic, influential versus powerless, optimism versus apprehension, related versus isolated, appreciated versus unappreciated, the sense of justice versus injustice, freedom versus controlled, pride versus shame.

The third level was that concerned with the behavioural symptoms, consequent upon the other levels. But he was discussing only the symptoms associated with negative feelings and he listed these under the headings of alienation with passive aggressive responses and alienation with active aggressive responses, together with a set of responses under the heading of low self-esteem (p. 9). Set out below in Fig. 1.6 is a complete statement of Walton's level three:
Alienation - passive aggressive response:

- turnover, absenteeism, tardiness.
- accidents, mistakes.
- lower energy, motivation.
- passive resistance to rules.

Alienation - active aggressive response:

- militancy in grievances, negotiations and strikes.
- wildcat strikes, failure to ratify contracts.
- individual acts of violence against people, property.

Low self-esteem:

- lower mental, physical health.
- harm to family, community.

This framework as presented had a number of limitations from the point of view of this study. Walton himself recognised the difficulties of measuring some of the organisational conditions (p. 7). He was also mainly concerned with the shop floor worker and his discussion of the behavioural system did not shed light onto the possible reaction of managers to negative conditions. Nevertheless the idea of the three levels was found to provide a helpful orientation and this will be discussed more fully in the next chapter on "Research Design."
CHAPTER TWO
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Introduction

In the design of this research study, a number of decisions had to be reached on the research objectives, the respondents and the research methods. These issues will be discussed in this chapter and the actual data collecting procedures adopted will be explained. The chapter has been structured into the following sections:-

a) Research Model and Objectives.
b) The Case Study Method.
c) The Organisation and the Respondents.
d) Gaining Access and co-operation.
e) The Design of the Questionnaire.
f) The Conduct of the Interviews.

a) Research Model and Objectives

Riley (1963) has suggested that "the research process starts with a conceptual model, or an organisational image, of the phenomena to be investigated" (p. 5). At an early stage, a simple model was set up to help to structure the gathering of data and to provide a focus for the research. This model was based on that of French & Kahn (1962) and of Walton (1973). French & Kahn, it will be recalled, had proposed four main sets of variables for their programme to study aspects of mental health and industry, as below:-

![Diagram of Research Model and Objectives]
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Walton's framework for the analysis of the quality of working life consisted of a three level approach, not distinguishing between the "objective" and the "psychological" environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Conditions</td>
<td>Leading to Psychological Consequences of these conditions Employee Attitudes</td>
<td>Leading to Behavioural symptoms, associated with negative feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst a distinction is theoretically possible between the objective and the perceived environment, operationally the pursuit of the objective reality of organisational conditions was considered for the purpose of this study a fruitless, if not impossible task. Johnson (1975) has argued that "the social reality making up the observational field of the social scientist is not inherently objective in nature. It exists only insofar as it is interpreted as a subjectively meaningful experience by living human beings" (p. 83). Bodgan and Taylor (1975) have summed up this position as follows. "While people may act within the framework of an organisation, it is the interpretation, not the organisation which determines action" (p. 15).

Thus the significant set of variables was identified as the individual's perception of the organisational conditions, contributing to, or militating against, his quality of working life and the following three-level model was adopted for this study.

- 56 -
The main research objective was to identify the behavioural responses of managers and technical specialists to perceived negative aspects of their world of work and to study these responses aimed at maintaining or improving the quality of their working lives. This process has been termed "individualism" (Schein 1968) or "individualisation" (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975). As early as 1953, Bakke used the term "personalization" to describe this process. In this study "personalising behaviour" was adopted in that it was felt better to convey the attempts of the individual to make the organisational conditions more personally acceptable.

Managers and technical specialists were chosen for this study for a number of reasons. In the first place this had been identified as an under-researched field. (Porter, 1965; Sofer, 1970; Hackman, 1977). Secondly, the researcher had "privileged" access to these people as former course members. In addition, there had been a growing concern about the world of work of the manager, faced as he was with stress and tension in his work situation. The researcher, as a member of a School of Management, was concerned with the provision of management development programmes and saw the relevance of this type of research for the development of a manager's ability to "manage" his environment.

b) The Case Study Method

It was decided that an in-depth study would be adopted, taking one organisation as the host. It was recognised that such an approach had a number of critics. Paterson (1960) has suggested that "what can be learned from the case alone concerns only the case" (p. 1).

* The various terms were discussed with managers attending courses at Leicester Polytechnic in order to ascertain their reactions.
Phillips (1971) has noted that "where only one unit is involved, whether it be a given individual or a given social system, what can be said within the context of justification becomes quite limited" (p. 150). March and Simon (1963) similarly questioned the standing of the single case as evidence (p. 6). Fensham and Hooper (1964) observed that "the disadvantage of case studies is that they can never establish general laws or theories. But their strength is that they can reveal the important factors in complex social situations and generate powerful hypotheses" (p. 4).

Emery (1963) has argued for the wider recognition of the case study. "Firstly, there is the overwhelming practical consideration that our scientific generalisations are called upon to help or explain problems to individual persons, families, work groups etc. These individual cases have to be studies in all their uniqueness if we are to decide what generalisations are applicable and what action is to be taken in view of the particular conditions of their existence. Secondly, there is also the dilemma in our research methods that the more the reliability of a survey is increased by taking more cases, the fewer the variables that can be studied for the same expenditure of research funds and time" (p. 1). He concluded from his analysis of the uses to which actual case studies had been put that the case study might be used to illustrate theoretical typologies; that it was probably the most suitable method for opening new fields of study or for breaking new ground; and that it might suggest hypotheses, refine or clarify and partially verify them.

Thus a distinction needs to be made between the verification of theory and its generation - between hypothesis testing and exploration (Riley 1963). Glaser and Strauss (1967) have suggested that there has been "an over-emphasis in current sociology on the verif-
ication of theory" (p. 1.). They saw this in part due to the development of the computer and its capacity to handle large quantities of statistical data. Davis and Cherns (1975b) have regretted that "degraded simple data are thus preferred to the rich complex material of the case study" (p. 21). Marshall (1976), supporting the case study approach added the practical point that focusing on one company kept "organisational variables constant" (p. 93). But there are clearly strict limitations to the generalisations that could be made from this material and these limitations will be discussed more fully in the conclusions.

c) The Organisation and the Respondents

The actual organisation was chosen partly because it had supported a large number of DMS course members over a number of years, partly because it was interested in the study and prepared to grant facilities, and also because the researcher was a former employee there. He had been employed there for some 11 years and had already conducted research within the company, studying aspects of industrial relations (Knibbs, 1968). Although he had left the organisation some 13 years before, he was still familiar with the technology and the organisation and therefore able to establish an empathy with the respondents. This was felt to be a considerable advantage in the discussions. (Dalton, 1959; Sutton, 1972).

The Company possessed certain special characteristics. In the first place, it was a large complex organisation, employing some 12,000 persons, with a wide range of production, marketing, maintenance, research and technical functions. This meant there was a wide range of disciplines represented in the group of respondents studied. It was also part of a larger organisation, the nationalised British Steel
Corporation, which throughout the period of the research (July to
November 1977) was facing a number of difficulties. "The steel
industry of the World was in depression" (B.S.C. Annual Report, 1977,
p. 2). There was a serious over-capacity of steel-making within the
World in general and the U.K. in particular was suffering from too
much plant and too low productivity, due in part to over-manning
and in part to old plant. It was therefore incurring very heavy losses -
£95 million in 1976/77 and in 1977/78, this loss had reached £443
million. Sir Charles Villiers, Chairman B.S.C., talked about the
"imperative of increased productivity" (B.S.C. Annual Report, 1978,
p. 3) and strenuous efforts were being taken to reduce the numbers
employed in the Industry. As the result of closures, early retire-
ments and frozen establishments, they had fallen from 210,000 in
1976 to 197,100 in 1978. But the need for more cutbacks was still
apparent. At the Works under study in the late Summer of 1977, the
appointment of a new Director was announced with the specific task
of cutting back costs of production. This newly appointed Director
was labelled by a number of the respondents as the "axeman." In the
Autumn of 1977, "an announcement was made .... of the intention to
reduce manning at .... by 1200 and to cut fixed overheads" (B.S.C.
Annual Report, 1978, p. 25). During this period, the problems of
the Industry had been the subject of national and local debate. The
local newspaper had talked of "job crisis" and of a "Red Alert at
Steel Plant". Apart from the concerns at the loss of jobs as part
of the demanning process, there was a fear of total or partial closure.*
It was against the backcloth of this debate that the study took place.

* In February 1979, some fifteen months after the completion of the
interviews, the B.S.C. announced its proposals to close the Iron &
Steel Works at Corby; this, it was anticipated, would involve the loss
of some 6000 jobs.
For reasons of empathy and access, the managers and technical specialists here studied were not a random sample but were all former course members of the Diploma in Management Studies (DMS) courses. This meant they had either chosen to take the course in order to improve their performance, or more probably their qualifications for promotion, or they had been chosen by the company as individuals who had managerial responsibility or potential. It was decided to concentrate this study on some 50 persons aiming mainly for qualitative data. This figure was chosen to make the analyses a manageable task and at the same time to make possible some statistical analyses of quantitative data.

By taking those who had attended the DMS from within the company over the previous 10 year period, a population of 51 persons was obtained and in the event 49 people co-operated in the study. Their age distribution was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, this group of persons provided insight into career cycles over a 20 year span. Their service with the organisation and in their current job likewise covered this wide span. (See Tables 2.2 and 2.3).
### Table 2.2 Length of Service With Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.3 Length of Service in Current Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The length of service in post varied from some three or four weeks to 11 years and the persons' career achievements varied from those who perceived themselves as highly successful to those who perceived themselves as having failed. A wide range of disciplines was also included, the respondents coming from such diverse backgrounds as mechanical, electrical and electronic engineering, work study, O & M, operational research, statistics, training, industrial relations, research chemistry, fuel technology, metallurgy, quality assurance and production management. (See Appendix 1 for list of respondents together with their professions).

d) Gaining Access and Co-operation

Since the focus of this study was to be managers and might involve their covert activities within organisations, the difficulties of gaining access appeared, in the early stages of the research, to be a major consideration. Writing on this problem of research into management, Porter (1965) had observed that "numerous investigations were made of the causes and consequences of worker dissatisfaction. Curiously, almost none of these studies ever considered the question of possible job satisfaction amongst managers" (p. 6). He went on to say that important reasons for this were the greater availability of rank-and-file workers for such studies and also the assumption that managers and executives "obviously" had very little to be dissatisfied about. Cooper and Marshall (1975b) saw the problem as one of secrecy, particularly when it came to discussing aspects of the manager's work situation that might reflect on his loyalty and competence. For example, they noted a reluctance to explore and identify stress items. "It is contrary to our cultural norms to admit that one is under stress. Stress is viewed as closely linked
to weakness, incompetence and unreliability" (p. 30).

In a private discussion with Dr. Roy Payne of the Applied Psychology Unit at Sheffield University, Dr. Payne emphasised the difficulties he was having in following through his research into managers and their support systems because of the unwillingness of companies to allow him to conduct an intensive study into the variables affecting the manager. The problems of gaining access into organisations have been discussed by a number of writers - Jacobson et al. (1951), Kahn and Mann (1952), Richardson (1953), Delany (1960), Form (1969), Bowles (1976), Feldman (1976a). Delany (1960) believed that "systematic research into a range of theoretically significant problems is seriously limited by the relative inaccessibility of organisations for research purposes" (p. 449). Bowles (1976), commenting on the problems he experienced in his own study of job satisfaction, recorded that in his "considered opinion, in choosing a topic for research which needs industrial co-operation, research students should be very wary" (p. 518). In particular he pointed out that "it was necessary to expend an enormous amount of time in gaining access for research" (p. 512).

Some researchers have seen the relationship of the researcher to organisations in terms of providing an adequate "quid pro quo" (Delany, 1960; Stewart, 1976) or in terms of a bargain (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Davis, 1971) or in terms of reciprocity (Wax 1952). Wax argued that the researcher was more likely to get what he wants "by asking himself the questions: Why should anybody in this group bother to talk to me? Why should this man take time out from his work, gambling, or pleasant loafing to answer my questions?" (p. 34). To Argyris (1958), "the research itself must somehow be perceived as need-fulfilling". These issues and the notion of reciprocity were fully taken into consider-
In the tradition of social science research, former students of the School of Management were chosen on the assumption that they would be likely to agree to collaborate openly and frankly with the study. At one stage in the initial planning, a sample of such managers was considered, but because of the complexity of their organisational backgrounds and the problems of contacting and interviewing, this approach was discarded. It was felt desirable to hold constant, as far as possible, some of the organisational variables. Therefore it was decided to adopt an intensive study of managers and technical specialists who had attended the Diploma in Management Studies at the School of Management from one organisation. There followed a number of discussions with the management at this company and permission was granted to conduct the study. The researcher agreed as part of the "bargain" to gather data for the organisation on the views of these former course members about the programme they had attended and to make recommendations to the company on the basis of this.

Having gained the agreement of the organisation to conduct the study the next phase was based upon two broad considerations. In the first place, the researcher wished to ensure, if possible a 100% response - that is that all 51 persons took part in the study. He also wanted the managers and technical specialists to be as open and frank as possible in replying both to the questionnaires and to the discussions at the interviews. Kahn and Mann (1952) compared the problems of social scientists in gaining access with those anthropologists who "rely heavily upon the sponsorship of the tribal chief" (p. 4). They argued "that since the researcher requires spontaneity

* The individual respondents were offered a "counselling" session and the organisation a report on the Diploma.
and co-operation rather than docility and obedience, it is not enough to him to use the ready made authority structure" (p. 6). They therefore proposed a two-level approach—gaining support from management, as well as from the individual with whom the discussions were to be held.

Thus, in the first place, the letter was sent by the company to each potential respondent (a letter drafted by the researcher) pointing out that "the management of the ....... will not be given any of the details of the study, which will be confidential, although we do anticipate holding discussions with Leicester on the general findings". Since it was intended to use the questionnaires as the basis for the structured interviews, complete anonymity could not be maintained. Hamel & Reif (1952) concluded that anonymity was not as important as assurances on confidentiality. Therefore, in addition to the references to confidentiality in the letter from the Manager/Staff Development, this was reiterated in the letter* from the researcher and all questionnaires were similarly headed "Private and Confidential." Each individual was given a code number and specific reference was made to this in the letter so that there should be no suspicions about it. The letter went on to assure them that the replies were confidential and that their names would not be linked to the questionnaires. At the start of each interview, these points were reiterated, including the reference to meeting the company to discuss generally with them issues arising from the study. The confidential nature of the interview was however again stressed. The code number was deliberately displayed on their files and papers and nowhere did their surname appear on any part of the papers, all of

* This letter was on "Polytechnic" headed paper and was sent to each person at his home address.
which were headed "confidential." Although this made organising the interviewing somewhat complicated, it was felt that it indicated the researcher's determination to maintain secrecy. The interviewee was also asked at the beginning of the interview if he had any questions or concerns about the confidential nature of the study and some time was spent talking about this if the individual expressed any concern or worries.

The letter from the researcher, in addition to emphasising the confidential nature of the study, outlined again the aims of the study and enclosed a questionnaire made up of two parts. The first part referred to the DMS programme they had attended. It asked them to record their views on the programme and also to rate the importance of various aspects of management to their current job. In addition there was attached the "needs" questionnaire, linked to the DMS by the reference to its contribution.

With each questionnaire, there was included a reply-paid envelope, addressed to the Polytechnic. Upon the receipt of the completed questionnaire, the researcher asked the secretary of the Manager/Staff Development to contact the individual, usually by telephone, to arrange an interview time for the researcher to meet the individual. The interviews were all conducted in the same office, which was provided in the Training Department of the Company. It was decided not to visit the managers in their own offices in that, quite apart from the possibility of interruptions etc., there would have been a considerable delay in moving around the large complex. This was not entirely satisfactory, for managers sometimes forgot the interview or were delayed. Nevertheless, it was probably the most practical arrangement. They did not appear to resent this and, although a number invited the researcher to visit their offices for their second interview, they
accepted the reasons for declining.

A number of respondents were slow in completing the first questionnaire and were sent a reminder with another copy of the questionnaire. This in most cases had the desired effect. In the remaining cases the individuals were telephoned by the researcher at their office and asked if they would be prepared to co-operate. Usually the individuals apologised for not replying and all agreed to do so. In five cases, however, the questionnaires were still not returned and a final approach was adopted. This involved the secretary telephoning these individuals to arrange a meeting some 10 days in advance. At the same time she asked them to send in the completed questionnaire. This was successful in all but one of the remaining cases. When he failed to attend the interview, a second interview time was fixed, which he again failed to attend. It was therefore decided not to pursue this individual any further. Only one other person, out of the original 51 names, was not interviewed. He was in hospital, undergoing a major operation. Thus 49 out of 51 persons co-operated in the study.

At the end of the first interview, the respondents were thanked. They were told that the researcher needed some time to assimilate the material and that he would like to meet them again this time to focus in more specifically on the negative aspects of their work and on how they managed these. They were asked if they would be prepared to meet the researcher again and when they agreed, the date was fixed some seven to ten days in the future. They were then given the second questionnaire, with a stamped addressed envelope addressed to the researcher's home. They were asked to return this before the interview so that it could be analysed and could be used as the basis for the discussions. They were told that if there were any points they
wished to raise about personal career issues, they could spend time on this at the end of the second interview.*

e) The Design of Questionnaires

i) Organisational Conditions

In that the research objective was to identify the behavioural responses to perceived negative conditions in their world of work, a research instrument was required to enable the researcher to identify those aspects of the respondents' world of work with which they were not satisfied. As has been noted in the literature review, a number of organisational variables have been identified as influencing a person's quality of working life. The framework of such variables to be studied in this research was based mainly on the work of Warr and Routledge (1969) and Cooper and Marshall (1975a). The frameworks used by these researchers were in turn based upon intensive studies of the literature. It was not considered necessary therefore to spend time in this research programme validating this material, as the main sections of the questionnaire were a combination of the two frameworks as follows:-

* Some eight "counselling" discussions were held following the second interview and in addition, a limited number of third interviews were conducted to expand on significant research issues.
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In line with Warr and Routledge, "Relationships Within the Organisation" was divided into three sections — boss, colleagues, subordinates, for it was anticipated from the review that each of these sections would be important to the quality of working life of the managers under study. It was further decided to have separate sections covering "the job itself", "the organisational role" and "organisational life," although it was recognised that some overlap and ambiguity might be experienced. Nevertheless, this was not felt to be too important as the follow-up interviews would enable this to be clarified. The variable "intrinsic to the individual" was not included in this study but not because it was seen as unimportant. (See Appendix 2 for detailed framework of questionnaire). It was considered that to seek data from the respondents in these areas
might stretch the preparedness of the managers to co-operate (Marshall 1976). In addition the complexity of such data, if collected, when added to the qualitative data being sought, would make analysis too complicated at this exploratory stage.

In the choice of questions aimed at identifying aspects of the individual's world of work, again the Warr and Routledge questionnaire formed the basis, although it was somewhat expanded. A major aim in the design of the Warr and Routledge questionnaire had been to make it "clear and attractive with items, which were easy to respond to" (p. 100). They were concerned about the response rate from busy managers and they therefore concentrated on a "yes", "no," "don't know" format. Since response was not seen in this study as likely to be such a problem in that it was intended to hand out these questionnaires by hand, a somewhat longer format was chosen and a five-point classification with "strongly agree," "agree," "not sure," "disagree," "strongly disagree" was adopted. It was recognised that there would probably be a tendency to record answers away from the extremes but it was felt desirable to give individuals who felt strongly on certain items, an opportunity to express their more emphatic views in order that they might later be questioned on this.

The sets of questions were then randomly distributed throughout the questionnaire so that response contamination would be minimised. To avoid acquiescent response bias, the direction of wording of the questions was randomly varied; thus agreement with the question did not always reflect a positive aspect of the respondent's world of work. An initial questionnaire of some 55 questions, covering the eight sections, was compiled. This was piloted with a group of works managers, who were not due to take part in the major study. A number of questions were found to be ambiguous and non-discriminatory and
therefore were either amended or discarded. A final set of 50 questions was compiled and this was used in the study. (See Appendix 3 for actual questionnaire).

ii) Need Satisfactions and Deficiencies

It was decided to adopt, as the instrument for measuring the levels of need satisfaction amongst the respondents, a questionnaire based on that designed by Porter (1961). This questionnaire had been extensively used for the study of management - Porter (1961), Eran (1966), Paine, Stephen & Leete (1966), Cummings & El Sami (1970), Payne (1970), Ghiselli and Johnson (1970), Roberts et al. (1971), Schneider & Allderfer (1973).

It has been subjected to some criticisms, these mainly being directed against the "importance scores" (Ewen, 1967; Wanous & Lawler, 1972) and the lack of a common denominator in the development of the index of satisfaction, (Ewen et al., 1966; Locke, 1969). It was not however intended that the index should form a significant part of the study and the "importance" scoring, it was felt, could be omitted. In order to form a link with the DMS follow-up questionnaire, it was determined to ask the individuals to rate the contribution of the DMS to the satisfaction of each item of the questionnaire. It was recognised that this material would not contribute to this dissertation but it would be of relevance to the DMS study. It was also felt that the respondents would be prepared to complete it prior to the first interview and therefore it could form the basis of the initial discussions on their quality of working life.

The "Porter" questionnaire was checked to make sure that the wording was appropriate for managers in the U.K. Colleagues in the School of Management gave their advice on this. Only one small amend-
ment was considered necessary. The item "The feeling of self-fulfilment a person gets from being in my management position" was personalised by rewording it. "The feeling of self-fulfilment I get from being in my management position" (See appendix 4 for the framework of the "Needs" questionnaire and appendix 5 for the actual questionnaire).

iii) Additional Quantitative Data

The literature review identified a number of variables that might be significant in the relationship between the individual manager and his quality of working life. Therefore in addition to open-ended questions on aspects of their world of work and their strategies for managing it, additional data were collected including age, length of service with the organisation, length of service in the current job.

A number of studies had emphasised the importance of the individual's perceived control and influence within the organisation. It was decided to seek to measure the respondent's perception of his say and influence over a number of aspects of his work and to seek to relate these to his reported quality of working life and to other variables. A framework similar to that developed by Tannenbaum and Georgopulos (1968) was adopted. Individuals were asked to rate their say and influence in terms of a five point scale ranging from "Little or none" to "A very great deal" (see Appendix 6 for actual questionnaire). The areas covered by this questionnaire included their say and influence over activities in the organisation in general, activities of their boss, of their colleagues, of their subordinates, and two items specific to this study, over the way they spent their working day and over the quality of their working life. This questionnaire was handed to the respondents at the first interview and
they were asked to complete it at that time.

Interview cards were also used in the collection of other information. This technique was adopted, partly to provide some variety within the interview to encourage the respondent to contribute, and partly to give the interviewer a "breather" during which to consider what other areas should be further explored. On each card was a question with a "forced choice" response and the individual was asked to rate his reply, which was recorded by the interviewer. The cards were not all issued at the same time but at appropriate points throughout the two interviews. The following questions were asked by this method:

1. How long do you anticipate having to stay in your present post? (Six choices were provided, ranging from "Less than 12 months" to "Over five years").

2. How long do you want to stay in your present job? (The same choices as "1" above).

3. Have you ever seriously considered leaving the organisation? (Three choices were provided here - "I am now actively seeking employment outside the organisation", "I have at some time seriously considered leaving but am not at present actively seeking other employment", and "I have never seriously considered leaving".

4. If you were seeking employment outside the organisation how difficult or easy would you find it? (A six point scale was provided, ranging from "Very difficult", through to "Very easy").
5. How do you rate your "quality of working life" at the present.
   (A five point scale was provided, ranging from "Very high" to "Very low").

f) The Conduct of the Interviews

The main aim of the interviews was to gain qualitative data about the individual's strategies for handling his world of work and to achieve this a great deal of thought was put into the design of the actual interviews. Prior to the programme of interviewing, pilot interviews were conducted with former DMS course members (these were selected from other organisations so that the actual group of respondents would not be influenced). This pilot study was mainly to enable the researcher to explore some of the difficulties which might be experienced and also to test out the critical incident method of problem identification.

The literature review on research methods also provided advice on the handling of the interview. Blum (1952) emphasised the importance of establishing "good human contact" and in an attempt to reduce the distance between interviewer and interviewee, he reported that "I told the interviewee several things out of my own life" (p. 37). Barber (1973) stressed the role of "shared roles, goals and values" in gaining access and response (p. 106). Dalton (1964) supported "greater intimacy" as a source of insights into motives (p. 55). Alderfer and Brown (1972) noted that a respondent's preparedness "to reveal threatening information about himself or his organisation" might be a function in part of the empathy between himself and the researcher. They argued the case for research approaches that reduced the distance between the researcher and the respondent (p. 456). Bogdan and Taylor (1975) advocated that during the interview the
researcher should be attentive, non-evaluative, reflective and prepared to probe (p. 114). The interview approach therefore, adopted by the researcher was what Merton and Kendall (1967) have termed "focused" that is - with the minimum of direction, permitting individuals an opportunity to express their subjective experience.

Two aspects of the background of the researcher (quite apart from his age) assisted in this regard. Interviewing was not new to him. He had experience in conducting structured and unstructured interviews for a number of research, organisation development and consultancy assignments. His training as a "group dynamics" trainer and his experience as a process consultant (Schein, 1969) assisted him in adopting this approach, using the interview as a "sociological digging tool" (Manning, 1967; p. 309). As has been mentioned, he had already worked in the organisation some time before and he pointed this out to any of the respondents whom he felt might not know it. As part of the process of establishing rapport, he indicated that this would explain why he would probably understand quite quickly aspects of their work. It did indeed enable him to understand technical aspects of the discussion and also to structure questions about their relationships which they appeared to be neglecting or avoiding.

The impression therefore, gained by the researcher was that once the respondents were assured of the confidential nature of the interview, most were prepared to talk openly and frankly, in some cases as they had never talked to anyone else. A number actually stated this and recorded that they had enjoyed the interviews. The fact that none refused a second interview and that a proportion, some 16%, asked for advice in counselling after the sessions - these might be seen as indications that some rapport had been established.

After the opening remarks about the purposes of the study and
about confidentiality, approximately 15 minutes of the interview was spent discussing with the individual the DMS programme, asking for clarification of points raised in the first part of the questionnaire and requesting advice about how to improve the programme. This proved a valuable starting point, for it gave the individual an opportunity to talk about non-personal aspects. The transition from the DMS to the world of work was then made by discussing the need deficiencies recorded in the "Porter" questionnaire. They were asked to clarify the circumstances surrounding their need deficiencies. This was followed by a series of open-ended questions about the strategies they adopted in seeking to counteract these "short-falls".

Thus the first interview was centred around the "Porter" questionnaire, whereas the second interview used the "Work Attitude" questionnaire. Here the negative aspects of the individual's world of work were explored and individuals were again asked what approaches they adopted to counteract these.

At both discussions, interview cards were adopted, the respondent being asked to grade certain responses according to the card. (See Section "e" for full details). These cards were used at what the researcher considered to be appropriate positions throughout the interviews.

A number of other exploratory approaches were adopted in an attempt to gain additional qualitative data on the individual's relationship to the organisation. Based upon the critical incident method, respondents were asked at the second interview to identify a specific situation in which they experienced pressure at work. When the researcher felt that he fully understood the details and the implications of the situation, he asked what strategies they used to handle this. In addition those aspects of work that contributed to
a high quality and those that contributed to a low. One final series of open-ended questions was asked—about the respondents' reactions to organisation policies, approaches and procedures and upon their attitudes to authority. In so doing it had been hoped to explore how the individual manager attempted to reconcile his own individual needs and those of the organisation. The data collected from the critical incident method, the exploration of the individual's quality of working life and his views upon procedures and authority will be outlined in Chapter Five, which incorporates the supplementary data.
PART II

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSES
INTRODUCTION TO DATA ANALYSES

All the data that could be quantified were coded and punched onto cards for computer analysis. The data so handled included the responses to the needs analysis and work attitude questionnaires, the responses to the questions on desired and anticipated length of job tenure, the Q.W.L. rating, age, length of service, information on their views about their say and influence in the organisation. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences programme, (for details, see Nie et al.; 1975) frequency distributions for all the data were produced and these are reproduced in tabular form in appropriate sections (see List of Tables p. V). Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were also produced and again reference is made to these at relevant points in the discussion.

The correlation study was conducted for all data as an exploration of the strength of association between pairs of variables, rather than as a focussed analysis to support hypotheses. It was recognised that, with the limited number of respondents, the statistical analysis would not form a major part of the study: nor would it provide any conclusive findings. The actual levels of probability will be recorded throughout and in accordance with Moroney (1951) & Furneaux, Brynner & Murphy (1973), where the level of probability was .001 - that is it was significant at the .1% level, this will be termed "highly significant". A probability level of .01 will be identified as "significant", whereas a level of .05 will be accepted as "probably significant." It was anticipated that the quantitative studies would support the conclusions and observations, made as a result of the qualitative data analyses. This proved to be the case, particularly in the clarification of the sets of factors influencing the quality of working life of the respondents.
The quantitative study was reasonably straightforward, involving the coding of information, its preparation for processing and the use of established computer programmes for analyses. This contrasted with the analysis of qualitative material which proved to be the most difficult part of the research programme. The researcher felt at times overwhelmed by the detail and complexity of the variables. It was at this stage that the discussions with Professor Higgin proved reassuring, as did the research literature in this area. For example, Professor Deutscher's comments (1975) about qualitative research struck a distinct chord. "It is scary because the research outcomes are unpredictable. The nightmare of every qualitative researcher, novice or experienced, is 'what if I don't find anything'?' (p. vi).

This part of the study was based on the suggestions of Bogdan and Taylor (1975). They advocated the reading of field notes, recording themes, the coding of topics, the development of typologies and the review of the literature, arguing "it is important for the researcher to expose her or himself to different theoretical perspectives during the intensive analysis stage of the research" (p. 84). Glaser and Strauss (1967), in their support of qualitative data as a source of grounded theory, argued that "the root source of all significant theorising is the sensitive insights of the observer himself" (p. 251). They advocated a similar range of approaches to facilitate the capturing of insights and in this research it was found useful to maintain a list of ideas that stemmed from the various analyses.

The first examination therefore consisted in seeking to bring together all those respondents who had recorded negative reactions to different aspects of their work and thereafter describing the
reported strategies for handling those situations. An initial important task was to identify the set of organisational variables against which the strategies of the individuals could be analysed. Unfortunately, as has been noted, the categories under which the organisational conditions had been initially drawn up were by no means clear and unambiguous. Amendments were necessary and it was here that the quantitative analyses assisted. It was observed that some of the questions were differently perceived by the respondents and some did not fall neatly into the sets of variables (see appendix 2 for original framework). This applied particularly to those concerned with "organisational role" and "organisational life". The correlation analyses confirmed the researcher's view that, for many, the replies to certain questions were linked with other aspects. For example, communications and consultation were perceived by many as a function, not of their organisational life, but of their relationships with their boss.

Part II that follows sets out the material obtained from the questionnaires and the interviews. It is divided into three chapters - nos. Three, Four and Five. The first sets out the responses to the "Porter" Needs Questionnaire and the associated discussions held at the initial interview. The next chapter contains the main data on the personalising behaviour of the respondents, arising out of the discussions on the negative aspects of their world of work, recorded in the Work Attitude Questionnaire. The third chapter contains supplementary information, including the details of their views on the quality of working life, their reported incidents of pressure and their attitudes towards authority and organisational policies.
CHAPTER THREE
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Managers & Technical Specialists - their needs and responses
THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE ORGANISATION - I
Managers and Technical Specialists - their needs and responses

Introduction

This chapter concentrates on an examination of the replies to the "needs" questionnaire and the associated discussions. A number of shortcomings were encountered in this questionnaire and the discussions did not prove as helpful in identifying personalising strategies as it had been originally hoped. The chapter therefore commences with a statement of some of these limitations and the sections thereafter are based on the categories of need within the questionnaire. The structure is:

a) Limitations of Questionnaire and associated discussions.
b) Security Needs.
c) Social Needs.
d) Esteem Needs.
e) Autonomy Needs.
f) Self-Actualisation Needs.

a) Limitations of Questionnaire and Associated Discussions

It had been anticipated in the design of the research approaches that the identification of the need deficiencies by the "Porter" questionnaire would make possible an exploration at the interview of the methods adopted by the respondents to handle these need deficiencies. For a number of reasons this was not as straightforward as it had been hoped. Some of the areas covered by the questionnaire, such as personal growth, esteem needs, self-fulfilment, were very general and the same conditions at work tended to produce the same responses to a number of questions. This was illustrated by the high correlation of a number of responses (see appendix 7 for correlation table).
It was thought that the respondents would be reasonably articulate; nevertheless, they often were unable to distinguish between different aspects of the questionnaire. Individuals were frequently unable to identify their specific personalising behaviour in the face of deficiencies in these broad areas. The responses to questions were influenced by each other. If an individual identified promotion as a solution to one need deficiency, this answer was repeated to the interviewer for other need deficiencies.

Harper and Reeves (1977) have made a distinction between the emotional and the cognitive components involved in responses to questions. They noted that two people might record the same negative feelings about one aspect of work but their reasons (the cognitive element) for holding this attitude might be different. This proved to be the position amongst the interviewees in this study. For example, in responding to the question on "opportunities for giving help", some talked of a lack of opportunity to give counselling support to young colleagues. To others, it reflected the problems of a service department, such as work study, in providing support and guidance to line management.

Porter and Lawler (1964) have indicated that the questionnaire involved an "a priori assumption that the smaller the difference between the recorded amount of the characteristic that there is now and that which should be, the smaller the degree of dissatisfaction and the larger the degree of satisfaction" (p. 141). This assumption might have held good for one individual within the thirteen questions but did not appear to be true between respondents. Thus one individual recorded a total need deficiency score of 44 whereas the lowest total deficiency score was 1. It would seem difficult to compare quantitatively, the levels of satisfaction between these two people.
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The concept of the "ideal" was interpreted differently by the respondents. What was meant by "should" varied between individuals. To some, an ideal, by definition, was unobtainable and thus to record a need deficiency of one point was to be expected. To others, an ideal was a form of pressing imperative, where a need deficiency of "1" was seen as serious. A number of respondents recorded low scores for the ideal. For example one respondent, in responding to the question about "the feeling of self-fulfilment gained from his position", recorded "4" as the ideal and "4" for the amount, suggesting that his needs in this area were satisfied. Upon discussion, it became clear that in the absence of satisfaction, he had lowered his expectations of self-fulfilment and now talked solely of the instrumental role of his job - a means of earning money. Other examples could be quoted, where some denial of need seemed to be operating.

The "Porter" questionnaire has in the main been used in postal surveys where this was the only contact with the respondent. Cummings and El Sami (1968) criticised this "heavy reliance on the sample survey" in that it put "great constraints on the ability to draw adequate conclusions" (p. 141). In this research, the opportunity was available to discuss the respondent's views and responses at two interviews. This permitted the researcher to understand more about the recorded deficiencies. It also permitted him to explore apparent anomalies in responses - e.g. what Payne (1970) called "negative discrepancies", where the individual recorded that his job provided more satisfaction than he thought it ought. Payne noted that it was "difficult to interpret the psychological meaning of such a score" (p. 253). In this study it was possible to explore these responses and the findings will be discussed in the relative place within the following sections. Some emphasis will be given to this because,
in the view of the researcher, it illustrated how individuals used the questions to express their personal and immediate concerns, often irrespective of how tenous the link to the question. Porter regarded such negative discrepancies as denoting high satisfaction and he extended the scores from -6 to +6, a questionable extension of the scale. In this research, where quantitative analyses were used, a negative discrepancy was adjusted to indicate no needs deficiency, itself an arbitrary decision in the light of the reasons individuals gave for this type of response.

Notwithstanding these observations the questionnaire did provide a useful starting point in the first interviews to explore significant areas of concern with the interviewees. This discussion helped to interest the respondents, such that they were all prepared to complete the second questionnaire and to meet the researcher again. It meant that the first interview was somewhat general, with the researcher gaining background material and some data on the personalising behaviour of individuals. This left the second interview in which to concentrate upon areas of concern identified by the "work attitude" questionnaire and upon specific behaviours adopted to offset these. A number of useful insights were obtained from the discussions on the "needs" questionnaire and these will be outlined in the sections that follow.

b) Security Needs

The question on security needs, together with the responses, is set out below:-
Table 3.1: Security Needs

1. The feeling of security in my management position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 4. 6. 11. 11. 12. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 11. 12. 10. 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need deficiency:</th>
<th>-3. -2. -1. 0. 1. 2. 3. 5.</th>
<th>Mean deficiency: 1.04*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 2. 4. 17. 9. 10. 4. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant correlation between service, age and the reported security need deficiencies (Length of service .3940, sign: .003: Age .3312, sign: .010). As would be expected the correlation with "work attitude" question number six on redundancy was highly significant (.4497, sign: .001).

Seven of the respondents recorded what Payne termed a negative discrepancy - that is they recorded that there was a higher level of security than was ideal. When questioned about this, they were not actually saying that their own job should be less secure. They were making a general statement about the absence of pressure and accountability within the organisation. They seemed to be making a similar statement to Mant (1977), when he talked of the "debilitating incapacity of the British to sack incompetents" (p. 62). This in part reflected their own impatience for promotion and their lack of respect for some of their superiors. One or two of the

* Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
respondents acknowledged, however, that they might change their view as they grew older.

As noted above, there was a tendency for concern about security to increase with age and length of service but it was not a fear of the sack. It was rather a fear that the company would not continue operating in this town for the next fifteen to twenty years and if the whole plant closed, they would have to move. A number had settled into the district and considered they had little hope of finding alternative employment there in the event of total closure. It was a long-term fear and when asked how they handled it, they made such statements as "I don't let it bother me"; "I don't think about it"; "What can I do about it?". It was as if it was outside their "time span of concern."

In a number of other cases, the concern, expressed as a need deficiency, was about the continuation of their existing job for the next five years. Staffing cutbacks, technological and organisational changes might eliminate their jobs and although they would not be made redundant, there was uncertainty about the path their careers would take. The problem of career management under these conditions of declining job opportunities and uncertainty will be discussed more fully in a later section.

Particular attention was directed in the interviews to the two individuals who expressed a "five" deficiency. One case, a senior respondent in both age and position, was genuinely concerned that he might be dismissed. His department had been reduced in size over the past five years from some 150 persons to 100 persons. The senior management in this area of activity, he felt, was somewhat top heavy and he quoted an example of someone else at another
works in a similar position who had been dismissed. He had no specific strategy for handling this. He did not want to move because of the children's education, but he maintained it as a possibility both in case of an emergency and as a means of keeping alive the idea of ambition. Pessimism pervaded the discussion and his only response was "I concentrate on my job: I give it priority over my home and I don't think about the future." The other case was a young technical specialist, who admitted upon questioning that he had no real fear for security within his position. The "five" score was in line with every other score on the questionnaire. He was completely dissatisfied with his job and was actively seeking employment elsewhere. He talked of gloom hanging over the plant and it was as if he was confirming his decision to leave by colouring all other aspects of his employment position.

c) Social Needs

Two questions within the "Porter" questionnaire were directed towards identifying the need deficiency of the respondents in the area of social needs. The first question, and the responses to it, are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: The Need to Give Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The opportunity in my management position to give help to other people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 1. 6. 7. 20. 10. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 6. 12. 16. 14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need deficiency:</th>
<th>0. 1. 2. 3. 4.</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency: .78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>24. 16. 7. 0. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As mentioned in the introduction, individuals identifying a deficiency here might be commenting upon quite different aspects of their world of work. In two cases the respondents observed that, because they were newly appointed to their jobs, they did not feel expert enough to give advice or help to others. Four of the respondents were concerned about the lack of opportunity with their job to help their subordinates. Two of these felt too over-worked to spend as much time as they would have liked, helping in the development of their subordinates. The other two considered that their job too often involved them in trying to control their subordinates rather than in counselling and assisting. "I am so often twisting arms - chasing them rather than helping them." This added to the dissatisfaction they already felt with their managerial role and helped to confirm them in their decision to seek after other types of work, with a more technical, rather than a managerial content.

The two extreme cases, who identified a discrepancy of "four", were both commenting upon interdepartmental friction - a "them and us" relationship. In one case this was a friction between the Metallurgical Department and Production and in the other between the Work Study Department and its client departments. This response was also recorded, in less emphatic forms, by others who similarly had scored a deficiency. "There is not enough notice taken of the Research Department." "The Work Study Department isn't asked for advice." To counteract this situation, they said they tried to be available, helpful, to spend time on relationships with client departments, but they noted that in the main they were not satisfied with the results of these strategies. They did not feel personally responsible however for this failure, for they were able to view
this as an organisation rather than an interpersonal issue.

The second question on social needs and the responses to it, was as follows:

Table 3.3: The Need for Close Friends

3. The opportunity to develop close friends in my management position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 4. 7. 13. 13. 7. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 3. 1. 19. 13. 7. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-2. -1. 0. 1. 2.</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency: .30*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>3. 3. 32. 7. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that six people recorded a negative deficiency. This did not necessarily mean that they were satisfied with the friendship aspects of their job. Two of those, who noted a negative deficiency, were commenting on what they saw as the all-pervading influence with the company within the community. They felt that this meant that when they were outside the organisation, there was "too much shop". "I want to extend my range of friends, for this place is too limiting".

In the other cases it represented their views on the relationship of the manager both to his subordinates and his colleagues.

* Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
"Friendship is not necessary to do the job". "How friendly can a manager be?" "This place is too friendly for results". "The manager has to maintain his distance - it is a lonely job". It was almost as if they were denying the need for friendship by recording negative deficiency. They were indicating that they did not have close friendships within the works situation but reflected that they could not, or should not, have such relationships. They differed from others who noted an actual deficiency, in that in the latter group, some people regretted the isolation of management.

"My auditing role produces conflict. I have to shop others".

"Management is a lonely business and I regret this but .....".

It will be noted that the average ideal score for this question was lower than the average for all the other questions (see Appendix 8 for the summary of results). The researcher felt that a number of the respondents handled this issue by lowering what they perceived as an ideal.* They did not have high expectations of friendship from within their organisational situation and therefore were not disappointed.

d) Esteem Needs

Three questions were aimed at identifying esteem-need deficiencies - one on self-esteem, the second on internal prestige and the third on external prestige. In the interviews, it proved

* One individual did record seven as the ideal and similarly recorded seven for actual. This was the person, who in the second interview, presumably having forgotten the discussion at the first, commented upon his problems of relationships, arising out of his university degree and his hobbies. This was the individual, whom from other sources, the researcher knew to have problems in relating to others. It seemed reasonable to assume that this was an extreme example of denial.
impossible to differentiate between the questions on self-esteem and internal prestige in terms of causes and personalising responses. The responses to these two questions correlated significantly. (.4372, sign:.001). The discussion that follows therefore is divided into two sections - the first dealing with questions 4 and 5 on self-esteem and internal prestige and the second, question 6, concerned with the prestige of the job outside the organisation.

Table 3.4: Self-Esteem and Internal Prestige Needs

4. The feeling of self-esteem I get from being in my management position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Mean Score: 4.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>2. 3. 9. 16. 14. 5. 0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Mean Score: 5.35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 2. 9. 17. 12. 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-1. 0. 1. 2. 3. 4. 6. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>2. 17. 10. 9. 9. 1. 1. Deficiency: 1.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The prestige of my management position inside the organisation (that is the regard from those working in the organisation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Mean Score: 4.29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>2. 2. 10. 11. 15. 8. 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Mean Score: 5.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 1. 3. 9. 19. 14. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-2. -1. 0. 1. 2. 3. Mean Deficiency: .88*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 3. 24. 5. 10. 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
Of the thirty persons who recorded a need deficiency to one or both of these questions, the largest group was reflecting on the perceived low status of their department. They were members of such departments as Work Study, Research, Maintenance and when compared to Production, they felt they were seen as having less prestige. To offset this status problem, a number sought after jobs in Production, although this also would offer them greater job opportunities and promotion.

A further eight persons had recorded a deficiency because of personal career difficulties. For six of these, this arose out of failure to gain the desired promotion: for the remaining two, they had experienced career setbacks, demotion. In the case of four other respondents, the need deficiency was a function of inadequate job grading levels, when compared nationally with other parts of the Steel Industry. For a small number (two) the recorded needs deficiency was against the unattainable ideal and did not really represent a concern to them.

But a serious cause for concern amongst four respondents was the perceived low status of middle management. Of these, two were disenchanted with management as such and were expressing this dissatisfaction in their answers. The third was complaining about the privileged position of union officials. During the interview, he expressed concern at the extent to which shop stewards were taken into senior management's confidence and kept in the picture, whereas middle management were excluded. He felt they were now in a similar position to that of the supervisor, some ten years ago. The fourth member of this group presented a particularly interesting situation. He was probably the most senior respondent of the forty-nine, the Chief Engineer. He had achieved his life's ambition, which
seemed to surprise him. Yet having been successful, he still recorded a need deficiency of "two" on self-esteem needs and "one" on prestige within the organisation. When questioned about this, he observed that the job no longer had the status and power of earlier holders of the post. The job was now hemmed in with restrictions imposed by accountants, unions, headquarters. It did not match up with his vision of what the job had been. Thus he hankered for the past and for the power and authority of previous incumbents. He was ambivalent about seeking further promotion. To some degree he seemed to be concentrating on fulfilling his non-work ambitions of becoming a country gentleman—shooting and fishing—whilst just keeping alive some ambition for promotion into general management.

Five people recorded a negative deficiency score to one or other of the two questions. The range of reasons for this again illustrated the difficulties of interpreting the questionnaire results without access to respondents. In one case, the job preoccupation that had influenced his score was a regrading problem. He argued that he had taken on additional work over the past two years in his attempt to gain visibility and promotion. He had built up his job on his own initiative and as yet had not received promotion. He felt exploited and underpaid. Thus he observed that he gained more self-esteem from the job than he should, a strange piece of logic. This seemed to reflect the way an individual would use a question to convey a point that was of importance to him at the time.

Another respondent, in noting a negative deficiency, was reflecting the fact that he no longer wanted prestige or esteem from the management job. He no longer wanted a management job!
He wanted to drop out, to return to being a craftsman, but felt trapped by his family commitments and salary level. The third respondent, the technical assistant to the director, noted that because of his job and the fact that he had the ear of the person in charge of the whole organisation, he was accorded higher prestige than was warranted. "People try to get me to do things for them and this might not be a good thing".* The other two respondents with a negative deficiency to these questions, also had negative scores to question six and therefore discussion on these will be postponed to the next section.

Table 3.5: Prestige Needs outside the Organisation

6. The prestige of my management position outside the organisation
   (that is the regard from others not in the organisation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 4. 4. 17. 13. 9. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 1. 3. 15. 18. 10. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-2. -1. 0. 1. 2. 3.</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency: .40**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 3. 31. 10. 3. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest group of those who recorded a need deficiency here were arguing that outside the works, people did not understand the

* He was ambivalent about this, for in the second interview he recorded how he used the reflected prestige to delegate and to clear his own in-tray.

** Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
scope and importance of their jobs. This was well summed up by one individual who observed that "'manager' as a title does not convey the scale of my job. What about a shoe-shop manager?" The job and its title did not provide what Wilensky (1962) termed "a readily-visible status claim" (p. 559). They clearly regretted the absence of status outside but seemed somewhat reluctant to comment on it. This reluctance to admit to this as a need and the discussions with other respondents helped the researcher to a conclusion that the concern over low prestige outside the plant was probably more widespread than the scores suggested. There seemed to be some denial of this need in the sense that somehow the pursuit of prestige was not a socially acceptable activity.

Those recording a need deficiency in this area, included a number who saw this as a short-fall against an unattainable ideal. It also included the two persons who had been downgraded, with a consequent perceived loss of face. Three others saw their low prestige outside the organisation as a function of their low internal status. This probably therefore reflected their own personal view and their concern over lack of promotion rather than an accurate perception of outside opinion. One other person reported on a different set of conditions that had influenced his reply. This was a newly appointed manager, who had to deal with outside customers and who, because of his "new boy" position, felt he lacked prestige. He saw this however as only a temporary problem.

Of the four with negative scores, three have not yet been mentioned. Two of these had recorded in this manner for they felt that the people outside the plant saw them as more influential than they actually were. This was said with regret in the sense that they were not really seeking a realistic appraisal by other people.
of their influence, but rather an improvement in their actual position of prestige and influence. The other person was making an emphatic commentary about his views on prestige - "No job should be accorded prestige. This should only be given to persons, not to jobs". The researcher was not able fully to understand the significance of this statement, coming as it did alongside a number of other polemical statements by this individual.

e) Autonomy Needs

Four questions were directed towards identifying need deficiencies in what Porter called "autonomy" needs. These questions covered authority, opportunities for independent thought and action and participation in goal setting and determining methods and procedures. This set of questions, Porter (1961) acknowledged, was a "major deviation from Maslow's system" (p. 3). He saw these as connected both to the "esteem" needs that came below in the hierarchy and the "self-actualisation" needs that came above, although he offered no further explanation about their design. This section did however help to form the link between the two interviews in this research project for most of the discussion on "autonomy" centred around organisational issues.

Table 3.6: Authority Needs

7. The Authority connected with my management position

| Actual Amount: | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. | Mean Score: 4.06 |
| No: | 4. 2. 8. 13. 17. 5. 0. |
| Ideal: | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. | Mean Score: 4.84 |
| No: | 1. 3. 4. 7. 15. 18. 1. |
| Need Deficiency: | 0. 1. 2. 3. | Mean Deficiency: .78 |
| No: | 19. 24. 4. 2. |
In recording a need deficiency to this question, the majority were either relating it to an unobtainable ideal or were complaining about their lack of authority, particularly over subordinates. This lack of authority stemmed either from their perceived low status and their desire for promotion, or was a reflection of the power of the unions in restricting their ability to discipline subordinates. Another major concern that was finding expression in the responses to this question was the advisory role that some individuals held, particularly in such departments as work study and research. They were concerned that they did not have the authority to implement their own recommendations and thus their reports "gathered dust". In the Research Centre and Work Study Department, this lack of authority meant that they might be given jobs to undertake, which in their view were a waste of time. They could predict that, after a great deal of work, their findings would be ignored.*

Two expressed the largest deficiency - a score of "3". One was the recently downgraded senior manager whose scores, as has already been noted, were influenced throughout by this recent move. The second was an individual complaining about his relationship with his boss, whom he saw as interfering and thus limiting his authority and autonomy.

* This lack of implementation also found expression in the discussions over the lack of sense of achievement.
Table 3.7: Independence of Thought and Action

8. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my management position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-3.</th>
<th>0.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency: .78*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 26.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2. 3. 1.</td>
<td>0. 1.</td>
<td>Deficiency: .78*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be noted, some 53% recorded no deficiency in this area and if allowance was made for the "unattainable ideal" and those with a deficiency score of "1" added to this number, 84% of the respondents would be covered. This suggested that the question might be wrongly worded and when checking on this in the interviews, individuals generally considered that they possessed opportunities for independence of thought. They felt they had not sacrificed this, even though they might not possess "independence of action." Thus there might be a "social desirability" bias against the identification of a deficiency in this area and the two elements would be better separated in future studies.

The person with a deficiency of "6" was a work study engineer who had been working on a project for 2 years and was convinced it would be rejected at the end of the study. The respondent with the next highest deficiency - "4" - reported himself as belonging to a department with too many levels in the hierarchy, restricting his

* Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
ability to initiate and take decisions.* The other respondents with deficiencies have already been discussed above and no new insights were provided in the discussions except for the unusual explanation of the negative deficiency of "-3". The individual here argued that he had too much independence. He was involved in a series of major decisions, committing the organisation to large expenditure on new equipment. His boss however was not interested in this programme and he did not feel supported by him. No-one challenged his recommendations and this left him to comment to the researcher "what if it isn't really O.K.?" Thus he was reflecting his sense of vulnerability in the absence of any form of challenge or support: he was also concerned at the lack of recognition.

Table 3.8: Need for Participation

9. The opportunity in my management position for participation in the setting of goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>2. 4. 7. 9. 12. 12. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 7. 10. 19. 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-1. 0. 1. 2. 3. 4.</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency: 1.22**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 19. 12. 6. 8. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It was this individual who had noted that he was viewed as possessing more prestige and influence by outsiders than he actually possessed.

** Assuming a "0" score for a negative deficiency.
Table 3.8: Need for Participation (Cont)

10. The opportunity in my management position for participation in the determination of methods and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 5. 5. 5. 13. 13. 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 6. 12. 20. 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency:</th>
<th>-1. 0. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 28. 9. 5. 4. 1. 1.</td>
<td>Deficiency: .82*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a high correlation between the responses to these two questions (.6429; .001). The presence or absence of opportunities of participation in goal setting and methods determination was linked together for many of the respondents.

Where there was a difference in responses to one question as opposed to the other, it generally reflected a complaint against the organisation for the lack of consultation on broader issues, as opposed to the presence of good relationships with their own boss on methods and procedures. The absence of consultation, as would be expected, was the theme that ran through these discussions, Comments were made about too many levels in the organisation and that individuals were remote from headquarters decision-making. Goals and targets were issued as if from "on high" without prior consultation and with inadequate background reasons. In addition, problems of establishing appropriate goals and targets were also

* Assuming a "0" score for the negative deficiency.
raised. This was epitomised by the case of the Industrial Relations Officer with a recorded need of "3". He had just struggled at an appraisal interview with his boss to set goals in industrial relations for the next 12 months. He (and his boss) were at a loss to know specifically what targets he should seek. He came to the conclusion that he would have to respond to short-term demands and to problems on a fire-fighting basis and this lack of long-term sense of direction confirmed him in his decision to look for a job in a different aspect of personnel work.

At the more interpersonal level, criticism was directed against their bosses for their failure to take them into their confidence or to keep them in the picture. Ironically the two negative deficiencies, rather than expressing the view that everything was splendid, were both complaining about their bosses. In recording a negative deficiency to participation on methods, the individual observed "I am out on my own: the boss doesn't know what I am doing and what I have to put up with". On the question about goals, a different person was again commenting about his boss. He had recently completed an unsatisfactory set of appraisal discussions with his boss about his job and his targets for the next 12 months. He recorded that he had to take the initiative and set his own goals. He was criticising his boss for his lack of understanding, his lack of stimulus and interest in his work.

\( f) \) Self-Actualisation Needs

Three questions were included to direct attention to need deficiencies in the area of what Maslow had termed "self-actualisation". These covered personal growth and development, the feeling of self-fulfilment and a sense of achievement.
Table 3.9: Personal Growth and Development

11. The opportunity for personal growth and development in my management position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No: 3. 6. 6. 6. 12. 10. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 5.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No: 0. 0. 0. 4. 11. 17. 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Deficiency: 0. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No: 18. 11. 10. 4. 1. 4. 1.</td>
<td>Deficiency: 1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reported need deficiencies in reply to this question were virtually all to do with concern over their career progress or lack of it. A significant correlation was obtained between length of service on existing job and need deficiency scores to this question (.3219: sign: .012). Those with the highest deficiencies (4, 5, 6) all complained of being trapped in their jobs, of having remained too long there. "I know what the next year will look like". "I've been eight years in the job and I want a move". "I learnt a lot in the first three years, but now ......" "All the old problems keep coming round again." Those with smaller deficiencies tended to have been in the job a smaller period of time.

It was in the process of seeking the satisfaction of this need that a number came into conflict with organisational goals. The organisation wanted many of them to spend longer in the job than they themselves desired. The reason for this was straightforward - to permit the work of the department to benefit from their experience. A number of jobs required a number of years to gain adequate experience, in view of the non-cyclical or long cycle
pattern of work. But the individual wished to move to avoid becoming specialised, to avoid spending too long in the job and thereby upsetting his promotion timetable.

Table 3.10: Self-Fulfilment and Achievement Needs

12. The feeling of self-fulfilment I get from being in my management position (that is the feeling of being able to use my own unique capabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>1. 3. 7. 10. 18. 10. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 6.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 1. 12. 21. 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need Deficiency: | 0. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. | Mean |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>11. 16. 12. 6. 3. 1.</td>
<td>Deficiency: 1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The feeling of worthwhile achievement in my management position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Amount:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 4.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>3. 2. 6. 14. 12. 8. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal:</th>
<th>1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.</th>
<th>Mean Score: 6.49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 4. 17. 28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need Deficiency: | 0. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. | Mean |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>8. 7. 20. 6. 5. 2. 1.</td>
<td>Deficiency: 2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals found it difficult to discuss their self-fulfilment needs with the researcher. It was a personal and intangible area and individuals tended to link it either with their career progress or more often with the difficulty of gaining a sense of achievement.
A number of the other questions permitted the individual to move away from a discussion of "self" towards a discussion of "organisational shortcomings". This was not so possible with the question on self-fulfilment, although some found a link by indicating that they were under-utilised and that they therefore wished for promotion. In the main the respondents were well able to put into words their concern about lack of achievement. It will be noted that more people recorded "7" as the ideal for sense of achievement than for any other question - twenty-eight as compared to the next highest of seventeen. The need deficiency scores for this question were also the highest of any question and these responses, alone amongst all these questions, correlated highly with the respondents' scores on the Quality of Working Life (—.4424: 001).

Of the three respondents with the highest scores (5/6), two were from Work Study, both caught up in management / union politics, such that their recommendations were rejected. They recorded a sense of frustration at not achieving anything. The third individual was a section leader of a maintenance team who commented "This is a big place: nobody knows what you're doing, except when something goes wrong." This sense of being part of a large organisation recurred a number of times: "I'm only a small part of a large organisation". "It is difficult to get a sense of achievement from such a big plant as this one." "It's like painting the Forth Bridge", was what one maintenance engineer called it - "It just goes on and on".

The lack of achievement also came for some from their advisory or service role. There was a sense of "being on the side lines", of being ignored, of being blamed, rather than actually achieving production. Those in service departments somehow felt that "the
grass was greener" in the production departments, but members of production departments also recorded a lack of achievement. For the production manager this was a function of industrial relations difficulties or the continuous pressure for production - "24 hours a day, 7 days a week". It also came from difficulties with the customers over quality. "I can only lose - if we're on specification, a customer sees it as his right. If it's off specification, we are at fault."

Thus for the manager and the technical specialist in a large organisation, it would seem that to obtain a sense of achievement was a difficult task. It was easier for them to look for achievement from progress in their career rather than from work on a specific task. When movement slowed down, usually coinciding with mid-life, the individual was left with the dilemma of gaining a sense of achievement from the job itself. As will be noted, the absence of both career progress and achievement at work seemed to lead for many to a restructuring of the time and energy allocated to work in favour of their non-work life. This also involved some redefinition of the role of work. As was mentioned in the introduction, the person with the lowest "ideal" score, that of "4" for self-fulfilment also scored "4" for the amount of self-fulfilment present - a need deficiency of "0". He stated bluntly and emphatically that he no longer expected fulfilment from work; he worked for money and he would gain his satisfaction outside work. Thus a need deficiency of "0" might be a product of lowered expectations, of denial, rather than of satisfaction.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE ORGANISATION - II

Managers and Technical Specialists - their concerns and responses
Managers and Technical Specialists - their concerns and responses

Introduction

This chapter sets out the replies to the Work Attitude Questionnaire and the strategies, adopted by the respondents to counteract the negative aspects identified by this questionnaire. The full questionnaire, together with the replies, is set out in Appendix 3. Separate tables of replies and correlation statistics are shown in the text of this chapter, which is divided up on the basis of the organisational conditions identified by this study. These conditions, structured partly from the quantitative analyses and partly from the reactions of the respondents to questions in the interview, are not presented as a definitive list of the variables which might threaten the quality of working life of managers. Rather they represent a statement of those items that have been studied here and that proved helpful in identifying and discussing the processes of personalising.

The structure is as follows:

(a) Relationships at work
   (i) With their boss
   (ii) With their colleagues
   (iii) With their subordinates

(b) Their Career Prospects
   (i) Career development
   (ii) Redundancy and security

(c) Pay and Conditions

(d) Factors associated with the Job
   (i) Absence of challenge
   (ii) Pressures and overload
   (iii) Ambiguity and uncertainty
(e) Work/Non-Work relationships (i) Conflict between work and non-work
(ii) Location of home
(iii) Contribution to Society

(f) Organisational Life
(i) Belonging and personal identify
(ii) Communications and Consultation
(iii) Restrictions from being within the organisation

a) Relationships at Work

i) With their Boss

A dominant theme in the discussions with the respondents was their relationship with their boss. This has been identified by a number of writers as of crucial importance to the world of work of the individual manager. Wolfe & Snoek (1962) & French (1973) have emphasised the importance of the boss relationship as a buffering effect against job stress. Rosen (1961a) & Dubin (1968) reported that the manager had an upward orientation toward the demands of his superior. McGregor (1960) saw the climate created by the individual manager's immediate boss as critical. "It is probably the most important influence affecting managerial development" (p. 199). Rosemary Stewart (1976) has noted "the relationship with the boss is one that can be difficult for the managers. It can cause more problems for him than that of his subordinates, because it is less under his control. 'How can I manage my boss is a common cry' " (p. 58).

In order to identify those aspects of the boss relationship
that were considered unsatisfactory, the following questions were asked. Also set out below are the responses to these questions and the correlation statistics.

Table 4.1: Relationships with the Boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) My boss is not receptive to my ideas or advice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) My boss interferes in my work too much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) My boss helps me to develop my abilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) If I was under stress at work I could not discuss it frankly with my boss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) I feel I can discuss work problems with my boss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) I feel confident of the support of my boss when I make a decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Correlation of "Boss" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) Not receptive to ideas</td>
<td>.1452</td>
<td>-.5401</td>
<td>.4348</td>
<td>-.5830</td>
<td>-.6267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Interferes too much</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.1305</td>
<td>.2504</td>
<td>-.0776</td>
<td>-.1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Helps development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.6775</td>
<td>.3819</td>
<td>.6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Not able to discuss condition of stress</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.4784</td>
<td>-.6621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) Able to discuss work problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.5922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) Confident of support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It will be seen from Table 4.2 that the responses to these questions, with the exception of question 15, correlated significantly. Thus, if they perceived relationships with their boss as good, this was reflected in their responses to all the questions. Question 15 proved to be a badly worded question. The thirteen persons, who strongly disagreed, were found at the interviews to be using this item to complain that their boss was too remote and was lacking an interest in their work. The twenty-three people on the other hand who "disagreed", as opposed to "strongly disagreed", were satisfied with their relationship to the boss in this respect. This explains the absence of a significant correlation between the replies of this question and others. In addition, the responses to the questions on communication, consultation and participation (questions 8, 28, 41) were found to correlate significantly with the above questions on boss relationships. Thus, in the interviews when concern over communications was expressed, it was often a function of inadequate relationships with their boss. This was not, however, their only concern and these questions and the discussion, centering upon them will be postponed to the section on "organisational life" (Section f (ii)).

The questionnaires and the interviews, therefore, identified a number of aspects of concern in their relationships with the boss. These and the reactions of the respondents to them will be described under the following headings (although they should be seen as closely inter-related).

Boss's failure to help in "development"
Boss's interference in their work
Boss's remoteness and unapproachability
Lack of support from the boss
Boss's failure to help in "development"

Some fifteen persons could not agree that their boss helped them in their development programmes. This produced a number of reactions, to some extent dependent upon other aspects of their boss and work relationships. In most cases, the lack of help or interest produced a set of personal initiatives. These individuals attended, for example, the Diploma in Management Studies in their own time or requested time off to attend, by-passing their immediate superior to meet the Manager/Staff Development or in one case, the Director of the Unit. In the main they regretted their boss's failure to act as a development sponsor and in his absence sought after another. Such a sponsor could be the Manager/Staff Development, the next level of management or in some cases another production manager who might support his career (see further discussion on career progress). To two persons the "sponsor" was the union, but these were extreme reactions to personal situations and the strategy appeared to produce more difficulties for the individuals. Two respondents did however take the view that this lack of interest on the part of the boss was an advantage, - that it left them free to take their own initiatives to create their own development programmes. In other cases, it confirmed the individual in his decision to seek to leave the organisation - as one technical specialist observed. "I've written my boss off. I took my own qualifications at night school and I am also taking the Daily Telegraph".

Also of interest here was the large group of respondents who recorded "not sure" for this question. These were all questioned on this reply. In eight cases the respondents reported that all other aspects of the relationship with the boss were good or satisfactory and the "not sure" response reflected a genuine conflict.
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On the one hand they recorded that they would have liked their boss to take some positive initiatives, but their reported dilemma was that they did not know specifically what they wanted from him. Such replies as "Well what could he do to help?", or "I can't expect him to help me; he's got his job". "I suppose it is really my job". They were not prepared to blame him and although in this group there was a vague disquiet, they appeared to have reduced their expectations of their boss and reluctantly they had accepted responsibility or partial responsibility for their own development.

Boss's interference in their work

Nine of the respondents felt that their bosses interfered excessively in their work. This interference took a number of forms. One team leader suggested that his boss really had no job and was constantly seeking to dominate the way the respondent organised his job. Another interpreted the interference as stemming from feelings of insecurity on the part of the boss, who in consequence asked for detailed reports and even gave the same task to more than one person to cover himself. In another case, the interference was seen as seeking to steal the respondent's credit for a job well done. To yet another person, who was newly appointed in the position, the interference was seen as a reflection of the boss's lack of confidence in him, but he was optimistic that, as he proved himself, so he would be given more scope and autonomy.

The individuals reported that the way they sought to handle this was by discussions with the boss but in many cases they regretted that this turned into a confrontation where one or other lost his temper. From the interviews it appeared that this situation was a most difficult, emotional one, particularly where they per-
ceived the interference as stemming from the boss's own difficulties and insecurities. It was here that two of the managers reported the value of humour as a device for seeking to rebuff the interfering managers. Their concern stemmed in part from a feeling of inadequacy in handling this emotionally charged interaction - "the boss loses his temper" but it also stemmed from their lack of clarity as to what was a reasonable level of attention. This observation seems to lend support to Hall's argument (Hall, 1971) that the boss needed to develop a sense of supportive autonomy, treading "a fine line between allowing a man independence (i.e. sink or swim) on the one hand, and providing assistance with excessive control, on the other hand" (p. 27).

Boss's remoteness and unapproachability

In reply to the question on the individual's ability to discuss work problems with the boss, forty-three recorded that this was no problem, a similar finding to that of Rosen (1961, b), who had observed that superiors were willing to talk over their problems with them (p. 157).

The three, who had recorded "not sure", had new bosses and they were still trying to establish relationships with these new people. The remaining three, because of the lack of respect and lack of confidence in their boss, gave the impression that they did not particularly want to discuss their work problems with him. They were rather engaged in a game of "one upmanship", keeping him in the dark so that they could impress other levels in the hierarchy, particularly other production managers. This they knew was a dangerous game and there was no way of telling from the interview how well they played it. Their devices included amongst others sending copies of their reports to other bosses, putting certain items in
writing. They took solace in the view that other colleagues held similar low opinions of their boss and therefore did not feel too isolated in their manoevrings.

The nine people, who felt that they could not discuss feelings of stress with their boss, considered that to some extent this was not their boss's responsibility. "I would deal with it personally". They observed that to admit to being under stress would be an admission of weakness that in turn would make them vulnerable or less promotable. Thus, such statements as "Well everyone feels under the weather at some stage; you can't keep running to the boss". In view of these types of responses, it would be interesting to see if the thirty-six, who recorded that they could discuss feelings of stress with their boss, actually did.

In some cases the respondents were able to excuse the remoteness of their boss on the grounds that he was extremely busy and they wondered whether they could really expect him to spend time with them. But in other cases the individuals were highly critical of their boss's remoteness. This was particularly apparent when a low level of interest was linked to a lack of trust and to the view that they could not count on the boss for support. Their response to this was to take their own initiatives and for some, as in their own personal development, this was an opportunity. They could use the freedom to seek after other patrons.

Lack of support from the boss.

Twelve people recorded that they were not confident of their boss's support when they made a decision. This meant for a number that they felt exposed and vulnerable. On the one hand they wanted "visibility" so that they could be identified for promotion, but there was a limit to the risks they were prepared to take. A
particular area, identified as a high risk one, was in industrial relations, where if they felt they could not trust their boss, a number of strategies were adopted. They would take steps to implicate him in their decisions, perhaps in the presence of witnesses or by sending memos; they would turn a blind eye to malpractice, rather than risk being let down; they would set lower standards of performance for subordinates, rather than be exposed if there was industrial relations resistance.

This balancing act between visibility and exposure was made more difficult if they were "boss dependent" for promotion. Stewart (1976) developed a useful framework for the analysis of jobs in terms of boss dependency but she acknowledged that it did not include dependence upon the boss for security and promotion, "as this will vary with the policies of the organisation as well as in some situations with the personality of the boss". Such dependency, particularly for security, did vary as Dr. Stewart suggested but it also varied with the type of job, with different organisational structures and career options. It was seen in this study to be of crucial importance to the individual who did not feel able to trust his boss and yet at the same time was dependent upon him for promotion opportunities. This will be considered more fully at later discussions of the individual and his career management.

(ii) Colleague Relationships

Colleague relationships have been identified as a potential source of great satisfaction or of great strain. For example, Morris (1975) has submitted "In many ways, the manager's relations with his colleagues are the most relaxed yet constructive activities of the whole cross of relationships. Yet here too the trends are complex. The growing emphasis on performance and "results" may
lead to colleagues being set against one another as rivals" (p. 58). Pahl and Pahl (1971) talked about the manager being "forced into a love-hate relationship with colleagues" (p. 25). Kay (1974) noted that "one of the things middle managers have to learn to do is to cope with each other" (p. 121). In this study, in addition to the discussion on social needs, the following questions were directed towards identifying difficulties in those relationships. Also set out below are the correlation statistics.

Table 4.3: Relationships with Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) My colleagues in the organisation are willing to try out new ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) My colleagues are very defensive about their own departments and work areas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) I can share my difficulties with colleagues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Most of my colleagues should not have got where they are</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) There are too many political manoeuvrings and back-stabbings here</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) I find myself involved in conflicts of personality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) I can trust my fellow managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (N.A.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Correlation of "Colleague" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Willing to try new ideas</td>
<td>-.2625</td>
<td>.1436</td>
<td>-.0584</td>
<td>-.2197</td>
<td>-.2777</td>
<td>.1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Defensive about depts. &amp; areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.3643</td>
<td>.3082</td>
<td>.1314</td>
<td>.2183</td>
<td>-.4203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Share difficulties where they are</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.5019</td>
<td>-.2615</td>
<td>-.0647</td>
<td>.2689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Should not have got where they are</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.1723</td>
<td>.1396</td>
<td>-.2992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Too many political manoeuvrings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.3255</td>
<td>-.5266</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Involved in conflicts of personality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1073</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) Trust fellow managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of variables were involved in this area and the questions were not sufficiently focused in themselves to highlight these. This was illustrated in the relatively low correlation between some of the questions and from the interviews, it was clear that the term "colleague" was seen by some to refer to persons within the same department (this was particularly true of the technical specialists), whereas for others (the senior respondents), colleagues were members of other departments. The respondents made a distinction between the difficulties in departmental relationships as between quality control and production, and friction between individuals - inter-departmental as opposed to interpersonal. There was in addition the problem of degree; virtually all the respondents identified some colleague relationship difficulties at some time, but for many, these were offset by perceived good relationships with others.

For the purposes of this discussion, the section will be divided into co-operation between departments, internal politics, inter-
personal conflict.

Co-operation between departments.

Some thirty people felt that colleagues were defensive about their departments and work areas. The majority of these accepted this, albeit with regret. But eleven were also critical of their colleagues' approach to new ideas. This group in the main consisted of the somewhat younger respondents from service departments, who were complaining about the lack of acceptance, by their older production colleagues, of their ideas and advice. These problems of the advisory function have been well documented (Sayles, 1964, p. 86 ff). Stewart (1976) talked of peer dependency and identified a number of variables influencing this (p. 63 ff). These variables included the extent to which the individual required the services, supplies, co-operation of others; the degree to which they were required to provide services etc. to others; and the extent to which they had to deal with peers of higher professional status (p. 65).

A strategy mentioned by three of the respondents for dealing with the situation was to attempt to pair with the department against a common enemy or to seek the establishment of what Schein (1965) has termed "a super-ordinate goal" (p. 83). In the case of the quality assurance engineer, he had made himself available to assist the line manager during the period of an important inspection by a major customer. The Industrial Relations Adviser had gone out of his way to provide support and advice to one difficult departmental manager at the time of a major dispute, in the hope that this would lead to improved relationships. Special efforts were mentioned by the respondents to develop closer relationships - "I spend more time talking to them, trying to get to know them". However, this remained an area of concern. In spite of their efforts there was
an instability in their relationships with certain members of the organisation and it was not simply a question of the take-up of ideas. Issues of blame and attack and allegations of scapegoating were mentioned as entering into the relationship.

Internal politics.

Mant (1977) saw as "an outcome of bigness, the creation of a competitive ball park in middle management where the rules of the game and the criteria of performance are so vague that the players tend to deal in power rather than authority" (p. 55). Some eighteen respondents expressed concern about this internal power game. The internal political manoeuvrings and problems of trusting colleagues were linked in the minds of the respondents. There was a concern about being blamed if something went wrong. This could be the product of a customer complaint or an industrial relations difficulty or a production breakdown. For example, the team leader of a group of instrument mechanics commented that production management were always ready to blame them for difficulties. Instrument failure was easily noticed, although the cause might be negligence by production operatives. In this particular case he recorded that he did not feel too at risk and his response was somewhat aggressive. "They need me, so I bargain with them".

Other departmental specialists seem to be more vulnerable. This was particularly true about those in work study, where they talked of their department being made the scapegoat for industrial relations difficulties. To avoid blame and attack, the respondents responded with a number of self-protecting devices. "I don't give them the ammunition". "I cover my tracks". "I make sure I am fireproof". "Although I try to be helpful, I make sure I am right".
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"I double-check the facts". Two of the respondents made reference to putting decisions and discussions into writing in order to avoid blame and criticism afterwards. Although a number condemned "politicking", there was some indication from their responses to other questions that they too played at this internal political game. They did not all impress the researcher as men of complete integrity, open, frank and honest in their dealing with colleagues. In one case a technical specialist talked of "a deal of silence". "I have material with which I could shop them if they set me up." To some indeed overtly the internal political game appeared to be a source of excitement and challenge. "Well, you can play one group off against another".

Interpersonal conflict.

At some stage in their life in the organisation, most of the individuals recorded that they became involved in some interpersonal conflict. To a number this was a major area of concern. This was a function of a number of variables. Some found it very difficult to handle emotional outbursts or they had to deal quite often in the normal course of their work, with volatile individuals. Again, their organisational role, perhaps involving an "auditing" function (Sayles, 1964), created situations where personality clashes seemed inevitable.

Avoidance of contact was the most frequently mentioned strategy here. A senior manager indicated that he found certain of his colleagues in other departments particularly "wearing" and difficult to work with. He acknowledged sending a subordinate, wherever possible, to meetings with these departments. But he was by no means pleased at this approach. He saw it as "chickening out". A number
of others shared with this respondent the difficulty of dealing
with emotional outbursts. Two recorded that when this happened, they
over-reacted and it became a "slinging match". Where work contact
could not be avoided, some of the informal social contacts might
be minimised. On Saturday mornings, an informal coffee group of
managers assembled in the General Manager's office and one of the
respondents stated that he deliberately stayed away from these.
Another less senior respondent avoided taking coffee with his coll-
eagues, preferring to stay alone in his office with a flask. Two
other respondents mentioned the role of humour to reduce the tension
that might be generated from some departmental or interpersonal
conflict. A middle-manager, whose job included "auditing" his
colleagues, talked of using "banter to try to take the sting out".

Whilst a number acknowledged these difficulties and also
that they were not satisfied with their personal handling of the
situation, others denied any difficulties or saw the difficulties
as stemming from others. This displacement of blame was illustrated
by one respondent, whom the interviewer knew from other sources had
difficulties in relationships. In the interview he acknowledged
that he had problems with colleagues. "They don't accept me."
He argued that this was because he was a graduate and had hobbies
like playing bridge. He asserted "I take the view I can't pretend
to be dull", suggesting thereby that the reasons for the difficulties
stemmed directly from colleagues. One respondent talked of having
to "develop a thick skin and not letting it bother you". But the
indications were from the interview that it did "bother" him. It
might be observed parenthetically that management education, par-
ticularly in this situation, the Diploma in Management Studies,
seemed to have failed to assist in the development of the appropriate
skills to cope with emotionally-charged relationships with peers.

(iii) Relationships with Subordinates

Four questions were asked to ascertain the quality of relationships between the respondents and their subordinates. These, together with the responses and the correlation table are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Table 4.6: Correlation of &quot;Subordinate&quot; Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Would like to replace them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Good relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Work well as a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) Need too much supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation between the responses to three questions, Nos. 5, 40, 49 were highly significant but responses to question 32 did not correlate significantly with any other. It will be noted also that in replying to question 32, no one recorded that relation-
ships with their subordinates were other than good. This might mean that indeed all the relationships were of that kind, but at least two other interpretations are possible. Some individuals might not have been prepared to indicate in the interviews that their relationships were not good, since this could be perceived as critical of themselves. Again, they might not have been prepared to admit to themselves that their relationships were unsatisfactory, a form of cognitive distortion to avoid facing up to reality. No conclusive evidence can be presented by the researcher here, although the lack of correlation with other questions and the other issues discussed raised considerable doubts about the first interpretation, i.e. that all relationships with subordinates were good.

In addition to the questions on the Work Attitude questionnaire, the individuals were asked to rate their say and influence over subordinates and the replies are set out in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that some 80% of the respondents rated their say and influence as "a great deal" or "a very great deal". Rosemary Stewart (1976) has suggested that in assessing the demands of subordinate relationships, one important dimension to be considered
was the "compliance" of subordinates. In her study she measured this in terms of the extent to which the subordinates were unionised, the risk of industrial action and the basis of the manager's authority (p. 52). In this study the subordinates of most of the managers were highly unionised, often in a cohesive form and very capable of taking industrial action. To some of the younger managers, their authority was particularly fragile in that they lacked often experience, superior knowledge or even traditional respect. In spite of this, they indicated a high level of control and that relationships were good. It was as if there was a displacement of blame on to an impersonal body. For example some of the managers seemed able to record good relationships with the subordinate as individuals, as persons, but then to criticise them collectively in an impersonal manner, talking of bad industrial relations, bad practices etc., as if these criticisms did not apply to the individuals.

However, some ten respondents did state that relationships with subordinates were causing some form of dissatisfaction. A number of highly critical phrases were used about their behaviour - "You cannot rely on them." "They are not up to the job". "They have no commitment." "They are overpaid in relation to what they contribute." But in addition to criticising them, a more important set of phrases were included such as - "I inherited them." "The problem existed before I took over". "The union dictates promotion". "I would not have picked them". "It's not my fault; I've tried all sorts of approaches". By this means the respondents might have been seeking to persuade others that the shortcomings of the subordinates were not their fault. It appeared to the researcher that he was not the first to whom these phrases were addressed. They seemed too "rehearsed" and a number agreed that they had discussed
these problems with their boss, who "understood" the position. There was however an exception. One individual, with a small team of three persons, seemed to accept responsibility for these subordinates, although he was completely dissatisfied with their performance. He spent a long time in the interview outlining his problems and asked the researcher for advice. His boss was near to retirement and he considered that he had disassociated himself from the situation. Thus the individual respondent was convinced (perhaps by his boss's own statements) that the subordinates were his own problem and through meeting this challenge, he had to prove himself as a manager. From the extended discussion on this point, it appeared that this issue was unresolved and remained a source of worry and concern.

Others had become resigned to their situation - "Nothing I can do about it, so I don't let it bother me". "I don't lose any sleep over it". "What can I do?". But some of the respondents did try to get to grips with what they saw as inadequate performance. "I try to define their responsibilities very tightly to control them". "When I delegate, I give very detailed and explicit instructions". "I produce very detailed statements on procedures and targets". They identified this area as demanding a great deal of their time. "I just have to work harder, checking up on them". "I keep on to them, doing frequent rounds". But the resignation returned with observations about lowering performance standards - "I no longer expect very much from them."

Amongst a group of somewhat senior managers, pessimism, concern, disenchantment were recorded, stemming to a great extent from the unsatisfactory world of industrial relations. It was ironical that, whilst a younger group of technical specialists in the sample were
striving to gain supervisory experience, the more senior respondents, for whom the management of subordinates was a dominant activity, were trying to find ways of minimising the problems of supervising them, perhaps by dropping out production management. As one manager indicated "A production manager ought not to be expected to battle for performance for more than 5-10 years." He argued that provision ought to be made for the production manager to return to being a technical specialist or a staff manager, after the age of 45 years.

b) Their Career Prospects

This section is divided into two main parts, the first concerned with the respondents' perception of their career development and the second with the issues of redundancy and security.

(i) Career development

There is set out below the questions, aimed at ascertaining the concerns of the respondents in respect of their career and promotion prospects. Questions 9, 39, 48 were directed towards their own personal career situation, whereas questions 4 and 21 permitted a comment upon the organisation (personal experiences still greatly influenced their responses to these two questions). Also set out below are the correlations of these responses.
Table 4.8: Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Correlation of "Career" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Prospects</td>
<td>-.1369</td>
<td>.5281</td>
<td>-.4784</td>
<td>-.0531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as good as</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Stayed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.3759</td>
<td>.2519</td>
<td>.5913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.2619</td>
<td>.3606</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Have</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.1957</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to get on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) Feel &quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trapped&quot; in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that some seventeen people recorded that they felt trapped in their present job (of these, fifteen recorded that they had stayed too long at the same level). A broad division of this number could be made into the younger respondents mainly technical specialists with few, if any, subordinates (twelve) and the older more senior group (five).
The first group considered in the main that they were trapped in their specialism, i.e. research, work study, quality control, metallurgy, etc. Their lack of supervisory experience blocked them from promotion into a wider career arena. They believed therefore they were in a vicious circle. When they applied for promotion out of their specialism, usually into production management, they were told they needed supervisory experience, which they could not acquire without such a job change.

A common strategy amongst technical specialists to manage this situation had been to try to use the DMS as a lever to gain a job change to a supervisory position. Its failure so far to assist them in this led them to criticise the promotion policy which had encouraged them to study. But they were in the main still hopeful. They were not reconciled to their present position. They sought to achieve a wider visibility within their work in the hope that, when jobs became vacant, production management would support them in their application. This visibility was sought after by a number of techniques. They would willingly undertake production-type assignments, send copies of their reports to production management, ask for career interviews with the staff development manager, apply for internal jobs. In addition, they sought to avoid being linked with a specialist or departmental label. They attempted to extend their career options by presenting themselves under a broad heading and they argued quite strongly that they were generalists rather than specialists. The departmental manager saw himself as working in production management and capable of moving anywhere in this field. The departmental mechanical engineer wanted to see engineering as his field or in some cases the whole field of management as a career option. This partly explained their attempts to move quite frequently, for they were worried that, if they stayed too long, they would
become labelled and caught in a specialism. Yet they acknowledged the need for time to gain the necessary experience. For those not yet promoted into a supervisory or management position, this was a major career worry in that they had already become labelled and their career options, they felt, were narrowed. If their specialism was a scarce one, like electronic engineering, this was not a major source of worry; if it was research metallurgy, then it became the career preoccupation.

They remained optimistic, this optimism being illustrated in their responses to questions about prospects. Although they recorded they were trapped, they were not too critical of the prospects (note low correlation between question 4 and questions 9 and 48). In the interviews they recorded that some change would occur when the de-manning process had run itself out or that new opportunities would be provided by some new technical development. This optimism against the backcloth of declining job opportunities will be considered more fully in a later section.

Amongst the older group who had recorded that they felt trapped, two did so because, in Klemme's (1975) terms, they were suffering from "career disenchantment." They were not satisfied with their current job but they did not want the next level of promotion. In one case the individual had set himself a five year stint in the job to fulfill his family commitments. He had determined that he would then have a complete change to a lower status, craft-type job. The other person argued that he could make himself satisfied with his current level if it was correctly graded. He would then immerse himself in the technical aspects, rather than in the managerial aspects and seek his satisfaction that way. The remaining three more senior persons of this seventeen were beginning to feel that
they had reached the limit of their promotion. They were only partially of this view, as if gradually coming to terms with it but not totally prepared to admit they had reached their limit. One respondent recognised that he would have to move to achieve any further promotion; he felt that in five years time, such a move would be possible because of family considerations. He acknowledged that he "might be kidding himself about this". All three seemed to be gradually lowering their aspirations and at the same time changing the position of centrality that work played in their total life. To one of the three, gardening and a smallholding had become his major hobby, so important that he had recently turned down a management course because - "Who would plant my early potatoes?". The other two quoted external bodies with which they were associated and which clearly played an increasingly important part in their life space.

Eleven persons believed that they would have to move from the organisation to get on. Five of these recorded they felt trapped in their current posts; the remaining six did not feel trapped but nevertheless considered they would have to move to improve their position. This did not mean these eleven persons were actively pursuing jobs outside. There was some evidence of postponement, "wait and see", a sense of reluctance amongst nine of the eleven people actually to press to move. Only two of these recorded they were actively looking for jobs outside. The three other persons, who were convinced they would have to move from the company and were actively seeking for jobs outside, reported that their salary levels made job-seeking difficult. They were trying to use the DMS and other qualifications, such as a degree from the Open University or the IWSOM Diploma, as a lever. They were concerned
to undertake work which would help them in their external window-
dressing. This meant obtaining experience.

To move from this organisation was a difficult task for many of those interviewed. Job opportunities in their specialism were limited or even non-existent outside the Steel Industry. It would mean a change of home and might mean working in what might be seen as a less satisfactory environment. Although the future of the organisation could not be totally assured, the individuals in the main felt they could, or should postpone this career decision "until the children had grown up" or "until I've got more experience". They recorded that it was "not serious at present". "In another couple of years I must come to some decision".

A number had tried to obtain some clarification about their careers and promotion. One individual had actually confronted his manager, "Tell me what I have to do to get promotion and I'll do it". He was however unhappy for he had received an inadequate response from his boss, who had been embarrassed by the question and had "blustered" in reply. The respondents remained uncertain about their future, this uncertainty being reflected in the responses to question thirty-nine. Some nineteen had recorded "not sure" about whether they would have to move - the highest number of "not sure" responses, when compared to the other forty-nine questions (the next highest number, sixteen, was for the question on promotion policy). It could be that they avoided answering these questions for they believed that somehow it would reflect badly on them. They might not have trusted the interviewer. More probable was the interpretation that they genuinely were "not sure", being unable to resolve the dilemma of the future.
ii) Redundancy and Security

There is set out below the one question on this aspect of career prospects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) The possibility of me being made redundant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to this question did not correlate significantly with any other responses except with the "need deficiency" scores on security needs (see Chapter three) (.4497, .001 signif). The discussion on this question was somewhat limited by the fact that similar ground had been covered at the first interview, when exploring the responses to the question on "security needs".

The seven, who recorded a possibility of redundancy, were each quite different in their job positions and not all were describing a fear of actual redundancy so much as a fear of not continuing in their existing job. For example, one young respondent, aged 28 years, had been appointed as acting manager into a position, identified within the organisation as a most difficult one.* This job was about to be advertised throughout the B.S.C. Thus he was about to apply for his own job which, if he obtained on a permanent basis, would be a milestone in his career. Another respondent noted that in the structural changes, his job level might disappear "but I shall be O.K.". One of the respondents, who noted concern here, was currently actively seeking a job elsewhere. He asked for advice from the interviewer in completing job application forms and on

* The previous job holder had requested a transfer because of the stress and this person was also one of the seven.
interview technique. He was entirely dissatisfied with his world of work and this coloured every reply to the questionnaire. By expressing the view that he might be made redundant, (which was very unlikely in the short term), he was perhaps confirming and reinforcing his decision to leave.

The remaining respondents were all over 40 years and their concern was about their career future over the next 20 years. When asked about their strategies for handling this situation, the typical response was "I don't let it worry me". This type of avoidance might also be reflected in the small number who noted a concern and in the large number of "not sures" (twelve here was the third highest from the fifty questions). A number of writers have emphasised the job security needs of managers. For example Kay (1974) felt job insecurity to be "a source of continuing concern for many middle management" (p. 111). In the face of the over-capacity of the industry and its financial losses, works closure at some point in the future had to remain a possibility. There was nothing the individual could do about this and, bearing in mind this lack of control, it was perhaps not surprising that they simply expressed doubts about this and observed "I don't think about it".

c) Pay and Conditions

Table 4.10: Pay and Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13) The pay I receive does not reward me adequately for my efforts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) The working conditions are on the whole good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) The pay in this organisation is as good as with any other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent refused to answer this question on the grounds that pay should not be discussed.
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As would be expected, the responses to question 13 and question 31 correlated significantly (-.4868: sign .001).

A large number of those who viewed the pay as not as good as at other organisations, held the view that the grading levels at this works were not as good as at other parts of the industry. This led to some nine out of the twenty-four, who were unhappy with pay, to look to the unions as the means of rectifying this. Union activity amongst these respondents varied considerably from active union leadership to passive membership. One of the latter group was surprised at his own membership and interest: he commented that now middle management were turning to union membership and pressure in much the same way that foremen and supervisors had some ten years previously. Active union leadership had led in two cases to advice to the individuals from their boss that it was not in their best interests to be so active, implying that promotion was a better route. This route was the one chosen, at this stage in their career, by some eight of the twenty-four. They were therefore prepared to look to a change in job as the means of improving their pay. But four of the remaining recorded that they were resigned to the pay situation. "My wife likes it here, so I can make do." "I like the job so much that I put up with it."

The remaining three were trying individually to rectify the pay situation. Two were currently in negotiation with senior management over an improvement in their gradings and the third, a technical specialist, recorded that, as he was paid for overtime, he adjusted his pay by increasing the amount of overtime he worked (although he admitted this had led to some difficulties at home).

Working conditions did not feature very significantly in the interviews. Only nine felt that conditions were not good, but
they in the main did not object to this, accepting that it was a function of the type of industry in which they worked. Thus they did not feel slighted by this. But Fisher (1952) has argued "the typical executive wants to look the part" (p. 11) and one respondent was very concerned about the inadequacy of office provision made for production management, particularly when compared to headquarter and staff offices. He commented wryly about the office the interviewer was using, comparing it to the facilities for production management. He was disenchanted with his own career in production management and to him, these conditions were a symbol of the lack of benefits associated with his career.

d) Factors associated with the Job

Although in designing the questionnaire, a distinction had been made between the job of the individual respondent and his role in the organisation, this distinction proved of little value in the interviews. Job and role were seen as synonymous. The discussions, based on the responses to the attitude survey, identified three major areas of concern about their job. The first was concerned with the lack of challenge and stimulus - with being underloaded; the second was a condition of overload, of work pressure; and the third was that associated with conflict and ambiguity surrounding their job. There is some over simplification in this categorisation and this will be commented upon, where appropriate in the analyses that follow.

i) The absence of challenge/stimulus in the job

The following questions provided the starting point to discussions on this aspect of their quality of working life.
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Table 4.11: Stimulus within the Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) The level of work required of me is not sufficiently demanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I find this work stimulating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) I am not given enough responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) There is too little work for me to do here</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to these questions were found to be related to the questions concerned with length of stay in the job and feelings of being trapped. The correlation coefficients and significance levels are recorded in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Correlation of "Job" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Level of work not sufficiently demanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.4965</td>
<td>.5947</td>
<td>.6511</td>
<td>.4682</td>
<td>.4146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Job stimulating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.3724</td>
<td>-.4302</td>
<td>-.3809</td>
<td>-.5296</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Not enough responsibility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.5065</td>
<td>.4695</td>
<td>.3058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Too little work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.3672</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1807</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Stayed at present level too long</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5913</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) Trapped in current job</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group of respondents with jobs that lacked stimulus was preoccupied with moving either to another job, or in some cases to another company - thus the correlation with questions on "staying too
long at the same level" and "feeling trapped". An attempt was made in the interviews to find what short-term personalising activities were adopted. A number said that they felt able to extend the job by taking on additional responsibilities, by making themselves available, volunteering for other work. They sought to choose those tasks that provided them with visibility, challenge and stimulus, but this process brought with it some difficulties. They might be accused of neglecting the routine jobs. In some cases, their policy of accepting more responsibility had led to an overload and to personal dissatisfaction with their gradings. But of the twenty-three who would have welcomed more responsibility, eleven were quite despondent. This group were broadly divided into four, who had a high managerial content to their job, and seven who had no subordinates or only one or two.

Amongst the more senior managers, the theme was one of disenchantment; the enthusiasm had gone from the job although they had a great deal to do. They saw this as something of a "grind". Two were resigned to this in the short term. They mentioned no day-to-day method for handling it but both had a clear time scale. In one case the individual had accepted a job he did not want. "In two years time I shall challenge management and demand recognition and a move into the area I want". In the other case the individual had made a decision that production management was not for him. He was only 30 years old and was postponing the start of a family for he was determined to change career and to move.

The other two were older and could not see a dramatic job change, yet both wanted something extra in their work life. One person reported that he was reverting back to an emphasis on the technical aspects of his job. He was seeking to become the expert in the
field, trying at the same time to reduce the managerial content of his job, which he now saw as less satisfying. In the other case, he was adjusting to his job. No longer did it occupy such importance in his life. He spoke of his outside commitments, the Masonic Order, social events; he recorded his love for the countryside and pleasure at being in this area. He spoke of his young family. At work, there were friendships which came from his long service in the organisation and he particularly enjoyed the camaraderie of the middle managers' dining room.

Those with few or no subordinates had been in their job for a number of years and they seemed to suffer from what Pettigrew (1972) has termed an increased "response capability". Pettigrew argued that an individual's capability might be enhanced by management training and, if not given opportunity for expression, this could lead to frustration, aggressiveness and perhaps later to apathy or "moving on". The respondents had all undertaken the Diploma in Management, which as a number indicated had increased their expectations. They measured their success or failure in relation to their movement into management, to achieving supervisor/project leader status.

The absence of such "progress" led, as Pettigrew predicted, to a range of reported responses. For example, three recorded the union activity as an outlet. In one case, this had become a major part of his life at work, but the other two had now reduced their involvement, one having been advised by his manager so to do with an implied offer of a move, which had not yet materialised. Members of this group recorded that they focused on themselves and their technical specialism. "I work on my own thing"; "I improve my competence in the job"; "I read a lot around the subject"; "I try
to extend my range of subjects"; "I need stimulus that's why I took the DMS and now I am studying German". They had written off the actual job and indicated that the only hope would come with a move. A number noted that it was in leisure that stimulus could be found, emphasising the instrumental role of work. "Work is to buy my leisure; it is leisure that's important." Two indicated in addition the contribution of peer relationships. "If I am fed up with little to do - I spin out the job and spend time talking with people in the plant." The other saw horseplay with his colleagues, banter, verbal satire against the system as a significant activity - "sharing the burden and knocking the system".

These strategies therefore were either concerned with emphasising and developing intrinsic elements of the job, extending the opportunities for stimulus beyond the job boundary, either within the organisation or outside work.

ii) Pressures and Overload

The following questions were designed to explore areas of pressure and overload.

Table 4.13: Pressures on the Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) I am required to make too many decisions on this job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Any mistake I make here is treated with understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) I am faced with heavy time pressures on my job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) There is too much work for me to undertake properly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) The standards of performance here are always being tightened</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.14: Correlation of "Pressure" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Too many decisions</td>
<td>.0697</td>
<td>.1501</td>
<td>.4114</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Mistakes treated with understanding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.4340</td>
<td>-.1432</td>
<td>.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24)</td>
<td>Heavy time pressures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.2477</td>
<td>.2918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47)</td>
<td>Too much work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50)</td>
<td>Standards of performance tightened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be seen from the above table, the correlations between some of these questions were not significant. There were a number of reasons for this. Question no. 12 proved to be non-discriminating. Nobody was prepared to say they had to make too many decisions, even though some were subjected to pressures on their time which seemed to stem from the necessity of taking action. This would suggest that there was a "social desirability" bias, influencing how people responded. No-one acknowledged that they were required to take too many decisions, perhaps because decision making was the essence, as they saw it, of management. The low correlation between the question on time pressures and too much work was due to the fact that for some people, there was an endless queue of jobs to be undertaken - "It is like painting the Forth Bridge". Notwithstanding this, they did not feel under time pressure in the sense that they had refused to accept responsibility for meeting time targets. "I do what I can - the rest has to wait".

There was no significant correlation between the responses to the question on mistakes and on standards of performance. Those who felt mistakes were not treated with understanding were in the
main criticising their immediate bosses. A number, when registering that standards of performance were being tightened, recorded this in an impersonal manner, relating it to changing specifications in tube and steel making. They were also commenting on the financial position of the industry which had led to an emphasis on higher productivity. They were making what appeared to be statements of fact, rather than reflecting personal concern. At the interviews therefore, rather than seek to unravel these variables, the researcher concentrated on identifying how individuals reported that they managed job pressures.

The main method seemed to be for individuals to work out their own flexi-time, allowing work to flow into their non-work time, either by working longer hours or by taking work home. This in turn led to difficulties at home and the strategies they then had to adopt to cope with this will be discussed later. The adoption of "managerial approaches" to managing time made up another set of devices that were reported. These included an emphasis on delegation. Three people were particularly satisfied with this approach. Two were personal assistants to senior managers and were able to use their boss's name as the authority for delegation. The third was a senior manager who had established a daily routine for plant visits, so that his supervisors awaited his daily visit. Thus they tended not to get in touch with him beforehand and by this means his office became a haven for the limited time that he spent there.

Others were not so satisfied, either because of inadequate numbers of staff due to cut-backs in manning, or because of reported low standard of their subordinates. They tended to attempt to establish priority systems or criter{a, rules, with which to determine what action should be taken. If a priority system for undertaking work could be agreed with some significant authority figure,
they then had a structure within which to operate and to use to avoid blame.

In spite of these approaches the individuals remained unhappy about this aspect of their work. They noted that they had to attend meetings without adequate preparation - "I have to bull-shit my way through." They stated as a shortcoming of the DMS that it had failed to provide the answers to these situations. A number of the younger managers thought that this pressure was an isolated period but the older managers no longer seemed to believe this. It was this unlimited pressure that had confirmed some in their decision not to seek after promotion or to drop out of this type of work completely. As one manager logically recorded, "I haven't solved this problem, so I shall have to change jobs". Whether he would do so was another matter.

iii) Ambiguity and Uncertainty

The following questions were designed to identify unsatisfactory aspects of respondents' work situation involving uncertainty and ambiguity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Because of the different pressures, I am left uncertain as to which action to take</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) My responsibilities and authority are adequately defined for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) I am not sure whether I am doing a good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16: Correlation of "Ambiguity and Uncertainty" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Pressures leave me uncertain</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>0.3071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Responsibilities and authority adequately defined</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Not sure doing a good job</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an absence of high correlations between the responses to the questions on ambiguity and uncertainty. Each question seemed to stimulate discussion on a number of different aspects of their world of work and a more concentrated study, with more focussed questions, would be necessary to unravel the complex variables interacting on this aspect of their work. The questions during the interview therefore concentrated on how individuals managed the ambiguity and uncertainty that they identified as surrounding the job. To some this ambiguity was an opportunity - "It gives me scope." "It lets me take initiatives". "I can use it to buck the system and to build up the job". Thus those who felt able to tolerate ambiguity, also felt able to use it. One individual actually suggested it provided him with a means of blame avoidance. The fact that his duties and responsibilities were unclear meant that if things became difficult, he could use this lack of clarity as a protection and as an escape route. But amongst others there was a degree of concern. "The lack of definition gives me scope, provided I can cover myself." "I have to struggle to cover myself against recriminations." This concern in turn led some to seek a form of structure, so that they could achieve a balance between freedom and criticism. This structure might involve the establishment of some form of priority. "I have made production the "God" and if in doubt I make this the criterion for decisions."
In two cases attempts to structure and to obtain definition involved the use of the union. In both cases, it seemed to be a last resort, stemming from frustration. In the first situation, the union had been approached to press for a job description to clarify the responsibilities of the individual for people on secondment to the department. This had arisen because of a dispute between the respondent and the seconded personnel. The net effect of the negotiations that followed had been to reduce the scope of the job by clearly stating that he was not responsible for their activities - that he was simply to act as adviser. This outcome he now regretted, for he no longer possessed the much-sought "responsibility for others."

In the second case, as the result of union backing, the individual, together with a number of colleagues, had interpreted their job descriptions very strictly and narrowly. This had blocked the introduction of a new practice which the respondent agreed was a good idea and which would have provided more variety and challenge for him.

Two other respondents suggested that the ambiguity and uncertainty at present prevailing was temporary. One of these had recently been appointed to a quite demanding middle management post and was still not clear about his duties, responsibilities and authority. As a "new boy", he felt able to ask and to display his ignorance - almost to hide behind his inexperience. He recognised that this would only be possible for a limited time but was optimistic that during this period he would obtain a clearer picture and the necessary expertise to enable him to cope. In the other case, the "temporary" period seemed to be more a statement of hope, rather than based upon an objective appraisal of the situation.
e) Work and Non-work Relationships

Three aspects of the relationship between the work of the individual and the wider non-work situation were explored in the initial questionnaire. The first, and the main area studied, was the possible conflict between work and family/social life; the second was concerned with the desirability or otherwise of the area in which they lived; and the third was contribution of the work of the individual to society.

i) Conflict between work and non-work

There is set out below the questions and the responses aimed at exploring the relationships of work to the home and social life of the individual. In addition, in Table 4.18 are included the correlations of these variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have often to deal with conflicts of interests between those of the organisation and my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I do not find any conflict between the demands of my job responsibilities and my family/social responsibilities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The demands of the job are such that I have difficulty in maintaining my social and family activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18: Correlation of "Work/Non-Work" Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27) Conflict of interest between organisation and mine</td>
<td>-.2641</td>
<td>.0722</td>
<td>.2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) No conflict of demand from job and family</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-.6868</td>
<td>-.4494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) Difficulty in maintaining social/family activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Faced with heavy time pressures</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from the table that question 27 proved to be unsatisfactory. Individuals had different considerations when they have responded to it - sometimes it was a function of personality conflicts, sometimes job conflict between quality or production levels, or quality and cost: in other cases it was a work/non-work conflict. Included in the table above are the correlation coefficients for question 24, relating to time pressures at work. It will be noted that those who experienced these pressures at work tended to record difficulties in maintaining their family and social responsibilities. Although there was a significant correlation between question 35 and question 44, some of the respondents recorded that there was conflict in the demands of work and non-work but they did not have difficulty in maintaining their responsibilities. They were reluctant to indicate that they actually had difficulty in maintaining their responsibilities but they were prepared to indicate a conflict in demand. From the interviews that followed, there would seem to have been some denial of the reality of these pressures.

Some 20 persons recorded a conflict between the demands of the job and those of the family and social life. Not all these were reported as serious but there were a number of extreme cases. Here the individuals recorded that the job was so demanding that they...
returned home "shattered". Others recorded that the job required them to work long hours, to work week-ends, or to be on call in the evenings because of the shift-working. Their responses to this situation were various. A frequent reply was to present this situation as transitory. "I have isolated this period as unique and things will get better". "Home must take second place to the job over the next two years". "My wife and I have agreed that this is a special period". These respondents tended to be the younger managers, recently appointed and seeking to establish themselves. They were "prepared to work long hours as an investment," or "provided I get recognition". "I need to prove myself capable of promotion."

But one or two had set some limits to these long hours. "I won't work after 6.00 p.m., unless it's an emergency". "I'll no longer work 12 hours a day". During slack periods at work, one person indicated that he undertook a number of jobs at home in order to build up a store of goodwill for when the next period of heavy demand arrived.

The older managers, who recorded conflict, took one of three approaches. The first was to argue that although they gave pride of place to work, they were able to identify the compensations - a good salary, expensive holidays, a higher standard of living. "My wife gets a good allowance". One respondent was extremely emphatic, which suggested to the researcher he had been over this issue before. "My job needs overtime more than the home. The home gets comforts from my pay, so it must play second fiddle". Another felt that he had paid his price to the family by agreeing to stay at this company, rather than interrupt the children's education by moving.
There was some evidence of guilt amongst this group and of tension at home. "I wish my wife would find some interest outside the home". "She would like me to tell them to go to hell". But when pressed on this topic, a common reply was, "There is nothing I can do for the job demands this". "What can I do?". This would seem to be in line with the findings of Pahl and Pahl (1971) who concluded - "Many a wife felt a degree of antagonism towards her husband's firm, resenting the demands of the work and the inevitable conflicts between her husband's occupational and family roles, yet welcoming the material advantages the work brought to her family and the satisfactions it gave her husband" (p. 196).

The other group seemed to be gradually reducing their involvement in work. "As I grow older, I get better at blanking off work". "I have stopped taking work home and I am taking part in more and more leisure activities". "I have got my priorities right". "I am spending more and more time with the family". This reduction in involvement at work had been more rapid in two cases. Both were cases of demotion or setbacks in career progress. "I have neglected my family in the past for my career but now I reserve the right to look after myself and my home". Maintaining a balance between work and non-work for some meant lowering or adjusting their work ambitions. They recorded that the price of promotion would be too expensive in terms of their family and social commitments. They said that they were not prepared to "sell" themselves. In actual fact, there was some doubt whether the opportunity to gain the promotion about which they talked was indeed a possibility for all of them and this might have been their method of coming to terms with reality.

The third approach was to argue that it was a short-term situ-
ation, which they themselves would take steps to stop at some stage in the future. This latter group felt that they were trapped by family demands at the present, with children at school. They would do something about this, perhaps by totally dropping out of this type of work. One ex-craftsman who had gained rapid promotion to an important management position, had a plan, which he kept from the Company, to become a manual worker at some future date when the children were older. Another intended to leave and start his own business, again when the children were older.

The encroachment of work into non-work time was not seen as entirely undesirable. One individual recorded that he received a sense of importance from being called out in an emergency or contacted outside his normal hours. Another talked of responding to call outs because "life was at stake", a somewhat dramatised view of his job and the interviewer was left with the impression that it was his reputation that was at stake. A third and somewhat unusual example was of a senior technical expert who had accepted a worldwide trouble shooter job, partially, the researcher felt, to escape from domestic strains caused by having a mistress as well as a wife.

**ii) Location of Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23) My job requires me to live in an area different to the one I would choose.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from the above that 9 people recorded that the area in which they lived was not one they would choose. During the interviews, however, five of these indicated that they had responded to the question in terms of what was probably an unattainable
ideal. "I would like to have a home in the Lake District". "There are better places to live". "There are no lakes or mountains in this County". "I'd prefer to live on the coast". But they stated that this was not a serious problem for them and in two cases they went on to point to the positive aspects of their place of residence.

Two of the other four persons had some vague plan to change their residence. In one case this meant a move to a village when he had saved up enough money: in the other it was to be a move, when the children were somewhat older. In the remaining two cases, the place of residence was a dominant issue of concern. The first of these was a person who was engaged to a German girl. He was urgently seeking work in Germany for his fiancee's career in opera required this. Thus he was concerned to gain experience that would fit him for work in that country but he kept this intention to himself. To be so actively pursuing a job elsewhere might be perceived as a breach of loyalty and restrict his promotion chances. The second person was determined, with his wife, to make a life abroad in the Middle East. Their desire, or more emphatically their intention, to move appeared to dominate their overall approach to their work. The husband and wife had both recently returned to England, after being employed in Saudi Arabia and both were actively endeavouring to develop a marketable expertise to ensure a good job when they returned. They had singleness of purpose and had determined they would have no children. They saw all their experience and studies here as instrumental in securing them jobs in the Middle East.

iii) Contribution to Society

Only one question was asked on this aspect and as will be
noted this proved to be non-discriminatory in the sense that only one person expressed concern.

Question | Strongly Agree | Not Sure | Strongly Disagree
---|---|---|---
7) My job contributes to some degree to the good of society | 5 | 34 | 9 | 1 | 0

The individual who recorded disagreement, when questioned about this, noted that, as a user of the earth's resources which were finite, the company was depleting man's heritage. He was resigned to this and took no positive action to deal with his concern. "What can I do?". Some of the nine "not sures", although less emphatic, fell into the same category. Their mode of coping seemed to be one of resignation.

f) Organisational Life

Introduction

In the design of the work attitude questionnaire, the section on organisational life, based on the framework of Cooper and Marshall (1975a)*, was designed to identify the areas of concern that might arise from being in this large organisation. These included the possibility of a loss of a sense of belonging and identity, problems of communications and consultation, restrictions and internal politics. This last aspect was found from the interviews to be closely linked in the minds of the respondents with colleague relationships and has been discussed under that heading. This section is therefore divided into (i) belonging and personal identity, (ii) communications

* They termed this set of factors "Being in the Organisation".
and consultation, (iii) restrictions within the organisation.

(i) Belonging and Personal Identity

Two questions were asked in this area.

Table 4.19: Belonging and Personal Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36) I feel I belong and am accepted in the organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) I feel a loss of personal identity in this organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussions in this area were somewhat unsatisfactory in that they were general and confused and it was difficult to pinpoint specific situations. The responses to the two questions did not correlate significantly (-.2195; .065), but the feelings of being accepted, of belonging, of having a personal identity, as opposed to feeling alienated from the organisation seemed all to be linked together in the discussions. Some of the confusion centred around a distinction that some respondents were able to make between being part of an individual, informal network, whilst feeling detached from the formal organisation. Only four respondents acknowledged in their responses to the questions that they did not feel that they belonged or were accepted. Each of these four viewed their situation quite differently and a detailed discussion of each of these might shed light on the complexity of the variables at work in this area.

In the first case, the young supervisor aged 26, stated categorically that he did not belong, nor did he want to belong. "I am not staying with this department or Works for long". He was unmarried, ambitious, in a considerable hurry for job change. He saw each job as a means of gaining experience and therefore promotion. He acknowledged
relationship problems with his boss, problems which he felt to be a product of his boss. The researcher found him detached, remote, impersonal in his responses throughout the discussion. These responses tended to be general and theoretical, as if from a textbook. Although he asked for counselling, it seemed as if this was a device to avoid talking himself and to make the researcher talk.* The second respondent, a senior works study engineer, differentiated between the acceptance of his organisational contribution by the formal organisation and the acceptance of him as a person by close colleagues. He felt part of the informal network (he actually held union office for his group of colleagues). His work, however, he identified as having a low level acceptance by other departments and this left him feeling isolated. From the interview, the researcher was impressed by the friendliness, warmth and high level of social skill of this particular individual. The researcher therefore formed the view that the isolation was not a function of personal desire or shortcoming. The respondent had come to terms with the isolation, created by the occupational role and was in any case planning to leave as soon as possible.** The third case was somewhat similar, in that the respondent held a job function which did not help him to gain acceptance amongst some sections of the organisation - his was a production control function. But more significant in his case was the fact that he was a recent appointment to a new department, having been moved from another part of the organisation. He felt that members of the department resented his appoint-

** This was not because of his works situation but was part of his life plan to develop a career abroad.

* He was unsuccessful in this. A counselling session was fixed for after the interview to avoid distraction and this was non-directive.
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ment and therefore did not accept him fully. His method of dealing with this feeling of isolation seemed to be to see it as a temporary phase in his work life. This job represented a considerable promotion for him and since he hoped for further promotions, he recorded that he was prepared to tolerate this. He went on to question whether it mattered anyway. The fourth person had been in the same job some eight years - that is since joining the organisation and had been unsuccessful in his attempts to achieve some career change. He was alienated from all aspects of his job illustrated by his responses to other questions. His nervousness and general handling of the interview suggested that he would be unlikely to be successful in persuading senior management that he possessed supervisory ability. There was some resignation to this dilemma which he did not see as a function of personal shortcomings but blamed on factors external to himself - the lack of promotion opportunities in this declining industry.

To some degree, therefore, these four persons were extreme examples of situations in which others found themselves - the isolated, upward mobile, the rejected representative of an auditing department, the newly appointed manager, and the alienated. In all probability amongst the remaining forty-five respondents, particularly the eleven "not-sures", similar elements were present.

A large number, some nineteen, acknowledged loss of personal identity. In the literature, concern has been expressed about what Robertson (1978) called "the psychological remoteness" of large scale organisations. The debate has been concerned with the economies and diseconomies of scale, with the relative merits of centralisation versus decentralisation. In this study, the respondents seemed to accept that some loss of personal identity was
inevitable. They did not feel threatened by this, although they regretted it. Instead they identified with smaller units, with their profession or department, with their colleagues who shared a similar situation. In the pursuit of identity and significance, they adopted their own form of psychological decentralisation. This in turn might have led to the creation of boundaries within the organisation, an "us and them" reaction but it did seem to help the individual to achieve support and acceptance.

(ii) Communications and Consultation

The following three questions were asked in this area. Also included are the correlation statistics:

Table 4.20: Communications and Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8) I am adequately consulted in matters that really concern me.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) I am kept fully in the picture here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) I am encouraged to participate in the process of decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Probability (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Adequate consultations</td>
<td>0.7037</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3695</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6365</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4541</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3536</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5332</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28)</td>
<td>Kept in picture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3639</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5121</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5896</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4863</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3441</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4256</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41)</td>
<td>Participation in decisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3453</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3310</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2294</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1850</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3871</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Not perceptive to ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5401</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4348</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5830</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6267</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>Helps development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6775</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3819</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6228</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34)</td>
<td>Not able to discuss condition of stress</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4784</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42)</td>
<td>Able to discuss work problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5922</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43)</td>
<td>Confident of support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that there are close links between the responses to these questions and those concerned with boss relationships. In the interviews, it became clear that in criticising the communications or consultative procedures, respondents were often complaining about their boss. In general, it appeared that if relations with the boss were poor, he was held responsible by the individual for inadequate communications and for failure to establish a participative system. If, on the other hand, relationships with him were good, a more remote top management or headquarters might be blamed. Whatever the identified reason for inadequate communications, a number of approaches were adopted by the individual. Of particular significance to a number of the respondents was the "grape-vine" (Davis 1953). Reciprocal friendship networks, based upon the passing of information, seemed to have been established and in this respect the managers' room.
was mentioned by three of the respondents. The gathering together at a set time daily at the same table, meant that the lunch period was an occasion to which they looked forward as an opportunity to "plug" into the grape-vine. They recorded that they were able to get rid of some of their frustrations at being kept in the dark and this provided them with an opportunity to pair with colleagues in the same position. (The researcher, as a former member of this manager's room, can, from his own experience endorse these observations. Individuals tended to gravitate to the same table each day and these groupings took on an identity, some consisting of the older managers, others becoming quite boisterous and somewhat anti-organisational in their conversation).

For a limited number, the response to inadequate communications was to adopt more formal collective approaches. These respondents indicated that the shop floor and the more recently unionised foremen had been able to achieve, through their trade union, a high level of participation. They therefore had adopted similar approaches and a number were, or had been, union officers in the managerial or technology sections of unions and through this method were demanding information.* Where the lack of information was clearly identified as stemming from the boss, a "one to one" solution was sometimes sought. This however, often gave rise to a confrontation and some emotional reaction. There was therefore a reluctance to adopt this approach, although one individual observed that periodically he took his boss to task over his failure to keep him

* This strategy however, was not without its strain. Two of the respondents indicated that they had been advised by management to reduce their trade union activities if they wished to be considered for promotion.
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informed. This led to an improvement for a period but this would lapse into neglect and he would have to speak to him again. The avoidance of a confrontation with the boss and the sense of powerlessness to influence the remote organisation led some to respond by resignation and withdrawal. "What can I do; we're all in the same boat, so I don't let it bother me". "I simply obey the last order and if they don't tell me about new developments, they don't get seen to".

(iii) Restrictions from being in the Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) There are many restrictions placed upon me in my work with the organisation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although only one question was asked specifically about restrictions arising out of working in the organisation, respondents made mention of limitations on their behaviour under a number of headings. Thus out of the twenty-three who recorded that many restrictions were placed on them, a number saw these in terms of the limitations of their discretion in dealing with subordinates - restrictions that stemmed from the industrial relations climate and trade union pressure. At a more senior level, individuals criticised the restrictions placed on their financial and staffing decisions by headquarters or "top management", as part of the total organisational pressure for financial viability. At the junior level, these limitations were perceived as stemming from their bosses' reluctance to give them more freedom and responsibility.

At the interviews, no questions were directed by the researcher to ascertain the views of the respondents to question 1. This would
have produced overlap with other questions, in particular with the open-ended question on their reactions to procedures within the organisation. In the design of the research approaches, it had been recognised that an individual's approach to organisational policies and procedures might have a significant impact on the extent to which he would adopt personalising behaviour. Respondents were, therefore, asked how they reacted to the procedures, approaches and policies of the organisation. Their responses will be reported and discussed in the next chapter which concentrates on the supplementary data obtained from various open-ended questions and the discussions on the responses to other questionnaires.
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Introduction

In addition to the two main questionnaires, which the respondents completed at home and returned by post to the researcher, other data were collected at the interviews. Some of this information was in response to forced-choice questions and other material was collected by open-ended questions. This chapter reports on three main supplementary areas studied in this way. The first is concerned with incidents of pressure, experienced by the respondents and their reported strategies to counteract these; the second involves an exploration of their reactions to organisational policies, procedures and authority; the third is an examination of their views on the factors contributing to their quality of working life. This chapter is therefore divided as below:

(a) Incidents of Pressure and Responses
(b) Reactions to Organisational Policies, Procedures and Authority
(c) Quality of Working Life of Respondents

(a) Incidents of Pressure and Responses

A number of research studies into aspects of organisational life have adopted the critical incident method, e.g. Flanagan (1949) (1954), Finkle (1950), Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959), Andersson and Nilsson (1964), Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969), Pestonjee and Basu (1972), Harker (1972). Hall and Lawler (1970), adopting a similar approach but involving group interviews, studied the pressures experienced by professionals in R & D laboratories. They asked "what
sort of pressure do people feel around here the most?" and noted that three particular types of pressure were identified most frequently - those associated with time, financial responsibility and quality. These responses to some extent reflected a social (or an "organisational") desirability bias, probably a product of the group interviews. Although they provided little insight into the personal world of the professional, the areas of concern were somewhat similar to those identified in this study. Here, not only were the respondents asked to identify situations in which they experienced pressure at work but also what strategies they used to handle this.

The responses to this section of the interview fall into three broad categories. The first group, numbering five, recorded that they did not experience pressure in their work situation. This could either have been an accurate statement of their position or a denial of reality. The circumstances of these individuals, in particular the lack of stimulus and challenge in their job, supported the interpretation that they did not experience pressures at work. One individual for example recorded "I've got an enormous amount of slack that I could take up if I needed to." Another individual typically observed that the only pressure situation he experienced was at interviews, when he was seeking to leave the job.

A second cluster of responses was associated with the problems of managing time. The incidents here quoted were related to overfull in-trays, or to the range of conflicting demands on their time - meetings, reports, telephone calls. They observed: "The jobs are limitless; there is no end to them." "The demands on my time crowd in; I have meetings scheduled and then a customer rings up with complaints." These respondents did not add a great deal to the researcher's understanding of personalising behaviour, for the tactics
they adopted were similar to those presented in other parts of the interview. In the main they were not satisfied with this aspect of the way they managed. They sought after agreed priorities upon which to base their allocation of work, trying where possible to involve others in deciding which jobs were priority or emergency. Delegation was also quoted as a technique, as was the extension of their working day.

One or two individuals did reveal a special dilemma that time pressures produced. "I have to attend meetings without adequate preparation." "I have to bluff my way through." "I have to lower my standards." These individuals conveyed to the researcher the view that this put them at risk and risk was the theme of the third cluster of responses to this section of the interview. The pressure situations identified here often involved them in some form of confrontation with a powerful group either with an external customer, a production department (an internal customer) or a trade union group. This confrontation usually meant that senior management became involved (or might become involved) and therefore carried risk for the individual. In the first cases the pressure situations were generated by customer complaints. Incidents included problems of quality control or meeting of delivery dates. These were conditions of high visibility for the individual. In describing them, such phrases were used as "Although I wasn't to blame ....". "It was not my fault but ....". Similar words were used when describing the problems of relationships in the production departments, complaints about quality failures, with flow stoppages, maintenance breakdowns. Typically, the engineer quoted struggling to locate a fault in the production process, under pressure because of time delays. He might be carrying out maintenance repairs during a plant
shut down, with only limited time to undertake a range of repairs. He had to make decisions on how to achieve what he felt were unrealistic targets. The production manager was trying to cope with quality failures, bottlenecks in work flow.

The strategies for handling these were somewhat similar. Although risks were unavoidable, their potential effects could be minimised. The boss could be included in the decision-making and therefore in the responsibility. A problem-solving team could be set up to look at a customer complaint. A mutual support group could offer "protection." One engineer noted "Engineers tend to stick together because they are always being blamed." Time and effort would be concentrated on the issue, so that no one could say that the individual had neglected it.*

Six of the respondents mentioned pressure situations involving confrontation with a trade union. Here typically the individual took one position, perhaps on discipline or work allocation, and was opposed by a union group. The result was extended discussions with threatened or actual stoppages. Emotive phrases were used in the descriptions of the incidents, "I was attacked ...." "I lost." "I was isolated and beaten". "I had to cover myself". The most frequently mentioned step that they took in these situations was to involve their boss for support, but even so a number felt let down at the end of the incident. The result of such experiences could be best described by their own words, "Now I turn a blind eye". "I don't upset them". "I now take the view it's their problem".

* In one incident, or series of incidents, the production unit was so important in the work flow that the individual did not feel exposed, for senior management entered into the decision-making processes so quickly that the respondent, the assistant manager, was relieved of risk.
A theme, therefore, running through many of the strategies was blame avoidance. Hall (1974) has observed "the manager who takes risks runs an increasing chance of short-term and perhaps even long-term failure in terms of his business career." This led him to argue that organisations should avoid penalising this type of risk-taker (p. 11). Clearly, energy, that could have been directed towards solving specific work problems, was being expended by the individual "looking over his shoulder", making sure that the incident did not impair his career and prospects for further advancement.

(b) Reactions to Organisational Policies, Procedures and Authority

Introduction

A number of writers had discussed the processes of organisational socialisation and individual innovation in terms of the individual's attitudes and reactions to organisational policies, procedures and authority (Merton, 1968; Schein, 1968; Denhardt, 1968; Fox (1971)). The researcher had not been satisfied that the frameworks presented by these and other writers adequately covered the relationships between the individual and the organisation. Therefore to explore these more fully, two open-ended questions were asked - the first about the individual's reactions to organisational policies and procedures - the second about his attitudes towards authority. In addition, they were asked whether they perceived the large scale organisation as a source of opportunities for individual freedom and independence. The section therefore contains an analysis of their responses to these various questions.

(i) Organisational policies and procedures

Some ten respondents saw themselves essentially as conformists, responding to the question with remarks such as "I'm a corporate
"bloke"; "I'm an establishment man"; "I conform"; "I do as I'm told"; "I accept the system". In a number of cases these remarks were qualified with such observations as "There's no sense in arguing"; "I don't cause a fuss"; or "Top management are not complete idiots"; "You have to work to procedures, else it would collapse." But conformity did not sit comfortably on the shoulder of another small group of three people. They recorded a more reluctant acceptance. "I complain but I accept ..."; "I say my piece but ..."; "I speak out but in the end I toe the line."

Some ten other respondents did not see themselves as conformists but rather as "discrete" challengers, their challenge not necessarily being effective in bringing about change. They used phrases such as "I don't just accept;" "I question policies discreetly;" "I am prepared to question that I work within the law;" "I challenge and make my views known;" "I make my point." The strength of their challenge differed from a group of nine others who saw themselves as more aggressive and antagonistic in their approach to policies and procedures. "I stick my neck out;" "I challenge aggressively;" "I'm quite vociferous in my attitude;" "I'm not afraid to be blunt;" "I tend to speak out;" "I am a bit of a rebel." This group were somewhat ambivalent about their stance. They were pleased they were not "organisation" men, but they were not happy with their challenge. "It's bloody stupid but I do it;" "There's a time to shut up - perhaps I should have shut up earlier." Their concern about the stance seemed to be summed up by the remark of one of the respondents "It might do me harm."

Instead of individually challenging the organisation, one respondent reported that he had been elected as the union official for a group of technical specialists. He presented himself as part of
a collective process of challenging the organisation. He gave examples of how as a group, he had blocked the introduction of new policies and had "beat the system."

Another group of ten presented themselves as manipulators. Their responses were usually outwardly to conform and thereafter to try to find a way round the procedures and policies. "I bend the rules behind the scenes;" "I ignore;" "I pay lip service;" "I nibble away;" "I try to change procedures quietly and insidiously;" "I conform, then I do my own thing;" "I conform and then quietly get round;" "I hate red tape so I try to cut corners;" "You've got to be political here."

A group of six respondents took a somewhat "middle-of-the-road" position. They saw themselves as adaptable to the needs of the situation, "There's a time to be quiet, and a time to speak out;" "I challenge the nonsense but accept the correct." Within this group that neither saw themselves as one or the other there were three people, who, although able to accept a great deal of the policies and procedures, nevertheless every so often had to break out. "Every so often I set my stall out to bust the system;" "Basically I'm an acceptor but from time-to-time I have to challenge;" "I have to get it out of my system every so often."

ii) Attitudes and Reactions to Authority

The majority of the respondents (64%) unequivocally supported the notion of authority. "I accept that organisations have to have it;" "I accept the need for authority;" "There has to be a basic system;" "Someone has to make decisions;" "They are there to make decisions;" "There's a need to accept some authority or nothing gets done." This response from people with authority or seeking auth-
ority was predictable. Indeed one of the respondents observed "If I am to use my authority, I must accept the authority of others."

But others were less happy with the concept of authority or about the actual holders of authority, "I don't enjoy being told what to do;" "I resent authority a little;" "I'm not overawed by other's authority." They therefore challenged the authority of others, "I have problems in respecting authority, so I push it to the limits;" "I stand up for my views but I'll implement a decision once it's made." A small group of respondents were not concerned with the organisational necessity of authority but rather the personal necessity of accepting the authority of others. "I may push it to its limits but my self preservation instinct prevents me crossing certain barriers;" "Rebellion is futile: I will push until finally overruled;" "I may challenge, but with caution because they feed me."

Presthus (1962) has argued that reactions to authority were "the most critical variable in organisational accommodation" (p. 140). The attitudes of the respondents, as will be seen from their comments, influenced the way they adapted to their life in the organisation. But their reactions to authority were extremely complex. It was difficult for example to separate out their views on "authority" as a managerial concept, their reactions to specific authority figures and incidents in which they had been at loggerheads with the "system." Thus their responses in the main indicated an intellectual acceptance of the notion of authority but in specific instances, they often found it difficult to accept the edicts of those in authority. They might for career reasons ostensibly comply but covertly challenge and work against policy decisions. A further discussion on some of these points will be conducted in the final chapter.
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(iii) Freedom in Organisation

In the review of the literature, the researcher was impressed by the distinction made between those individuals who perceived a large organisation as an opportunity and those who saw it as restrictive (for discussion, see Cleveland, 1963, p.11 ff): the distinction was made between those who felt able to control their own fate, internal and those who felt controlled by external forces - external (Evans, 1973; Organ & Greene, 1974; Mitchell, Smyser & Weed, 1975). In this study, a simpler and less precise division was made by asking the respondents whether they felt they had more freedom and independence in a large organisation as opposed to a small one. The following replies were received.

Table 5.1: Freedom & Independence in Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More opportunity in large organisations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunity in small organisations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who saw the large organisation as providing less freedom and independence were more likely to comment upon the restrictions placed upon them and to complain about the political manoeuvring and backstabbing. Some of the respondents defined the situation at work as beyond their control and by so doing seemed to avoid a feeling of personal responsibility for any difficulties they might be encountering. It was also as if by this approach they sought to maintain their self-esteem and avoid blame from others. Thus an "externally controlled" stance might have a personalising function.
for these individuals. However, as a mode of adaptation, it might not be completely satisfactory, if Mitchell, Symser & Weed (1975) were correct when they noted "internally controlled employees are generally more satisfied with their jobs" (p. 629). Unfortunately, this research project did not adequately explore the characteristics and organisational situations of the internally as opposed to the externally controlled. A number of questions need to be answered. How far were the respondents' views of large and small organisations a function of their organisational experiences and their present situation? Did their views change with age? What influence did these views have in their actual behaviour? What personality variables were related to internal and what to external control? The researcher intends to explore some of these questions in the follow up study (see Chapter Seven).

(c) **Quality of Working Life of Respondents**

The discussion on the quality of working life of managers from the literature review proved inconclusive. Although the view was expressed that somehow quality of working life had an objective reality, no useful indicators were identified to assist in this study. Taylor (1978) came to the same conclusion, commenting on "the absence of explicit measures" (p. 153). A predominant view seemed to emerge, emphasising the essential subjectivity of QWL. The researcher took his framework for analysis from the studies of others - viz Warr and Routledge, Marshall and Cooper, but during the interviews themselves, an attempt was made to ascertain the respondents' views. Initially, they were asked to rate their own quality on a five point scale and the following table of responses was obtained.
Table 5.2: Quality of Working Life Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither High nor Low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents' QWL rating correlated significantly with their responses to the questions on "feeling trapped in current job" (-.3975:sign:.002), "stayed at the level too long" (-.3874:sign:.003) and "job stimulating" (.6952:sign:.001). QWL to respondents seemed to be associated with career progress and the extent to which the job was stimulating. To enlarge in this way they were specifically asked during the interviews to describe those aspects of work that contributed to a high quality of working life and those that contributed to a low quality. McDonald (1973) warned against the use of the researcher's own predetermined frame for the analysis of replies to open-ended questions. Therefore each reply to the above questions was recorded on a card and hand sorted into sections. Set out in Table 5.3 are the factors reported as contributing to a high QWL and in Table 5.4 those that contributed to a low QWL.

The variables identified by the respondents did not contain any surprises. Other researchers have obtained similar results. For example Schultz (1964) noted that "executives seem to be most interested in jobs that offer a really tough challenge. They want stimulation and variety, but even more than that, what they really seek are battles to win and new fields to conquer. The executive
Table 5.3: Factors Contributing to High QWL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I  INTRINSIC TO THE JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job stimulating</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II  CONTRIBUTION FROM THE JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III  OWN SITUATION IN ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being on top</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV  RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People related</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V  DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI  MISCELLANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the system works, things working well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building models that work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping young people to develop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not highly stressed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 113
Table 5.4: Factors Contributing to Low QWL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>INTRINSIC TO THE JOB</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>monotony, repetition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Challenge</td>
<td>stimulus, scope</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures</td>
<td>impossible demands, incessant pressure tensions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION FROM THE JOB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Futility</td>
<td>lack of achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>OWN SITUATION IN ORGANISATION (a) Freedom and Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of freedom</td>
<td>restrictions, pettiness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to do</td>
<td>can't influence, can't get own way</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>OWN SITUATION IN ORGANISATION (b) Insecurity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of future</td>
<td>future threatened</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>fall guy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being expendable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reward</td>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad Relationships</td>
<td>hostility</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicking</td>
<td>backstabbing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>over management, bad relationships, apathy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations</td>
<td>problems, climate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Progress</td>
<td>progression blocked</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI</th>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL CONDITIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low status of department</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of planning</td>
<td>too day-to-day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote decisions</td>
<td>with no consultations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII</th>
<th>WORK/NON-WORK</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work spilling over to home life</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 84
thrives on the excitement of coming to grip with problems .... if there are no more hurdles to surmount, the job becomes routine, and the man loses interest" (p. 10).

Similarly Herzberg (1966), reviewing his earlier research, recorded that "five factors stand out as strong determiners of job satisfaction - achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement." He differentiated between satisfiers and dissatisfiers, the latter consisting of such factors as "company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions (chapter 6). Bray et al. (1974) concluded from their extensive research programme, that "the study points to the need for stimulation and challenge in the work itself" (p. 191). Again Guerrier and Philpott (1978) observed "it seems very clear from the survey that responsibility, influence over the way things are run and challenging jobs are the most important motivators" (p. 40).

It will be noted that, excluding references to industrial relations, relationships were mentioned some 28 times, 14 in each section. The importance of this aspect of their world of work (in the opinion of the researcher as a source of satisfaction as well as potential dissatisfaction) was highlighted in this research. Hansen (1974) in his study of British Managers also found that his respondents, in reply to an open-ended question about quality of life, made frequent mention of the contribution of interpersonal relationships.

In the interviews, some of the responses seemed to be "text book" answers, but in other cases the individuals identified specific aspects of their own world of work that were significant to them at that stage in their career. For example the individual, who
recorded the one work "failure", felt himself very much on trial as an "acting works manager" and the possibility of failure was very real to him. This identification of personal problem areas provided in a number of cases another avenue from which to study the personalising strategies. The focus of this research project was not on the specific components of a manager’s quality of working life but rather on the strategies that individuals adopted to manage their work situation. Thus individuals were asked to indicate the amount of say and influence they considered they had over the way they spent their day and over the quality of their working life. Set out in Table 5.5 are their responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Say and Influence over Working Day and QWL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stewart (1976) had commented that individuals perceived themselves as having more choice than they actually possessed. This comment might apply to the absolute scores on the degree of say that the respondents recorded, 76% suggesting that they had a great deal, or a very great deal over the way they spend their day. Of interest here however was the recognition by them that their say and influence did not necessarily cover to the same degree the quality of their working life. The mean rating of 4.06 for their recorded
level of "say and influence over the way they spent their day" fell to 3.39 as the mean of their "say and influence over their quality of working life." They were questioned on this situation and indicated that the choices on how they spent their day were only within limits. They could determine what they significantly called "their routine" but there were many imperatives, what Brown (1965) has called the "prescribed terms of reference" (p. 97) which limited their discretion. This helped to explain the importance they attached to job change as a personalising strategy and also to explain the relationship between low QWL and feelings of being trapped.

Therefore, during the interviews, from specific questions and from the discussions, there emerged a composite picture of what constituted a high QWL for the respondents. The individual would possess a boss who would assist him in his personal development and take an interest in his work but not interfere. His boss could be trusted to support him if this was necessary and he would consult him, giving him feedback on performance and keeping him in the picture about wider events within the organisation. His relationships with colleagues would be friendly, supportive and co-operative. His subordinates would be motivated to contribute, not requiring close supervision. They would not be too militant or too organised, so that he would not have to spend a long period of time getting their agreement to changes.

His own job and responsibilities would provide him with challenge, variety and opportunities for problem solving. It would also provide a sense of purpose and achievement, with associated recognition in terms of pay and status, both internally and externally. It would be a responsible job, with adequate freedom from restrictions: he would also feel able to influence the course of events within the
organisation. His day-to-day work would contribute to his personal and career development, so that he would not have to hold the same job for "too long" but would be able to move up after a "reasonable" lapse of time. His job would provide him with a visibility but not a feeling of being exposed and he would feel secure about the future. Thus, if he wished to stay at this organisation till retirement, this would be possible. It would be demanding but not so demanding that he could not manage his time at work: nor would it eat excessively into his non-work time or sap his energy so that he could not enjoy a full family and social life.

As here presented, the model of a high quality of working life might have the ring of utopia about it. The individual manager and technical specialist had to accommodate to an actual situation that was usually less than satisfactory. In the next chapter, an attempt will be made to structure the whole range of personalising strategies adopted by him in his search for an acceptable quality of working life.
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TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF PERSONALISING RESPONSES

Introduction

In the previous three chapters the information from the analyses of questionnaires and from interviews has been reported. This has identified the issues of concern to the individuals, issues that threatened their quality of working life. The discussion has also reported on their efforts to counteract these pressures. Grounded upon this data, in this chapter an attempt will be made to develop a typology of personalising strategies to encompass the various approaches, reported to, or identified by, the researcher.

The first section of this chapter will concentrate on presenting the elaborated research model and will contain a general introduction to the typology. It will then be followed by a more detailed analysis of each of the major categories. The structure therefore is as follows:

a) Elaborating the Research Model
b) Personal Redefinition of job and work circumstances
c) Personal/Collective restructuring of job and work circumstances.
d) Restructuring/redefining work/non-work relationships.
e) Seeking to change jobs within the organisation.
f) Seeking a move to another organisation.

a) Elaborating the Research Model

It will be recalled that the research model upon which the programme was designed was as follows.
The model can now be elaborated to take into consideration the findings of this study.

As indicated earlier, the research findings of other writers, particularly Warr and Routledge (1969) and Cooper and Marshall (1975a), were taken as the starting point in developing the set of organisational conditions likely to contribute to, or detract from, the respondents' quality of working life. These were somewhat amended by this study but still do not necessarily represent all circumstances that might be significant to an individual's world of work. Similarly the framework of needs relied heavily on Porter (1961).

The specific aim of the research was to identify the behavioural responses of the managers and technical specialists to negative aspects of their world of work, responses aimed at maintaining, or attaining an acceptable quality of working life. In this respect, the respondents did not passively accept the organisational conditions and pressures to which they were subjected. Sometimes as individuals, sometimes collectively, they endeavoured to change the aspects of their world of work with which they were not satisfied. In addition to trying to change these conditions, they also, consciously or unconsciously, amended their perception of, and attitudes towards, certain of these situations. In developing a typology of personalising strategies, therefore a distinction has been made between restructuring and redefining, this distinction building upon the framework, used by Hall (1972) in his study of how women coped with the
role conflict, inherent in their various sub-identities.

Restructuring, individually or collectively, refers to those processes whereby the individual, by his own actions or those of a group, seeks to bring about changes in his work - its demands, his relationships, the organisational conditions to which he is subjected. The term redefinition is used to describe the processes, conscious and unconscious, by which the individual amends his perception of his world of work. Conscious mechanisms will include an objective reappraisal of his situation, whereas unconscious redefinition will involve some distortion and will include those mechanisms usually referred to as defence mechanisms (Kroeber, 1963).

A distinction has also been made between the processes of restructuring and redefining the job and work circumstances and those concerned with the restructuring and redefining of the relationships between work and non-work. Thus an individual might seek to redesign his job to provide additional stimulus and challenge; he might try to change the relationships at work to reduce some of the tensions and difficulties. On the other hand, his work was not a closed system and he could allow work to spill over into non-work to offset some of the pressures. He could try to compensate for unsatisfactory conditions at work by some non-work activity.

In addition to these strategies undertaken whilst in the same job, he could by seeking after a job change, either internally or externally, try to remove himself from the situation. Whether those, who reported that they were seeking to remove themselves, actually intended so to do will also be explored.

The elaborated model is set out in fig. 6.1. There follows a discussion on each type of personalising behaviour. The inter-
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active nature of each response should however be emphasised and an individual might at any one time be adopting strategies from all the areas in an attempt to balance the demands being made upon him.

b) Personal Redefinition of Job and Work Circumstances

Introduction

Personal definition refers to the processes whereby attitudes towards, or perceptions of, the situation are changed in order to make it more compatible with the needs of the individual. These processes proved to be particularly difficult to study. The literature in this area provided a bewildering array of concepts and concerns, but the main problem stemmed from the inevitably subjective nature of the research observations. These two sets of problems will be discussed at some length in this introduction.

Although there is a lack of specific studies into the processes of redefinition adopted by managers, a number of writers have discussed these processes, either in theoretical terms, or as a function of adaptation to a wider range of psychological concerns. Frenkel-Brunswick (1939) talked of the mechanisms of "self-deception", Argyris (1957), of "internal adjustment" and "defense mechanisms"; Lazarus (1967) referred to "defensive reappraisal"; Festinger (1960) referred to the mechanisms directed towards the reduction of "cognitive dissonance"; Riley et al. (1969) talked of restructuring of orientations; Seashore (1973 a & b) referred to the processes of "cognitive distortion" and "goal reduction". The term "personal redefinition" has been taken from Hall (1972), who adopted this in his study of the role conflict, inherent in women's sub-identities. Although the various authors, particularly when writing about defensive strategies, have produced lists of concerns and of coping mechanisms, Lazarus
(1967) reviewing the literature concluded that "there is currently no satisfactory classification of defensive processes" (p. 295). The researcher came to the same conclusion in 1979.

Thus there was a lack of an acceptable structure within which to locate the specific behaviours which the researcher believed he had identified in this research. The section that follows is an attempt on the part of the researcher subjectively to interpret the apparent inconsistencies in the responses and behaviour of the respondents that suggested a form of denial or distortion of reality.

The difficulties of studying the unconscious processes have been identified by others. Dalton (1964) talked of the need to study "the informant's revealing behaviour and unique intonations" (p. 71) and although he acknowledged that subjectivity might mislead the researcher he concluded that it was "indispensable" and required "no apology". Douglas (1976) talked of the self-deceptions of respondents as "the most difficult problem facing the researcher into the unconscious", but notwithstanding this, he agreed that "it is necessary to get at the inner-emotional and symbolically meaningful experience in order to adequately understand human behaviour" (p. 133). Gorden (1956) argued that "the respondent tends to with-hold any information that he fears may threaten his self-esteem" (p. 159). In addition, there might be a social desirability bias at work as the respondent sought to impress the researcher.

The researcher was faced with the difficulty of determining whether what the interviewee was relating was based on an accurate and conscious assessment of reality or involved some unconscious distortion; whether it represented an attempt to deceive the researcher, i.e. to show the individual in a better light, or whether it also
involved some self-deception. In psychotherapy, counselling or staff appraisal, some decision has to be reached, however tentatively, on whether the individual was lying about, denying, distorting, or realistically adapting to, reality. But in this research the aim of which was to understand the range of possible responses adopted by an individual to handle their situations, a final decision on each person's response was not necessary (nor was it possible). Here it was sufficient to identify these behaviours as possible strategies to be adopted by individuals to cope with specific areas of concern. The researcher believed that he was able to identify some of the processes of redefinition being adopted to redefine the individual's relationship to his job, his relationship to other people, his relationship with work and with non-work. It was also possible to note some redefinition as the individuals sought a move from their existing jobs. The sections that follow will concentrate on the redefinition of the job and life in the organisation and the relationships of the individual with others at work, postponing the exploration of the other processes to a later part of the Chapter.

The structure is as follows:

i) Lowering and setting standards and expectations
ii) Denial or avoidance of reality
iii) Redefining the time perspective
iv) Displacement of blame or responsibility away from self.

i) Lowering and Setting Standards and Expectations

If the situation at work did not meet the expectations of a respondent, he could adapt to this by lowering his expectations. This could either be in terms of what he, in his managerial role, expected from others, or what he personally wanted from work.
The process of lowering expectations or standards was on occasions specifically referred to by respondents. For example, when discussing the performance of their subordinates, a number stated that they had "ceased to be disappointed." "I have lowered my targets." Having tried to get a certain level of commitment from them and failed, they sought to adjust their expectations and thus minimise their concern. Twelve had noted that they were not confident of their bosses' support when they took decisions. By lowering their personal standards of the performance required of subordinates and by turning a blind eye to malpractices, they were also avoiding a confrontation with a power group - the unions - thus avoiding having to back down. The fact that they still criticised their subordinates for low performance indicated that they had not really lowered their standards. They still used them as a basis for evaluating their performance, whilst still not actually expecting that level.*

In addition to the explicit lowering of expectations, individuals seemed implicitly to have lowered them, or to be in the process of adjusting them. When discussing their boss's lack of interest in their development, they often made excuses for his failure to give them the attention they desired. "He's a busy man;" "He's got a lot to do;" "I can't really expect him to spend much time with me." There was evidence of some internal debate; one manager asked the researcher and himself the question "What can I realistically expect? ...," as if to imply it was his fault for holding unrealistic expectations. This group differed from others in that they did not blame their boss, at least not in front of the interviewer. This might have stemmed from a genuine respect, a feeling of dependency, a sense of loyalty

* They still appeared to need to avoid blame or self-criticism and this will be considered in a later section.
or a lack of trust in the researcher.

A number of respondents recorded that they no longer expected satisfaction or stimulation from their job. They argued that they had come to terms with this and they emphasised the instrumental role of work, as a source of money with which to enjoy their non-work. This changing emphasis from work to non-work will be explored in a later section. There was, however, evidence of some bitterness at this situation. One assistant manager who felt passed over for promotion, talked of being reconciled to this. He said that all he hoped for now was to survive till retirement, yet all this was related with such concern that the researcher found it hard to accept that the reconciliation had indeed taken place. This differed from another person, slightly older, who had asked to be relieved of a management position, which he felt was too much for him. He appeared, from his quiet, slightly sad manner, to be moving to an acceptance of his situation and to be coming to terms with it.

Cummings and El Sami (1968), in their review of Porter questionnaire, felt that respondents should have been asked to record "the perceived possibility of need fulfilment" (p. 132). Their interest in desiring this information stemmed from their view that the perceived absence of such possibilities could lead "to frustration and ineffectiveness" (p. 132). But respondents, faced with a low possibility of need fulfilment, could lower their expectations of such fulfilment. This is one of the interpretations of the reported need deficiencies for the question on close friendships. The average "ideal" score here, 4.65, (see appendix 8) was the lowest for all the questions and the average "deficiency" score of .30 was again the lowest. The competitiveness of management or the internal
politics might have led to a reduced expectation of close friendships and by this they could avoid disappointment. The process was also accompanied by a denial of need, with a number arguing against close friendships at work (hence the six who recorded negative deficiencies). "The manager has to maintain his distance...."

Other areas of the world of work, where the expectations of some had been lowered, were those concerned with feelings of identity and belonging and failures in communications. Faced with a large, complex organisation, they argued that it was unrealistic to expect to feel a sense of belonging with the total organisation. Similarly they recognised the difficulties of communication and became reconciled to identifying with their own section or department — what the researcher termed "psychological decentralisation". They also settled for the informal "grape-vine" system of rumour and communications. Based upon these observations, it seems reasonable to suggest that the process of lowering expectations so that they reflected a realistic analysis of the situation was at work in the case of a number of those respondents who recorded a "0" score to questions on the "needs" questionnaire.

In addition to lowering standards or personal expectations, individuals could also try to set standards to provide a personal framework for decision-making. Some twelve recorded that because of different pressures, they were sometimes uncertain as to what action to take. One response to this uncertainty and ambiguity was to establish criteria to use as a basis for choosing between alternatives. If these criteria could be agreed with others, this was more helpful and, as will be noted in the section on restructuring, some effort was expended in trying to accomplish this. Even with-
out this agreement, the individual could provide his own set of goals and these could assist him to handle his concerns. Ideally these goals should be acceptable in principle to the organisation (even if his boss or colleagues had not explicitly agreed them). By this means, there was provided a form of insurance against blame. One example of this was the goal of production. "I have made production the God." In another case it was the "Customer." The respondents' difficult decisions were related back to these goals and some of their feelings of vulnerability were reduced.

ii) Denial or avoidance of reality

On a number of occasions during the interviews, the researcher felt that what he was being told did not constitute the "truth". That is not to say that he believed the individual was telling him lies but that through a process of self-deception, the individual was denying a feeling or concern about some aspect of his world of work. For example, at one interview, the interviewer reported unsatisfactory relationships with his boss and colleagues. He went on to say that he "had developed a thick skin" and "I don't let it bother me". The emphasis behind the assertion and the time spent on these issues during the discussions led the researcher to the opposite conclusion.

In completing the questionnaires, the researcher again felt that individuals denied to him, and probably to themselves, the existence of areas of concern. An extreme example of this was the Technical Assistant to the Director. His "Work Attitude" questionnaire contained only one issue of concern and that might be construed as reflecting well upon him, for it referred to the fact that he was working under pressure. Every other aspect of his world
of work he reported as being good. Argyris (1965) has suggested that a reluctance to present negative views about the organisation might be "related to the concept of loyalty" (p. 70). The researcher felt in this case that issues in addition to loyalty were involved. The researcher did not feel that he had made contact with the person. The replies at this discussion were detached, "pontifical", as if somehow the individual was not part of the "hurly burly" of organisational life. And yet the researcher knew that the respondent was facing a major career milestone for it had recently been announced that the Director, to whom he was attached, was to be transferred. A new Director had been named but was not yet in post. The stated task of this new person was to bring about significant staff reductions and economies. This meant that the near future was uncertain but the respondent denied any feelings of concern. It was as if he had become personally identified with senior management and yet was not part of it.

Denial of concern about certain aspects of their world of work appeared to be widespread. As Seashore (1973 b) noted, "distortions are one way to create satisfaction where there should be none" (p. 13). Thus, no-one recorded that their relationships with subordinates were other than good and yet in the interviews, some form of concern about their subordinates was frequently presented. Similarly, no-one said, in replies to the question on decision-making, that they were asked to take too many decisions, although for some the pressures of management were identified as excessive. In reply to another question, thirty-six of the respondents, approximately 75%, indicated that they felt able to discuss stress situations with their boss. The researcher doubted whether this was true in all the thirty-six cases, particularly bearing in mind the views expressed by the respondents who acknowledged some difficulties in this respect. Their
reported inability to share with their boss stemmed from a lack of respect for their boss or their personal value system, according to which, personal displays of strain were a sign of weakness and therefore likely to be interpreted as an indication that the individual was not suitable for further promotion. Again a high number of respondents recorded a high QWL score but in the discussions presented a quite different picture. There was the example of one assistant manager, with some twenty seven years service at the Works, who rated his QWL as "I", very high! He mentioned his job satisfaction on a number of occasions throughout the second interview but without enthusiasm or joy. In the notes of the interview, the researcher observed that it sounded "rehearsed" and "repetitive". At the first interview he had talked quite differently - of his concern for the future, his reduced expectations of promotion, of his problems with colleagues, of his lack of time to spend at home with his family.

As has been noted, the future for the Works and therefore for the staff was uncertain. Against the background of rumour, public statements about the need for closures and economies, banner headlines about fears for the future, only sixteen respondents recorded a need deficiency score of 2 or more for the question on security. A number of the managers knew of the need for a major investment decision that had to be made to secure at least some future for the plant (this had to do with the rebuilding of coke ovens) and yet the majority did not see security as an area of concern. Those who admitted a concern to the researcher tried to avoid its reality - "I don't think about it"; "I don't let it bother me". It was so beyond their control and so potentially disruptive to their present way of life, it was not surprising that they adop-
ted this position. The researcher coined the notion of a person's "time span of concern," suggesting that, because security was not a present, immediate threat, it could be pushed beyond their present time span of concern and by this method, they could concentrate on the present pressing problems.

Other examples of avoidance included the use of the "don't know" section of the work attitude questionnaire. Reference will be made in a later section on the number of "don't know" replies to some career questions but in this respect the researcher was impressed by one respondent who recorded fifteen "don't know" replies, out of fifty questions. He was a recently appointed project leader of an Operations Research Team and his interviews were somewhat similar to his questionnaire responses - uncertain and not sure. He was ambivalent about his new supervisory role and he noted that he gained his pleasure and satisfaction at work from the individual role of O.R. model-building. He was clearly uncertain about whether he had taken the right decision in becoming responsible for others. Thus he recorded "I don't know" to any question from the interviewer that challenged the balance at work. He did not appear to wish to face up to these questions or to acknowledge his own dilemma at work.

iii) Redefining their time perspective

Argyris (1957) predicted that where individuals "have no control over the clarity and stability of their future .... they will tend to experience short-term perspective" (p. 233). This he defined as a situation in which "the present largely determines behaviour" (p. 50). However, in this research, the author discovered on a number of occasions that the respondents, in the face of unsatis-
factory circumstances, would extend their time perspective, looking to the future for the satisfaction of their needs and ambitions. Although this process will be explored more fully in the section on job change, some reference is relevant here.

To a number, the long hours, the pressure, the less than satisfactory job or relationships could be endured because this, they believed, would improve their prospects. "I see this job as experience": "I am prepared to put up with this now in order to ....": "This is an investment." By defining the situation as one of short-term duration and perceiving the future as holding out promise, the individual was helped to tolerate the present. Indeed out of the very uncertainty of the future, individuals could generate hope - "something will turn up" or "technological changes will provide opportunities."

iv) Displacement of blame or responsibility away from self.

If a respondent's performance in his role, or his life in the organisation did not meet the standards that the individual would have liked or did not match his expectations, it had been noted that the respondent could deny this or he could lower his standards/expectations. He could also seek to avoid experiencing a sense of failure by suggesting that the circumstances were beyond his control or were not his fault.

As in all the cases of redefinition, the distinction between realistic appraisal and distortion of reality was not clear. Thus a situation could be defined as outside their control "If only I was able to ..." By so defining it, the individual did not see himself as having to bear any blame for the unsatisfactory situation. This, in a number of cases, seemed to be an accurate description
of the situation and although so defining it helped the individual maintain his self-esteem, it did not change the reality. One person actually stated "The union situation is outside my control, so I don't lose any sleep over it." The same person indicated that he wanted a transfer out of production management.

One individual appeared to represent an extreme example of this displacement of blame. At the first interview, he denied that relationships with his colleagues were other than good, whereas at the second interview he acknowledged that they were not satisfactory. He was extremely critical of his fellow managers. He recorded that they did not accept him because he had a degree and played bridge.* Dismissing them, he observed "I am not prepared to be dull".

A number were highly critical either of their boss, or their colleagues (or both). The researcher found that when the individual took up a judgmental stance against others, he seemed to be redirecting the blame, in which he should probably share. For example, one assistant manager was extremely critical of his colleagues for their 'politicking' and he reported that he could not trust them. During the interviews, however, he revealed to the researcher with apparent pride, his own secret plans and his strategies for handling his colleagues. Another, a work study officer, complained about his boss and production management. He indicated that he was "open and frank" in his dealings with them and that he was prepared to admit to his mistakes. Later in the second interview he observed that the slightest mistake on his part could colour relationships.

* A number of his colleagues at work were similarly qualified and the researcher had witnessed some of the relationship difficult problems this individual experienced, when working on an industrial project with other DMS course members.
He went on to relate his strategies aimed at avoiding being "caught out", giving the researcher an impression of other than "open and frank" behaviour. When this was reflected back to the respondent, he observed that he was obliged to adopt this behaviour because he could not trust them.

Blame could be directed towards a number of impersonal power groups. "Top management", "Headquarters", "the Unions" were available as pegs upon which to hang responsibility. Thus, as has been noted, individuals could argue that their relationships with subordinates were good and yet complain about bad industrial relations. Any difficulties with subordinates could be removed from the interpersonal level, the situation "depersonalised" and presented as the fault of the trade unions, or as the failure of top management to do anything about it. The inadequate performance of subordinates could be blamed on the previous incumbent - "I inherited them" or on the union's restrictive practices, which the manager saw as limiting his ability to take positive action.

There was an apparent paradox here. In one section of the study the majority of respondents recorded that they had a "great deal" or a "very great deal" of say and influence over their subordinates (some 80%). Yet at later discussions, a number defined aspects of their relationships with subordinates as outside their control.* Thus they presented themselves as managers with responsibility and influence, perhaps to enhance their self-image and the researcher's image of them, and without control, to avoid blame or

* This process might also be adopted to cope with their perceived lack of career success, seeing it as a function of manpower reductions or financial difficulties. This will be explored in the following section.
a sense of failure. A similar paradox seemed to exist when they recorded a high level of say and influence over their working day but less over the quality of their working life.

This process of allocating blame/responsibility to other groups led to a form of resignation - "Well, what can I do? ......." This resignation was however of a different degree to that identified by, for example, Seashore (1973b). He was discussing the adaptation of the manual worker to unsatisfactory conditions and he observed that, having reached the conclusion that "it is impossible to change the job, one can feel locked-in, unable to move from it" (p. 14). In the case of the respondents, they might be resigned to one aspect of their work situation, but avoid a deeper feeling of resignation, by optimistically viewing the opportunities for internal and external job change (see later sections).

A number were disappointed, or not satisfied, with the present but as has been noted, could look to the future for its correction. Two however looked back to the past and, since the present did not match up to their expectations, blamed other circumstances for their absence of fulfilment. Both were in their forties and both held senior posts - one in Research, the other in Engineering. In the first case, he was disenchanted with his organisational life and half hoped for a crisis, such as works closures, to propel him into a second career. He blamed the situation onto "nationalisation". "Before nationalisation, it was different. Morale was higher; initiative was rewarded; there was a sense of purpose and co-operation." In the second case, he had fulfilled his career ambition and had been appointed Chief Engineer. But the job was now fraught with restrictions and did not present him with the autonomy, the achievement or the fulfilment, which he sought. "It was the fault of the unions
and that of headquarters with all their financial and bureaucratic restrictions. The job was no longer what it was or should be."

From the discussions with both of these respondents, the author was convinced that both were wrestling with the processes of mid-life adjustment (Collin, 1977). Neither seemed able at this stage to admit that his career was "no longer relevant to the needs of his middle-aged life" (p. 59). The blame was outside of them.

c) Personal and Collective Restructuring

Introduction

Dill, Hilton and Reitman (1960) concluded that successful managers did "not passively leave the definition of their jobs ... to the discretion of their superiors" (p. 15). Fiedler (1972) observed that "executive jobs and supervisory responsibilities almost always can be modified to a greater or lesser extent .... by the incumbent of the position" (p. 248). Managers, in the process of decision-making, exercise choice and the personal/psychological dimensions of decision making have been noted by a number of workers (Pfiffner, 1960; Bass, 1965; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Ferber, 1967).

The existence of a process of personal restructuring seems therefore to be well established; its nature and extent is less clearly known. A similar situation pertains for the processes of collective restructuring. The manual work group has been identified as an important vehicle for restructuring the work situation to satisfy the needs of its members (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939; Argyris, 1957; Scott et al., 1963; Lupton, 1963; Fox, 1971). Less attention has been paid to the role of the group in the life of the manager, although "a mood of militancy" has been noted recently by
a number of researchers (Tavernier, 1975; Opinion Research Centre, 1977; Jenkins, 1977).

The researcher was able to gain some insights into these processes but the research method, based on the personal recall and revelations of the respondents, inevitably involved limitations. Unfortunately, no specific questions were asked by the researcher about the informal groups and cliques from which respondents might have gained support. Thus the section that follows does not represent a comprehensive picture. Its structure, however, is based on a distinction between personal restructuring, that undertaken by the individual in his attempts to counteract negative aspects of the work situation, and collective restructuring, where a group, clique or union is sought as the vehicle for this process. This section is therefore divided as follows:

i) Personal Restructuring
   Restructuring the Job
   Restructuring relationships.

ii) Collective Restructuring
    Formal Restructuring
    Informal Restructuring

i) Personal Restructuring

Restructuring the Job

Ten respondents replied that they did not find their job stimulating, with another seven recording a "don't know." These replies correlated with the references to feeling trapped in their current job and, when questioned about their short-term personalising strategies, they were, in the main, pre-occupied with job change.
rather than with redesigning the job. Some evidence was provided about the steps they and others took to make their job more stimulating. They recorded that they were able to extend their responsibilities over a wider range of tasks. This was particularly true in the first period of their appointment. As their experience grew, so they took additional responsibilities. Individuals were able to volunteer to undertake additional jobs and by making themselves available for some types of work and by showing interest in other tasks, they were able to influence the make-up of their job. Some jobs provided more scope for this personal restructuring. This was partly a function of the attitude of their boss and partly to do with the "imperatives" surrounding the job. Thus at one extreme the technical assistant to a senior production manager, having been in the job for over eight years, had been able to extend his range of duties, making optimum use of his ambiguous role. The remoteness of his boss and the lack of prescribed elements in his role had facilitated this. At the other extreme, the technologist in the laboratory felt trapped by the routine requirements of his job. He reported that he had tried to "redesign" his job, but at a recent appraisal interview had been criticised for choosing the interesting work and neglecting the routine.

There was some doubt in the researcher's mind that the choice of tasks was generally aimed at increasing the intrinsic satisfaction of the job, even when this was the stated reason. Often the desire seemed to be to increase visibility and widen experience, the purpose being to improve their promotion opportunities.

But among the factors that they could not build in for themselves were recognition and feedback. Thus, the technologist, who had undertaken a challenging and stimulating task, producing what
he thought to be an important manual for users, lost some of his pleasure and sense of achievement, when his boss had made no comm-
ent on his work. In another case, the individual had gradually accepted more responsibility, but had received no recognition in the form of regrading and as a result was bitter and frustrated.

The Instrument Mechanic Section Leader submitted a report, on his own initiative, on recruitment and training, only to hear no more about it. A number of examples of this type of response to their initiatives were included - the Work Study Officers' reports that were ignored; the Research Study report not acted upon; the Quality Assurance Engineer's recommendations that gathered dust.

Another problem mentioned by the individuals was that of acquiring a personal overload. Since the extension of their job by personal initiatives was the one usually mentioned by younger and less senior respondents, they often did not have many subordinates or only limited authority over them. This process of taking on more work and responsibility meant that they were often faced with undertaking this themselves, since the opportunities for delegation were limited. In the absence of recognition or in the absence of early job change, individuals reported a job overload, feelings of exploitation and often some bitterness against others, who had not adopted what they thought was a motivated approach to their work.

The aspiring young respondent was looking for opportunities to take responsibility for others as a means of displaying competence for promotion and also to enable him to show he had the requisite supervisory experience. This was not an easy area for job restructuring and a number were able to present to the researcher what they saw as cautionary tales against the use of initiative. Individuals
could take on additional responsibility but in the event of a difficulty or a challenge, they might find themselves isolated. The degree of isolation depended upon their boss – whether he would support them in this situation and give them the retrospective authority if they were challenged, or protect them if they were in deep water. The Senior Work Study Officer had sought to control the work of seconded staff, only to be blocked by their union and to be told that he should not have done so. The Warehousing Manager, assuming he had the support of his boss, found he had to withdraw a staff reorganisation programme in the face of union opposition.

The older, more senior respondents were less concerned with finding stimulus at work or acquiring responsibility for others than with trying to avoid an overload or a condition of pressure. They reported that they adopted a range of managerial approaches. They devised priority systems; they tried to develop their subordinates so that they could take more work from them; they set up their routine for managing their time; they adopted a personal flexi-time. But the sources of pressure were frequently power groups, such as the unions, senior management, the customer, client departments and their scope for discretion and restructuring was limited. They were faced with a steady reduction in manpower and a decline in the morale of subordinates. Thus the respondents recorded that they had not solved this situation. Internal promotion did not provide the solution. They sought, often unsuccessfully, to restructure the job by reducing the managerial component and increasing the "technical expert" role: one argued the case for the lateral move, back to the staff job. But there remained the dream of a second career. This theme will be expanded in the later section.
Restructuring Relationships

For ten of the respondents, concern about subordinates centred upon their inadequate performance, low motivation and need for continuous supervision. As has been mentioned, this might be handled by lowering standards, by turning a blind eye to malpractices. On the other hand, this might not be possible if the manager himself was dependent upon their work for his own reputation. In these cases, the managers reported that they diverted more and more energy into defining tasks, into monitoring performance, in checking up, in issuing detailed orders, in trying tightly to structure the situation. This process involved, in McGregor's terms (1960), a shift from Theory "y" towards Theory "x". It consumed more time; it led to an experience of pressure and disenchantment; it did not produce a significant improvement, for the respondents acknowledged their continuing concern. It did, however, assist the manager to avoid blame, "I've done all I can".

In the relationships with colleagues, problems and concerns were centred around failures of co-operation or internal politics and back-stabbing. Most of the respondents were dependent upon others for the adequate performance of their job and they lacked the authority or power to order such co-operation. Individuals with whom they had difficulty might be avoided, traded with, confronted. Thus contact might be minimised by dealing with, or through, other levels in the hierarchy - a form of informal redrawing of the organisational chart. If the situation deteriorated to an extreme, confrontation might be necessary but this seemed to be a last resort, because of the "slanging" match or emotional outbursts that might accompany it.
More likely was an attempt to establish a relationship of reciprocity. For the more dependent respondent, with little or no power or authority, this could involve paying special attention to the needs of a difficult manager when the opportunity presented itself - going out of his way to provide help or resources in the hope that the service would be returned. For the more powerful, it might be a more specific overt system of mutual exchange of services, or support, perhaps including the "deal of silence" - the reciprocal cover-up.

As identified in Chapter Four, relationships with the boss might be perceived as unsatisfactory because he failed to take an interest in their development, was too interfering or too remote, or because they could not count on him for support. The contribution of the lowering of expectations has already been explored and the issue of career development will be taken up in a later section. What respondents found particularly difficult was the interference or remoteness of their boss. To try to discuss this with him seemed to lead to confrontation from which they emerged less than satisfied with their own performance. They did record that this usually had the desired effect for some time. It helped in this process, if humour could be used. By banter, joking, or modest teasing, they recorded that they were able to get their message across without the issue becoming emotionally charged.

Frank and open discussion was not mentioned as a successful approach, either in the cases of interference or remoteness. Perhaps the respondents felt too vulnerable, not sufficiently competent or self-confident to initiate these discussions, particularly if they believed the behaviour of their boss stemmed from some emotional shortcoming on his part. The annual appraisal interview
was identified as an opportunity, to which some looked for a chance to explore with their boss some of the deficiencies but they seemed to be disappointed with the outcome.

One aspect of concern, mentioned by a number of respondents, particularly during the discussion on critical incidents, was that they should not be identified as being "to blame" for some wrong decision, for some failure to achieve targets or quality standards, or for some break-down in production flow or industrial relations, or for a failure to eliminate a problem. A major strategy to avoid this blame was to try to involve some significant others in the situation. Putting intended decisions into writing, the use of memos or minutes, discussing issues in the presence of witnesses, were some of the approaches. Another was to attempt to bring together a group as a problem-solving team to diffuse responsibility and avoid personal exposure. Thus when a furnace was experiencing production difficulties and one manager was being pressed for a solution, he set up a "team of experts" to study and report.

In some cases, being placed "on the spot" could be avoided by restructuring the expectations of others. Reference has already been made to a lowering of personal expectations in an attempt to avoid disappointment and frustration. But unless others could be convinced that these lowered expectations or goals were "realistic", the individual was still open to criticism. He needed to transmit the redefined situation to them in an attempt to influence their perception and to gain their support. One respondent therefore in discussing the inadequate performance of his subordinates, observed, with some relief, "the boss understands." It was towards the boss that these efforts at restructuring were mainly directed. They might involve convincing him that the respondent had only a limited
day, that the unions were unreasonable, that the target dates or expected performance levels were unrealistic. It might also involve convincing him that he was capable of carrying more responsibility or operating with less supervision.* To achieve these, the support of colleagues was sought and informal collective pressure might have to be exerted.

ii) Collective Restructuring

Formal Collective Restructuring

References have been made in Chapter Four to the use of collective pressure as a means of influencing the situation at work. This applied to the managerial as well as the technical non-managerial grades. Fox (1971) had argued that "career interests and ideology are normally of overriding importance in obliging managers to abstain from overt, collective action" (p. 90). But the circumstances have changed in many large organisations since Fox recorded the above statement. Jenkins (1977), some six years later, observed that, for middle management, "the logic of collective action becomes harder and harder to resist" (p. 17). Thus in the organisation under study here, individual managers and technical specialists were able to belong to a union without harming their career interests, provided they did not take an active union office and thereby risk being labelled as a "rebel" or "militant." A number recorded that they had been advised that it was not in their best career interests to continue to pursue an active union role. As Fox (1971) predicted above, there remained some tensions in the relationship between the manager and his union membership. In any case some individuals,

* The search for other career sponsors, such as a production manager or the Manager/Staff Development will be explored in the later sections.
upwardly mobile and taking senior management as their reference group, tended to support an ideology, ambivalent towards union challenges to managerial authority and prerogatives. They were torn between what Fox (1966) termed "unitary" and "pluralistic" ideologies. As has been noted, some 64% of the respondents unequivocally accepted the notion of managerial authority and, the researcher believed, the concept of managerial prerogatives. They seemed to be able to criticise manual unions for their pressure on management, yet at the same time to support their own union in its pursuit of increased pay, better conditions, overall improvement in gradings, and better severance payments.

In this research, the few respondents who did become active or personally involved in union affairs and who persisted in this strategy, seemed to do so because of frustration at their lack of individual success. But they believed that they had finally cut themselves off from managerial support in their careers and they saw themselves as taking up an opposition role. An example was provided in the case of the Technical Training Officer who felt thwarted in his career prospects and who lacked confidence in his management. He had become a union official for his colleagues. He reported at the interviews that, together with his colleagues, he had become frustrated at the lack of recognition and consultation. Under his leadership the branch had blocked an attempt to introduce an adult retraining scheme into the plant. In discussion, he acknowledged that in a sense he regretted this because he felt such a scheme was both socially beneficial and would have increased the challenge and stimulus within the Training Officer's job.

Irrespective of this, there were limits to the benefits that managers and technical specialists could gain from collective restruc-
turing. If the individual manager was seeking another job, promotion, or resources to undertake his managerial role more effectively, the pressure group could not do a great deal to help.

Levinson (1969) talked of the pain of rivalry from "an intensively competitive career pattern" (p. 53). He called the problems created by rivalry "one of the great undiscussed dilemmas of the managerial role" (p. 56). The lack of shared objectives and of a co-operative base meant that it was often difficult to gain cohesive support for policies within the managerial unions, except for a general increase in pay. An exception to this was the use of the union to press for an extension of the staff development programme to lower supervisory, technical grades. The individual, who had been associated with this, had hoped to further his own career prospects through this annual staff appraisal programme, if he could get management's agreement that his grade should be taken within its scope.

Generally the formal collective restructuring adopted by the respondents tended therefore to be a depersonalised process in which they individually played an inactive role - one of low visibility and therefore of low risk. Thus they reserved the right to benefit from collective bargaining but also to show loyalty to the organisation, should their careers require this.

Informal Collective Restructuring

Culbert (1974) has stressed that "without support we feel like one poor bastard pitted against all the problems of the world: with it, we're one of many involved in a very human dilemma" (p. 74). Unfortunately, no specific questions were asked by the researcher about the informal groups and cliques from which respondents might have gained support. No comprehensive picture can therefore be
presented, although some individuals did mention their group membership and this was then followed up by questions.

One such group that was mentioned by a number of respondents was that of the mechanical engineers at plant and departmental level. They were split up across the whole complex but they still felt themselves to be part of the same interest group. This group identity stemmed partly from their shared view of production management as a "common enemy" and partly from their career structure, which brought them all together.* They therefore saw themselves as a pressure group to combat what they perceived as unreasonable demands from production, a lower status and grading and, ironically, a restricted promotion structure. (It was rare for an engineer to enter production management from which ranks came general management). Over time, they developed a network of mutual support, illustrated by the comments of one departmental engineer. He had worked in a number of plants in the Works during his career and, when discussing restrictions on expenditure and resources, observed he could always get round these. One of his colleagues in another department would help him out. It was indeed significant that the older respondents tended not to criticise the internal politics or the manoeuvrings, for they were part of it, part of the system of reciprocity.

Very little reference was made by the respondents to their membership of pressure groups. One respondent, an assistant manager, had talked of trying unsuccessfully to gain support from his colleagues to counteract a senior management policy, by which he and his colleagues were required to cover seven days a week.

* This was not the case for the production managers, for interchange between departments was not so well established and some boundaries were relatively impermeable.
Another talked of successful pressure exerted by him and his fellow project leaders against their boss's tendency to set unrealistic targets for project completion. Goldring (1973) argued that, although there was "already much lip service to team work in management, all too often the reality behind this is individual empire building and competitive power hierarchies" (p. 5). Therefore the lack of reference to pressure groups might reflect their paucity; on the other hand, it might have been a product of respondents' reluctance to disclose them, or a shortcoming in the approach of the researcher.

Foa (1971) has indicated the group might provide a range of services for its members. He identified six different types of resource which could be exchanged - love, status, information, money, goods or services. A group, lower in status to the mechanical engineers, providing some of these "resources", was that of the Work Study Officers. They had actually formed themselves into a union branch and one of the respondents had been their union official until advised to drop it. Although he felt that the union branch, as a pressure group, was not a success, he did believe that the informal group provided a valuable source of support and friendship. Work study did not provide an adequate career structure for the ambitious young officer and therefore they were very dependent upon management for promotion out of the unit. It will be recalled how the senior Work Study Officer was himself surprised at the horseplay in which he took part with his colleagues, a process which he identified as releasing some of the tensions, attendant on the auditing, advisory and much blamed role of this group.

Although some groupings were made difficult by career competition or by conflict over resources or the allocation of "blame", the Organisation was sufficiently large for it to be possible for
friendship groups to form, particularly within the managers' room or through car-pool arrangements. The members of these groups might have no, or very little, work contact and therefore did not provide each other with physical resources or put pressures on others. On the other hand, they could provide each other with a valuable source of information about what was happening (or "alleged" to be happening) in the Works or within B.S.C. "Plugging into the grapevine" was an important lunch-time activity. The groups could provide friendship, an opportunity to join with others in a process of displacing blame onto a mutually acceptable power group - Headquarters or the Unions. In one sense this was a process of "collective redefinition" in that from the joking, the anti-headquarters sarcasm, individuals received a sense of perspective. They obtained what Hackman (1975) termed an additional "source of data about the nature of reality" (p. 1476).

Reference has already been made to the possible denial of any problems in sharing feelings of stress with their boss. The researcher gained the impression that they could not share their intimate concerns with colleagues. Group membership of these management cliques provided an arena in which individuals could share their frustration and concerns, albeit impersonally, or in humour and satire, without displaying weakness, without providing their "enemies" with ammunition, or their bosses with evidence of their psychological shortcomings.

d) Restructuring/Redefining Work - Non-Work Relationships

Introduction

The demands made upon a manager by his home or his work constantly change. It might be a short, one-off demand - a funeral
to attend or an urgent report needed at work - or it might be of a longer, more extended duration - the chronic ill-health of his wife, the demands of young children, or the continuing pressures of a demanding job. The individuals therefore needed some means for adjusting to these changing demands. With managers, the actual number of hours to be worked were ill-defined and the borderline between work and non-work was often difficult to identify. Dunnette (1973) came to a similar conclusion when he observed that "distinctions between work and non-work are blurred. Probably the best definition of leisure is 'discretionary time'" (p. 23). It was this idea of "discretionary time" that permitted the individual to allocate more or less time to work or to non-work. Apart from "restructuring" the way he spent his day to respond to changing demands, he could "redefine" the degree of importance, the degree of centrality that work held for him, without necessarily altering his mode of working. The processes of restructuring and redefining are inter-related but for the purpose of this discussion they will be separated.

i) **Restructuring Work/Non-Work Relationships**

*The Increased Allocation of Time and Energy to Work.*

Individual respondents extended their working day, either by working longer hours at work, early starting, late finishing, working week-ends, or by taking work home. This included the study of management and relevant topics. These activities, they seemed to undertake, either because they perceived the job as demanding it and they could see no way of avoiding it, or they felt their career required such activity, or because they preferred so to spend their time.
A distinction is made here between the perceived demands of the job and those of the career, although clearly, this was sometimes blurred. The younger manager often permitted work to encroach upon non-work time, not specifically because this was necessary adequately to perform the job, but rather as a form of display, or as they termed it, a form of "investment". This was particularly true in relation to taking management courses, which took up a great deal of their non-work time and which individuals indicated they undertook to fulfil the expectations of others and in the hope of career progress.

A number of writers have suggested that the organisation exploited its managers. Fendrock (1969) argued that "some executives expect their managers to make everything else subordinate to the requirements of work ... managerial madams exist, and they hire men as managerial prostitutes" (p. 213). Pahl and Pahl (1971) accused management of "exploitation" and managers of "being willing slaves" (p. 258). Gowler and Legge (1975) talked of the "hidden contract" between the individual and the organisation, whereby the individual in accepting a career was left "with reduced time and energy to devote to the daily running of the home" (p. 73). This meant that the organisation was able to make heavy demands in terms of the manager's commitments and resources (p. 75). According to the "hidden contract", it was assumed that in addition to employing the manager, the manager's wife would fulfil the full domestic role.

Individuals often saw this encroachment of work into non-work time as a form of flexi-time. They claimed they had no qualms in taking time off when home circumstances required it, in return for the time they had worked for the organisation. But a feature of a formal flexi-time system was that extra hours worked were credited
and time off was taken in lieu. Amongst most of the respondents, where extra time was worked or work taken home, there was no "quid pro quo" and although they might talk of taking time off when circumstances required it, the researcher was left wondering whether this formula was accepted by other people and whether the individuals felt no guilt about it. One individual assured the writer - "the Company gets the best of the deal".

The encroachment of work into non-work was not viewed by all as a satisfactory process. Individuals, who were required to exert so much energy in their work that they returned home "shattered", were highly critical of the demands made of them. They were dissatisfied with the balance, or the lack of it, that they had achieved between work and non-work.

There were others who allocated time to work not so much because the job or career required it but because they preferred so to do. This was mainly because they enjoyed the job and found it intrinsically challenging and stimulating. But there were examples, the researcher believed, of individuals who spent time at work because this was an escape from the non-work situation. An extreme example of this was the technical expert, coping with a mid-career crisis, during which he was involved in a prolonged extra-marital sexual relationship. He seemed to take the opportunity to act as a "trouble shooter" for the Company, travelling around the world to avoid from some of these tensions. Burke (1973) accepted that the reported desire of some of his respondents to spend more time in their family roles might be an example of the socially desirable or appropriate answer (p. 57). He speculated that they did not really wish so to do. Similarly, it is reasonable to predict that the number of the respondents in this research project, although no
direct evidence was available, were using their career as a means of escape from the chores of bringing up young children.

A limited amount of non-work time could itself be restructured. In order to handle the pressures from his wife, one individual noted that he would try hard to do those jobs demanded by his spouse in a major effort to build up what he called "goodwill", for when he needed to spend more time at work. If a family event - an outing, holiday or party was planned, some individuals went to great lengths not to disappoint. This meant on occasions having to neglect temporarily some aspect of work. Individuals also placed time limits on the amount of overtime they would work, refusing to work after certain times. Indeed, one individual mentioned how he insisted on having breakfast with his family in order to have an opportunity of being with them. These strategies did not necessarily resolve the conflict but they might hold the problem at bay.

ii) Restructuring Work/Non-Work Relationships

Reducing the Time and Energy Allocated to Work

Some of the respondents felt able to reduce the amount of time and energy allocated to work. This might involve reducing the actual number of hours spent at the job or the reduction or cessation of taking work home.* This downward adjustment might have been from the long hours previously spent to master a job, or worked in order to display one's suitability for promotion. It might have followed a personal reappraisal of the individual's career or some career set-back. It was often accompanied by assertions of

* It might involve a refusal to attend a management course, because of an "horticultural" concern over early potatoes.
regret at the central position that the job had previously occupied - as one individual commented "I've got my priorities right now."

Higgin (1975) has identified "the pull of interest and energy away from the centrality of work in our lives". He suggested that individuals were "more concerned to find a new and more satisfying focus for their lives" (p. 22). Two of the group recognised however if circumstances changed at work, they would probably increase their involvement - they would return work to a more central position. It was as if the search for a "the new and more satisfying focus", of which Higgin spoke, was too difficult and disturbing.

Amongst the younger, less successful respondents, the low centrality of work in the individual's total life space tended to be a function of its lack of interest and challenge: it also reflected their lack of career progress. They still had to spend a certain limited number of hours at work but they could use their discretionary time in non-work activities in an attempt to compensate for the lack of stimulus and progress. Even work time could be frittered away by taking books to read, personal jobs to undertake or in social chit-chat. The non-work activity adopted as a form of substitute stimulus could be the study of German, golf, music; it could be the membership of clubs and societies; it could involve playing a more active part in the family.

iii) Redefinition of the Relationships Between Work and Non-Work

A number of writers have observed that the encroachment of work into non-work time was becoming increasingly less acceptable to managers and particularly to their wives (Pahl and Pahl, 1971; Gowler and Legge, 1975; Marshall, 1976). In this research, a number of respondents mentioned the adverse reactions of their wives
to the time and attention they directed towards their work. From this therefore it could be predicted that managers, who believed themselves to be forced to extend their work at the expense of non-work, would be faced with an increasing dilemma, which the restructuring of their limited non-work time would not resolve. In this respect the process of redefinition, involving a change of attitude towards, or altered perception of, the situation could be noted.

A frequently mentioned approach seemed to be to define it as one of limited duration and to gain the agreement of one's wife in this. A typical phrase, already noted, was "my wife and I agree that this is a special period". By seeing this as temporary, the situation became tolerable. It was presented as a postponement of pleasures in return for a greater yield - an investment. It was if these individuals saw themselves as operating a large-scale version of flexi-time, what Clutterbuck (1973) termed, in a different context, "flexi-life". How far the individuals were deceiving themselves and their wives was open to debate. The evidence from the older respondents, who still faced these time pressures, suggested that in 10 years time the same situation could prevail, although they might no longer have the collusion of their wives in this.

The idea of future return on current time and energy invested seemed to develop in later years into an emphasis on the actual returns and benefits. The older managers sought to justify their present position of over-work and their neglect of the non-work situation, both to convince themselves and their spouses, by emphasising the material benefits - the good allowance, the well furnished home, the "quality" holidays. The emphasis however used in one or two of the interviews suggested both internal conflict as well as con-
flict at home on this issue.

The redefining of work/non-work relationships was not only adopted to handle the tension caused by work encroaching into non-work time and the ensuing guilt. It seemed also to provide a way of coping with career failure or the lack of success, or a means of coming to terms with the failure of work to provide the life goals now sought after. If an individual manager could lower the importance of work within his total life space, the arrival at his career ceiling could be more easily tolerated. Thus, in the absence of promotion opportunities, some individuals argued that the price of promotion would be too high in terms of their family and social commitments - a "sour grapes" response. The fact that no-one was asking them to pay this price was not commented upon. They were also able to displace the blame for their lack of ambition or lack of promotion, on to the desire of their wife to stay in the district or on the educational requirements of their children. In this way the individual did not have to admit that he no longer thought in terms of promotion and he could gradually adjust to the necessity of staying in the same position for the next 15 years. But it would be wrong to assume that these arguments were always unconscious self-deceptions. In a number of cases the emphasis on family and personal life was the product of a personal reappraisal, a coming-to-terms with one's shortcomings and with the lack of satisfaction to be gained from their work role. One of the respondents had actually asked for a downgrading because of the physical and domestic strain from his job. Others, as part of their mid-life reappraisal, seemed genuinely to be concerned at this lack of significant reward from their work and they were planning some life change, or developing significant out-
lets for their energy in non-work activities.

One other approach that seemed to be adopted by the respondents in this situation was that of denial. For example, some 20 respondents were prepared to record some conflict in demands between job and family, but only seven, in responding to the questionnaire, acknowledged a difficulty in maintaining their social and family commitments. Discussions were not held with their wives to check out the reality of this. The evidence however from other research (Pahl and Pahl, 1971; Marshall, 1976; Burke, Weir & Duncan, 1976; Burke and Weir, 1977) would suggest that their wives were probably less than satisfied with the current situation.

iv) General Observations

The debate about the relationship between work and non-work has centred around two broad approaches, the "compensatory" theory and the "spillover" theory. (For review, see Barr, 1975). According to the compensatory theory, workers compensated for the lack of satisfaction at work in their free time. The "spillover" theory suggested that work was so constraining that "worker capacity for meeting the demands of spare time activities which require discretion is reduced" (Meissner, 1971).

But the research and discussions were in the main concerned with the office and manual workers, whose jobs lacked discretion, challenge and responsibility. The managers and technical specialists within this study provided support for both sets of views (albeit somewhat amended). Individuals, who had jobs that did not extend or challenge them, reported that they directed their time and their efforts into non-work activity. Whilst this did not necess-
arily fully compensate for the shortcomings of work, the range of activities seemed rich and varied. These included local authority council membership, chairman of the Parents' Association, membership of various clubs, running the local youth football team, sculpture and music, competitive bridge etc. etc. The respondents were however in the main graduates, professionally qualified and their jobs were probably not as restrictive as those of the manual or office grades.

There was also evidence of the "spillover effect" but in these cases, it was function of the excessive demands, rather than their absence. As has been noted, some of those studied reported their jobs as so time-and-energy-consuming that they lacked the opportunity and vitality to play a full and rich part in family and social life. A similar conclusion had been reached by Rapoport (1970), Pahl and Pahl (1971) and Burke (1973).

e) Seeking to Change Jobs within the Organisation

Introduction

A number of research studies have emphasised the importance of job change to the manager. Argyris (1957) had argued that job change was an important strategy for dealing with unsatisfactory work circumstances. He did, however, go on to observe "there do not seem to be any studies that focus on executive upward mobility as an adaptive mechanism" (p. 81). Sofer (1970) had noted the frequent emphasis placed on promotion by the managers and technical specialists in his study. He was also impressed by the fact that "advancement was so important to these men" (p. 10). Bray et al. (1974) noted that "moving upward in the management hierarchy represents a very important fact of life for management recruits (p. 68)
Progress, or lack of it, may well have been a central concern of many of the recruits" (p. 82). Marshall (1976) noted that "for many managers, their career progression is of overriding importance" (p. 69). Melrose-Woodman (1978) from his survey of managers recorded that "despite the fact that many have been with the same employer for years, few of them have remained in the same job" (p. 21).

Notwithstanding these submissions the researcher was still surprised at the frequency with which job change was mentioned by the respondents during the first interview. He decided therefore to gather consistent information about this and at the second interview all the respondents were asked to record the length of time they wanted to stay in their current job and the length of time they expected to have to stay in this job. The following results were obtained:-

Table 6.1: Desired and Anticipated Length of Stay in Current Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Length of Stay in Job</th>
<th>Anticipated Length of Stay in Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 12 months</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1 yr. - 2 yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2 yrs. - 3 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 yrs. - 4 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4 yrs. - 5 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Over 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus some 82% wanted an early move and they looked to this for a number of reasons. They wanted to ensure that their career progressed according to what Martin & Strauss (1956) called their "career timetable" or to try to get it moving again; they sought
a move from an unsatisfactory works situation to what they saw as "greener" fields; they looked for a sense of achievement that was so often missing from their day-to-day work. This section will therefore initially be concerned with these functions that the seeking after a job change seemed to perform. But to some the prospects of, and the desire for, job change appeared to have diminished. The implications of this will be next examined, followed by a discussion on the role that uncertainty seemed to play in these processes. The structure of this section is therefore as below:

i) Job change and career progress

ii) Job change to improve conditions

iii) Job change and a sense of achievement

iv) Diminishing desire for and prospects of job changes.

v) Job change and uncertainty

i) Job Change and Career Progress

Length of stay in their current job was a major concern. Dickson (1977), who from his survey of middle managers noted a similar pressure for job change, reported that his respondents held the view that "any who does not move in two years is regarded as dead as a dodo" (p. 68). Levinson (1969) talked of each year "as a mile post." "Time in a job or level is a critical factor" (p. 53). He went on to argue that "this means there necessarily must be repetitive sub-peaks of anxiety around time dimensions." Approximately half the respondents had, in their opinion, been in their jobs too long (see section on career development) and were therefore having to cope with this anxiety. One method for handling their anxiety was to adopt an optimistic approach about forthcoming changes,
what Bridger (1972) called "comforting assumptions about the future" (p. 37). Therefore there was in the view of many of the respondents, little or no discrepancy between their aspirations and their anticipated job movement.

Set out below is a table of approximate discrepancies, calculated by subtracting an individual's desired length of stay from the anticipated length of stay.

Table 6.2: Discrepancy between Desired and Anticipated Length of Stay in Current Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No discrepancy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Up to 2 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2 - 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 - 4 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4 - 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5 years and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This optimism seemed to be in line with the findings of Grupp and Richards (1975), who concluded from their study of U.S. executives that "they are not only presently content, but are also optimistic about their future" (p. 104). Yet the conditions in this study were one of decline and therefore an attempt was made to judge whether the respondents' perception of internal job opportunities was realistic. Discussions were held with the Manager/Staff Development and the General Manager (Training). From the information received from these discussions, it would appear that the respondents were very optimistic, for the reduction in staffing levels, already made public, was cutting down the number of managerial posts avail-
able. Already a policy of not replacing leavers and those retiring was being rigorously pursued. Indeed, the Manager/Staff Development expressed concern about the frustration that would be generated by this policy amongst middle managers, faced as they would be with a reduction in job opportunities. This situation was by no means secret and yet still the respondents maintained their optimism.

This optimism seemed to be often particularly misplaced. For example, one individual, extremely nervous at the interview, who had been eight years in post as a specialist and who appeared unlikely to impress an interview panel with his supervisory and influencing skills, nevertheless felt that technological changes would provide him with opportunities. He appeared to have convinced himself that his failure to date to gain promotion was not due to personal failings or shortcomings. He emphasised to the researcher that no-one else in his department had received promotion, a statement which was not true. Thus "It's not just me," coupled with an optimism about the future, seemed to help him handle the current situation.

From Table 2.3, showing the length of service in the current job, it will be seen that a number had already spent a lengthy period in post. It was difficult to understand how some of them could continue to be optimistic. If this had been the experience of so many in the past, the younger-respondents must have faced reduced hopes for the future.

ii) Job Change to Improve Conditions

Guerrier & Philpot (1978) from their survey of managers for the B.I.M. observed that middle management was "often boring and repetitive" (p. 25). 20% of the respondents in this research
project observed that they did not find their job stimulating. 41% did not consider the job to be sufficiently demanding and 46% wanted more responsibility.

The major strategy for dealing with these circumstances was to seek a job change promotion. Limited restructuring of the job was adopted as has been noted, but the respondents felt it was better resolved by movement. Thus even the restructuring was towards gaining higher visibility, extending experience, widening career options, all of which were valued for their extrinsic value as a means of gaining that next move, rather than of improving job satisfaction.

Similarly taking the Diploma in Management Studies was seen as a means of aiding job change. The respondents were specifically asked at the first part of the first interview about their reasons for taking the course. In the main they replied that it was either as a lever for promotion or because it was an expected part of their development and therefore a prerequisite for job change.* Few gave, as their reason for attending, the contribution the course might have made to how they performed their job. Thus the objectives of the tutors and the sponsors might not match the views of the students. A number of the respondents reported in the interviews that in retrospect they regretted that they had not taken more advantage of the personal development and learning opportunities provided by the course. They noted that they had evaluated many of the sessions in terms of its contribution or lack of contribution to helping them pass examinations. The tutors were to some degree aware of this mismatch but it should be re-emphasised, for their

* These findings were in line with those of Sibbald (1978).
search for the proactive student, prepared to gain the most from the programme, might be thwarted by the instrumental role that the DMS was seen to play in the career strategy of the students.

Individuals therefore attended the DMS in the expectation of a return. Similarly some of the respondents were currently tolerating unsatisfactory jobs as part of their "investment" in the future. A warehouse manager had accepted a job which he found to be lacking in challenge and interest as part of a "deal". At the end of two years he considered he would be entitled to "demand" a better job. Again, a newly appointed planning manager, in the "hot seat", felt that he could tolerate the friction and frustration of this job because he would have earned the right to look for a change in two years time.

A job change could also provide the respondents with an opportunity to improve their pay. A third of them felt inadequately paid and, although a few looked to collective or individual negotiations as the solution, the majority saw job change as the answer. Whereas, however, job change might be the perceived answer for the underpaid and the underutilised, for those who suffered overload and a disenchantment with managerial responsibilities, job change, or at least promotion, did not offer the same hope of relief. For many the probable next job threatened more strain, more work, more commitment. They were not too concerned about their current pay levels and some saw these levels as a trap. This meant that one manager argued for the automatic transfer to a staff job, after five years in production management. It led one respondent to bemoan his choice of production as a career and to indicate that his children would be advised differently. At the extreme, one respondent, brought close to a physical and nervous breakdown, had been
obliged to ask to be withdrawn from his management job and was now in "limbo" with nothing but a succession of "manufactured" tasks. For these, a "second career" or "dropping out" was the future dream.

iii) Job Change and a Sense of Achievement

From the analysis of the "needs" questionnaire, it was noted that achievement needs were rated as the most sought and the least satisfied. Individuals often found it difficult to gain a sense of achievement from their work. This was partly a function of the size of the organisation and the associated difficulty of feeling their contribution was significant; it was partly a function of the advisory role that a number of respondents had to perform; it was also a product of the continuous, incessant pressure made upon some by the demands of production - what Lorsch et al. (1978) called "a perpetual preoccupation" (p. 273). In the absence of achievement intrinsic to the job, career progression represented another potential source. This provided for a number of the younger respondents the stimulus for change and produced an optimism about change.

A number of the older respondents had passed through this career stage and had now reached a level when the internal job opportunities were limited. Job change, either because of lack of competence (or perceived competence), or because of narrowing promotion ladders, was no longer as available. Smith (1978) talked of this as the "job plateau" (p. 34). Some now recognised that they could see no job that offered them the answer to their search for achievement. The comment was made that they were not prepared to pay the price they saw others paying in terms of long hours, commitment and stress. This might have been the "sour grapes"
mechanism at work in that in the researcher's view a number of these had little hope of achieving these positions. For others, it was a realistic appraisal of job opportunities, involving a restructuring of expectations.

Irrespective of this, some of the respondents recognised that internal job change, at least in the short term, did not seem to provide the means for improving their quality of working life. Tausky & Dubin (1965) differentiated between "downward career anchorage" by which the individual valued his progress to date and an "upward career anchorage", looking to the future - "the sky's the limit" (p. 726). They suggested that the orientation changed, as the individual grew older, to a downward orientation. Some evidence to support this was presented by this research. A number of those whose progress was halted looked at their achievements to date and to non-work activities for their future satisfaction.

iv) Diminishing Desire for, and Prospects of, Job Change

Thus for some of the respondents, the narrowing of job opportunities had already occurred. Job change has become less and less likely as promotion through "dead men's" shoes faced them, or as they faced another "impermeable" boundary, or an internal job change no longer seemed to offer them an improvement in the quality of working life. It was as if some of the individuals had come to firm conclusions on those jobs they did not want, rather than on those they did want.

Not all the respondents wanted or expected an early job change. The three persons, who answered with category 5 or 6 for the desired length of stay in the job, were aged 43, 43 and 44 years respectively. They recorded a high quality of working life rating, considered their
job to be stimulating and held reasonably senior posts. One of the respondents, the Chief Electrical Engineer, was pleased with his own progress. He wanted to continue living in the area for the foreseeable future. He and his family were just settling into a new home and the children were at an important stage of their education. In a sense, the next five years could bring changes that might give him a wider role but he was not prepared to take initiatives - he would "wait and see".

In the case of the second, he was extremely happy in his job as a research supervisor and he said he would have been prepared to stay in that post until retirement. In addition to a stimulating job at work, he reported a full and varied non-work life. The future did offer him some possibility of promotion upon the retirement of his boss and to this he looked forward. He therefore felt relieved of any need to initiate and the chance of promotion meant that he did not have to surrender all his ambition.

In the case of the third person, the researcher was not convinced that the balance existed as suggested by his stated desire to remain in the same job probably until retirement. There was a number of indications during the interview that he felt passed over for promotion and that he was not entirely reconciled to this. He was struggling, it seemed, to achieve this reconciliation, to convince himself that to stay in the job would be no bad thing. Yet this process was producing tensions. He was critical, for example, of the promotion policy and of his colleagues, who had received appointments. He argued that what he now wanted was to complete his service at the works and to spend more time with his family and the pursuits of walking and music. The researcher nevertheless felt that he was trying to repress his frustration and this
could easily come to the surface as happened at different points in the interview.

Eight people anticipated having to stay four or more years in their current jobs. The positions of three of these have already been discussed above. The other five were not so reconciled to it. All felt that finding a job outside would be difficult and none were seeking such employment. Two would have liked to change jobs immediately but neither could see any hope of that. In consequence one was planning to "drop out" of management at some point in the future; the other, now aged 47 years, was pursuing an active union role and seeking election as a local authority councillor.* The remaining three were more hopeful of some change in the next two - four years, although it was by no means clear from where this change was coming. This might have reflected their optimism in viewing the internal market.

Fifty per cent - nine out of the eighteen - who recorded no discrepancy, had been in their job for less than twelve months. The job change they had recently experienced, gave them a sense of movement. This had been important to a number of them for it had brought them through an impermeable boundary into a wider more visible career world, or it had involved a discernible step up the promotion ladder. In the remaining cases, it was an opportunity to broaden experience and although two persons recorded that they were unhappy with the new job, they were prepared to undergo the period in that post in return for the "promised land." "In two years time, I shall have earnt the right to knock on the door and then ...." The job change had moved them off the sub-peak of

* He was appointed a magistrate shortly after the interviews.
anxiety - it pushed forward their plans for the future in that they now looked two years hence for the next move.

The period of time they and others wished to spend in the same job was in general shorter than that desired by the organisation. The organisation was prepared, as part of its management development programme, to move certain people to new jobs to broaden their experience but not as rapidly as the individuals would have liked (and not all individuals). They wanted a period of stability, particularly from middle management, during which the individual contributed to the job from his now experienced position. The individual on the other hand with his personal career timetable, his fear of being trapped and labelled a specialist, or of being left, forgotten, wanted regularly to move.

Hall (1971) complained that amongst young new members of the organisation "there is a tendency to avoid sustained effort in one activity ...... a difficulty in committing oneself for too long to any one system" (p. 20). He concluded that "the talk of wanting challenge and competence seems to be more rhetoric than reality." This mis-match between the expectations of the organisation in terms of the length of stay in job and the desired tenure of the individual manager has been inadequately studied. Even if the organisation made its expectations in terms of length of stay, known to the individual when taking up the job, he was so vulnerable at that stage, having just passed through the boundary, he was unlikely to challenge it. That did not mean that he accepted it and the respondents seemed to reserve the right to press on in accordance with their own time-table, irrespective of that of the organisation, but not without frustrations and tensions.
v) Job Change & Uncertainty

Dubin (1958) saw an individual's career as a "way of ordering his future life and giving it direction." "A career provides a degree of predictability about an individual's future" (p. 279). Wilensky (1962) defined a career as "a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered, predictable sequence" (p. 554). The individual respondents in this study did not see their career in this light. Their viewpoint was more in line with the conclusions of Pahl and Pahl (1971) who concluded that "Many men move through a succession of jobs that only retrospectively turn into careers" (p. 67).

Others have supported this submission, arguing that the future career prospects of individuals in modern organisations were beset by uncertainty and ambiguity (Becker and Strauss, 1956; Dill, Hilton & Reitman, 1960). In this organisation, the uncertainty was made more compelling by the publicity about the declining industry and its financial problems. Yet it was as if out of this very uncertainty, an optimism could breed. For example, one respondent, who had been on the threshold of general management, had recently received a setback in his career due to senior management changes. His prospects over the next few years were discussed and he accepted that there was a great deal of doubt hanging over him. He argued that the job he now had, although a sideways and even a downwards move, still contained a great deal of challenge to exercise him over the next two years. His view was that, during that period, out of the uncertainty, "something would turn up." So pervasive was this philosophy that the researcher and the respondent together called it his "Micawber" approach to his career.

Another approach to this uncertainty was to make the personal
career time-table more flexible than Dickson suggested it was. If a two year desired length of stay in a job could not be achieved, it could be, almost unconsciously, extended. The individual, however, still needed some milestone, some basis for structuring time and the researcher was impressed by the number of occasions individuals pointed to some point in the future when they would initiate some change or when they would negotiate for a new job.

Anderson (1973) criticised the individual manager for his failure to define his career goals. "All too often people never get round to asking or even answering the question - "What do I want to do and be?" (p. 358). But under conditions of uncertainty, individuals might, by defining their career goals (even if they were so able), limit their options. They worked to avoid being labelled as a specialist or trapped in a department - what McClelland (1967) called getting "typed" (p. 56) - whose boundaries were seen as relatively impermeable.* In their pursuit of another job, they wanted to extend their experience, particularly into the supervisory/managerial fields and to broaden the range of jobs that they could thereafter pursue. This was aimed at counteracting the narrowing of promotion opportunities that occurred as one progressed up the hierarchy.

f) Seeking to Move to Another Organisation

Introduction

Leaving the organisation has been identified by a number of researchers as a means of handling unsatisfactory work situations.

* Those in the Research Centre held this view of their department and the respondents who had successfully gained a transfer into production or another service department, saw this as a major event in their career.
There is an extensive literature, discussing the relationship between labour turnover, job satisfaction, and other factors (for review see Pettman, 1973). These labour turnover studies have been conducted, in the main, on persons who were in the process of leaving or had actually left, often at their exit interview. They also were usually concerned with manual and office workers. In this study, however, the discussions centred around the intention or the desire to leave and on the reasons for wanting to leave, rather than on the fact of leaving and the reasons for having left. This orientation produced a different viewpoint on the possible function that the process of seeking to leave might provide for individuals.

At the interviews the respondents were asked whether they had seriously considered leaving the organisation. Three choices were offered and the following responses were received:

Table 6.3: Leaving the Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I am now actively seeking employment outside the organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I have at some time seriously considered leaving but I am not at present actively seeking other employment</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I have never seriously considered leaving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guerrier & Philpot (1978) in their B.I.M. Survey obtained a very similar result from their general study - 10% were actually applying for jobs. The number who were actually seeking employment could have been higher than those recorded above in that individuals might not have wished to tell the researcher of their
It appeared, however, that the effects of the standstill in recruitment and the declining numbers employed and thus declining job opportunities were probably offset by other factors. In the main the respondents considered that there was still a wide range of internal job opportunities (see discussion on job change) and for many the external labour market was difficult, requiring almost certainly a change of district. The respondents were asked about the ease of finding alternative employment and as will be noted from the table below, some 72% chose the "difficult" half of the response sheet.

**Table 6.4: Ease of Leaving the Organisation**

**If you were actively seeking employment outside the organisation, how difficult or easy would you find it?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat easy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat difficult</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These results will be discussed more fully later in this section)

In discussing this strategy of leaving the organisation, a distinction will be made here between those currently actively seeking employment elsewhere and those who recorded this as a possibility at some point in the future. The section is therefore divided on this basis, as follows.
i) Those currently seeking other employment

ii) Those intending to seek other employment in the future.

i) Those currently seeking other employment

The six persons in the first category were all aged between 29-34 years. Here the similarity ended. Two of the six were seeking to change organisations because they had decided to live abroad, one to marry his German fiancée, the other to return to the Middle East. In the case of one of the six, the researcher was left in some doubt as to whether he actually intended to leave. This person was extremely dissatisfied with his job, his boss, his colleagues. He observed that he made job-seeking a hobby and quite enjoyed the experience. He seemed to reserve the right to leave but whether he would actually do so was another matter. Two of those remaining saw leaving the organisation as the last resort. They were totally disillusioned with their jobs and had been unsuccessful in seeking an internal job change. Both felt trapped in their current job and felt obliged to look outside. They saw themselves as unsuccessful and were highly critical of internal promotion policy. The sixth person was quite the opposite. He had been very successful and, although still only 30, he was disenchanted with his job and his career. The pressures of management on his home life and the stresses of industrial relations on his work time had led him to want a change. There was no job he particularly wanted in the organisation. He differed from others in this study who recorded a disenchantment with their jobs, in that he had reached this stage at the age of 30, whereas they had reached it later perhaps at the age of 40-45 years. They felt constrained by family commitments but he felt free to change his career (he was postponing the start of a family until he had resolved this).
ii) Those intending to seek other employment in the future

Few, if any, of the respondents had completely written off the possibility of leaving the organisation at some point in the future. It remained a possibility and this seemed to serve a number of functions. Some, mainly the younger well-qualified, attached a high probability to moving as part of their own strategy for promotion and career development. For a second group, the somewhat older members, the possibility of leaving kept alive their ambitions; to a third group, the chance of a change of organisation represented what Leider (1974) (1976) termed a "second career", akin to what Merton (1968) termed "Retreatism"; to the fourth group, it was an insurance against failure, against dismissal, redundancy or works closure.

Actual Outlet for Ambition

As has been mentioned in the discussions on seeking to change jobs within the organisation, there was a group of ambitious young managers who were "in a hurry". They were optimistic of their chances for job changes internally and they also felt that if they had to take to the outside labour market, it would similarly not be too difficult to find alternative work. They were not tied to the district nor to this organisation. The jobs they were undertaking were not seen in terms of intrinsic rewards but as instrumental in facilitating their career. If they did not receive the sought-after promotion within the specified period, they would look elsewhere.

Keeping Ambition Alive

Schultz (1974) has pointed out "without goals and dreams and
hopes there is no longer a sense of future, nothing to work towards, and struggle for" (p. 10). The older respondents still had some 20 years of work before them. They did not want to think of remaining in the same job for that length of time and yet they feared they had reached their career ceiling. Leaving the organisation before retirement was thus a dream they held. They were not seeking jobs outside at present because of their family commitments but in two, three, four, five years, they indicated they could be entering the labour market. They saw it as a means of keeping their ambitions alive. One such person, aged 48, accepted that promotion within the organisation was almost impossible. "It would require a quantum of effort." He argued that he could not seek work outside at present, for his children's education would keep him here. "But in two years time, there will be a break in clouds and I will be off." Upon further discussion, this break did not seem real because of the space between the ages of his three children. Since he did not seem to want to admit that he had reached his promotion limit, he kept alive the notion of leaving.

Hughes (1968), writing in America, saw it "as a society where people generally claim to believe in ambition and to be ashamed of the lack of it" (p. 398). Howard (1978) in a study of Canadian managers has observed that "unfulfilled ambition is a universal problem; it only varies in intensity" (p. 83). He went on to report that as the manager grew older, so he became less ambitious. What he did not point out was that for many, the process of lowering ambition, adjusting expectations, changing life goals was often a slow and painful process. This process, it seemed, could be aided by keeping alive the possibility of changing organisations. Ambition could still flourish a little longer but its pursuit be post-
poned. "When the children have completed their G.C.E.'s or their University career - then I can start actively seeking a job outside."

Whether this would actually happen was by no means clear. A longitudinal study covering perhaps some five years would be necessary.* It seemed quite possible that over the next five years, unless there was some crisis at the works, they would gradually reconcile themselves, perhaps arguing that they were now too old for such an upheaval.

The "Second Career"

Wilson (1976) predicted that "there will be a growing, but still tiny, minority drawn from the upper end of the affluence scale who either 'drop out' from a sense of alienation or choose the life of the 'perpetual student' " (p. 179). Leider (1974) (1976) has discussed the phenomenon of "second career seeking" in America. He predicted "life/career issues will be among the most discussed of society's problems in the next five years and one of the hottest problems that business and industry will be faced with." (p. 16).

A number of the respondents kept alive the possibility of leaving at some stage in the future but not to seek promotion - to them the dream was of opting out. Two thought in terms of working on the land or becoming manual workers. They argued that their family commitments kept them in their current employment but .... Three others specifically mentioned their dream of one day setting up on their own, running their own business. Leider (1976) however noted that many of those who talked about a second career

* The researcher had intended to try to contact all the respondents after 5 years had elapsed to check on their career movements. The impending closure of the Iron and Steel Works might make this impossible.
"fatalistically waited for some special moment, for an opportunity
to be thrust upon them, for a push over the hill" (p. 16). Indeed
one of the respondents recognised this and he talked of some crisis
that might force him to make a decision. By this he meant the
closure of the works or his section of it. When he spoke of this
possibility, there was an ambivalence about such an event - half­
hoping, half-fearing.

Insurance against Career Failure/Redundancy

The future of the industry in this geographical area at the
time of the interviews was by no means certain as has already been
mentioned. In any case Becker and Strauss (1956) have argued that
"the occupations and organisations, within which careers are made,
change in structure and direction of activity, expand or contract,
transform purposes ...... paths and mobility become indistinct and
less fixed" (p. 262). Yet some of the respondents had 25-35
years of employment ahead of them.

For the older group, with the possibility of early retirement
at the age of 55 years in the event of closure, the next 10 year
period was an important span of time. Committed to the area by
personal choice and family ties, they would be extremely reluctant
to move and yet they could not guarantee that the plant would still
be there in 5 - 10 years. Personal career set-backs could not be
totally ruled out, particularly for those in senior posts. They
were able to identify one of the respondents to whom this had just
happended. Such an event might compel them to consider leaving.
Thus they could not finally rule out the necessity of moving.
They could, however, try to ignore it. The researcher was left
with the impression when the conversation moved into this area that
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the individual often did not want to talk or think about it. Indeed he was met on two occasions with "I don't think about that probability" and "I try not to think about it." It might be that 5 years or more in future was outside the individual's span of concern.

iii) General Observations

Schein (1971) used the concept of permeability of exit boundaries to describe the extent to which individuals feel free to leave the organisation (p. 424). He believed that the less permeable the exit boundaries the more the individual would be subjected to what he termed "coercive persuasion" - to a greater pressure towards total conformity. He therefore suggested they would be less prepared to innovate. To Schein innovation meant initiating changes within the organisation in the pursuit of organisational goals. But being forced to stay in the organisation, as this research indicated, gave rise to a great deal of personalising behaviour, perhaps with surface conformity, behaviour aimed at making life at home and at work more compatible. Furthermore, Schein did not mention the extent to which individuals might distort perception of the external job market to reconcile other pressures. The extent of the distortion in the results set out in Table 6.4 cannot be accurately assessed. There was an indication that some saw the exit boundaries as more permeable than they probably were. For example one individual, without easily transferable skills and yet with an unsatisfactory work situation, recorded that it would be easy to get a job - possibly denying reality to provide some sense of hope for the future. Again the individual, who had withdrawn from his managerial job due to strain and now had no real responsibilities, recorded that it would be "very easy" to get another job, a statement which
the researcher personally doubted.

At some time these individuals might have to put their perception of the job opportunities to the test, when they applied for jobs.* To some, however, the boundaries were seen as less permeable and the individual might avoid such a test. One of the respondents, a professionally qualified young manager, possessing a skill sought after by other organisations, recorded it as very difficult. Upon discussion it appeared that it was not so much that jobs were difficult to obtain but his own circumstances, a young locally born wife, meant that he was not prepared to look for jobs elsewhere. Thus as if to avoid blaming her, he saw the exit boundary as impermeable.

A number of surveys have been conducted in the U.K. into the mobility of managers (Acton Society, 1956; Clements, 1958; Clark, 1966; B.I.M., 1971; Guerrier & Philpot, 1978). Reviewing the earlier studies and their own data, Guerrier & Philpot (1978) felt that managers were "becoming more willing to change employer" (p. 7). Nevertheless they noted a reluctance of the older married manager to move home. The opinion Research Centre (1977) also recorded "a very strong reluctance to move home to take a better job elsewhere" (p. 7). For many therefore it would seem that it is the possibility of changing organisations at some point in the future that serves as a personalising mechanism rather than the fact of changing.

* Footnote: Of the six who were currently seeking outside jobs, only one remained optimistic, the other 5 scoring on the "difficult" side of the choices.
"Suppose the physiognomist ever did have man in his grasp, it would merely require a courageous resolution on man's part to make himself again incomprehensible for centuries" (Litchenberg, 1788).

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS
CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Introduction

In this final chapter, the researcher looks again at the approaches of a number of writers in the light of his own research. He goes on to present the managers and technical specialists as seeking to achieve, by the use of personalising responses, a condition of dynamic equilibrium in the face of internal and external changes. This is followed by a description of the situations of a number of respondents to illustrate the framework. The next section contains a discussion of the limitations of this research project and some suggestions for further study. The chapter concludes with a limited consideration of the implications of the study for management development. The sections are as follows:-

a) Other studies and this research
b) Case histories from the research
c) Research limitations and proposals for further study
d) Implications of research for management development

a) Other Studies and This Research

As has already been mentioned, the term "personalising" was taken from Bakke (1953). Bakke, in this book talked of the "fusion process", which he defined "as the simultaneous operation of the socialising process by which the organisation seeks to make an agent of the individual for the achievement of organisation objectives, and of the personalising process by which the individual seeks to make an agency of the organisation for the achievement of his personal objectives" (p. 5). This he depicted as below.
He hoped that his framework would form the basis for other research but it has remained a neglected field.* He recognised that the socialising process was not simply a function of the formal organisation but also of informal groups. He did not, however, expand on the range of behaviour that the individual might adopt in his pursuit of "personal objectives". His model was also limited to the interactions of the individual within the organisation and, although he did not present it as a closed system, he did not incorporate the non-work environment into his model. The use of the concept "fusion", which the Oxford Dictionary defined as "the blending of different things into one," is misleading. Although individual, as well as organisational, needs must find some satisfaction, the implication (which Bakke did not submit) that the "blending into one" was achievable seems to be unrealistic, particularly bearing in mind the complexity of needs, both personal and organisational.

Barrett (1970), rather than the term "fusion", talked of "goal integration" and it will be recalled that he classified into three

* It seemed significant that a copy of "The Fusion Process" could not be obtained by the British Library from the U.K. and one had to be obtained from the University of Tennessee.
categories the integration processes, adopted by the organisation, in its efforts to integrate organisational and individual goals. These he termed, exchange, accommodation and socialisation. Although he was studying these processes from the standpoint of the organisation, he felt that, "the individual may be viewed as making use of complementary mechanisms to increase his goal integration with the organisation" (p. 95). He presented the individual as exchanging his services for rewards. He felt that "socialisation might also be viewed in reverse - by persistently verbalizing and modeling his personal goals, the individual might succeed into getting the organisation to adopt some of them as organisational objectives" (p. 95). In addition he believed the individual could amend his role to make it more compatible with his own goals.

The researcher was able to identify respondents, negotiating individually and collectively, for rewards in exchange for their services. However the exchange process was by no means as explicit as some individuals would have wished. They undertook extra duties or personal study in the hope of some return on their investment of time and energy and some frustration was experienced when the organisation did not reward them by promotion. The "contract" was often a very vague arrangement and led to accusations against the organisation of a failure to "honour" their part in it. Individuals were able, as Barrett predicted, to restructure their job and work circumstances better to satisfy their own personal goals, although, as has been noted, many preferred to seek to move from their job rather than to try to amend it. Barrett's notion of the individual persuading the organisation to adopt some of his personal goals as "organisational objectives" seemed somewhat unrealistic when considering large organisations, such as the one studied here. This
research also brings into question the assumption that the individual was seeking to integrate his own goals with those of the organisations. Quite apart from the problems of discovering what constitute organisational goals,* the individual has been identified here as seeking to satisfy his own needs against the backdrop of perceived organisational constraints and demands. This might involve him in surface compliance or in some process of personal redefinition to minimise any dissonance. A number of the respondents quite explicitly resisted the idea of integration, declaring their opposition to becoming "conformists" or "organisation men."

Reference has been made in the literature review to the frameworks of Merton, Schein & Fox developed for the analysis of individual adaptations to socialisation. These are set out in Fig. 1.1. The "Schein" range of adaptations (conformity, creative individualism and rebellion) has been called by Porter, Lawler, & Hackman (1975) - reactions "roughly classified into three types" (p. 171). They went on to emphasise that these were "merely three points on a continuum." From this research, it seems questionable, however, whether this is a single continuum. Fox's (1971) arguments seem to support this contention. When discussing the Mertonian concepts, Fox differentiated between overt and covert, collective and individual, convergent and divergent innovations. Fox's definition of divergent innovation included "all situations in which incongruencies produce a divergence between the individual's goals and the behaviours prescribed by the organisational norms - divergence of a kind which does not benefit top management goals" (p. 82).

In the study of large complex organisations it is extremely

* This will be explored more fully later in this section.
difficult to identify, except in general terms, the norms and goals of the organisation. Moore (1962) observed that "strictly speaking, organisations do not have goals or ends or purposes. These are subjective concepts properly attributable only to individuals" (p. 23). Simon (1970) concluded that "it is doubtful whether decisions are generally directed towards achieving a goal. It is easier, and clearer, to view decisions as being concerned with discovering courses of action that satisfy a whole set of constraints" (p. 173). The individual manager encounters many conflicting pressures – from headquarters, from statutory requirements, from customer and production demands, from special departmental and functional interests, from his boss, colleagues or subordinates. He can, by some process of rationalisation, present his behaviour as contributing to the goals of the organisation, but this does not mean that it is the most effective contribution. Fox (1971) recognised this, when he referred to the manager clothing his behaviour "in this respectable garb of service to the organisation's best interest" (p. 85). Perrow (1977) described therefore the organisation "as nested (even infested) with group interests" (p. 4) and this and other arguments led him to state "we should abandon the notion of goals" (p. 9).

Feldman (1976 a & b) proposed a three stage model of socialisation: the first stage, "anticipatory", occurred prior to entry into the organisation; the second he termed "accommodation", and the third stage was "role management". As mentioned in Chapter One, the researcher had been disappointed at the lack of data gained from Feldman's study of "role management". Feldman went on to suggest that the three stages were successive and he talked of "completed" and "successful" socialisation. Completed socialisation was def-
ined as the stage reached, the individual "having proceeded through all three stages" (p. 436). Apart from an inadequate model of role management, the idea that socialisation* could be completed, in the light of this research, seems too static a view. As Smith (1978) observed "the relationship between an individual and his job is not usually a stable one" (p. 32); if one extends this to the individual's relationship to his work and non-work environment, one can be more emphatic about its instability.

Bearing in mind the various typologies of managers, identified by the literature review, (see fig. 1.4), the researcher, in the early stages of reviewing the research data, made an attempt to classify the respondents in accordance with their various personalising strategies. This however, did not prove satisfactory for the complexity of the variables made it impractical and although it was possible to locate some of the respondents under broad headings, this was not helpful in other cases. In reviewing the typologies of other writers, the researcher had felt some unease at the idea of labelling individuals. Some of the types seemed to fit some of the respondents at that particular point in their career or life cycle - the thwarted manager, the mobile, internal and external, the craftsman, the gamesman, the company man etc. etc. Other respondents did not fit easily into these categories and in any case a person's classification was not necessarily fixed for all time, as the writers themselves have noted - the internally mobile could become thwarted or recessional; the thwarted might turn to external mobility or indifference and so on.

* An adequate critique of his model was limited by the absence of what the researcher considered to be an adequate definition of the concept "socialisation": an attempt to clarify this by correspondence received no reply.
The broad concepts therefore presented by these various approaches tended to cloak the subtleties and changing nature of the individual's process of adaptation to the organisation. From this study, he is presented as trying to establish some form of balance between non-work pressures, personal needs and organisational demands and constraints. This concept of balance has been adopted by a number of writers in their description of the manager's role and by systems theorists in viewing both the individual and the organisation (for review see Emery, 1969). Morris (1975) talked of the manager as having to "balance the claims of his seniors, his unions, his colleagues and external contacts. Within these, he must find an acceptable balance between development, maintenance and coping with failure" (p. 63). Sayles (1964) presented the manager as seeking "to compensate and improvise constantly to readjust his behaviour, marginally, in response to the everchanging environment about him" (p. 259). He argued that the individual manager, in his manager's job, was seeking a stability, by adjusting to external changes.

Lewin (1952) developed the concept of "quasi-stationary equilibrium" in his analyses of social, as well as psychological, situations. He believed that any social condition might be viewed as an equilibrium of forces which might alter or be altered by a change in the forces involved. He adopted the term "quasi-stationary" because he argued "group life is never without change" (p. 199), yet some conditions of constancy remain. This condition of equilibrium could be changed either by adding forces in the desired direction or by diminishing opposing forces - "forces and counterforces." His most fundamental construct was that of the "field" - "a totality of co-existing facts which are conceived of as mutually
inter-dependent" (p. 240) and he submitted that the field with which the scientist must deal was the life space of the individual - that is the person and the psychological environment as it exists for him. Thus Lewin might have portrayed an individual's situation at work at one point in time as a balance between those variables contributing to, and those detracting from, the quality of his working life. The "field" would have encompassed the individual in his work and non-work environment, and the range of personalising responses might have been divided between those aimed at enhancing the forces contributing to a high QWL and those at minimising the forces detracting from his QWL.

But the individual experiences changes, long-term and short-term, in his needs and in the values by which he evaluates his current situation. Seashore (1973b) talked of these as "highly individualistic fluctuations" (p. 10). The individual in the organisation may not simply be seeking to maintain a steady state; he may be looking for growth and development. Stagner (1951) coined the phrase "dynamic homeostatis" to describe the condition by which "the organism does not simply restore the prior equilibrium. A new, more complex, and more comprehensive equilibrium is established" (p. 5). This sought-after condition of equilibrium is elusively dynamic because of the constantly changing situation in which the individual finds himself. The personalising responses, identified by this study, are seen as mechanisms, adopted consciously and unconsciously, collectively and individually, covertly and overtly, to try to achieve this balance. A simple model of this framework

* The term "homeostatis", borrowed from biology, has been used to refer to the process by which a system regulates itself around a stable state, around a condition of equilibrium or balance.
The impact of the situations at home and at work upon the individual produces need satisfactions and need deficiencies or dissatisfaction - these latter acting as cues for personalising behaviour, aimed at reducing the dissatisfaction. This personalising behaviour, as noted in the previous chapter, might be directed towards any or all of these sets of variables. It might include a distortion of the actual feed-back loop, such that the information received from the environment is perceived differently. Personalising behaviour may be generated by changes at home, at work, or from within the individual. A new boss, a new job, union pressure, technological and organisational changes, a declining industrial situation, changing customer demands, may produce tensions which the individual
seeks to resolve. At home, the new house, marriage, the arrival of children, the changing demands of a growing family, the changing expectations and needs of a wife, set into motion pressures to which the individual has to find some accommodation.

The individual's needs, values and expectations are not simply dependent variables upon these other pressures; they change. The theories of life-cycle changes (for review, see Collin, 1977) and the motivation theories that incorporate the notion of "ever-expanding needs" (Maslow, 1954), suggest that need deficiencies will occur over time and these in turn will trigger off behaviour. For example, the length of time an individual spends in a job will improve his competence and may reduce the sense of challenge: it may also generate concern over his "career time-table". Thus even if it was possible to hold organisational and non-work conditions constant, the passage of time would produce pressures from the individual manager. Hence there is required a dynamic homeostatic model, according to which the individual strives to offset the negative aspects in his environment that threaten his existing balance, the existing quality of his working life; the model also presents him as striving to respond to internal tensions that move him towards an improved quality in his working life. The range of personalising responses that might be adopted by the individual in this search for an acceptable quality of working life is set out in Fig. 7.3. In the section that follows, the model and these responses will be illustrated by six short case histories of respondents from this study.
Fig. 7.3: Personalising Responses

Personal Redefinition of Job and Work Circumstances

i) Lowering and setting standards and expectations
ii) Denial or avoidance of reality
iii) Redefining the time perspective
iv) Displacement of blame/responsibility away from self

Personal/Collective Restructuring of Job and Work Circumstances

i) Restructuring the job
ii) Restructuring relationships
iii) Formal collective restructuring
iv) Informal collective restructuring

Restructuring/Redefining Work-Non-Work Relationships

i) Increased allocation of time and energy to work
ii) Reduced allocation of time and energy to work
iii) Redefinition of the relationships between work and non-work

Seeking to Change Jobs within the Organisation

i) Establishing and adjusting career timetable
ii) Seeking support and visibility
iii) Establishing suitability for promotion

Seeking a Move to Another Organisation

i) Currently seeking other employment
ii) Intending to seek other employment in the future
b) Case Histories from the Research

Introduction

In chapters three and four, the personalising responses of the respondents were discussed against the framework of "heed deficiencies" and areas of concern in their work and non-work environment. In chapter six, these responses were structured together to produce the typology. But since each respondent's organisational and non-work situation was unique, each adopted his own "package" of personalising responses in an attempt to achieve an acceptable condition of equilibrium, each with varying degrees of "success". The section that follows, therefore, contains six short case histories to illustrate the model outlined in the previous section and to portray the possible variety of responses adopted by individuals. In the main, the case histories outlined here are of respondents facing a somewhat acute situation to which they were struggling to adapt. Many of the other respondents faced similar situations but not in such an extreme form. The case histories chosen include an example of career disenchantment, of career failure, of severe job dissatisfaction, of a young man poised at a critical stage in his career, and of an older man adjusting to the lack of job satisfaction and to the absence of perceived promotion opportunities at work. The sixth example is of a promotion seeking young engineer and this illustrates how the pursuit of an internal job change can play an important role in an individual's adjustment to work.

(i) Career Disenchantment - Production Manager: 39 years old

This respondent had risen from being a craftsman to an important middle-management position. He was being groomed for promotion and had recently been sent on a London Business School Senior Manage-
ment programme. In looking back at his career he felt that he had been successful. But in spite of this success he was dissatisfied with his situation. He recorded a QWL rating of 3 and an emphatic desire to move immediately from his existing job. He was in the process of reappraising his life style, a process which he felt was aided by the interviews. He was oppressed by the continuous demands of production and the pressures of industrial relations. He recorded that he felt alone, isolated and had recently been ill, probably stress-induced. His job was very demanding. Although he recorded that he no longer took his work home, he considered there was still a spill-over to non-work because of his mental exhaustion at the end of the day. In his managerial role he was extremely energetic. On two occasions the interviews had to be postponed because of industrial relations difficulties and he interrupted one interview to make an urgent call. He had his lists of jobs to be done and at the end of one of the interviews he had to phone his office to check and to issue a string of orders, before sitting down again for a counselling discussion with the researcher.

His career dilemma was presented as straightforward - there was no job within the organisation which he felt would give him the satisfaction which he sought. Promotion which he believed was very possible would give him more pressure and would involve "too high a price" to him. Production Management made unrealistic demands upon him and this view had been confirmed by his recent course at the London Business School, where production management had been ignored, where he had been the only production manager present and where "the grass seemed greener" amongst so many other disciplines.
He coped with this set of circumstances partly by restructuring and redefining the relationship between work and non-work and partly by maintaining the idea of seeking other employment in the future. Some years previously, he had been prepared to work away from home, from his wife and family for a period to undertake a special commissioning task. Recently he had refused another trouble-shooter role which would have involved him with a spell away from the district. He had also taken a personal decision not to take work home - he had "got his priorities right." He had reduced the allocation of time and energy to work but he continued in the job, arguing that he was doing it for the sake of his wife and three children who benefitted from his high salary. He nursed however the ambition of a "second career". In five to ten years he would leave for an entirely different career. This would be a manual, craft-type job, in agriculture or forestry, at a third of his current salary. It was from this dream that there appeared to be a light at the end of the tunnel. The feeling of current sacrifice for his wife and three children gave him the determination to continue in his job and also a sense of purpose. The length of the tunnel (his youngest child was nine years old) and his concern for his own health and survival left him dissatisfied.

(ii) Career failure - Former Works Manager: 47 years old

This respondent had some two years previously been promoted to take over a Works Manager's job. The job involved a considerable promotion for him but it also meant a move from the Steel Works, with its network reciprocal relationships, to the Tube Works with its separate and distinct system of colleague relationships. This was a somewhat isolated, responsible position rather than the type of job he had previously held, which was closely linked with other
levels and colleagues. The individual found he could not cope. He tried to counteract the lack of experience by working long hours and gradually his health suffered, so that, following medical advice and a personal reappraisal, he asked to be removed from the job. He had experienced therefore career failure and he was still in the process of achieving a new condition of equilibrium after the major upheaval of the past few months.

His salary continued to be paid and, although the managerial union had offered to protect him, at the age of 47 years he was now without a specific appointment. He had to cope with the sense of past failure, the present lack of job satisfaction, together with the future uncertainty. The main personalising responses to this situation were the processes of personal redefinition. The sense of failure seemed to be diminished by his submission, perhaps correctly, that he had been pressured into taking the job against his better judgement. The mistake was the General Manager's — his own mistake was in finally agreeing to move. He was also able to reduce his sense of failure by defining the situation as one in which others from the steel works would also have failed, displacing some blame on to the internal politics surrounding the situation. He could, with a downward career anchorage, perceive his previous job position as an achievement and he looked at it with considerable nostalgia. He had lowered his expectations of his current job and reported himself as satisfied that he had his health and was able to spend more time at home with his wife, whose health was not good. He reported with some pleasure the fact that many of his friends at the works had expressed sympathy and support. He indicated that he felt somewhat guilty at receiving his same salary, half hoping and half regretting the possibility of a reduction in salary. He
said that the surplus over what he thought he should receive was being saved. He had lowered his expenditure in anticipation of some form of future reduction.

As to the future, he expected no internal job movement that would bring him back his status. He mentioned his dream of being permitted to return the position that was vacated when he moved to the tube works. He spoke of this job with considerable affection. Alongside this dream he talked of going into business with his brother or taking a manual job. Although he indicated that it would be easy to find a job outside, the researcher was left with the impression that unless there were plant closures or particularly attractive redundancy arrangements, he would continue with the company with reduced expectations, rather than take the initiative and move into a second career.

(iii) Critical Career Stage - Acting Works Manager: 28 years old

This respondent was amongst the younger respondents. He had recently been appointed as acting Works Manager, replacing the individual referred to in case history (ii). This position represented an important step in his career. It was however highly visible and the individual felt exposed. He was very concerned at the fact the job was soon to be advertised and he would be required to compete for it. The possibility of failure dominated the discussions and to try to guard against this and to establish his suitability for the appointment, he had restructured the relationship between work and non-work. He had diverted all his energies to his job, working long hours and taking work home with the consequent neglect of his non-work life. He coped with this situation to some degree by defining it, in agreement with his wife, as "very special".
He indicated that his wife understood this and supported him. He appeared to have established a "flexi-life", deferring non-work benefits to the future.

He felt that if he was successful in this job, the next stage in his career would automatically follow. But there was the ever-present fear of failure and to some degree he had prepared himself for this possibility. By defining the job as difficult and by reference to the previous incumbent's failure, he gave the researcher the impression that, if he failed, he could displace the blame away from himself and maintain his self-esteem. Current difficulties in the job were presented as of limited duration, a function of his newness to the role. He presented many of his problems as stemming from inadequate subordinates. They were not in his opinion competent and he avoided responsibility for them by noting that he had "inherited" them. In this situation he felt reassured by the fact that his boss "understood."

Failure was the most serious threat facing him and this could hamper his internal mobility. He therefore indicated that he might have to seek other employment in the future. It was significant that in such an event he observed that it would be "somewhat easy" to find a job outside. In spite of all the pressures, he recorded his quality of working life as high.

(iv) Job Dissatisfaction - Work Study Officer: 34 years old

This individual saw his current job as "totally futile". He had been working for a number of months on the development of an organisation-wide system of incentives which he believed would never be introduced and which he saw as part of the politics of industrial relations. This he termed a "charade" and he felt that work study
was being used as a scapegoat in the complex industrial relations negotiations. He could see no hope of internal job change. The section leaders in work study were well settled and he did not believe from his experience at interview panels that he would be acceptable in any other department, particularly with the cut-back in jobs.

The main personalising response to this situation was to seek a move to another organisation. His energies therefore were directed towards leaving the company and as if to reduce any dissonance associated with this decision, he defined his present work situation as extremely black. He recorded one of the highest "need deficiency" scores - 40 and a "quality of working life" rating of "4". The researcher believed that in some of his responses there was some distortion of reality and by this means, he presented a negative picture of his job and supported his decision to leave. One aspect of his work situation which he had not criticised was his pay. The irony was that this pay level had kept him at the organisation for seven years, which was longer than he felt he should have stayed. He was actively seeking jobs in light engineering. He acknowledged this process as difficult but he was nevertheless determined to leave. He asked the researcher for career advice and this took the form of helping him to present his "curriculum vitae."

(v) Adjustment to lack of Job Satisfaction - Technical Training Officer: 47 years old.

This respondent was one of the oldest respondents. He recorded that his job had lost its challenge and interest. In his needs questionnaire, for six out of the thirteen questions, he recorded the lowest score possible for the amount of satisfaction present in
his job - a score of "1", and for a remaining five questions he recorded a score of "2". He felt trapped in his job and unable to make it more interesting and challenging. He talked of being "locked in the training workshop from 7.30 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. with 17 students." He had tried to get internal job change but had failed. He had under his own initiative taken the Diploma in Management Studies in the hope that this would assist him to get another job. But it had not helped and he was quite bitter. Although he still nursed a hope of a job change, it was a faint hope and he rated the highest discrepancy score possible, that is he wanted an immediate change but expected to have to stay in his current job until retirement. He recorded that he had not looked outside for another job. He was, for family reasons, unprepared to move out of the area and job opportunities locally in his field were virtually non-existent. His salary level made it difficult for him to consider a career change.

The main personalising strategies adopted by him to counteract these negative conditions were to turn to collective restructuring activities and to his non-work activities for fulfilment. At the time of the interviews, he was the TASS branch secretary and he represented his department on the Works Consultative Committee. These posts made it possible for him to restructure some of his time and he thereby gained a break from his instructor duties: they enable him to meet with senior management and these contacts helped him to maintain a "faint hope" of a job change into the wider field of personnel: they also gave him an opportunity to oppose and challenge his departmental management, of whom he was very critical. The process of formal collective restructuring had produced some improvements in his organisational life, in that
there was a better flow of communications and more participation in
decision making. But paradoxically, during a recent round of nego-
tiations, out of frustration, he and his colleagues had blocked
the proposed introduction of an adult retraining programme which he
admitted would have reduced his "custodial" role and increased his
job satisfaction. In addition he was seeking election to the local
council and shortly after the interview the researcher learned that
he had been appointed to the local magistrates bench. This appoint-
ment would give him time off from work with pay: it would release
him from being "locked in" with his students.

One final observation is relevant here. After recording a
total need deficiency score of 33, he, at the end of the second
interview, rated his quality of working life as high. Whether
this reflected the success of his personalising strategies or
whether it reflected inadequacy of the QWL rating is a matter for
debate. Notwithstanding this, he seemed to be adjusting to the
absence of challenge within the job itself and to be able to view
his total situation with some satisfaction.

(vi) Promotion Seeking - Section Engineer: 26 years old

This young respondent, a section engineer in the Coke Oven
Department, had been twelve months in his current job and, although
he was pleased with his progress, he was eager for another move.
He expressed concern at the possibility of being trapped in a spec-
ialism - coke oven engineering - and he was also concerned at being
identified as part of engineering management. He wished to present
himself as suitable for promotion into production, as well as eng-
ingineering, management.

He was "critical" of his boss, his colleagues, his superordinates,
the unions. He felt that there was too much backstabbing within the works, that there were too many personality conflicts, and that he could not trust his fellow managers. By this judgmental stance, he seemed able to displace any blame for these bad relationships onto others. His "answer" to these unsatisfactory conditions was to seek to change his job. His QWL rating was "3", neither high nor low, but he felt that he had little or no say over the quality of his working life. When asked about the components of a high QWL he referred only to promotion and increased earnings. He was not interested in relationships or job satisfaction. He simply wished to stick to his career timetable of not more than eighteen months in a job. He recognised that the technology of the Coke Ovens and By Product Plant was extremely complex. The maintenance cycle for parts of it was a very long one, running into years and therefore it needed a long period of experience to master it. He had, however, no intention of staying in the job that length of time. Although he recorded that he was not actually seeking a job outside the industry, he did appear to be applying for jobs at other parts of B.S.C. and he felt that it would be quite easy to get a job outside steel making.

He had taken the D.M.S. because it had been suggested to him by senior management and, although he was pleased to have done it, he recorded that, during the period of studies, he had not "taken it seriously" as a personal development but had seen it as a means of furthering his career. The programme did appear to have increased his managerial/organisational "literacy", such that he was able to parry any difficult questions by some statement of principle. The researcher was able to make little contact with him. He was very detached in the interviews, giving "text book" answers to many
questions and in the interview notes, the researcher recorded that he did not believe many of the responses. He presented himself as a "loner" and reported that he had learned to "fend" for himself at public school. He was a bachelor; his parents were dead. The researcher was therefore left with the impression that although he was very intelligent and prepared to work long hours to establish his suitability for promotion and support his tight career timetable, the way he appeared to distance himself from others would mean that he would find it difficult to gain the support, particularly of his immediate bosses, for his career plans. This would probably mean that he would achieve his timetable by changing jobs within the B.S.C. rather than at Corby.

c) Research Limitations and Proposals for Further Study

The research study involved a number of limitations to which reference has already been made. It was centred upon one organisation, which could not be presented as representative of industry. This organisation was very large and complex, located in a somewhat rural setting. It was part of the Steel Industry, which had a declining number of employees and which was passing through a particularly difficult financial crisis. All these factors influenced the internal and external job opportunities and, although this research has emphasised the role of perceived job opportunities as a personalising strategy, the realities of this situation remained important.

The respondents were not a random sample: they all shared the characteristic of having taken the D.M.S. course. This meant they had either been sent on the programme or they had taken the initiative and undertook it in their own time. In addition the study
took place at one point in their careers. Although the age span of some twenty years provided insight into career progression and changes over time, a longitudinal study would be required accurately to trace the outcomes of the dreams and aspirations of those being studied. Ideally, such a study should encompass an even wider spectrum of ages — including the fifty to sixty-five years age bracket. It has already been mentioned that the researcher had intended in a limited form to follow up the career progress of the forty-nine respondents, five years after the initial study but with the proposed partial closure, this might not now be possible.

The research procedure involved the identification of areas of concern and a discussion with respondents about the strategies for handling these. But these strategies to some degree were unsuccessful in that the areas studied had been identified by the respondents as being unsatisfactory. A number had recorded a high quality of working life, with few negative aspects in their world of work, with few "need" deficiencies. The approaches that they had "successfully" adopted (apart from denial or lowering of expectations) have not been explored. This partly explains the negative impressions given by this study — it was directed only towards the unsatisfactory aspects of work and not towards those that were already satisfactory.

The two main research methods adopted were questionnaires and interviews. The study highlighted some of the shortcomings of the postal questionnaire as a provider by itself, of reliable data about needs and concerns. It illustrated how the individual might interpret certain questions to enable him to express his concerns and preoccupations, almost irrespective of what the question was actually asking. The interview also had limitations, as Dean and Whyte (1958)
observed. "We are getting merely the informant's world as he sees it. And we are getting it only as he is willing to pass it on to us in this particular situation" (p. 34). The researcher, from a School of Management, was known to many of them and whilst it has been argued (see Chapter Two) that this helped to create an empathy, it might have led to a "managerial desirability" bias*, by which the respondents presented managerially acceptable views rather than their own. Phillips (1973) referred to the process of "modeling" (p. 60), whereby respondents take up the attitudes and opinion of the researcher. Argyris (1952), in his important analysis of the defences adopted by individual respondents to the researcher, noted that it was "not uncommon to find some subjects who defended themselves by simply giving the "correct" or "book" answer to every question. They tended to quote the "principles of supervision" (p. 26). There were a number of occasions during the interviews when the researcher believed this was happening.

In addition the qualitative data obtained have been interpreted by the researcher. This involved the possibility of bias, although Blaxter (1977) thought that "to talk of bias or error in this sense was not useful, since bias was inevitable unless it was possible to transcend the society in which one lives" (p. 5). Bogdan and Taylor (1975) concluded that potential bias and distortion was "the price we must pay to gain understanding of complex social settings" (p. 13). In one sense, some of the distortions were research material in so far that by these means the respondents sought to satisfy their own needs in this the work situation. Dean and Whyte (1958) therefore argued for this positive approach, pressing

* This term is derived from that of Edwards (1953) who talked of the "social desirability variable."
the researcher to ask "What do the informant's statements reveal about his feelings and perceptions and what inferences can be made from them about the actual environment and events he has experienced?" (p. 38).

Notwithstanding these arguments, the research shortcomings have to be recognised and this was accepted in the design of the study. A number of areas warrant further research and these will be explored in the remainder of this section. This will be followed by a discussion of the implications of this study for manager and organisation development.

Since the organisation in which the respondents worked possessed special characteristics, it would be of value to extend the study to managers and technical specialists employed in smaller organisations in a geographical area where industry was more concentrated. This would mean that the opportunities for internal and external mobility would be different, with consequent differences in the emphasis in certain types of personalising strategies. The organisation here studied was part of the British Steel Company and it was therefore possible to move out of Corby and yet stay with the same company. To change organisations usually meant however a change of district. The B.S.C. was passing through a period of decline; manpower reductions, closures, financial restrictions affected job opportunities and the scope for work restructuring. Where an organisation was passing through a period of growth, the opportunities for internal promotion would be enlarged and the future might seem more secure.

Respondents from smaller firms might identify a different range of concerns and the scope for collective restructuring might...
be reduced. It would be interesting to see if the same criticisms about unsatisfactory relationships were forthcoming and if so, what personalising strategies were adopted in this more "concentrated" environment. This might be particularly significant for people in a mid-career situation, where the opportunities to reduce their personal commitment to the organisation and to transfer their energies to non-work might be less available. (An assumption here, that needs to be tested, is that the individual manager is more visible in smaller organisations and therefore less able to "retire" on the job).

One area in which additional research would be appropriate is that concerned with the restructuring of the work of junior and middle management. Hackman (1977) has observed that "relatively little research and few change programs have focused on the design of lower-level management jobs in organisations" (p. 160). The researcher was somewhat surprised that he had not been able to observe more in evidence "the multi-purpose man who mixed his own particular work cocktail to suit his own individual task" (Goldring, 1973, p. 22)*. In general, rather than stay to mix their own job cocktail, the younger respondents wanted to move to another job. The older respondents, when faced with a longer duration in their job, no longer gave a central position to work and turned for their satisfaction to non-work, with some guilt at their neglect of it in the past. Thus a more intensive exploration is required into the range of choices that the individual manager might possess to redesign his job and into the organisational conditions that might influence the exercise of these choices. Particularly relevant in

* Goldring saw this taking place from future reductions in the length of the working week and from the individual undertaking "multi-jobs" - doing two or more part-time activities.
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this respect is the current research of Dr. R. Stewart. Funded by the SSRC, she is conducting a study "Classifying Choices in Management Jobs". In this project, interviews and limited observation studies are being adopted; she is also studying pairs of managers in similar jobs to understand better the differences and similarities in approaches to their situation. She is therefore exploring the world of the manager in terms of the demands and constraints upon him and the choices that he might make in facing these.

Discussions were held with Dr. Stewart to explore the relevance and implications of her work for this research but too late actually to influence the research design. Her study is not directed towards the exercise of choice as a personalising strategy but as a means of performing the managerial task. She is less concerned with the identification of personal factors that influence the manager's perception of constraints or demands or choices. Her research rather seeks to locate, identify and describe these constraints, demands and choices. Her current work promises to provide valuable material about the world of the manager and to provide a framework within which to set future studies of personal restructuring strategies.

The heuristic approach to the interviews meant that on occasions there were some superficiality in parts of the study. This stemmed from the fact that it was only in retrospect that it was clear that areas of study had been somewhat neglected. A specific example of this was in the exploration of the role of cliques in the life of the manager. There was some evidence of the importance of informal groups - for example the role of the cliques in the managers' room but more research is needed. The student of management has to refer for insights into the role of cliques to Dalton's study published in 1959. When one considers the length of the study
and the range of methods* he had to employ, it is not surprising that research in this area is meagre. But notwithstanding this, the role of these colleague relationships and particularly the role of "trading" (Sayles, 1964) appears to be so significant that more attention should be directed into this area, both by researchers and those involved in management and organisation development. This theme will be expanded in the next section.

In the design of the research project, as explained in Chapter Two, it had been decided not to collect data on personality variables. But the possible relationship between personality variables and the type of personalising strategy that might be adopted could be important for selection and management development. As has been mentioned, researchers have differentiated between the internally and externally controlled manager, between those who felt able to control their fate and those who felt controlled by external forces. (Rotter, 1966; Organ and Greene, 1974; Mitchell, Smyser and Weed, 1975). Guerrier and Philpott (1978) similarly differentiated between those who took "an aggressive, positive attitude towards their career and those who felt they had no control over the way their careers developed" (p. 11). In this research a distinction was made between those who saw large organisations as providing more freedom and independence than the small organisation. Those who felt this, some 47%, were less likely to complain about relationships or about internal politics. In their approach to policies and authority, they were more likely to take a challenging, manipulative stance, rather than a conforming, accepting one.

* In addition to formal interviews, he used a range of approaches, work diaries, intimates, participant observation, socializing and the research was conducted without the support or knowledge of the senior management in the organisations. (See Dalton 1959, 1964).
A number of questions warrant further study here. To what extent is an external orientation a function of the individual's experiences within the organisation? To what extent does his I-E rating change over time in relation to job and career success? Durand & Shea (1974) have suggested that internality might be developed through training programmes. To what extent could their approaches be successfully incorporated in such management programmes as the D.M.S.? There was some indication from this research that individuals redefined a situation as beyond their control to cope with some failure or to avoid blame. The perception of failure and the concern over blame in turn stem from personality variables. The relevance of these and similar questions will be again taken up in the next section.

It is easy to point to areas for research, but conducting the research into the behaviour and personality of managers is fraught with difficulties as has already been discussed. In this study the researcher took advantage of special relationships and access, stemming from his role in a School of Management. Other researchers, for example, from the Business Schools, from Henley, Ashridge, and the Oxford Centre for Management Studies have similarly recognised the value of the course member as a respondent.* This privileged access has not been exploited as fully as the school or undergraduate population has been by the social scientist. The reasons behind this might be a function of the lack of research tradition in institutions such as the Polytechnics, Regional Management Centres and Colleges of Further Education, where there resides the bulk of post-experience course members. It might reflect a reluctance to

take time from these more challenging students, because of concern about an adequate "quid pro quo".* There exists also a gap between the researcher and the teacher in some of these institutions.

In this regard, the researcher, in conjunction with Professor K. Elliot of the Department of Management Studies at the University of Technology, Loughborough, is planning to study the impact of extended management development programmes (such as a part-time MA and DMS) on an individual's "locus of control" rating. The reasons behind this proposed study will be expanded in the following section which aims to set out the implications of the current study for management and organisation development.

d) Implications of the Research for Management Development

Higgin (1975) concluded his discussion on the challenges to continuing management education with the assertion that "the only thing that is certain is that for some time there will be uncertainty and we will need to monitor constantly and to be prepared to learn and to change" (p. 30). This theme of uncertainty and change has been explored by a number of writers, of whom perhaps the most influential were Toffler (1970) and Schon (1971). Jameson (1979) talked of the environment of management "as changeable as the weather" (p. 61).

Faced with this situation, managers have to try to plan their own futures and those of the companies for which they work. This research had identified managers who saw uncertainty and ambiguity as an opportunity and those who saw it as a threat: it has noted those who "managed" their careers and those who wanted their careers

* No such reticence should be necessary if the insights can be used as a basis for counselling, self-appraisal, and for improving the management and organisation development programmes of the institutions.
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"managed" for them by senior management: it recorded those who saw a large organisation as a source of freedom and independence and those for whom it was full of restrictions: it has differentiated between those who conformed and those who challenged the system: it portrayed those who were internally controlled and those who felt controlled by external events.

The importance of the internally controlled has been pointed out on a number of occasions, although different terms have been used and in different contexts. Schein (1968) has argued the case for the development of "creative individualism" to avoid "a sterile form of bureaucracy" (p. 10). In a similar vein, Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) talked of "individualisation", the process by which the individual strives to satisfy his own needs, as having "potential survival value for the organisation" (p. 170). Handy (1973) submitted that "pro-activity, or the will to shape events rather than let events shape you (re-activity) seems to be one of the hall-marks of the effective individual" (p. 3). In the U.K., the Training Services Agency (1977) has asserted "Managers should actively take responsibility for their own development and not sit back and wait to be developed" (p. 11). Binnie (1976) supported "aggressive subordination" (p. 94), a process whereby the manager initiated changes in his relationships with his boss. Mitchell, Smyser and Weed (1975) concluded "the internally controlled person may be better able to adapt to the more personally demanding, fluctuating environment which may characterise future organisational settings" (p. 630).

Although it is by no means certain that some organisations would support the development of the internally controlled person, the development of such individuals presents an important challenge to
management education. Already great strides have been taken in this direction with the joint development activities at Manchester Business School (Morris 1972), the project based management development of Durham University Business School (Ashton, 1974) and the action learning projects of Revans (Revans, 1976). These approaches all share the common features of a work-based team, taking responsibility for their own learning as they work on actual problems facing their companies. The project-based learning approaches have been taken up by a number of other institutions and the idea of the pro-active course member, responsible for his own learning, learning to cope with uncertainty, has become the focus of a number of learning programmes (Rice, 1965; Berger, 1972; Harrison, 1973; Cooper, 1976; Mant, 1976).

Nevertheless, as has already been mentioned, insufficient is yet known about the variables influencing the development of the internally controlled individual and also about the possible approaches to the development of such persons. Anderson & Schneier (1978), from their study of management students, noted that "those group members possessing an internal personality type are more likely to emerge as leaders of their groups" (p. 697) and they concluded that "training in this construct may become an important part of future leader development efforts in applied settings" (p. 698). At the undergraduate level and that of the professional trainee, the situation is still predominantly as Mant noted in 1972; "A majority of the total student body continued to strive for a paper qualification without worrying too much about the process" (p. 286). As Allinson observed in 1976, "most students, in view of their school experiences, are often unable to understand the purpose and relevance of anything other than formal lecturing techniques" (p. 93). On post-graduate,
post-experience courses, in spite of the developments that have now taken place, the emphasis continues to be at the knowledge level (Sibbald, 1978). As Jaques (1970) observed, "the teaching and absorbing of knowledge give both teacher and pupil a secure feeling of certainty" (p. 114). Many management teachers, or rather those involved in assisting the learning processes for managers, need to learn how to cope with uncertainty in order to assist others to learn how so to do.

As has been noted, the respondents in this research did not believe the DMS Programme they had attended had adequately prepared them for the tensions of management, for the problems of dealing with pressures and the interpersonal strains of dealing with bosses, colleagues and subordinates. As part of the DMS survey they had been asked to rate a number of items in terms of importance to them in their job and also to rate the contribution of the DMS to improving their knowledge and ability in their areas (see appendix 9 for full questionnaire and responses). Using the scale of "3" for high rating, "2" for medium and "1" for slight, a rank order of areas of importance was established (table 7.1) and a rank order of the contribution of DMS (table 7.2).

It will be seen that high improvements were recorded in a number of important knowledge areas but unfortunately none of those that appears in the first eight for importance appears in the first eight for improvement. A "discrepancy" score has been produced by subtracting the "improvement" scores from the "importance" scores and this is set out in table 7.3.*

* This is a rough method of analysis in that an individual might have rated an area as important but might also consider that he was already competent in that area and therefore he would be unlikely to record much improvement from the DMS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ability to communicate and contribute in work situations</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ability to establish good working relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Enjoyment of own job</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Confidence in own ability as a manager</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Understanding the behaviour of others</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ability to manage my time effectively</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Ability to motivate and deal with subordinates</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My prospects for pay and promotion</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question No.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Understanding financial techniques for costing and budgetary control</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Greater awareness of the financial implications of management decisions</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Understanding the characteristics of organisations</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ability to evaluate the economic environment of the firm</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ability to analyse marketing priorities</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Understanding the major elements of economic analysis</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ability to analyse critically numerical data</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ability to develop alternative problem-solving approaches to complex situations</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7.3

**The DMS & The Respondents**

**Discrepancy Scores Between Importance & Contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ability to establish good working relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Enjoyment of own job</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My prospects for pay and promotion</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ability to manage my time effectively</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ability to communicate and contribute in work situation</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Ability to produce management reports</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ability to adjust own behaviour to the needs of the situation</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Ability to motivate and deal with subordinates</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of the "high discrepancy" scores were in areas involving interpersonal skill. These findings were similar to those of Mottram (1975). Mottram, from a study of DMS students, had noted that the students themselves felt that they had derived least benefit in their capacity to handle and deal with people. Perhaps even more disturbing, he concluded that when compared to a control group, the DMS students, after the course, tended to be more anxiety-prone and tense.

In retrospect the respondents criticised the DMS course for its failure to help them in their personal development: they recorded high progress in the knowledge areas - the "examinable" areas and they acknowledged that they attended the programme primarily for career development reasons rather than for personal development. They had focussed their main energies on that learning that would lead to exam success. The self-insight, necessary to improve their capacity to relate to others, was a "non-examinable" subject.

Another closely related area of concern to the respondents was their inability to handle the internal politics of organisational life. As Higgin (1975) observed, "Every organisation is riddled with politics. Scheming, pleading, intriguing are going on all the time. We all know it, but pretend not to" (p. 23). An ingredient of these internal politics is the process of "trading", negotiating with others to ensure that goods, services, support are provided. Sayles (1964) has pointed out that "some managers are loathe to accept these trading relationships as a part of their job" (p. 64). The researcher, in a different context (Knibbs 1975), has argued that "whilst it has become increasingly legitimate to teach the manager to negotiate with the customer, the suppliers, or with an organised work group, virtually no attention is paid to
negotiations with colleagues" (p. 225).

There is a great deal of debate about the contribution and ethics of interpersonal skill training* and a number of individual managers and organisations are emphatic in their condemnation of some of these training approaches. Apart from the concerns about potential psychological damage, perhaps there is an assumption that to provide such opportunities for individuals to develop their trading and interpersonal skills, would be to legitimise the internal system of reciprocal relationships and indeed to encourage its extension. It is however the researcher's view that this need not be the outcome. The more an organisation understands this aspect of organisational life, the more it could avoid the diseconomies associated with it. The more confident an individual feels in his own interpersonal skills, the less threatening he will find the internal politics of the organisation and therefore the less defensive will be his approach to others.

Revans (1976) has observed that "one important reason for wanting to learn is an awareness of one's incapacity to do one's job" (p. 21). A number of the respondents were, at the time of the research, prepared and able to acknowledge this condition to the researcher. They would not have been so prepared to acknowledge it to the Manager/Staff Development through whose patronage they hoped to gain another job. At the time of taking the Diploma they might not have held a demanding management position and therefore were unaware of this incapacity. Some, because of the potential threat to their self-esteem, were not able to acknowledge this condition to themselves.

* For a review of the arguments, together with specific research evidence, see Cooper and Bowles (1977).
Bearing in mind these various observations, therefore, it would appear that, even if the tutors wished and were competent to provide, within the DMS programme, opportunities to extend the individual's capacity to manage uncertainty and to develop his interpersonal and trading skills, some mismatch would be inevitable between the expectations and requirements of the sponsoring organisations, the course members and the tutors. Stuart (1976) termed this the "contractual triangle" (p. 2). He submitted that "by employing appropriate, explicit and genuine negotiating procedures, dysfunctional incongruences between each party's expectations of the others may not only be diminished, but may be replaced by strong and vigorous contracts which will do much to mobilise the parties' endeavours in a synergistic consortium" (p. 7). Whilst the researcher supports movement in this direction, he is not convinced it would be possible, or, in some circumstances, desirable, to make "explicit" all of the covert issues in sponsoring, attending and providing extended management development programmes.

Harrison (1973) has criticised traditional management development for being "education for bureaucracy. It teaches the individual to look outside himself for the solutions to problems and for guidelines to action" (p. 111). The challenge is to find ways of developing the individual's internality, his capacity to manage the stresses and complexities of the present and to face the uncertainties of the future.
Concluding Observations - Personal

From this study the manager/technical specialist has been presented as a somewhat isolated individual, trying a range of covert and overt, conscious and unconscious, personalising responses in an endeavour to cope with the uncertainty, changes and tensions in his life in the organisation. The researcher was impressed by the pleasure and insights that many recorded they had gained from the interviews and by the depth of disclosure attained with some. In their normal competitive situation, where the individual wished to present himself as "promotable", such disclosure seemed rare, if not non-existent. But the researcher supports the individual's right to maintain his "private world" and to sustain his non-work life. This might mean amongst other things the right of the assistant production manager secretly to plan to marry the German opera singer and the Plant Metallutgist to plant his early potatoes. Thus the contribution of external in-depth career counselling, particularly for those struggling with a period of mid-life reappraisal, seemed to be endorsed and the shortcomings of internal systems of such counselling again highlighted (for a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Handy, 1975; Molander, 1976).

The individual respondent was often the willing party to a process of exploitation; he "mortgaged" the present in return for the uncertain expectations of the future. In this study, the threatened closure of the plant meant that for many the "investment" of time and energy from non-work into work would not yield the expected "return". Many organisations, particularly in the Steel Industry, will require less staff in the future and the opportunities for internal promotion may disappear. A similar situation faces the young researcher and lecturer in many universities.
During the study, the researcher has noted the frequency with which respondents looked to some future date for the alleviation of their present problems - usually to some hoped-for job change. The high number of respondents seeking promotion might have been a function of the specific group chosen for study here, although Harlow (1973), from her study of professionals, talked of them as having "an intense desire for a management position" (p. 140). The technical specialists frequently talked of their desire to obtain a supervisory post and line managers of their desire for a reduction in their supervisory duties. The lack of promotion opportunities disappointed some and the nature of the supervisory/managerial job, when achieved, disappointed others.

Therefore, with the future uncertain, for most, a career, as a planned progression, will be, indeed already is, a myth. In this situation the postponement of personal growth and development, the neglect of family and social life, the disregard for the present leaves the researcher with a feeling of disquiet.

"This fleeting instant - this now - is the only reality. The past is gone forever. The future is not yet born .... the eternal life belongs to those who live in the present" (Lewis & Straitfield, 1973, p. 49).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Instructor</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programmer</td>
<td>Computer Prog.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>Works Chemist</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Engineer</td>
<td>Metallurgy</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Engineer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Work Study Technician</td>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Engineer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Engineer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Works Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Leader</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>Operations Research</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Engineer</td>
<td>Metallurgist</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relation Officer</td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Engineer</td>
<td>Instrument Engineer</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Metallurgist</td>
<td>Research Metallurgy</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Production Planning</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, Central Services</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Engineer</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Sales Service</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Chemist</td>
<td>Works Chemist</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Central Engineering Services</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Metallurgist</td>
<td>Metallurgist</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE</td>
<td>PROFESSION</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Fuel Technologist</td>
<td>Fuel Technology</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Assistant Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Senior Project Engineer</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Research Metallurgist</td>
<td>Research Metallurgy</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Control Engineer</td>
<td>Metallurgist</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Technical Assistant</td>
<td>Central Planning</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Assistant Plant Register</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Metallurgist</td>
<td>Metallurgist</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Senior Work Study Officer</td>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Technical Training Officer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Works Metallurgist</td>
<td>Metallurgy</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Section Leader, Work Study</td>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Superintendent, Research</td>
<td>Research Metallurgist</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Assistant Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Project Leader</td>
<td>Research Chemist</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Assistant Manager</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Superintendent, Research</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Works Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Plant Metallurgist</td>
<td>Metallurgist</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Stock Controller</td>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRAMEWORK OF QUESTIONS

WORK ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The Job
   1.1 The level of work required of me is not sufficiently demanding.
   1.2 I am required to make too many decisions on this job.
   1.3 Any mistake I make here is treated with understanding.
   1.4 I find this job stimulating.
   1.5 I am faced with heavy time pressures in my job.
   1.6 The working conditions are on the whole good.
   1.7 There is too little work for me to do.
   1.8 There is too much work for me to undertake properly.

2. Relationships with Boss
   2.1 My boss is not receptive to my ideas or advice.
   2.2 My boss interferes in my work too much.
   2.3 My boss helps me to develop my abilities.
   2.4 If I was under stress at work, I could not discuss it frankly with my boss.
   2.5 I feel I can discuss work problems with my boss.
   2.6 I feel confident of the support of my boss when I make a decision.

3. Relationships with Colleagues
   3.1 My colleagues in the organisation are willing to try out new ideas.
   3.2 My colleagues are very defensive about their own departments and work areas.
   3.3 I can share my difficulties with colleagues.
   3.4 Most of my colleagues should not have got where they are.
   3.5 I find myself involved in conflicts of personality.
   3.6 I can trust my fellow managers.

4. Relationships with Subordinates
   4.1 I would like to replace quite a number of my subordinates if it was possible.
4.2 My relationships with my subordinates are good.

4.3 My subordinates work well as a group.

4.4 My subordinates need too much supervision

5. Organisation Life

5.1 There are many restrictions placed upon me in my work with the organisation.

5.2 I am adequately consulted in matters that really concern me.

5.3 I am kept fully in the picture here.

5.4 There are too many political manoeuvrings and backstabblings here.

5.5 I feel I belong and am accepted in this organisation.

5.6 I feel a loss of personal identity in this organisation.

6. Organisational Role

6.1 Because of different pressures, I am left uncertain as to which actions to take.

6.2 My responsibilities and authority are adequately defined for me.

6.3 I have not enough authority to maintain discipline.

6.4 I am sure whether I am doing a good job.

6.5 I am not given enough responsibility.

6.6 I am encouraged to participate in the process of decision making.

6.7 The standards of performance here are always being tightened.

7. Work/non-work situation

7.1 My job contributes to some degree to the good of society.

7.2 My job requires me to live in an area different to the one I would choose.

7.3 I have often to deal with conflicts of interests between those of the organisation and my own.

7.4 I do not find any conflict between the demands of my job responsibilities and my family/social responsibilities.

7.5 The demands of the job are such that I have difficulty in maintaining my social and family activities.
8. Pay and Career Development

8.1 The prospects in this organisation are as good as with any other.

8.2 The possibility of me being made redundant is low.

8.3 I have stayed at this present level too long.

8.4 The pay I receive does not reward me adequately for my efforts.

8.5 There is a fair promotion policy here.

8.6 The pay in this organisation is as good as with any other.

8.7 I shall have to move from this organisation to get on.

8.8 I feel "trapped" in my current job.
PART 2

Survey into the world of work of the manager

Code No.

Research Unit
School of Management
Leicester Polytechnic
Leicester
**Introduction**

This section is concerned with various aspects of your working life. You are asked to indicate your views on each of the statements listed below. Please do this by placing one tick only in one of the five spaces against each statement.

As you will see there are no right or wrong answers. You are asked not to spend a long time filling in this form. It may at first appear rather long but if you record your immediate reaction you will find it does not take long to complete.

Thank you for your co-operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) There are many restrictions placed upon me in my work with the organisation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) My colleagues in the organisation are willing to try out new ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The level of work required of me is not sufficiently demanding.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The prospects in this organisation are as good with any other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) I would like to replace quite a number of my subordinates if it was possible.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The possibility of me being made redundant is low.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) My job contributes to some degree to the good of society.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) I am adequately consulted in matters that really concern me.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) I have stayed at this present level too long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>Because of the different pressures, I am left uncertain as to which actions to take.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>My boss is not receptive to my ideas or advice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>I am required to make too many decisions on this job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>The pay I receive does not reward me adequately for my efforts.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>My responsibilities and authority are adequately defined for me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>My boss interferes in my work too much.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>Any mistake I make here is treated with understanding.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>My colleagues are very defensive about their own departments and work areas.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>I have enough authority to maintain discipline.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>I can share my difficulties with colleagues.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>I find this job stimulating.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>There is a fair promotion policy here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>I am not sure whether I am doing a good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>My job requires me to live in an area different to the one I would choose.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>I am faced with heavy time pressures in my job.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My boss helps me to develop my abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have often to deal with conflicts of interests between those of the organisation and my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I am kept fully in the picture here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Most of my colleagues should not have got where they are.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>There are too many political manoeuverings and back-stabbings here.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The pay in this organisation is as good as with any other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My relationships with my subordinates are good.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am not given enough responsibility.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>If I was under stress at work, I could not discuss it frankly with my boss.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I do not find any conflict between the demands of my job responsibilities and my family/social responsibilities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I feel I belong and am accepted in this organisation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I find myself involved in conflicts of personality.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>There is too little work for me to do here.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I shall have to move from this organisation to get on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>My subordinates work well as a group.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I am encouraged to participate in the process of decision making.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I feel I can discuss work problems with my boss.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I feel confident of the support of my boss when I make a decision.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The demands of the job are such that I have difficulty in maintaining my social and family activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I feel a loss of personal identity in this organisation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I can trust my fellow managers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>There is too much work for me to undertake properly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I feel &quot;trapped&quot; in my current job.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>My subordinates need too much supervision.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The standards of performance here are always being tightened.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framework of Needs Questionnaire

(i) **Security Needs**
   The feeling of security in my management position.

(ii) **Social Needs**
   1. The opportunity in my management position to give help to other people.
   2. The opportunity to develop close friendships in my management position.

(iii) **Esteem Needs**
   1. The feeling of self-esteem I get from being in my management position.
   2. The prestige of my management position inside the organisation (that is the regard from those working in the organisation).
   3. The prestige of my management position outside the organisation (that is the regard from others not in the organisation).

(iv) **Autonomy Needs**
   1. The Authority connected with my management position.
   2. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my management position.
   3. The opportunity in my management position for participation in the setting of goals.
   4. The opportunity in my management position for participation in the determination of methods and procedures.

(v) **Self-Actualisation Needs**
   1. The opportunity for personal growth and development in my management position.
   2. The feeling of self-fulfilment I get from being in my management position (that is the feeling of being able to use my own unique capabilities realising my potentialities).
   3. The feeling of worthwhile achievement in my management position.
NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Characteristics of your position - Instructions

On the following pages are listed several characteristics or qualities connected with your management position. For each such characteristic you are asked to give three ratings.

Rating One... How much of the characteristic is there now connected with your management position.

Rating Two... How much of the characteristic should be connected with your management position.

Rating Three... How much was the contribution of the D.M.S. to this characteristic of your management position.

Thus you are asked to answer these three questions by circling a number on a rating scale, from 1 - 7, where a low number represents a low or minimum amount and higher numbers represent a high or maximum amount.

Questionnaire

1) The authority connected with my management position
   a) How much is there now?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)

2) The opportunity in my management position to give help to other people
   a) How much is there now?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
3) The feeling of self-esteem I get from being in my management position
   a) How much is there now?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)

4) The opportunity for personal growth and development in my management position
   a) How much is there now?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)

5) The prestige of my management position inside the organisation (that is, the regard received from those working in the organisation)
   a) How much is there now?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)

6) The feeling of security in my management position
   a) How much is there now?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   b) How much should there be?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (high)
7) The opportunity, in my management position, for participation in the setting of goals
   a) How much is there now?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)

8) The feeling of worthwhile achievement in my management position
   a) How much is there now?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)

9) The opportunity to develop close friendships in my management position
   a) How much is there now?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)

10) The opportunity for independent thought and action in my management position
    a) How much is there now?
       (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
    b) How much should there be?
       (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
    c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
       (low)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  (high)
11) The prestige of my management position outside the organisation (this is, the regard received from others, not in the organisation)
   a) How much is there now?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)

12) The opportunity, in my management position, for participation in the determination of methods and procedures
   a) How much is there now?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)

13) The feeling of self-fulfillment I get from being in my management position (that is, the feeling of being able to use my own unique capabilities, realising my potentialities)
   a) How much is there now?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   b) How much should there be?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
   c) How much contribution was the D.M.S.?
      (low) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  (high)
YOUR INFLUENCE AT WORK

In general, how much say or influence do you consider you have in the organisation. Please tick the appropriate square for each of the following questions.

a) Over activities in general with the organisation.

- A very great deal [1] 5
- A great deal [2] 4
- Quite a bit [8] 3
- Some [21] 2
- Little or none [17] 1

b) Over the decisions and activities of your boss.

- A very great deal [1] 5
- A great deal [11] 4
- Quite a bit [26] 3
- Some [9] 2
- Little or none [2] 1

c) Over the decisions and activities of your colleagues.

- A very great deal [2] 5
- A great deal [19] 4
- Quite a bit [17] 3
- Some [10] 2
- Little or none [1] 1
d) Over the decisions and activities of subordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Over the way you spend your working day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Over the quality of your working life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION NO.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SECURITY</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GIVE HELP</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FRIENDS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PRESTIGE 'IN'</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PRESTIGE 'OUT'</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AUTHORITY</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PARTICIPATION IN GOAL-SETTING</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION No.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PARTICIPATION IN METHODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PERSONAL GROWTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SELF-FULFILMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 'NEEDS' QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMARY OF RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Needs</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feeling of security</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Needs</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Giving help to others</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Close friendships</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esteem Needs</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Self - Esteem</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prestige inside</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prestige outside</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy Needs</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Authority</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Independent thought and action</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participation in goal setting</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Participation in methods</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Actualisation Needs</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal growth and development</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feeling of self-fulfilment</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Feeling of achievement</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objective of the D.M.S. programme is to improve your effectiveness as a manager by increasing skills and understanding in relevant fields. Please indicate the influence of the course on you by circling, under the heading 'Improvement', the appropriate number alongside each of the statements below.

Would you also please indicate whether an item is of importance to you in your current job by circling the appropriate number under the heading 'Importance'. The rating of importance should be made independently of the degree of improvement. For example, it may be of high importance to you but no improvement may have been achieved. Thus importance is not related to the D.M.S. Course.

| Statement                                                                 | IMPROVEMENT | IMPORTANCE | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------| |
| 1) Greater awareness of the financial implications of management decisions| 15 27 7 -   | 26 16 6    | |
| 2) Ability actively to contribute to the process of model building for management decision making | 5 23 13 7 10 20 13 | |
| 3) Confidence in own ability as a manager                                | 9 28 8 4 35 12 1 | |
| 4) Understanding the systems of material warehousing and handling         | 1 8 24 16 8 7 23 1 | |
| 5) Ability to analyse marketing priorities                               | 15 20 13 1 5 11 19 1 | |
| 6) Working knowledge of industrial relations practices                    | 8 21 17 3 29 10 9 | |
| 7) Ability to evaluate the economic environment of the firm              | 14 25 9 1 8 15 20 | |
| 8) Ability to initiate and carry through changes                          | 2 28 15 4 31 15 3 | |
| 9) Ability to accept increased responsibility                            | 6 19 20 4 26 21 2 | |
| 10) Ability to set and monitor standards of performance                   | 10 16 19 4 25 19 5 | |
| 11) Understanding the characteristics of organisations                    | 17 18 13 0 3 20 22 | |
| 12) Ability to adopt appraisal and counselling approaches                 | 5 21 15 6 15 25 5 | |
| 13) Ability to tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity                         | 1 19 20 8 23 17 4 4 | |
| 14) Ability to develop effective recruitment and selection procedures     | 4 20 21 4 13 11 17 8 | |
| 15) Ability to influence boss                                             | 2 17 21 9 19 21 8 1 | |
| 16) Ability to contribute to the planning of marketing strategies         | 10 19 13 7 3 8 7 31 | |
| 17) Ability to reconcile conflicting interests and goals in industrial relations conflict situations | 1 22 24 2 21 14 10 4 | |
18) Ability to develop alternative problem solving approaches to complex situations
19) Understanding approaches to production and operations planning
20) Enjoyment of own job
21) Ability to manage job pressures
22) Creative approaches to decision making
23) Understanding the behaviour of others
24) Ability to establish good working relationships with colleagues
25) Ability to manage my time effectively
26) Ability to view objectively the stresses at work
27) Ability to communicate and contribute in work situations
28) Understanding the legal framework within which business activities are conducted
29) Ability to analyse critically numerical data
30) My prospects for pay and promotion
31) Ability to deploy resources—staff, accommodation, equipment
32) Ability to deal with inter-personal problems and conflicts
33) Ability to evaluate and deal with Industrial Relations problems
34) Understanding the major elements of economic analysis
35) Understanding financial techniques for costing and budgetary control
36) Awareness of own motives
37) Ability to motivate and deal with subordinates
38) Understanding the purchasing systems in organisations
39) Ability to adjust own behaviour to the needs of the situation
40) Ability to produce management reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Ability to develop alternative problem solving approaches to complex situations</td>
<td>11  24  11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Understanding approaches to production and operations planning</td>
<td>8  23  13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Enjoyment of own job</td>
<td>0  17  19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Ability to manage job pressures</td>
<td>2  20  16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Creative approaches to decision making</td>
<td>4  16  23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Understanding the behaviour of others</td>
<td>12  20  13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Ability to establish good working relationships with colleagues</td>
<td>0  14  24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Ability to manage my time effectively</td>
<td>4  11  29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Ability to view objectively the stresses at work</td>
<td>7  13  22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Ability to communicate and contribute in work situations</td>
<td>3  21  21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Understanding the legal framework within which business activities are conducted</td>
<td>7  16  20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Ability to analyse critically numerical data</td>
<td>13  17  17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) My prospects for pay and promotion</td>
<td>1  13  26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Ability to deploy resources—staff, accommodation, equipment</td>
<td>0  18  26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Ability to deal with inter-personal problems and conflicts</td>
<td>2  16  23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Ability to evaluate and deal with Industrial Relations problems</td>
<td>1  17  27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Understanding the major elements of economic analysis</td>
<td>13  23  10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) Understanding financial techniques for costing and budgetary control</td>
<td>25  19  5  0</td>
<td>18  20  11  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Awareness of own motives</td>
<td>1  19  20  8</td>
<td>22  16  7  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Ability to motivate and deal with subordinates</td>
<td>0  21  24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Understanding the purchasing systems in organisations</td>
<td>0  14  21  14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Ability to adjust own behaviour to the needs of the situation</td>
<td>1  13  27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Ability to produce management reports</td>
<td>3  13  24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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