NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Irish Factory Workers and Their Orientation: A Case Study

Bernard J. Fagan

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Sociology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

ISBN 0-315-90951-X

Canada

Abstract

Irish Factory Workers and Their Orientation: A Case Study

Bernard J. Fagan

This paper examines the attitudes of Irish factory workers towards their work, fellow workers, their company, and their union. The researcher conducted the study in Dublin, Ireland and interviewed 121 men and women who worked in a food processing plant. The study followed from Goldthorpe's conclusion that the male workers in his sample had an orientation primarily toward the material rewards of their job. He called this an instrumental orientation and added that he felt the attitudes of these workers were proto-typical of the attitudes of workers in the future. This present study did not find support for the instrumentalist thesis.

The results indicate that the interests of Irish workers center on their relations with fellow workers and the survival of the company rather than on their personal pay packet. This relates to the particular economic and social situation the Irish worker finds himself or herself in. Irish workers have long experienced economic hardship coupled with emigration abroad and the result has been a broad based effort in Irish society to focus on economic growth.

Dedication

To my wife, Ann and to my sons, Brendan and Timothy who are glad to see it finished and to my father whom I wish had seen it finished.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

This thesis is an attempt to test John Goldthorpe's (1968) conclusions that the proto-typical workers have a privatized attitude and an instrumental orientation toward their work. My own experiences as a factory worker in a tobacco plant, as a machine operator in a wire and cable company, and as a telephone equipment installer prompted, in part, this research. This experience, entirely impressionistic, did not match the description of privatized workers outlined by Goldthorpe and his associates.

This present study has too many differences from Goldthorpe's to make it a replication; but it does look at the issue of instrumentalism using many of the same questions. Goldthorpe's sample did not include women while the majority of workers in this sample are women. Goldthorpe conducted his study in a relatively new industrial town, Luton, in England, with a geographically mobile workforce, while this researcher carried out this study in an old, established city (Dublin, Ireland), in an old established firm and perhaps more important, in a different country. There are important economic, social and cultural differences that impinge upon the populations of both countries and thus make it difficult to generalize with any sort of confidence. This study is really a case study of a group of Irish factory workers.

However, while this study is not a full replication of Goldthorpe's, it is no less valid a territory to explore his thesis of

instrumentalism. As Banks suggests (1969, 91), Goldthorpe's sample is not representative of the proto-typical worker as the sample is self-selected to some degree. Banks also offered the view that this type of worker was declining in the workforce and as a result the instrumentalism they showed would more likely decrease (p. 90). This present study of Irish workers with its large sample of female workers is perhaps more representative than Goldthorpe's.

This paper will first present an outline of work as seen through the ages. There will then follow an examination of Goldthorpe's study, his subsequent results and interpretations. This will include critical comments from other researchers. The following chapters will give a complete presentation of this study and its conclusions.

Chapter 1 looks at the concept of work on a broad basis. The chapter traces work from its earliest recorded times right up to the present. The researcher presents the different meanings work has had for people throughout the ages and attempts to place Goldthorpe's work within this framework. Also, there is an examination of the studies that have moved away from his perspective.

Chapter 2 will present Goldthorpe's work and will examine the research that followed as a result. Some of these works lend some support to his conclusions, but for the most part they reject his thesis. Goldthorpe's concept of the new worker as an instrumentally driven person is a limiting one and most researchers reject his

narrow view of the worker as *homo economicus*. Several conclude that workers have a much broader orientation to work and that they do not have only an instrumental orientation. For some it is obvious, if not necessary, for any blue-collar worker to have an instrumental orientation; but this orientation can hardly be a full description of what motivates a worker, nor may it be a worker's most important motivation.

Further, Goldthorpe's emphasis on the source of this instrumental orientation, the world outside the workplace, is also open to challenge. His emphasis on the external sources ignores the dynamics of the workplace itself and the crucial role it plays in affecting worker attitudes and behavior. For some writers, the workplace is of critical importance.

Chapter 3 elaborates the research design. A food processing factory in Dublin, Ireland, was the setting for this study. The researcher interviewed a hundred and twenty-one workers of whom 38 were men and 83 were women. This is a significant difference from Goldthorpe's work as he interviewed men only. All the workers in this case study were blue-collar employees and included 11 skilled workers all of whom were male.

Chapter 4 through Chapter 7 examine the results of the study. Chapter 4 looks at the attitudes of the workers toward their work and their job. While Goldthorpe concludes that the men had a low level of satisfaction with their work, he found, on the other hand, that they were satisfied with their job. This he attributed to the

fact that they met their monetary goals. These workers had chosen these jobs because of the pay they could earn and to date were pleased with their decisions.

This study investigates both the level of satisfaction with the work and the level of satisfaction with the overall job. The point of this exploration of attitudes is to compare the rates of satisfaction with those of the British workers as well as to test for differences in the reasons for this satisfaction. Goldthorpe's assumption about the instrumental orientation being proto-typical is continually open to challenge. These Irish workers operate in a very different economy from that of their British confreres, and the researcher suggests that the state of this economy influences workers' attitudes. Employment in Ireland precludes, at least in the short term, the scourge of having to emigrate.

The following section, Chapter 5, presents the attitudes these workers have toward their fellow workers and their supervisors. Goldthorpe found that the men he studied had little interest in friendly relations with either their workmates or their supervisors. This lack of interest he attributed to their instrumental orientation. What was important to these workers was the money they received and while they were not antagonistic to their workmates and supervisors, they did not seek any real gratification from these relationships.

To a certain degree Goldthorpe may have been looking for too much from his men in this area. Workers' important relations are

usually with their families. Although they do not seek close ties with fellow workers, this does not indicate that these relations are unimportant to them; and while they do not have close relations with their workmates, this is not necessarily a reflection of an instrumental attitude.

This study investigates whether the workers had close relations with one another or not. It also challenges Goldthorpe's attempts to explain worker relations by reference to instrumental values. An additional element in the Irish research is the presence of women in the sample. Women may have a different approach to relations at work. This study will explore the attachments women have to their fellow workers and where these differ from either Goldthorpe's sample or from the men in their own factory, the researcher will propose reasons for this.

In chapter 6, emphasis shifts from the workers' relations with their workmates and supervisors to their relations with the firm itself. Goldthorpe's interpretation of the men's satisfaction with their job holds true for their satisfaction with their respective companies. These men held a positive view of their firm as they were happy with the money they received for the effort they made. They were not completely satisfied, however, as many of them felt the company could have paid them more than it did. However, this incomplete satisfaction was not enough to make these men dissatisfied with the firm itself.

Chapter 7 explores the relation the workers have with their union. Goldthorpe's men had little active participation in union affairs. Goldthorpe attributed this to their lack of ideological commitment. Men who are keenly interested in instrumental rewards are not likely to be ideologically motivated to support their unions. Perhaps it is Goldthorpe's own expectation that workers should participate in union affairs that leads him to this conclusion, but it is questionable that workers are habitually so involved with union business whether ideologically motivated or not.

In addition, Goldthorpe did not probe the workers' real commitment to their union. This is an issue that he may have tested only in a real crisis such as a strike. However, he did not research this aspect of the workers' commitment.

In Ireland, the unions, the State, and management have reached open agreements on the direction the Irish economy should take. All concede the importance of job creation through industrial growth as a means of alleviating both unemployment and emigration. Thus, in a country where the major institutions are actively cooperating to solve economic problems, there may be less of an orientation toward active participation in union affairs.

The concluding chapter sums up the results of the study and questions Goldthorpe's emphasis on the instrumental orientation of workers as a proto-typical response to their work situation. For the British workers, money was their main purpose in going to work and the search for better paying jobs coloured these men's attitudes

toward many aspects of their work. Despite their dissatisfaction with the work itself, they were generally happy with their job and their company. Goldthorpe interpreted their attitudes toward their fellow workers and their supervisors as reflecting this instrumental approach to their job. In addition, he concluded that their minimal involvement with their union was further evidence of this approach.

This study examines evidence of such a relation between the desire for money and the attitudes of the Irish workers toward the many aspects of their jobs. The researcher looks at the overall economic situation in Ireland both historically and in the present as a possible explanation of the worker's orientation.

In Ireland, the severe problems of unemployment and its concomitant of emigration have socialized Irish workers well before they enter the workforce. As a result, one might expect an orientation concerned with the importance of employment itself, particularly as a means of avoiding emigration. Remaining in Ireland is an important value in a country that has experienced many waves of emigration since the 19th century famine. Having work allows for the people to enjoy the values most important to them: staying in Ireland in one's own culture among family and friends. The policy of the major societal institutions that focus both on industrial development and the creation of employment reflects this fact.

The approach to the job that the Irish worker exemplifies in this study results, in part, from the worker's socialization before entering the plant. To grow up a working class person in Ireland is

to know through family experience, if not personally, the shock of unemployment and the dislocation of emigration. This experience shapes the consciousness of the Irish people and influences the orientation of the worker as well as that of the whole State.

The next chapter explores the meaning that work has had for mankind through the ages. Mankind has looked at work as a curse, even a punishment, and at other times as a means to salvation. Some writers, looking at the role work plays in the life of men and women, conclude that work is important to their essence and to their self-definition. Goldthorpe's proposition that the worker strives to pursue instrumental values is essentially a revival of Frederick Taylor's view of the worker as an economic being. In the literature review, the researcher will attempt to situate Goldthorpe's work as part of a long history on the purpose and meaning of work in the life of man.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Background

Goldthorpe contends that we must know the meaning that work has for people if we are to understand their orientation to that work. He proposes that an action frame of reference be adopted by which he means, "... a frame of reference in which actors' own definitions of the situations in which they are engaged are taken as an initial basis for the explanation of their social behavior and relationships" (1968, 184).

Work does not have the same meaning for everyone in the particular society or even in the particular plant one is examining. Further, as a social institution, work has a social history. We shall see that work has had different meanings throughout history. For some, work was a burden (in some instances actual slavery), while for others it was a blessing.

For Berger (1964, 212), the question of the meaning of work is a particularly modern problem. Kumar (1980, 3) shares this perspective. For both of these writers, work has a historical as well as an ideological dimension. Throughout history work was bound up with other spheres of life -- leisure, religious activities, and home life -- and it made little sense to seek the meaning of work.

For most people work was not a freely chosen activity, but was more likely related to one's station at birth. Ascription rather than achievement determined one's lot in life. The mass of people worked to provide themselves with the daily necessities of life. Some were fortunate enough to be in a position where they were able to force others to do the most burdensome work; but these, kings, priests, or warriors, were in a minority.

The question of the meaning of work for traditional societies is difficult to separate from the meaning of other activities. Work was not a unique activity and was often bound up with the rhythms of life. The task or even the amount of daylight often governed the length of the work day or work week. In traditional societies, it is not possible to separate the meaning of work from the meaning of life itself.

The coming of industrialization with its extreme division of labor, its separation of work and home life, and its rupture of the religious aspects of work has brought the problem of the meaning of work to the fore. The exaltation of the economic sphere as the pre-eminent arena for man's development has brought with it conflicting elements.

Work has become celebrated as the most important element for determining a person's identity, while at the same time work's fragmentation, its insecurity, and its monotony have made it almost impossible for most people to achieve that identity. Berger (1964, 216), as do many other writers (Moorhouse 1984, 249), points to the

development of the self that occurs away from the workplace, specifically in the home. Goldthorpe's view is that work is important for the instrumental values it provides, for what it allows the person to do away from the factory.

This has not been the traditional picture of work that has been passed on down throughout the centuries. Neither the ancient Greeks nor the Hebrews could conceive of work as having an instrumental purpose. However, there are difficulties in studying the ideas of the past when it comes to examining what work has meant to mankind.

Dominant Meanings

The first problem met in studying the historical meanings of work has to do with the sources available (Nosow and Form, 1962). The historical record describes, for the most part, the life of the privileged classes.

The written record is also a product of the literate classes. How much it reflects the knowledge and understandings of the ordinary persons is uncertain. When we speak of the meanings that work had for historical societies we must pay attention to this fact. The ideas available may be only those of the elite.

Marx concluded that the ideas of the ruling class were the accepted ideas throughout society. He wrote,

> The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of

> society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationship which make one the ruling class, therefore the ideas of its dominance (Marx 1977, 176).

Abercrombie (1980, 157) feels, however, that the dominant ideology was mainly restricted to the upper classes and did not have the effect on the lower classes that Marx attributed to it. Abercrombie (p. 28) says that there have been two interpretations of this doctrine. The first suggests that other ideologies exist alongside the dominant ideology, but because of the capitalist's ownership of the means of production, including the production of ideas and their dissemination, these ideas do not come to public view. The other interpretation of this doctrine excludes the possibility of competing ideologies. The dominant ideology is so powerful and pervasive that it leaves the working class and their allies unable to think in any other categories. Abercrombie rejects this perspective.

He then outlines the views of Gramsci and Althusser. Their outlook helps us understand the subordination of the Irish worker. Gramsci (1980, 11-15) uses the term hegemony to describe the

control the ruling class exerts over the subordinate classes. The ruling class does not achieve this control only by force, the use of which it may obscure, but achieves it primarily by consent. The dominant class achieves its hegemony in the superstructures -- the schools, the media, the church, and other institutions. Ideology is the main tool in this process which Gramsci views as ongoing.

He believes there are elements in the subordinate classes not incorporated into the dominant culture. These elements are, nonetheless, contained, and in the case of trade unions can even participate in their own containment. Peillon (1982, 75) describes the role of Irish trade unions in perpetuating the existing system of class relations.

Althusser (1980, 20-24) also, gives prominence to such institutions as the family, education, the church, and trade unions for their ideological role in reproducing the conditions in which capitalism can survive, if not thrive. These institutions must not only provide the workers with the necessary skills to do their jobs, but also must produce in these workers the proper attitudes and values which allow for their submission to the rules and order of the capitalist system and its ruling class.

Althusser, as Gramsci, views ideology as a lived practice. It is more than a system of beliefs but the individual experiences this ideology in a manner whereby the experience convinces the individual of the correctness of the system and his or her position in it. Burawoy (1979, 106) examines this lived experience of the

workers and outlines the process whereby management uses consent rather than coercion to gain control. He demonstrates how workers willingly participate in their own subjugation.

Fox (1974, 140) states that rival values and meanings exist and adherents can use them to challenge the prevailing order. He begins with the premise that the ascendant groups in society seek to have the meanings which serve their interests adopted by not only work organizations but also by other socializing institutions such as the family, the school, and the media. The predominant meaning of work which these groups push is an instrumental one. They have more power than their rivals and are more successful in having their meanings accepted and acted upon. Fox concludes, "For the most part, then, work for the majority is little more than an irksome precondition for the real business of living. ...both the social meaning and the personal meaning stress the instrumental, not the intrinsic, value of work" (p. 151).

He adds, however, that the working class has access to a different perspective and is not dependent on some interpreter to explain their true interests.

Before we examine the historical meanings available to us it is important to remember their sources and to consider the position of the elite in, if not having their meanings fully accepted, at least having the power to have them communicated.

Historical Meanings

The Greeks

The ancient Greeks did not hold work in high esteem. For them, working to provide the necessities of life was equivalent to living the life of animals. The Greeks believed wealth to be essential to the enjoyment of the ideal life that concerned itself with the *vita contemplativa* and was a life without work; but they scorned the active pursuit of wealth as an end in itself. The contempt that they held for work was not because it was done by slaves, but it was because work was tied to securing the necessities of life and the Greeks felt that slaves should do this work. Hannah Arendt states:

> The institution of slavery in antiquity, though not in later times, was not a device for cheap labor or an instrument of exploitation for profit but rather the attempt to exclude labor from the conditions of man's life. What man shared with all other forms of animal life was not considered to be human (1958, 74).

While this view expressed the attitude of the elite, most people had to work for a living in ancient Greece. Only a minority held the philosophy that work was contemptible. That, however, does not lessen the philosophy's influence. The Greek aristocrats have had their imitators throughout history, a recent example being

the plantation owners in the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Kumar 1979, 6).

The Hebrews

The Hebrews did not hold work in high opinion either. One significant difference between them and the Greeks was the religious importance they attached to work. Work acquired meaning because it was a way to achieve atonement, a way of returning man to his original state of happiness with God. Man, through hard work, will gradually create the Kingdom of God on earth. The Hebrews thought of this hard work as a curse, a punishment from God (De Grazia, 35).

The Hebrews shared with the Greeks their admiration for the contemplative; but, unlike the Greeks, they viewed work as an essential element in the effort to achieve harmony with God. Work itself did not provide meaning for them, but they exalted work for the holy ends it would secure.

Early Christians

The early Christians agreed with the Hebrew position on work as a punishment from God. They, however, added a positive element to their perspective on work. For the Christians, there existed the opportunity to engage in charitable activities as a result of one's participation in work. It was not only a means to a living, but also

allowed one to contribute to the needs of others. By engaging in work a person was not only avoiding occasions for doing evil, but was, through charity, conferring God's blessing upon the soul.

The addition of a religious meaning to work had not yet conferred any intrinsic value to work. It was not an end in itself, and while it could bring wealth only those possessing it would consider this desirable. Possession of wealth might by itself indicate a turning away from God.

Nonetheless, the attitude of these Christians signified a change from that of the Greeks. Work, and perhaps even workers, were no longer objects of scorn. There remained a hierarchy of work with religious and intellectual endeavors such as prayer and contemplation of the divine being considered more important than manual work (De Grazia, 24).

Thomas Aquinas

St. Thomas Aquinas introduced the idea of work as the foundation of society, in a sense coming close to Marx's idea of production as the base. For Aquinas, work was the legitimate foundation for the possession of private property and for the making of profit; although, one had to keep profit to that level that maintained an individual amongst that person's peers (Tilgher 1958, 40).

Society was a mutual exchange of services for the sake of the good life (Anthony 1977, 37). Every worker, no matter his or her

station, contributed to this endeavour. The division of society into classes whereby each class makes its own significant contribution to the common good was a natural system for Aquinas. The hierarchical nature of society was to be accepted as given, a point of view later challenged by Marx.

Although Aquinas assigned an important role to work in society, he did not imbue it with any intrinsic significance. Work was important because it was a way to glorify God and was a means to attain the life hereafter. Contemplation and prayer stood above all other forms of work (De Grazia, 42).

The Protestants Sects

Anthony (1977, 39) says that Weber (1958), in his analysis of western style capitalism, helps us understand both the changes in the ideology of work and the construction of such an ideology. Western style capitalism is different from previous forms of capitalism which have existed in civilizations throughout history (Weber 1958, 21). This new capitalism is characterized by a formal rationality which is organized towards the pursuit of specific goals in the most effective and efficient manner possible (Smucker 1980, 33). Traditional values no longer suffice to guide people's actions but have been replaced by the pragmatic requirements demanded by the very ends themselves. These ends, at first, religious in orientation later became transformed into secular ends. Weber ties

the change from speculative capitalism to rational capitalism to the beliefs of the Protestant sects (Smucker, 34).

Weber points out that capitalism had to overcome many obstacles to flourish. Traditionalistic approaches to enterprise and work were among the most important of these obstacles. In the case of the worker, Weber wrote:

> The opportunity of earning more was less attractive than the idea of working less. ... Whenever modern capitalism has begun its work of increasing the productivity of human labour by increasing its intensity, it has encountered the immensely stubborn resistance of this leading trait of pre-capitalist labour (Weber 1958, 60).

Weber adds that the solution to these traditional attitudes did not lie in harsh measures nor in different pay schemes. For him, "Labour must be performed as if it were an absolute end in itself, a calling." This calling, "can only be the product of a long and arduous process of education" (Weber, 62). Weber traces the idea of a calling, both in a devotion to making money and in working hard, to the Reformation.

Luther held the notion that work was a method to serve and honour God. He believed that all workers, no matter their station, served God by doing their best. No one should aspire to rise above his divinely ordered position as each contributes equally to the glory of God and to the common good (Weber, 85). Luther concluded that no

work is better than another in honoring God and no distinction is to be made between religious activity and other work.

This elevation of all forms of activity to the same level as prayer and contemplation emancipated economic and commercial activities. Luther, however, still felt that work should produce only enough for sustenance; profits were still taboo However, work had acquired a new dignity, and was not only relevant to the life hereafter.

It was Calvinism, however, which provided the doctrines necessary to the development of the new work ethic (Smucker, 35). Calvin believed that a minority of men were predestined to share everlasting life with God, while the majority were to be condemned to eternal damnation (Weber, 98).

There is no way to know to which group one belongs, but each person must act as though he were part of the select group. To doubt one's selection to everlasting salvation was itself a temptation. Although there was nothing a person could do to alter his divine destination, he could convince himself through success that he was one of the called (Weber, 112).

Many Protestant sects, such as the Baptists and Methodists, promoted hard, unremitting toil as the will of God. These sects also felt that no one should derive pleasure from the fruits of this labor. They even condemned contemplation of God, as what was pleasing to Him was hard, incessant work that resulted in success. A person

could acquire wealth as long as that person did not use that wealth for pleasure but reinvested it in the enterprise.

Calvinism encouraged people to move beyond their present station as this was virtuous and agreeable to God. This approach to work was important to the development of capitalism and industrial life (Anthony, 41). Industrial society required workers willing to submit themselves to the unnatural rhythms and rigors of factory life.

Calvinism went beyond Luther's views and rejected Luther's ban on mobility and profit taking. These activities were now virtuous. The new ethic extolled the value of wanting to work hard and the desire to work and achieve success was the new element in the definition of work (Burstein 1975, p.11).

Samuelson (1961) investigated the iinks between Protestantism and economic progress. He examined the critical points made by Weber in defense of his thesis that Protestantism was crucial to the development of capitalism. Samuelson concluded that Weber's analysis was incorrect. In his examination of Puritan writings, Samuelson found attitudes and ideas similar to those of early Christian writers such as St. Paul (p. 30). Puritan ideas were not necessarily new, nor necessarily in favor of wealth. Samuelson contended that some of the writings were anti-capitalistic. The economic views of the Puritans neither encouraged nor obstructed the Spirit of Capitalism that he finds in writings before the Reformation.

Samuelson stated that other factors such as the Renaissance, the breakdown of the feudal system, and the Enlightenment contributed to the emergence of capitalism. He criticized Weber for his historical analysis, his poor geography, his circular arguments, his vague concepts, and his methodology. Samuelson remarked that he could not find any support for Weber's thesis.

Notwithstanding Samuleson's criticism of Weber, Tilgher adds that many important thinkers for whom work became the mainspring of man's existence followed Calvinism. Kumar (1980, 7) notes that work becomes a secular religion for writers such as Schiller, Hegel, Saint-Simon, and Marx. Whereas before a person might turn to religion for an identity, now that person would turn to work, or more particularly, to his or her job.

The separation of work from home, family, and from religion elevated work and economic activity to the highest status amongst society's activities. This was far from the ideas of work held by the ancient Greeks. These modern writers were defining man as a producer and as a worker. However, the degradation of the worker in the factories of the industrial revolution accompanied this elevation of work to its exalted status.

Karl Marx

For Marx (McLennan 1977, 160), man discovers his essence as a producer. Through work, man defines his species being and is able to fulfill his inherent potential. Marx feels that the capitalist system

undermines man's possibilities for self-fulfillment and development. This is because control over the process is not in the hands of the producer but in the hands of the capitalist class.

The capitalist's concern for profit determines the structure of work organization and the division of labor. The capitalist purchases labor power as he does any other commodity. Labor power is different from labor itself. Labor power is a potential that the purchaser must organize, direct, and control if he is to realize his goals. The worker is not selling a commodity in which he has expended his labor, rather he is selling his labor power as a commodity (McLellan 1977, 226).

A consequence of this, however, is the conflict of interest between the worker and his employer. The worker, who wishes to extract as much reward as possible with the least amount of effort, now faces an employer who desires the greatest profit for the least reward possible. The worker is under the authority and control of the owner who uses the worker's labor power for the owner's ends. Whatever goals the worker may have for self-fulfillment are incidental to the goal of securing profit (McLellan, 317).

Because the workers are engaged in tasks not of their own choosing, management will not trust them to fulfill their obligations without close supervision. Many writers have pointed out that the search for more effective measures of control is incessant (Edwards 1979, 18; Salaman 1979, 16). These methods of control are related to the division of labor, technology, and

management itself. Littler and Salaman (1984, 79) indicate that today's tight economy requires more control than ever, not only to protect profitability, but also to improve the flexibility and efficiency of labor.

Marx examined the deskilling of labor and the separation of hand and brain work. The owners break down skills that used to belong to the individual craftsman into many operations and divide them among several workers, while at the same time, the decision making, knowledge, and control over the operation pass into the hands of the owner. This process of deskilling is constant and reduces the worker's autonomy, makes him more expendable; and, as a result, the owners can more easily control and exploit the worker (McLellan, 227).

This deskilling, the loss of control over both the process and product, and increasing exploitation have the effect of creating an alienated worker. First, man is alienated from his product and from the process of producing. He does not own what he produces nor does he control the process. There are four other aspects defining this alienation: 1) man is alienated from nature; 2) man is alienated from himself; 3) man is alienated from his human essence and; 4) man is alienated from other men (Struik 1964, 110-113). No worker can find meaning in work controlled by another for the other's own ends. Only the disappearance of the capitalist system and its replacement by a socialist, and ultimately a communist, system will allow man to discover his potential.

Arendt criticizes Marx for his blurring of the distinction between work and labor (1958, 87). For Arendt, there are important differences between the two activities. Labor is concerned with those activities which serve the life process itself. Man must eat, drink, sleep, and perform a host of bodily functions every day of his life. As a part of nature, man must engage in a wide range of actions whose purpose is to allow man as a species to survive. The products of labor are bound up in a cyclical and repetitive process which follows the biological rhythms of our own bodies (Arendt, 98). We labor to produce food which in turn replenishes our energies so that we may begin all over again the next day.

Labor's products, such as food, are meant to be consumed right away. They are not meant to last and if not used up , they will rot. Labor leaves nothing permanent behind. It does not create an objective world for men to live and work in. The products of labor are consumer goods which have no independence on their own apart from their function to serve man's biological needs. These products are tied to the never-ending process of life and as such the activity of labor is bound to the necessity of continual regeneration... In the realm of labor, man is tied to the world of nature.

Work, the activity of *homo faber*, is qualitatively different from that of labor, the activity of *animal laborans*. In work, man produces permanent objects which stand over and against him. He takes material from nature and constructs a world to live in. The products of work are meant to last and are not goods to be consumed.

They are not meant to spoil and can outlast their creator. Unlike the products of labor which are used up immediately, the products of work are meant to be enjoyed and used over a long period of time. These products include ordinary household furniture, such as tables and chairs, to great works of art, such as the *Mona Lisa.* The world of *homo faber* creates a permanent and durable space for man to engage in both political and cultural activities.

The objects of work help man define himself. They mark his place in the world and help separate him from the cyclical world of nature. Work allows man to identify the time when these objects first appeared and gives him a sense of continuity with the past and a relationship to the future when some of these objects will outlast him.

Marx, according to Arendt, correctly identified the fecundity of labor. He noticed that labor, by its ability to produce a surplus, was able to produce more than the life process of one individual . Marx however, defined man as an *animal laborans* who would one day by his enormous productivity do away with the need for labor at all (Arendt, 105). Marx, at the same time, fails to recognize the world of *homo faber* and his products "whose durability will survive and withstand the devouring processes of life" (Arendt, 108). This lack of differentiation between these two activites leads Marx to create a world in which "the ideals of *homo faber*, the fabricator of the world, which are permanence, stability, and durability, have been sacrificed to abundance, the ideal of *animal laborans* (Arendt, 126).

This will result in a world no longer governed by necessity, but also a world unable to provide man with an productive activites.

Arendt contends that Marx contradicts himself when he says that man discovers his essence in his labor. Marx sees man as essentially an *animal laborans*, engaged in the necessary functions imposed by nature itself, but than he proceeds to argue that in the future man will no longer need to labor . By failing to recognize the world of *homo faber*, Marx ignores the need for man to inhabit a world of durable objects which provide a place for man to be human.

Taylor and Scientific Management

Frederick W. Taylor (1967) had no interest in the meaning of work. He was interested in solving the main problem facing the large enterprises of the day which was essentially improving worker productivity. Workers were not interested in the inherent rewards a job might offer, nor were they concerned with the social aspects of the work either. What interested the workers, according to Taylor (p. 10), were jobs that paid well and jobs that were not too physically strenuous. Taylor wanted to improve output and was not concerned about the worker other than in the worker's contribution to this effort.

Taylor studied work processes to learn the one best way to do a job. He set out to reduce unnecessary movements and steps so that

there would be an increase in efficiency. Increased efficiency meant higher profits for management and higher wages for the workers.

The workers who were only interested in money would respond well to a wage incentive scheme. They would not resent losing control over the work process nor would they regret not having any say in how they worked. Although, he contradicts himself later when he states that management would have to enforce the adoption of this system and enforce cooperation on the part of the workers (p. 83). Taylor (p. 26) was an advocate of deskilling the workers and of having management appropriate all the knowledge of the work processes.

Although Taylor showed interest in the individual as a worker, he paid little attention to the individual differences amongst workers, nor did he comprehend the impact that social relations have on the worker. Workers vigorously resisted attempts by managers to take away their skills (Penn 1982, 107). Moreover, supervisors and foremen arraigned themselves against these changes as they found that Taylorism was as much an attack on their position in the labor process as it was an assault on the workers' skills (Littler 1982, 144).

Rose (1975, 84) points out that British researchers criticized Taylor's approach as being too mechanistic and simplistic. Their study of fatigue shifted away from a physiological analysis to a psychological one emphasizing individual differences. They began to pay attention to the subjective factors of a worker's experience.

They turned their investigation to the issues of boredom and monotony on the factory floor. The results led them to suggest antidotes such as rest pauses and increased variety to alleviate the problems of the workers. Later studies emphasized the social pressures at work, but for the most part concern lay with the individual's response and needs.

Overall, there was movement away from Taylor's mechanistic, money-driven worker to a more complex being affected by precise job conditions, the physical environment, and social relations. The ideas that followed explored the needs of workers for significant relationships at work and researchers delved into what has become known as human relations.

Human Relations

Human relations followed soon after Taylorism as another method of improving worker output (Mouzelis 1967, 97). Several writers (Mouzelis, 98; Rose 1975, 104) indicate that while the human relations studies encompass far more than the studies done at Western Electric (the Hawthorne experiments) and those done by Elton Mayo, they have been the most influential.

The human relations school emphasized both the informal organization established by the workers and management's modes of supervision. The relations amongst the workers and between them and their supervisors became the nexus of the researchers' approach.

They concluded that these relations were more important to the workers than the nature of the task they were doing and the money they could earn.

The researchers, who viewed conflict as an aberration, felt that workers who acted against management were irrational. Management could resolve problems of conflict through proper communication and, in some instances, by therapeutic intervention. A strong and informed management would be able to reduce, even eliminate, conflict.

Carey severely criticized the Hawthorne studies (1967, 416). He concluded that the significant variables that increased productivity had more to do with old-fashioned coercion and economic incentives than anything to do with the attention the workers received. He also condemned the studies for the lack of scientific rigor and stated the evidence does not support the conclusions.

Mayo followed the human relations school in stressing the importance of primary group relations at work. Mayo, like Durkheim, felt that modern industrial society created a hostile environment which produced anomie in individuals (Mayo 1945, 7). For Durkheim, the division of labor was an integrating force which would reduce this anomie.

Mayo thought that the social life at the factory could mitigate the isolating and deleterious effects of industrialized society. He assumed that a benign elite (management) was necessary to direct

the workers and to raise their morale. The workers should not be responsible for their own solidarity (Mayo, 112).

Critics remark that human relations supposed concern for the worker is only a mask for management's real goal of manipulation of the workers to achieve higher productivity. In paying so much attention to the informal organization, Mayo's system ignored the monetary concerns of the workers. Also, in this schema, workers had little interest in personal development.

Etzioni (1985, 49) points to the influence of the human relations studies on subsequent research. Herzberg (1959) conducted a study on the work satisfaction of engineers and accountants. The results led him to propose a Two Factor theory. He theorized that the sources of satisfaction with work were different from the sources of dissatisfaction.

He identified two groups of factors which affected the attitudes of the workers. First, the workers most often mentioned those factors which Herzberg claimed were intrinsic to the work as reasons for being satisfied. These included the work itself, achievement, and responsibility. They least often mentioned these same factors as reasons for being dissatisfied. Herzberg called these factors motivators (p. 114).

The workers identified extrinsic factors as sources of dissatisfaction. These included salary, working conditions, supervision, and relationships at work. Herzberg stated that while workers may declare themselves dissatisfied when they did not

meet their expectations with respect to these factors, they were not necessarily satisfied when they did meet them. Herzberg labeled these factors, which generally deal with material elements of the job, as hygienes (p. 113).

Intrinsic factors affected satisfaction while extrinsic factors stirred dissatisfaction. Russell (1975, 303) found Herzberg's approach oversimplified and that the key variable in determining worker satisfaction or dissatisfaction was neither the motivators nor hygienes in themselves but was the worker's orientation to the job.

Perrow (1972, 113) pointed to problems with Herzberg's methodology and to the difficulty with replicating his findings when a researcher used a different methodology.

The Quality of Work Life

Etzioni (1985, 52) remarked that another result of the Hawthorne studies were the ideas that work could be made more interesting for workers and would lead to better cooperation between management and employees.

Abraham Maslow (1970, 97-104) was influential in launching this movement with a theoretical contribution. He postulated a hierarchy of needs that had to be satisfied at each lower level before the person concerned could proceed to the next level.

He identified five categories of basic needs. The first level had to do with physiological needs such as food, water, and shelter. Once a person satisfied these needs, safety needs took precedence. The third category of needs were those of belonging and love. Acceptance by one's peers fits into this category. The fourth category was the need for self-esteem and, lastly, came the need for self-actualization. This is similar to Marx's ideas about man finding his essence through work.

In Maslow's theory, material rewards can be important. As long as they remain unfulfilled, a person will not focus on goals such as peer acceptance and self-actualization.

There has been much criticism of Maslow's approach (Perrow 1972, 121; Rose 1975, 194). Criticism centers on the idea of a hierarchy of needs and its universality. Another problem has to do with the failure to differentiate between needs and values. It may be possible to agree that certain physiological needs are both primary and universal, but it would be difficult to make the same claim for values.

The theory, however, does bring out the idea that workers come to the workplace with expectations that will affect their behaviour at work. A worker's orientation to his work is thus complex and can be prior to, although not unaffected by, social relations at work. Another important aspect of this theory is the highlighting of the need for intrinsic satisfactions once the worker has met the other needs.

Chris Argyris (1957, 75) added to Maslow's approach by insisting that the organization tends to suppress the individual, keeping the person immature. However, he believed that through restructuring management could overcome its predisposition to inhibit its employees growth and development. The organization would then promote the workers' maturity.

McGregor (1960), following Maslow, assumed that employees needed self-fulfillment. He stated that management so designed the structures of the organizations that it thwarted any efforts by workers to achieve personal growth on the job. His solution was to have management allow workers to participate in decisions and to give them more autonomy in doing their jobs.

McGregor proposed that management had two ways of categorizing workers. The predominant method he called "Theory X" (p. 33). Management viewed employees as indigent, uninterested in their work, and indifferent to the company's goals. This opposed his "Theory Y" (p. 47) in which management believed workers wanted to take on responsibility, and wished to pursue personal goals within the framework of the company's goals. Fein (1976, 500) found only minimal support for McGregor's ideas. Fein added that most workers are interested in pay and security.

The quality of work life movement attempts to create environments that provide opportunities to workers to participate in decision-making. This approach is a practical solution to the problems identified by McGregor, Herzberg, and Argyris. Through

such programs as job redesign, job enlargement and job rotation, management hope to engage the enthusiasm of workers to increase productivity. Supporters contend that the aim of these efforts is to improve the working environment so that the individual better achieves his own goals. Critics, such as Rinehart (1986, 500), argue that the purpose is to enhance productivity and reduce costs, and that little humanization of the workplace actually occurs.

The Technology Proponents

Rose (1975, 175) suggests that technology replaced human relations as the key explanatory variable in understanding workers' behavior and attitudes. Woodward (1958, 16) proposed that technology determined the organizational structure which in turn affected the satisfaction of the workers. Management structures and styles varied depending on the production process (unit, batch, or process) the firm used (Woodward, 18).

Trist and Bamforth (1969, 356) examined the effect of two different methods (traditional and longwall) of coal-mining on the social relations of the miners themselves. In the traditional method, the miners retained a good deal of control over how they worked and over production. Miners worked over a small area and they exercised many skills. There was only a minimal division of labor. New technology contributed to the introduction of the longwall method. Under this system workers mined a longer coal-face and worked in three shifts. The division of labor increased and

workers lost much of their control over the process. While production increased initially, so did the tensions between the miners' and management. The introduction of a new technology affected the social relations which existed in the tradtional method. This created many problems for mangement and the workers.

For Walker and Guest (1952, 20), who studied automobile assembly-line workers, technology affected the worker on the job with its machine pacing and it also influenced the structure of the organization. The researchers discovered that the men found the work boring and unchallenging, and that the majority said they worked for the pay. However, the most important finding for Walker and Guest was the lack of meaningful social contact. This is reminiscent of the human relations approach to the workplace whereby the researchers claim that men have a need for close interpersonal contact (Walker and Guest, 161).

Sayles' examination of industrial conflict led him to conclude that technology was a crucial variable in explaining worker attitudes and behaviour (1958, 160). Technology could either inhibit or promote the formation of work groups. Strong groups, motivated by economic concerns, would show a high degree of grievance activity.

Sayles, like Walker and Guest, emphasizes in-plant factors and ignores the experiences the workers have outside the plant. He returns somewhat to the Taylorite proposition of the worker motivated by greed, but his concern for the impact of technology

does alert us to the objective factors affecting workers attitudes and behaviour.

Blauner associated the degree of alienation experienced by the worker with the technology used in the company. He stated that technology was the key variable in explaining the degree of alienation. He remarked, "The most important single factor that gives an industry a distinctive character is its technology" (Blauner 1964, 6).

He contended that alienation was low in craft industries characteristic of the pre-industrial period (printing), high in assembly-line factories (automobile assembly) and machine-tending operations (textiles), and low again in plants using continuous process technology (chemical plants). Blauner predicted that as more plants used the continuous process technology, as found in the petrochemical industries, alienation would decline (p. 182).

Rose (p. 210) questions Blauner's explanation for the low alienation of the textile workers whom one would expect would have had a high level of alienation. Blauner proposed that their lower level of alienation was due to their strong family, community, and religious ties which they brought into the plant with them (p. 88). This contention dilutes the strength of his primary explanatory variable.

His reliance on technology as the key variable in determining the worker's experience ignores both the human relations aspects of the job and the external, socially produced motives of the worker.

Blauner came close to recognizing the impact of the out-plant, social factors in his discussion of the textile workers, but he failed to develop this idea sufficiently. The textile workers were outside the norm of what was predicted for the future.

The optimistic outlook which Blauner predicted has not been shared by subsequent researchers. Nichols and Beynon (1977, 24) said the process workers, contrary to Blauner's expectations, were not really skilled in the same way as craftsmen (p. 24). Halle (1984, 115) remarked that many of the jobs in chemical processing plants are dull and uninteresting. In addition, these jobs are hazardous given the nature of the materials the men have to work with. Halle (p. 115), Gallie (1978, 87), and Nichols and Beynon (p. 25) examine the disagreeable and difficult problem that shift work poses for continuous process workers.

Gallie concludes that technology is of little relevance in explaining industrial relationships and states that researchers should pay attention to the 'wider cultural and social structural patterns of specific societies for determining the nature of social interaction within the advanced sector' (p. 295).

Charles Perrow (1967) has made an important contribution to the role technology plays in organizations. He argues that technology is the key independent variable that explains the social structure of the organization (p. 194). The type of technology used by the organization depends on the nature of the raw material being processed. The structures of the organizations vary along a

continuum based on a combination of the exceptional cases the organization has to deal with and on the search procedures it uses to deal with these exceptions.

The key criticism of the technological determinists comes from those who see technology as a dependent variable. Child (1973, 91) argued the importance of strategic choice. The structure of the organization is such as it is because it reflects the interests of those in charge. Agyris (1973, 79) shares this perspective and attests to the conscious efforts of management to design the workplace to suit its own needs. Dickson (1974, 79) writes that management employs technological innovation as a method to control workers.

A significant contribution to the debate about the respective roles of technology and management in determining organizational structure was the work of Harry Braverman (1974). For Braverman, it was capitalism's concern for control which determined the technology employed in the plant.

Braverman revived Marx's thesis about the degradation of the worker and the homogenization of the working class. His analysis of the labor process is a radical critique of capitalism and, as such, is a macrosociological attempt to examine the alienation of workers.

Capitalism requires increasing control if it is to extract the surplus necessary for its survival (p. 65). Management, itself, has no choice but to employ whatever scheme it can to ensure domination over the design and organization of work. Braverman

concluded that Taylorism was the perfect strategy and method to achieve this control, and he added that it would spread to all work, including white-collar jobs (p. 325).

This extension of control clashes with the worker's need for satisfying, non-alienating work. Braverman relied on Marx's differentiation between labor and labor power to explore this conflict.

Braverman (p. 112) also built on Marx's ideas of deskilling and control. The complete degradation of labor begins with Taylor's conclusion that unless management takes possession of the worker's knowledge of the work process, maximum efficiency would not be possible. Davis and Taylor (1976, 411) assert that management makes choices about the technology it employs based on assumptions about the qualities of workers.

Noble (1978, 347) supports Braverman's view that management chooses the technology which is put in place. Technological development is itself a social process which affects the workers in many ways. Nichols and Beynon (p. 13) conclude that the management in the company they studied selected their technology for economic reasons.

Researchers have paid considerable attention to three particular areas of Braverman's thesis. These are his treatment of the concept and extent of deskilling, worker control, and his view of management.

Penn (1985, 629) conducted a study on numerical control and found little evidence to support Braverman's view on deskilling. The workers required considerable training and experience in order to perform their tasks properly. Penn proposed a compensatory theory of the labor process. While it is true that some skills are disappearing, other skills are in greater demand. In his study, the introduction of new machinery led to a tripling of skilled maintenance workers.

Form (1987, 44) after a review of the literature came to the same conclusion. He saw little evidence of an aggregate decrease in occupational skills. For Braverman control is a zero-sum game. However, he is confusing formal systems of control with actual control. Recent literature demonstrates that considerable control rests with the workers (Halle 1984, 139).

Braverman ignores the extent to which management depends upon the cooperation of the workers. In his assessment, the working class is completely at the mercy of the vicissitudes of the capitalists. However, as Giddens (1982, 32) has mentioned, no matter how detailed the work process, management always depends upon the willingness of workers to do their job. The job involves more than can be specified by rules as the success of work to rule campaigns suggests.

Braverman's conception of the workplace is too abstract. He asserts a relationship of class antagonism, thereby obviating any need to investigate that relationship (Penn 1985 b, 12). In doing so,

he neglects the degree to which management attempts to gain the consent of workers and the degree to which workers themselves willingly cooperate because they feel they have a stake in the system. He ignores the intersubjective aspect of work relations.

Burawoy examines the manner in which management structures the work in order to gain the consent of the workers (1979, 80). According to Burawoy, workers engage in games to make out on their piece rates and do so with the knowledge, approval of, and even participation of management. By engaging in these games, workers deflect attention away from the relations of production. As well, by their game-playing these workers agree to the rules of production (p. 82).

Burawoy argues that management organizes the workplace to meet production goals while, at the same time, workers perceive that they are undermining these goals. It is not technology that structures the relationships and attitudes on the shop floor but the desire of management to gain profits. Management can successfully do this when it allows the workers to have some limited control over the labor process (p. 87).

Worker Orientation

The appearance of Ely Chinoy's work, The Automobile Worker and The American Dream (1955), marked a move away from the

emphasis on human relations, the worker as a configuration of needs, and the behaviorism of the technological approach.

Chinoy (p. 133) studied the adjustments automobile workers had to make to the harsh realities of assembly line work and to the 'American Dream' whereby each man can realize his ambitions if he works hard enough. The men come to the plant socialized by their society to expect rewards in income, status, and promotion in return for their hard work.

Chinoy discovered that the workers had to modify their goals in light of their everyday work experience. Their orientation changed to reflect the demands made on them within the factory. Workers had to give up on their goals of success and of doing interesting and challenging work and many substituted goals of consumerism, leisure activities, or ambitions for their own children (p. 126).

Moorhouse (1984, 248) criticizes Chinoy's analysis for his Marxian perspective on work whereby it is in paid labor that man discovers his true self. Moorhouse says that workers may achieve self-development and personal satisfaction in out-of-work activities. He also contends that Chinoy pays too little attention to the informal world of work (so well described by Roy (1973, 209-212).

Moorhouse adds that Chinoy does not detail sufficiently the values which make up the American Dream nor why or how the workers are to work them out on the factory floor. It is possible

that the whole arena of life outside the factory could provide a person with fulfillment and meaning in life. Dubin (1962, 257) said that work was not a central life interest for workers; he concluded life in the home and the community was far more significant. Halle (1984, 52) emphasizes the active social life workers led both in and around their homes and in recreation activities.

Despite these criticisms Chinoy did make a significant contribution in bringing attention to the socialization process that takes place before a person enters the labor market. It is not only the relations at work, nor inherent psychological needs, nor the technology of the company that determine a worker's attitudes and behaviour, but also the orientation that person brings to the factory floor.

Gouldner's two works, Patterns of Bureaucracy (1954) and Wildcat Strike (1955) explored the differing work orientations of both workers and managers. These orientations partly depended on their social origins and community ties. A change in managers with different outlooks based partly on their community origins produced a wildcat strike. Of course, the senior management, in replacing the local manager, expected some changes to be made. The new manager instituted a regime whereby the formal rules took precedence over the existing informal patterns.

Gouldner allied the community generated expectations of the workers with their in-plant experiences. Neither alone could account for the strike. Gouldner identified a pattern of indulgency

which had been accepted by management and workers alike and which extended into the community (1954, 53). The new management broke with this accepted way of doing business when it enforced the formal rules and the result was a breakdown in relations between management and the workers.

Gouldner, like Chinoy, showed the complexities involved in the relations amongst groups of workers and between management and workers. His analysis focuses some of the attention to the world outside the plant which is essential to understand what is happening inside the plant.

Goldthorpe's primary point, as well as that of his supporters, is that researchers must take into account workers' orientations if one is to understand their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Critics are mainly concerned with his lack of interest in the informal aspects of work as well as the workers' experience of work on the factory floor.

Goldthorpe, Dubin, and others claim that workers are primarily involved in work for its monetary rewards. Because they are more interested in their life outside the plant, workers whose jobs are not intrinsically rewarding are no more likely to be dissatisfied than are workers whose jobs are rewarding. This raises the issue of whether workers who are instrumentally oriented can be alienated.

Rose (1975, 210) considers this an example of false consciousness and claims that workers have become blinded to their complete subjugation. Anthony (1977, 142) interprets the

instrumental orientation as an example of alienation as Marx defined it. He adds that is not clear that the present day worker is any more instrumentally oriented than was the peasant worker of medieval times.

Hamilton and Wright (1986, 233) disagree with the view that workers are only concerned with monetary issues and that it matters little to them that their work is intrinsically unrewarding.

Job Satisfaction

Braverman's thesis of the degradation of labor leads to the conclusion that workers will find little meaning and little satisfaction in work as long as it is done within a capitalist system. Others, such as Dubin and Moorhouse, contend that workers' main interests lie outside of work and, as a result, satisfaction with work is not a critical issue.

Burstein (1975, 35) looked at Canadian surveys and concluded that workers were generally quite satisfied with their work. In another Canadian study, Atkinson (1983, 39) discovered that more than 80 per cent of workers were satisfied with their work. Hamilton and Wright (1986, 288) conducted an extensive analysis of surveys on job satisfaction and found that a large majority of workers were either very satisfied or moderately satisfied. These surveys showed little change over a twenty-year period. Tausky

(1984, 97) comes to a similar conclusion after examining survey results over nearly a twenty five year period.

It appears that research data does not support Braverman's position. Hamilton and Wright (1986, 87) point out that there are those who feel that direct questions on work satisfaction are poor indicators of workers' true feelings about their work. Goldthorpe (1968, 11) believed in this approach. Rinehart (1978, 7) is less interested in the questions asked than in the interpretation of the data. Workers have examined the alternatives available to them and have concluded that compared with those possibilities, they are happy with their work. The workers are expressing relative satisfaction according to Rinehart. Hamilton and Wright reject this position and are prepared to accept the answers of the workers at face value. Not to do so raises the question of false consciousness and all that it implies.

The survey results indicate that there is a minimum of 70 per cent of blue-collar workers who claim to be satisfied with their jobs. Even at the lowest skill levels in the automobile industry, on the assembly line, a majority of workers spoke positively about their jobs (Blauner 1964, 104). Walker and Guest (1952, 55) reported that there were even some workers who preferred the routine work. Form (1973, 9) found that most workers in the automobile plant he studied were satisfied. Although the assembly line workers were the lowest of the four categories, they still claimed satisfaction at a rate of 75 per cent.

Hamilton and Wright (p. 264) suggest that one reason for the high level of satisfaction amongst many blue-collar workers is due to the self-selection of workers for these tasks. In other words, the dissatisfied workers have left or moved on to other jobs. Rinehart (1978, 7), however, questions the freedom workers have to choose their jobs.

Blue-collar workers are generally less satisfied than white-collar workers. This would seem to indicate that jobs which offer more intrinsic rewards also offer more satisfaction. It may also be that there are other factors other than the job content which affect satisfaction. White-collar jobs are less physically onerous, have higher status, and usually are better paying. Nonetheless, survey results indicate that, while most blue-collar workers are satisfied with their work, satisfaction declines as intrinsic rewards decline (Friedmann and Havighurst 1962, 53).

Craftsmen claim a higher level of satisfaction than do semi-skilled and unskilled workers (Hamilton and Wright, 243). However, when asked if they would continue to work if they were rich, three-quarters of the blue-collar workers said they would. Only a third of these, however, would continue to do the same kind of work.

There are some differences between the male and female blue-collar workers. While most blue-collar workers would continue to work if rich, women were less likely to do so. This was particularly true of the machine operators where less than one half would continue to work. This is probably because women have poorer

paying, physically demanding, intrinsically deprived jobs in the secondary labor market. Where women had professional jobs and skilled jobs there was little difference from the men in preferring to continue working if rich.

Burstein (1975, 61) found differences between men and women in his analysis of the Canadian surveys. Women were more interested in good social relations and supervision than were the men. Women were also concerned with good working hours and easy travel arrangements. They were not, however, as interested as the men were with pay and opportunities for promotion.

Rinehart (1978, 7) attributes the women's satisfaction with their work and their lower interest in pay and promotion to their adaptation, even accommodation, to a system in which they have little power to change matters. Women find satisfaction in social and supervisory relationships because they have experienced little else on the job. Their lower concern with promotion reflects their understanding that promotions are a male domain. It is not an orientation to work developed on the outside but one that is fostered by the real life experience of these women while on the job.

The results that infer that workers would continue to work even if rich indicates that most workers have more than an instrumental attitude towards work. Agassi (1982, 231) contends that most workers are not instrumentally oriented. Burstein (p. 35) said that workers placed instrumental values low down on a list of priorities of what they wanted from work. Kalleberg (1977, 136)

concluded that intrinsic values contributed more to job satisfaction than did extrinsic ones. Atkinson (1983, 40) pointed out that dissatisfaction with work was not related to pay. Hall (1986, 99) in an analysis of research on work orientations found that intrinsic rewards were more important determinants of job satisfaction than were extrinsic rewards.

Some workers are instrumentally oriented and probably most are to some degree. However, that should not be surprising given the value that society places on economic values Burstein (p. 49) and Hamilton and Wright point to the higher instrumental orientation of the younger workers. Halle found a similar attitude amongst the workers in his study. Younger men wanted those jobs where the economic return was highest. Young workers' higher interest in instrumental goals and their lower level of satisfaction may indicate that they generally have poorer paying jobs while, at the same time, they have young families to take care of. Usually, younger workers are employed in the least desirable jobs and their orientation may be an adaptation to their intrinsically unrewarding work (Mackinnon 1980, 13). On the other hand, the higher level of satisfaction amongst older male workers may be due to the better jobs they hold.

Summary and Conclusion

The chapter began with the idea that the meaning of work is a modern day problem. People in ancient and even more recent civilizations were not haunted by subjective meanings of work.

The ancient Greeks, the Hebrews, and the early Christians saw work as a punishment. While the Greeks tried to avoid work the Hebrews and Christians viewed it as essential to salvation. However, work had no personal value. It was a means to an end.

St. Thomas Aquinas elevated work somewhat by attributing higher value to certain types of work, such as that done by religious orders. Those involved in commerce were ranked near the bottom.

Martin Luther introduced the idea of work as a calling. For him, all work served God equally, and because of this a person should not try to move up in status.

Calvinism emphasized the virtues of hard work and asceticism, and extolled commercial success. Social mobility was encouraged as no one was to be satisfied with his current station in life. Work was the principal means of serving God and success was a possible indication of being amongst the chosen.

Karl Marx perceived man's essence as that of man the producer. Free man, in cooperation with others, will discover his true self through work. However, this was not possible as long as capitalism reigned, where the workers were not masters of the system of production.

Marx also proposed that the ruling class controlled the propagation and dissemination of ideas. However, how much the

meaning of work, as proposed by the elite, has ever been accepted by the peasantry or working class is open to doubt. It is definitely in the interest of the ruling class to have those doing the donkey work accept the ideas and meanings mentioned above. To the extent that they do, the dominant group can maintain its power and privileges.

Taylor stated that workers essentially wished to avoid physically demanding work and to earn as much as possible. The human relations school, exemplified by Elton Mayo, rejected Taylor's approach and substituted social man for economic man.

Herzberg, McGregor, and others returned somewhat to the Marxian ideas of workers seeking personal fulfillment at work. They saw, however, no contradiction between capitalism and the workers' needs for self development.

The technologists proposed that technology was the primary cause of the satisfactions or dissatisfactions found at work.

Goldthorpe and his associates revived Taylor's economic man and rejected the deterministic outlook of the technologists. The worker's orientation as a product of out-of-work factors was the key variable in understanding the meaning of work for the modern factory worker. Goldthorpe placed little importance on the workplace as a factor in explaining worker attitudes or behavior.

Subsequent research agrees that the worker's orientation is important, but writers such as Salaman and Burawoy focus on the nature of work and the work environment as the key variables in understanding that orientation. Others disagree that intrinsic

rewards are not important to workers, while some suggest that an instrumental orientation, where it exists, is a product of an unrewarding, routine job and, as such, is an adaptation to a bad situation rather than a preference for economic value. Fox and Tausky argue that workers derive meaning from many aspects of their work including social relations.

Braverman resuscitated Marx's ideas about the labor process. He contended that capitalism increasingly deskilled and degraded workers of all kinds. Under these conditions, they could not find satisfaction.

Braverman's attention to macrosociological issues stirred considerable debate. However, subsequent research did not always support his claims of progressive deskilling and worker degradation. Hamilton and others found high levels of satisfaction amongst workers, even in lower skilled jobs. Salaman says that class relations, while important, do not account for all divisions between classes and amongst workers. Sex, age, and racial variables must be considered also. Even geography counts in trying to understand workers' attitudes and behavior. Gallie adds that culture cannot be ignored either.

In looking at the meaning workers derive from their work, it is apparent that trying to divine the sources of that meaning is a complex matter. Many variables are involved including the orientation which the worker brings with him or her to the factory floor. However, it is clear from the research that the experience of

the worker in the plant bears considerable weight in determining the worker's outlook. That experience does not indicate an instrumental orientation is the predominant orientation amongst workers.

The next chapter will look closely at Goldthorpe's thesis and will examine both aspects of his theory. Some researchers focused on his instrumentalist viewpoint, while others concerned themselves with his emphasis on the external source of the worker's orientation.

This research project will examine the issue of instrumental orientation as it relates to a group of factory workers in Ireland. The issues raised in the review will inform the interpretations to be made.

Chapter 2

Goldthorpe's Study

Working class images

Before embarking on an analysis of Goldthorpe's work, it would be useful to remark on the contribution made by David Lockwood (1975), a collaborator on The Affluent Worker studies, to the theoretical approach of Goldthorpe's work.

Lockwood wrote an influential article on the class images held by British workers. This article was an examination of working class consciousness. Lockwood stated that the diversity of industrial and community backgrounds of blue-collar workers would lead us to believe that there would be a range of images of society held by the different working class groups (p. 17).

Lockwood identified three types of workers, each with its own different social consciousness: the traditional proletariat, the deferential worker, and the privatized worker (p. 17).

The traditional proletariat works in industries such as mining and shipbuilding. These industries supposedly serve to isolate the workers in their own communities and to insulate them from the influences of the wider society. These workers possess an occupational identity based on men's work that extends outside the

workplace as well as into their leisure activities. There is little social or geographical mobility amongst these men.

These traditional workers develop a consciousness based on a power model of society -- a we against them view of the world. Lockwood maintains that where this dichotomous model of society is present, there is likely to be a class of workers with strong involvement both in their work and in their community.

The second type of worker, the traditional deferential worker, possesses a status or hierarchical view of society rather than a power model of society. This type of worker accepts the status quo and the legitimacy of those who govern the organizations. This worker labors in service organizations, in small family operations, and in agricultural work, usually in isolated communities. The relationship between the owner or manager and the worker is personal and paternalistic and does not lend itself to strong identification with other groups of workers. However, his position in the community reinforces his position at work and gives him a sense of his place in society.

Lockwood identifies the third type of worker as the privatized worker. This worker tends to see the divisions in society in pecuniary terms. He has an image of society based on income and material possessions and advantages. This instrumental approach to society reflects the image to be found in emerging industries such as continuous processing plants, large batch, or mass production industries.

According to Lockwood, the industries that employ the two traditional types of workers are backwaters and are in serious decline. This decline has forced workers to move to new towns and communities where traditional influences and interpersonal relationships no longer hold the same sway. Now the proto-typical worker has low involvement in his job, with his firm, and with his fellow workers.

This new worker toils mainly for extrinsic reasons as the work itself provides little of intrinsic value. His instrumental attitude does not lend itself to the formation of strong work groups nor to the development of a class consciousness. He is more likely to have an attitude of indifference to his fellow workers and his employer, as well as towards his neighbours. The type of community these workers live in where relationships are superficial, where geographical mobility is high, and where status derives from conspicuous consumption reinforces this attitude of indifference.

Lacking this class consciousness, the privatized worker is predisposed to see his union in instrumental, rather than ideological, terms. The union does not exist, in his mind, to pursue political ends, but it exists to improve his economic position.

Critiques of Lockwood

Lockwood's typology has been the target of much criticism. Moore (1975, 51) challenges his view of the traditional proletarian.

He was looking at a mining community at the turn of the century. He writes, "... a very substantial part of the community did not develop a proletarian image of society." Moore argues that Lockwood oversimplified the question of the relations amongst work, community, and social beliefs. The religious, social, and economic pressures on the miners to conform were such that the traditional proletarian outlook would have been a deviation from the norm.

Cousins and Brown (1975, 55) conclude that the variables Lockwood associates with the traditional community are more likely to inhibit proletarianism than to promote it. They also contest his characterization of the traditional workers as homogeneous in outlook and as sharing a class consciousness. There has been a long history of conflict between many groups in traditional communities (p. 56).

Bell and Newby (1975, 96) looked at agricultural workers and their supposed deferential outlook. They found a multiplicity of class images amongst this group of workers and concluded that other groups of workers probably shared this ambivalence of class imagery as well.

Roberts (1978, 48) argued there was little evidence to support the claim that deference is more prevalent amongst workers in smaller firms or amongst those workers who have greater contact with white-collar workers. What is more important for this present study is that Roberts could not find evidence that supported the

existence of the privatized worker where instrumental orientations were predominant (Roberts, 50).

The Affluent Worker Study

Nonetheless, Lockwood's typology stimulated a great deal of debate and informed the research done by Goldthorpe and his associates in the late sixties. Goldthorpe first explored Lockwood's instrumental orientation in his 1966 study of assembly-line car workers in the town of Luton.

In this work, Goldthorpe outlined the critical differences he had with previous studies of such workers. Mainly, he felt that other researchers had placed too much emphasis on technology as the explanatory variable for the workers' behavior and their attitudes. He added that other investigators had not paid enough attention to the orientations workers had before taking on their present jobs.

> Most previous writers, we would suggest, have tended to over-simplify the problems of workers' response to the stresses and constraints of assembly-line technology (and have tended to assume greater uniformity in this respect than tends to be the case) because they have left out of account one important variable: that is, the orientations which men bring to their employment and which mediate between the objective features

of the work situation and workers' actual experience of, and reaction to, this situation (1966, 240).

These orientations are important because they influence the choice of job a worker makes, the meanings he assigns to that work, and whether he remains in that job or not.

Goldthorpe found that the car workers enjoyed little intrinsic satisfaction in their work and were more interested in the extrinsic rewards the job offered. Goldthorpe attributed the assemblers' lack of satisfaction to the technology in place. These jobs were minutely sub-divided, repetitive, and the pace was machine controlled. This type of work offered little or no intrinsic satisfaction.

Previous studies by Blauner (1964, 119) and Chinoy (1955, 85) have related this emphasis on extrinsic rewards to alienation. The work has become a means to an end for the workers rather than an end in itself. Goldthorpe characterizes this attitude towards work as an instrumental orientation. Goldthorpe provides a definition for this orientation in his study, The Affluent Worker,

> The primary meaning of work is as a means to an end, or ends, external to the work situation; that is, work is regarded as a means of acquiring the income necessary to support a valued way of life of which work itself is not an integral part. Work is therefore experienced as mere 'labour' in the sense of an expenditure of effort which is made for extrinsic rather than for intrinsic rewards. Workers act as 'economic men', seeking

to minimize effort and maximize economic returns; but the latter concern is the dominant one (1968, 38).

This extrinsic orientation was not a consequence of their work and its technological attributes, but the very fact that they were car assembly workers was a consequence of their instrumental orientation. They had chosen these jobs precisely because they offered better pay.

In addition, Goldthorpe feels that, if we are to treat these workers as alienated workers, the search for that alienation must extend beyond the workplace. The technology that the company employs is not the sole or even primary source of this alienation. Goldthorpe states, "that in *any* attempt at explaining and understanding attitudes and behaviour within modern industry, the probability must at least be recognized that orientations to work which employees hold in common will need to be treated as an important *independent* variable relative to the in-plant situation" 1968, 183).

Goldthorpe carried out his study of car assembly workers at Vauxhall Motors, a subsidiary of General Motors, as part of a larger study. In that work, Goldthorpe investigated the hypothesis of the embourgeoisement of the British working class. This thesis proposed that as the working class becomes more affluent it would abandon working class values and adopt a middle class way of life with its attendant values.

Goldthorpe and his associates selected Luton as the site to test this hypothesis. They did this because they concluded that Luton, as a new industrial town, had the essential characteristics most likely to produce the new type of worker. The researchers stated that Luton was prosperous, was growing rapidly, had a geographically mobile labor force, was distant from traditional industrial regions, and contained a number of high-paying companies (Goldthorpe 1968, 2-3).

The study elaborated on the findings made by Goldthorpe in his 1966 article. The conclusion that the workers in his sample had an essentially instrumental orientation was a by-product of the original study on embourgeoisement. Goldthorpe, in a reply to Daniel, points to the after the fact interpretations of the data. Bechhofer (1973, 132), one of the associate researchers, mentions that the concept of orientation to work was "introduced neither a priori nor as a matter of deduction from out-plant variables", but "... the concept was derived by induction from the very variables that it purports to explain."

The researchers carried out their study in three firms in Luton: Vauxhall Motors, The Skefko Ball Bearing Company Ltd, and Laporte Chemicals Ltd. These firms represented small batch production, large batch and mass production systems, and continuous process production. The sample consisted of 229 male workers defined by the following characteristics: "i) between the ages of 21 and 46; (ii) married and living with their wives; (iii) regularly earning at least

17 pounds per week; (iv) resident in Luton itself or in immediately adjacent housing areas" (Goldthorpe 1968, 4).

The researchers stratified the workers by skill into three different groups. There were the craftsmen who had completed apprenticeships, the relatively skilled workers who learned their skill on the job, and the semi-skilled who operated the machines, worked on the assembly line, or were process workers. The jobs of the semi-skilled workers required little training.

Goldthorpe examined the attitudes of these workers towards their job, their work group, the firm itself, their union, and their economic future. He concluded that the workers in his study had a predominantly instrumental orientation that, as he had outlined in his previous article, we cannot understand by reference to human relations factors or to technological variables. He stated:

> ...little systematic association was revealed among the workers we studied between their immediate experience of their work situations as technologically conditioned, and the range of attitudes and behavior which they more generally displayed as industrial employees. (Goldthorpe 1968, 181).

He feels that any explanation for the attitudes and behavior of workers in industry must take into account the actors' definition of the situation. He terms this the action frame of reference. His examination of this sample of workers led him to conclude that the workers' orientation to work was an important independent variable.

Goldthorpe found that despite technologically different environments the patterns, both in attitudes and behavior, of his male workers were quite similar. While technology was a key variable in determining immediate work satisfaction and affected social relations by, in some cases, inhibiting the formation of solidary work groups, it did not affect the overall attitude of the workers towards their jobs.

Despite the dissatisfactions with certain aspects of their work and work-roles such as its monotony and pace, most of the men were pleased with their jobs and had a positive attitude towards their employer. That these men shared a similar orientation to work, namely an instrumental orientation, explains this satisfaction. This orientation affects the men's' attitudes towards their job, their fellow workers, their firm, and their union.

In looking at the relationship of the worker and his job, Goldthorpe found that these men had chosen these jobs, with all their attendant drawbacks, such as boredom and unpleasant working conditions, because of the higher economic benefits compared to other jobs they had or might have. These men derived satisfaction because they were generally able to meet their desires for good economic benefits.

This desire for economic well being coloured their relationship with one another. Workers who seek extrinsic rewards from work in preference to intrinsic rewards have little concern about the social satisfactions they might obtain at work. These men expected little

from either their workmates or their supervisors in social terms. These men had only minimal interest in spending time with each other outside the plant, and most felt that a move to another group of workers would not be a problem for them.

Goldthorpe contends that the favourable economic aspects of the workers' jobs are the basis for their positive relation with their employer. They saw the relationship in calculative terms as they were little interested in intrinsic rewards. To this degree, Goldthorpe felt these workers' could not be characterized as alienated (Goldthorpe 1968, 86).

The instrumental orientation of these workers also affected the relationship between the men and their union. These men did not see their union as a force for political change nor as an instrument for greater controls over, or involvement in, the management of the company. They wanted their union to be a force for their economic betterment. From their perspective, the union was doing its job when it looked after their economic interests.

Critiques of Goldthorpe

Goldthorpe's conclusions have received both support and criticism. Fox (1980, 154) points out that workers derive their work orientations from many sources, but he adds that the experience of work itself may modify their orientation. As well, the orientations learned outside the immediate workplace may

themselves be products of an individual's prior work experience or of those responsible for that person's socialization (Fox, 156).

Russell (1975, 303) found the worker's orientation to be the critical independent variable in explaining job satisfaction. Kalleberg (1977, 141) states that work values that workers bring to the shop-floor have a significant bearing on job satisfaction. However, Kalleberg added that intrinsic rewards were more important to the workers as determinants of job satisfaction than were extrinsic rewards such as pay. While Kalleberg agrees with Goldthorpe that orientations are important, he does not see workers as instrumentally oriented.

Wedderburn and Crompton (1972, 146) come to the conclusion that the workers in their sample had an instrumental orientation. They added, however, that the different settings and technologies facing the different groups of workers in the work setting affected the behavior and attitudes of the workers. While an orientation was useful in understanding a worker's behavior, these authors added that, "An approach to the study of organizations still fruitfully take as its starting point technology and the ... much management devise for the planning and execution of the task" (p. 151).

Daniel (1971, 329) questions whether workers have a consistent set of priorities that reveal themselves in the choices and decisions the workers make. Daniel found it was not a matter of whether workers were more interested in intrinsic or extrinsic

rewards, but it was a matter of when they were concerned about both types of reward. During a period of bargaining the extrinsic rewards became salient, but once management and workers agreed upon the issues and implemented them, the intrinsic rewards became more important.

Daniel reported on another group of workers whom Goldthorpe would classify as instrumentally oriented as they choose their work because of the good pay. These workers, however, were quite involved in shop-floor discussions relating to the intrinsic content of their work.

Daniel contends that workers do not have one consistent set of orientations that govern all aspects of their attitudes and behavior. The factors that predispose a worker to take a job may differ from those the worker finds rewarding and again differ from those that influence a worker to leave the job.

Blackburn and Mann (1979, 178) support Daniel's argument. Workers may have more than one orientation. They remark, "Different aspects can come into play with varying degrees of force in different situations" (p. 158). Further, these authors question the usefulness of orientations when there is so little choice available to workers, most of whom "expend more mental effort and resourcefulness in getting to work than in doing their jobs" (p. 280).

Mann and Daniel point to the complexity of studying workers' orientations and allude to the idea that orientations are not static but dynamic. Bechhofer, one of the researchers in the Goldthorpe

study made the same point when he remarked that "The dynamic nature of the orientation was perhaps insufficiently emphasized" (Bechhofer 1973, 134).

Form (1973, 9) reported that most workers were not instrumentally oriented. In his study of auto workers, he found only about 1/4 of them chose pay as the reason they preferred their job, while over half claimed to like their work for intrinsic reasons. He added his study supports the socio-technical viewpoint that working conditions influence the attitudes of workers. He found that skilled workers were more satisfied than unskilled workers.

Mackinnon (1980, 11), in a replication of Goldthorpe's work, conducted a study of automobile workers in a plant in Oshawa, Ontario. He attacked Goldthorpe first on methodological grounds. He pointed out that "Goldthorpe's instrumentalism is related to four causal variables: geographic mobility, intergenerational mobility, career mobility, and age." Mackinnon said that these four variables lacked statistical independence and that this contradicts Goldthorpe's theory.

While Weddeburn and Crompton (1972, 146-147) found their sample to be as instrumental as Goldthorpe's, they found them quite dissimilar on his four causal variables. This raises questions about the proto-typicality of his sample.

Shephard (1977, 10) also criticized Goldthorpe's methodology claiming "his research design did not allow him to adequately test

the hypothesis that instrumental orientation caused these workers to choose meaningless jobs for their extrinsic rewards."

Mackinnon, in looking closely at Goldthorpe's results, noted that contrary to Goldthorpe's conclusions his data revealed that working conditions had an affect on orientations. The skilled workers were less instrumental than the other workers in the sample. Mackinnon found the same result in his own study.

In a cross-cultural study (Israel, Germany, U.S.), Agassi compared the orientations to work of men and women. She also was critical of Goldthorpe's methodology (1979, 91). She asserted that Goldthorpe provided no data to truly judge an instrumental orientation. For Agassi, there are two critical aspects to assessing this approach to work. First, one must determine a worker's evaluation of the nature of his or her own job and determine whether it has intrinsic qualities or not. Second, when it lacks intrinsic qualities, one must find out whether this is of concern to the worker or not.

Agassi says Goldthorpe used the positive answers to three questions to declare the workers in his sample instrumentally oriented: whether they would keep the same job, whether they had close friends at work, and what they wanted from their union. She contends that none of these questions reflects an instrumental orientation.

In her own study, Agassi found considerable differences both between men and women and across cultures. About 18% of the men

had an instrumental orientation, while just over 46% of the women did so. Only 5% of German men appeared to be instrumental and this contrasts sharply with the 45% of American men who were so. Agassi ascribes the difference in orientation between men and women to the extreme poverty of women's jobs. Only a restructuring of the work organizations to allow women access to men's jobs, and further, a radical change in the quality of jobs available will modify this situation.

Sabel (1982, 11) used the concept of world views to characterize a worker's understanding of the social world he lives in. This world view includes the worker's ambitions, hopes and fears. Sabel identified three different world views, which include an orientation towards work, amongst unskilled workers. Peasant workers have an instrumental orientation to their work. The would be craftsman wants acceptance, promotion, and skills. The ghetto worker wants only to escape from his confining, suffocating work.

To a certain degree, Sabel points out, there are different markets for each type of worker (p. 101). However, there is fluidity here as well, as over time these workers can exchange places and a ghetto worker could become a would-be-craftsman. Both a worker's social background and his geographical roots can play a role in his world view. However, these views are not static and the worker's experiences on the job can modify them. In addition, many factors such as the strength of the union, the power of management, the role

of the state, technology, and the health of the economy may have an impact on these experiences.

Workers also belong to groups and sometimes it is only through their collective struggles that they know what they really want (p. 188). There are many variables that affect the lives and experiences of workers and given the fluidity of their situations, it is difficult to categorize them, at least in the way Goldthorpe has.

A study conducted by David Halle amongst chemical processing workers turned up no support for Goldthorpe's thesis of the privatized worker. Halle (1984, 338) declared that, for the men in his sample, the work place was an important source of their identity. He added that the men had good friendships at work that they valued highly. These men derived a consciousness of themselves as working men from the work setting. Halle also reported that the men in his sample looked askance at those who worked mainly for the money (p. 125).

He pointed out the effects of technology on the attitudes and behavior of the workers in the chemical plant. The mechanics were the only group in the plant who reported satisfaction with their work (p. 127). The production workers found their work dangerous, boring, and uninteresting. As a response to this work, most of the men looked for ways to avoid doing work. They did this to find time to engage in social activities with their fellow workers.

Research in Canada found little support for the instrumentalist hypothesis. In a survey on work values, Burstein (1975, 35) reported

that the workers rated intrinsic work values such as interesting work much higher than extrinsic values such as pay. Where workers do exhibit instrumentalist values, Rinehart attributes this to the working conditions on the job, and not to any prior orientation the workers might have. He says:

> Instrumental orientations should be understood as rational adaptations to jobs that are characterized by extreme specialization, subordination, and inequalities of prestige and treatment. If jobs are selected on the basis of economic criteria, this only reveals the flatness of the world of blue-collar work and not an absence of (abstract) desires for gratifying jobs (1978, 7).

Fox (1980, 168-171) delineated many reasons why people work, only one of which had to do with money. Workers may work because it allows them to relate to other people in society, and because it fulfills some social needs. Others may find work gives them some sense of achievement, status, or identity; while some may be escaping from the burden of serious problems. There are those for whom work fills time and without which they would find life boring.

Tausky (1984, 70) using the concept of work outcomes presented a similar list of orientations. Hall (1986, 99), in an analysis of research on work orientations, found that intrinsic rewards were more important determinants of job satisfaction than were extrinsic rewards.

While there has been some support for Goldthorpe's instrumentalist view, the overall conclusion of the research is that monetary benefits are not the prime motivators for these workers. Given the emphasis on material rewards in our society and given the even more important fact that a person has to work to earn a living, it should not be surprising to find workers emphasizing their pay packet. The studies quoted above indicate that workers have many orientations that can change over time and there are many factors, not the least of which is the work situation itself, that affect these orientations.

Chapter 3

The Research Design

Introduction

This research was carried out in the spring and summer of 1975 at a food processing factory in the city of Dublin, Ireland. The business was located in the centre of the city and has been in operation since its establishment in 1856. In the 1940's several smaller concerns became subsidiaries of this company. The company manufactures a variety of food products under several brand names as well as producing store brand products under the name of particular chains. The factory sells soups, sauces, mayonnaise, relish, pickles, jams, and other similar products. As well, it has a confectionery department which produces well-known chocolate bars, mints, jellies, hard candies and individually wrapped chocolates. The company exported many of its confectionery items, its canned and bottled goods, and its whiskey flavored chocolate to many parts of the world.

In 1968, a major multi-national company acquired majority control of the company. A few years later management decided that the present premises were inadequate for its objectives. A new plant was ready for the summer of 1975 and was located in the

suburbs of Dublin. This was a source of some discontent to the workers as most had lived close to the old plant.

The old premises included two buildings separated by a lane way. Management was in the main building along with several of the food processing departments. The second building housed the dispatch and transport department and the warehouse on the ground floor and several other food processing departments on the second floor. The engineering staff were located in the basement.

The new premises placed all departments in one building and on one floor. Also, much of the old equipment used in the food processing was replaced with modern machinery. Some departments, such as the jellies and pastilles, were eliminated altogether in the move. These were very labor intensive and to supply them with new machinery would have been too expensive from management's viewpoint.

Irish Economy and Emigration

Ireland had become a member of the European Economic Community in 1973 and the multi-national which had taken over was looking for an opportunity to expand its product line as well as its market. Many employees were satisfied with the takeover as they felt it gave them more security. They were also aware, however, that the new plant with its more modern equipment would not require as many employees.

Management offered employees the possibility of early retirement or a bonus for leaving the company as a means of reducing staff. Only 8 employees took up this offer. The lack of employment elsewhere made it difficult for workers to accept the offer.

Ireland has traditionally had a record of high unemployment. The solution to this problem, for the most part, has been emigration. Between 1871 and 1961 (Courtney 1986, 27) regular censuses indicated a steady population decline while the rate of natural increase was never less than 4.5 per thousand. The migration rate, sometimes as high as -14.8 per thousand, was the reason why the population declined. The population in 1841 had been approximately six and a half million while in 1971 it had reached just under three million.

The ten year period between 1961 and 1971 saw only the second population increase since the famine in the 1840's. The other increase was during the five year period after the Second World War. However, while the population increased during this decade, the migration rate was -3.7 per thousand. It was during the 1970's that Ireland reversed its negative migration for the first time since the famine.

The reversal in emigration and the concomitant population increase were partly due to government policies to expand the economy. Policies which favoured the exporting of goods led to an

influx of industries wishing to avail themselves of Ireland's generous tax policies.

While, on the one hand, there were more opportunities due to growth in several sectors of the economy, on the other hand unemployment continued to be a major problem. A growth in the labor supply and returning emigrees in the early 1970's made it difficult to absorb the potential workers. Unemployment reached 12% in early 1975 (OECD 1975, 11). Officially over 75,000 persons were out of work, but, as many categories of workers were excluded from the insured lists, the real numbers may have been much higher.

This study was done during a period of recession in which several thousand manufacturing jobs disappeared. The workers in this company were well aware of economic conditions, both historically and personally. They knew well the difficult labor market facing them should they leave their present work. This is why so few availed themselves of the offer to retire or resign.

Although Ireland has been modernising and industrialising itself since the 1950's, it remains, as Wickham points out, a dependent and a peripheral economy (Wickham 1986, 73). In a peripheral economy, the foreign firms tend to employ the less skilled workers saving the more skilled jobs for their base country. Wickham claims that foreign firms, which employ almost one third of the manufacturing workers in Ireland, do very little research and development in Ireland. Most of the work is in assembly or in other semi-skilled operations.

The dearth of home-grown industries which can compete in an international market leaves the Irish economy and workers in a vulnerable position. Goldthorpe's study was conducted in what Wickham would consider a core economy. Britain is better able to compete in the world market than Ireland can. As well, when Goldthorpe did his study, he selected a town, Luton, which was prospering and offering good opportunities to blue-collar workers.

One important factor which makes this study different from Goldthorpe's is the setting. Attitudes to work do not develop in a vacuum and those which Goldthorpe found may not have the same relevance in another setting even if it is only a short distance away. There are distinct differences between the Irish and English economies which should have some bearing on the orientation of the workers to their work.

The problems of high unemployment and the long-standing problem of emigration have had their impact on Irish culture and on Irish psychology. It would be unlikely to find the same orientation to work amongst Irish workers as amongst the group which Goldthorpe studied. While British workers have known their own hardships, they are not afflicted with the emigration which has hit the Irish. British workers are more likely to emigrate internally, that is, to a different part of the country whereas Irish workers have to leave their country. Goldthorpe emphasized the importance of a worker's orientation prior to entering the factory, but he paid

little attention to the social and cultural differences which can affect those orientations.

This study on the attitudes of workers towards their work remains relevant today when one considers what is called the globalization of the world's economy. Many workers in what were considered core economies, such as Britain and the United States, are facing the same prospects which the Irish have long known. Perhaps attitudes towards work will reflect the vulnerability which many blue-collar workers now face. There will be less concern with Goldthorpe's instrumental values and a greater emphasis on other values. These concerns may reflect themselves in the kind of cooperation amongst state, industry, and the unions which developed in Ireland during the last two decades.

Purpose of the study

Goldthorpe conducted his study in a different social context and one of the purposes of this study is to see how his results compare with those done in another country. If there are differences between the two samples in orientation, can part of this be due to social and cultural factors? This study relied for the most part on the questions used by Goldthorpe to determine the attitudes of the workers toward various aspects of their work. These included their attitudes towards the job itself, the company, their fellow workers, and their union.

As was pointed out in chapters 1 and 2, many writers disagreed with Goldthorpe's conclusions. Some challenged his interpretation of his own data, while others found little support of the instrumentalist thesis in their own studies. This study aims to determine if the same instrumental orientation is mirrored in a contemporary group of factory workers.

One of the major differences between the two studies is the inclusion of women in this study. Goldthorpe's sample was a male only sample whereas the majority of workers in this study were female. Comparisons are made throughout the study to test for differences in attitudes between the sexes and also to present an analysis of the differences in the working conditions of men and women in Ireland. Goldthorpe presented the hypothesis that his workers were proto-typical of the workers of the future. However, it seems that the argument carries less weight without the inclusion of women, unless one assumes there are no differences between the two groups.

Goldthorpe first looked at the job satisfaction of the workers and concluded that while the workers were satisfied overall with their situation, the work itself was not satisfying. They were satisfied because the material rewards were good. Many studies have not agreed with Goldthorpe's conclusions about the level of dissatisfaction with the job and this study will look at the same areas to see whether these workers are satisfied or not.

Goldthorpe also claimed that the human relations and technological variables were less useful in explaining the attitudes of these workers than was their prior orientation. Again some researchers have challenged his rush to abandon these explanatory variables, and one of the purposes of this study is to test for their importance in understanding workers' attitudes.

In his examination of the workers' attitudes toward their union, Goldthorpe concluded that these workers had abandoned the traditional approach to their union and replaced it with an instrumental one. They saw their union as a means to economic betterment and improvement in their material well-being. They did not have a class-conscious approach to their union whereby they viewed it as a political organization which could affect broad changes in their society. Several writers have challenged whether this attitude was ever that prevalent amongst workers and others have questioned the abandonment of the idea of class consciousness. Blue-collar workers do see themselves as different than other groups in the labor market and this study aims to examine the view that Irish workers have towards their union and the role they see it playing. It is not necessarily an either-or scenario as Goldthorpe presented it.

The Sample

The company employed 205 workers in the plant, 78 males and 127 females. Of the 78 men, 19 worked in dispatch and transport and another 6 worked in the security departments. These men, along with 1 other from the welfare department, were not included in the study as they had also been excluded from the Goldthorpe study. On the female side, 5 women from the welfare department and 1 woman from the training department were also ruled out from the study as their jobs were not blue-collar jobs. This left a potential pool of 52 men and 121 women to be included in the sample. Of this group, 38 men and 83 women agreed to be interviewed. Not all workers were available during working hours as some were already busy in the new plant preparing and testing equipment. Of the 19 men in the Engineering department 8 were unavailable as they were at the new premises. Many women were also unavailable as they were part-time workers. The researcher decided to include only those working full-time. A few workers, such as the chefs, were difficult to replace. The workers, however, who were not interviewed, whatever the reason, were from the same departments as those who were interviewed and were essentially comparable in terms of skill.

The workers were separated by sex and skill (see Table 1, Table 2). They were further divided into skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers. All the 11 skilled workers were male. These were men who by nature of their training prior to entering the

workforce had acquired a skill. These men were machinists, electricians, and plumbers. Of the 27 remaining men, 19 were classified as semi-skilled. These men included the chefs who prepared the foods, the machine operators, and the men who helped the skilled workers. The 8 men who were classified as unskilled worked mainly in moving materials to and from the different departments. Sometimes, they were switched to other jobs to act as replacements.

Of the 83 women, only 28 were classified as semi-skilled. These women operated many of the machines throughout the plant. The other 55 women were classified as unskilled. Most of them were involved with hand work. They either wrapped or packaged finished products, or they cut and separated fruits and vegetables.

The men and women were generally long-term employees some having worked over 40 years with the company. While more women than men had worked less than five years for the company, most women had the same length of service as the men.

The Wet Department

The work was divided between two buildings separated by a lane way. In the main building, much of the Wet Processing Department operated. This department was itself divided into 5 different departments each with their own supervisor who was

always male. Supervisors were part of the administration and not part of the blue-collar staff.

These five departments produced sauces, mayonnaise, soups, ketchup, pickles, beetroot, and preserves. There were 4 male chefs who were responsible for cooking the product. A chef generally worked on his own, sometimes with a male assistant, and had a fair degree of autonomy. While he was not responsible for choosing the product to be made, once it was chosen, he was the one in charge of the cooking process. Sometimes the process would take several days which gave an irregular rhythm to his work. He would be very busy during the mixing and preparation part of the job, but less so during the cooking and cooling part, most of which demanded careful monitoring of the equipment. Many of these tasks were to be taken over by the new equipment which was to make the process more automatic. The men were expected to become dial watchers.

When the chef finished cooking the product, the equipment had to be cleaned. This onerous task fell to the women in the factory. The canning and bottling machines were also operated by women. These machines gave little of the respite accorded to the chefs once their machines were in operation. The women's equipment was noisy and ran at assembly line speed. While the chef was able to pace himself to a great degree, the women had to follow the pace of the machine. Women also inspected the finished product for defects and breakage, and were responsible for packing the goods into cartons. While there was a male supervisor for these operations, there was

also a senior female worker who was designated as a foreman for these workers. However, she was not part of supervisory staff.

In the pickles department, much of the work had to be done by hand. Women stood around a large table cutting, separating, and bottling vegetables by hand. The work was labor intensive and was carried out in a damp, smelly atmosphere due to the water and vinegar which was used in the bottling process.

The Chocolate Department

The chocolate department with 20 employees had two separate activities. One operated as did the other food processing departments. A chef prepared the chocolate which then was either used to make chocolate bars or boxes of chocolates. The preparation of the chocolate took up to 36 hours to complete before packaging could begin. Machines would then make the chocolate bars and wrap them. Women would operate these machines and were responsible for checking and packaging the finished product. The second activity involved hand work. Once again a male chef was charged with preparing a batch of chocolate. Women were responsible for making the chocolates and individually wrapping them.

The Lozenge Department

The lozenge department which was housed in the second building was the single largest department. There were 34 employees, 4 men and 30 women, in this department. This area produced mints, jellies, pastilles, and other candies. In the mints area the sugar was mixed by machine which two men operated while the women hand wrapped and packed the finished product. The area was noisy, dusty, and involved lifting of heavy trays by the women. As in all departments, relief was expressed when the machinery was down, allowing the workers an unexpected break. One reason for the relocation was the age of the machinery which resulted in many breakdowns.

The mixture for the jellies and pastilles was also done by men. Again there were two men in this area. It took 2 to 3 days for the crystallization process which meant that the women who wrapped the jellies by hand were free to move to other departments to help out. Other products were also wrapped by hand.

Engineering

The engineering department consisted of 19 men who were mostly skilled tradesmen or their helpers. They were responsible to keep the equipment running. There were electricians, plumbers, setters, and machinists amongst these men. There were no women

in this department which was true throughout the country for this kind of work. The men were divided into two departments partly because there were two buildings to operate. Each department was responsible for their own machines, with a supervisor for each of the two departments.

Men vs. Women

It is clear that the men and women were segregated into different jobs. The men were given the more responsible jobs which entailed more discretion, more freedom of movement, and less onerous tasks. Men's work was higher paid and also involved considerable overtime. There was no overtime for women's work.

The position of women in this factory was reflected in the position of women at work throughout Ireland (Wickham, 88). Women in this factory worked with other women, while men worked with other men.

The same picture is seen in the management and administrative side of the operation. There are 7 senior management positions, all occupied by males. The factory staff which includes all the supervisors are also all male, while the sales staff of 27 includes only one female. The 41 females in administration are concentrated in clerical positions.

The management of the firm operated in a conciliatory fashion. Many of them had worked at the company for most of their working

lives and knew most of the employees by name. The senior managers would rarely enter the factory but dealt with the supervisors over issues of production and employee relations. Management had a good working relationship with the unions and mutual respect was expressed on both sides. When this researcher applied to do the research management arranged a meeting with the shop stewards to secure their approval as well.

There was some concern expressed by the workers over the recent takeover by the multi-national corporation. They were unsure how the relationship between themselves and the new management was going to work out. There was some suspicion and fear expressed that the relationship would become more formal and more strict. The company had always been run by Irish people and now had its headquarters in another country.

Approval For the Study

The management of the company was approached about the possibility of conducting a study in their factory. The researcher explained the purpose of the research having given the background of the Goldthorpe work. The management readily agreed to the project although several of them, including the CEO, sympathized with Goldthorpe's conclusions that workers were interested primarily in monetary rewards. This is understandable as they were in the process of negotiating severance packages for some of the workers

as well as the incentive package for accepting the move without labor problems.

Management, followed by the unions, gave their approval for the study to be done. Management supplied a room in the administration building and also provided a room to interview the workers in each building. The study was conducted one department at a time. Management arranged for workers to be replaced at their post when it came time for their turn. The interviews were conducted in a room with only the researcher and the worker present. Each question was read to the worker and the researcher wrote down the response. There was no time limit imposed on the worker so the length of the interview varied. Some workers were quite voluble and would quickly digress onto other matters. It was not always easy to return them to the questionnaire without fear of disturbing the worker's ease.

It took nearly three months to complete all the interviews. As the interviewing was being done during work hours, workers were not always easily available for questioning. However, the cooperation of everyone was exemplary. The workers seemed appreciative for the opportunity to express their sentiments about their work.

Methods of Analysis

The data was coded and then entered onto computer cards. This was subsequently transferred to magnetic disk. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to analyze the data.

Frequency and percentage tabulations were taken on all the questions. Crosstabulations were done on the questions of preference for present and previous jobs, and for having thought of leaving the company. These crosstabulations were done using sex and skill as the independent variables. These tests were done to see if there were differences in expressed satisfaction or dissatisfaction amongst the different groups. Tests were conducted on these same questions using the variables of monotony, pace of work, ability to think of other things, and the physical demands of the job to see how these variables affected satisfaction.

The analysis of the data relies most heavily on the percentages drawn from the crosstabulations. Although this work is based on Goldthorpe's, it is essentially a case study given the differences between the two studies. Of the original sample, 30% were dropped because of unavailability or because they did not represent production work roles. As a case study, this thesis is designed to raise questions about Goldthorpe's findings rather than represent the attitudes of an entire population of workers.

Chapter 4

The Worker and The Job

This chapter proposes to look at the worker and his or her experience of the job. The satisfaction of the workers will be examined to determine if differences exist amongst the groups based on skill, as well to test for differences between the sexes. The workers' experience will be investigated in the light of their responses to questions about monotony, the pace of the work, the physical demands of the job, and the amount of attention needed for the task.

Goldthorpe found that for the workers in his sample these variables were sources of deprivation and were related to job dissatisfaction. The dissatisfaction of the workers with these aspects of their jobs did not mean they were dissatisfied with their situation. The lack of intrinsic rewards was more than compensated for by the extrinsic rewards of the job. The workers in his study were in it for the money; that is, they had an instrumental orientation.

This study will focus on the variables of deprivation to see if they always are such; and it will also examine how these variables relate to the workers satisfaction or dissatisfaction and whether these workers possess an instrumental orientation or not.

Job Satisfaction

The question of job satisfaction is a difficult one to answer. Determining which questions to ask to arrive at interpretable answers is the first difficulty. Goldthorpe felt that direct questions which would ask workers if they were satisfied with their jobs were bound to result in too positive responses (1968, 11). Even in situations where workers face severe deprivations Goldthorpe concluded that a large number of them would say they were satisfied with their jobs.

Goldthorpe felt that social and psychological pressure made it difficult for a worker to admit that he did not like his job. The solution to uncovering worker satisfaction was to pose indirect questions which would have workers compare these jobs to jobs previously held, as well as to jobs currently desired.

A second problem with determining satisfaction with work is in knowing what one means by work and further, being sure that the workers know what they mean when they talk of work. Are the workers talking about the actual job, or are they talking of their relations with fellow workers and management? When workers speak of their work, are they speaking about the formally designated tasks or are they talking about the job they have constructed it within the framework of the formal organization? Despite the difficulties noted above this study followed the same questions to

determine worker satisfaction as Goldthorpe did to compare and contrast the results.

Satisfaction with present job

One way of checking on workers' satisfaction with their job is to ask them whether they prefer their present job compared to one previously held in the same firm. Of course, satisfaction with one's present job may indicate relative satisfaction. That is, the workers may prefer this job to the previous one, but still might not be satisfied compared to some other job they know about or to some ideal job they carry in their heads.

Satisfaction may indicate a resignation to one's condition, a realization that things could hardly be otherwise and, that all things considered, the worker is content with the way things are. Conversely, stating that one prefers a job previously held in the same firm is not a full measure of dissatisfaction. It may indicate a relative rather than an absolute dissatisfaction. It is possible to find one's job satisfying while at the same time preferring a previous one. Other evidence is needed before researchers can reach definite conclusions concerning satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Before determining the worker's preference for a previous job, the researcher ascertained how many of the workers had done previous jobs in the same firm. Table 3 shows that except for the skilled workers virtually everyone had held another job in the firm.

Ninety-five per cent of the unskilled workers and 91% of the semi-skilled workers had done other jobs in the company.

It was not possible for someone to move into a skilled worker's job without training at a recognized technical college. All the skilled workers at the factory had followed this course, and it usually meant a life-long commitment to their particular trade.

Thus, no unskilled or semi-skilled workers would have held a skilled job in the firm before their present work. At the same time, no skilled worker had done any other job in the factory either. Consequently, this question of satisfaction did not apply to the craftsman. Altogether, 103 workers had done previous jobs in the same firm and Table 4 presents the results for these workers.

Overall, 70% of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers claimed they preferred their present job with 18.4% stating they did not and the remaining 11.7% either were not sure or did not have any preference. There is no difference in satisfaction between the unskilled and semi-skilled.

In the Goldthorpe study, 67% of his all male sample stated they preferred their present job. In this study, however, 77% of males responded that they were satisfied with their present job while 68% of women answered similarly. The larger number of females saying they didn't know whether they preferred their present job or not covers the difference. The next question asked the workers to give reasons for preferring their present job.

Reasons for preferring present job

As was mentioned above, none of the unskilled or semi-skilled workers had occupied or were presently occupying skilled jobs. For the most part, a change in job meant a change to work of a similar skill.

Unskilled and semi-skilled work is generally categorized by a low level of intrinsic content. The work is not intellectually demanding or challenging, provides little opportunity for developing skill, and offers little in the way of variety.

Table 5 presents the reasons' workers found this work preferable. Seventy-three per cent of all answers recorded relate to extrinsic, social, and physical aspects of these jobs. What is interesting is the importance of the physical and social environment in determining the relative satisfaction of these workers, particularly for the female workers. As will be seen later on, both of these elements play an important role in the work experience of the female worker. Better supervision and work atmosphere accounted for 30% of all reasons given by women compared to only 8% for men. This is an indication that perhaps men and women do not derive their satisfaction from the same sources.

Another important reason for both males and females preferring their present work is habituation to their present job. Workers mentioned habituation to the job almost as often as all the intrinsic reasons together. Clearly intrinsic values do not play a

large role in current expressions of job satisfaction compared to other reasons. It is important to note this because it affects the interpretation of answers to questions of job satisfaction.

A positive response to a question on job satisfaction may indicate either satisfaction with social relations or habituation to the present job, and may not relate to the content of the job at all. The question is whether workers make the separation in their minds when asked questions about satisfaction. Perhaps without more precision there exists the difficulty of contamination That is, one has to ask specifically about satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job.

Workers, even if they express dissatisfaction with the lack of intrinsic features, may not be willing to make changes if they think such alterations might affect those areas which provide them with satisfaction. This brings up the whole difficulty of considering social elements of work extrinsic to the work itself.

Work, in modern society, is organized in a hierarchical fashion. If work is to get done according to this model, relations between management and the managed are essential to the outcome. Management understands this and invests heavily in this side of its operations. Also, much of the work performed in the factory requires cooperation among the workers. They have to communicate with each other frequently if the work is to get done. Thus social relations are an essential part of the work and its design. This

makes it difficult to separate intrinsic aspects of the job from what has often been considered the extrinsic.

The workers virtually ignored those areas regarded as extrinsic, such as pay and security, as reasons given for preferring the present job. Seniority, and not the job a person currently held, governed a person's security in this company. The work one did explained the pay a person received. The men earned more money at their jobs than the women did at theirs. Except for the skilled workers' jobs there did not, in many cases, seem to be any obvious reason why women earned less then the men. Nevertheless, such was the case.

For women, movement to another job meant movement from one female job to another female job at the same rate of pay. The highest paying jobs belonged to the craftsmen, all of whom were male. The semi-skilled workers were mostly male, while the unskilled were mostly female. Thus, unless one had changed category when changing jobs there would be no reason to claim pay as a reason for being more satisfied with the new position.

Preference for another job

The researcher posed another question to assay the satisfaction of workers with their present jobs. They were asked if there were any other shop-floor jobs they would rather do in comparison to their own. The results are in Table 6.

About 85% of the semi-skilled workers compared to 77.8% of the unskilled workers claimed they would not prefer another job. As in the case of the previous question, there is a small difference between the unskilled and semi-skilled on this question with the unskilled revealing a slightly more negative response. Although none of the skilled men would like another job on the floor, it is interesting that slightly more men than women would prefer another job, 18.4% to 13.3%. Altogether eighteen people (14.9%) expressed an interest in a different job.

It is clear from these results that skill plays a large role in determining whether one desires a job change or not. The skilled workers clearly stated that they would prefer to keep their present jobs. This is not surprising. They earn more pay than the other workers, have a more marketable skill which is not industry or company specific, and have a certain view of themselves based on their achieved status which they would not want to give up. Their work also entails more freedom of movement, allows for initiative, offers more autonomy, and has more variety than the work of others in the plant. In Goldthorpe's study, 16% of skilled workers preferred some other shop-floor job.

While the skilled workers in this sample unequivocally do not wish to change jobs, this does not mean that there are no problems on the job. They give many answers later which reveal their sources of dissatisfaction with their work. The differences between the answer to this question and to those other responses indicate the

problem with relying on this question alone as an indicator of job satisfaction.

Goldthorpe's men preferred another job at a rate of 34% contrasted with only 14.9% in this study. He attributed this interest to the lack of intrinsic rewards in the workers' present jobs. In this study, far fewer workers desired another job and there was less emphasis on intrinsic rewards as a reason for desiring a change.

Reasons for preferring another job

The eighteen workers who said they preferred another job were asked to their give reasons (Table 7). The answers reflect that at least for some workers the lack of variety and of interesting work is a deprivation. Also, for some workers the physical demands of the job make the work undesirable. This is particularly true of the female employees who had the most physically demanding jobs. Six of the eleven women who desired a job change did so because of the physical conditions.

While in Goldthorpe's sample reasons relating to extrinsic rewards such as pay accounted for 17% of all reasons given, in this sample no workers offered these issues as reasons for wanting another job. Of course, the pay scale was the same for all jobs which were open to the semi-skilled and unskilled workers. The difference was in the opportunity to earn overtime pay and a bonus. Women, however, did not have the opportunity to earn overtime pay.

The majority of workers preferred to stay where they were. To return to a point made earlier, it is not clear that by choosing their present job over another job in the firm that the workers are stating that they find their work satisfying. Most of them had done other jobs in the company and they were well aware of the job content of other positions. The workers were able to evaluate their job in comparison to other jobs potentially available to them. They knew that most of these jobs contain the same amount of intrinsic interest and thus a job change offers little or no advantage.

As many of the workers stated that their preference for their present job related to social reasons and to relations with their supervisors, along with being used to their job, a change would seem to offer more risks than benefits. However, this does not mean that the workers were satisfied or were without deprivations, as the next set of questions will show.

Experience of work

The researcher asked the workers a series of questions to determine what their actual experience of work was. Factory work is characterized by its repetitiveness, its fast pace, its physical demands, and its low demand for full attention. Four questions examined these aspects of their work and the results follow below.

Physical demands

The first question looked at whether the workers found their jobs physically tiring or not (Table 8). It is interesting that there are differences based both on skill and on sex, with women least favored in both instances. What this means, of course, is that women lose out in two ways. One, they are excluded from the jobs which are least tiring, that is, the skilled jobs, and two, they, as the majority of unskilled workers, have the heaviest jobs in the plant.

The results show that 42.1% of workers find their work physically tiring while 57.9% do not. None of the skilled men find their work tiring. They generally have more control over their work than do other workers and, if they notice themselves getting tired, have more discretion in dealing with this problem. Almost 56% of the unskilled workers compared to 34% of the semi-skilled say their work is physically tiring. The semi-skilled workers are most often process workers, machine operators, or assistants to the craftsman. These semi-skilled workers have more control over their work than do the unskilled workers.

On the other hand, just over 50% of women stated their work was physically tiring as compared to only 23.6% of the men. Many of the women worked on machines as sorters and packers. They had to keep pace with the machines and often had to lift heavy trays or boxes. When one considers that many of these women then had to go home and begin work all over, their heavy work was an unfair burden.

While physically tiring work would appear to be a deprivation at work, only 17.1% of workers who found the work tiring selected a previous job over their present one. As it turns out, there are more workers who did not find their job physically demanding (24%) who preferred a previous job (Table 9). On the other hand, 20.4% of workers who felt their job was physically demanding would want to move to a different job compared to only 11.6% of those workers who did not (Table 10).

The heavy work which the women had to do was a serious problem for them. This was clear in the response to the question concerning why they preferred their present job to one previously held in the same firm. Five women mentioned better physical conditions as a reason for preferring their present job. Further, in responding to the question as to why they preferred some other shop-floor job, six women, of the eleven who said they would prefer another job, said they would for reasons concerning physical conditions.

Overall, however, few workers who find the work tiring would consider moving whether to an older job or to a new one in the same plant. The chances were quite high that for many of the shop-floor workers their previous job was exhausting. They recognized that most jobs they were eligible for were not much different from the jobs they were doing currently.

Monotony

The next question dealing with experience of work had to do with monotony (Table 11). A high percentage of workers admit to finding their jobs monotonous. Just over 50% of all workers stated that their job was boring. It is striking that while in Goldthorpe's sample only 14% of craftsman found their work monotonous, 55% of this sample did so. The two groups of skilled workers were comparable in terms of level of skill.

The same percentage of unskilled workers claimed their work to be boring while 42.6% of the semi-skilled said their work was boring. Further, monotony is the one variable which has a clear and strong relation to not preferring one's present job in comparison to one previously held in the firm (Table 12). Of the 46 workers who found their jobs monotonous, 14 (30.4%) maintained they preferred a previous job. At the same time, only 11.1% of workers who did not find their work monotonous favored a previous job in the same firm.

While altogether only 19 workers declared they preferred previous work, 14 of these found their present job monotonous. There is a similar tendency amongst workers in their preference for another job in the same firm (Table 13). The workers who felt their work was monotonous chose another job by a ratio of 2 to 1 over those who did not find the work monotonous. The percentages were 20.3% in favor of a new job contrasted to 10.2%. Goldthorpe found a similar result in his sample.

Can think of other things while working

The third issue looked at was how much attention the workers had to pay to their tasks (Table 14). A large majority of workers said that they could think of other things while doing their jobs.

Over 78% of all workers could think of other things while doing their job. Fully 90% of the skilled workers found their work did not absorb their full attention, again a far higher percentage than Goldthorpe discovered amongst his sample.

More men than women felt their job did not involve their full attention. This is interesting since more women than men held unskilled jobs. As mentioned above, women had more physically demanding jobs and this heavier workload often kept the women's attention on their work. Machines set the pace for far more of their jobs and were more likely to require the women's full attention.

Although men's work needed more skill, the difference is not so great as to call for more attention. The jobs of the process workers may involve more steps, more responsibility, and more discretion. However, these jobs are not difficult to learn and after a time the experienced worker probably finds them routine. The skilled workers, too, while their work involved more variety probably found little new in their work and could do it without much thinking.

There is no association with a preference for a previous job in the same firm (Table 15), another firm (Table 16), or with a desire for another job in the same company (Table 17).

In fact, when one looks at some other questions, such as talking to one's workmates, it is clear that as the work does not absorb the workers' attention, it allows them the chance to converse with workmates, a practice these workers engaged in frequently. Workers may not see work which does not demand full attention as a deprivation at all. Perh[illegible] the work [illegible]s accompanied by prohibitions, either by managerial direction or by the nature of the tasks, the workers might have felt differently.

Pace of work

Lastly, the workers answered a question on whether they found the pace of work too fast or not. Unlike their other responses, only a minority of workers expresse the view that their jobs were too fast. Table 18 presents the responses of the workers. More than 72% of all workers felt that their work was not too fast. Women were no more likely to think the pace was too fast than were the men.

What is interesting is that only 8.3% of workers who found the pace of work too fast expressed a preference for a previous job in another firm (Table 19) contrasted with 22.4% of workers who did not find the pace too fast. A higher percentage of those choosing the

pace as too fast also preferred their present job over some other job in the company (Table 20). In addition, only 12.1% of those who said the pace was too fast had thought about leaving while 28.7% of those who did not see the pace as too fast had thought about quitting (Table 21). There was little difference between the two groups in preference for a previous job in the same firm (Table 22).

Workers who find the pace of work too fast have less interest in changing jobs than other workers. Perhaps, pace, in a company where many jobs are monotonous, is not seen as a deprivation at all. Below a certain, undefined threshold a fast pace may be a welcome aspect of the work.

These four variables: monotony, physical conditions, the pace of work, and work that demanded little attention were characterized as deprivations by Goldthorpe and others. However, this study did not come to the same conclusion. Two of these variables, monotony and physically tiring work, are definitely related to job dissatisfaction, while the other two variables may not only be unrelated to job dissatisfaction but may even be a source of satisfaction.

The one condition of work that stands out amongst all the workers is monotony. For the women, physical conditions appear to a salient issue. The question remains how the workers experienced these deprivations. Did they believe that they were inevitable or did they believe that changes were possible? The next question posed

asked the workers what one change they would most like to make in their job. The results are in Table 23.

What One Change Would You Make in Your Job?

The predominant response to the question of change was 'don't know' or 'nothing'. Forty-five workers could not think of a change they would like to see in their job. Although many workers complained of monotony, it was not a problem that the workers sought change for. Perhaps this is one characteristic of the work which they viewed as inherent in the job. Their experience with other jobs both in this firm and elsewhere as well as the knowledge of other jobs from family and friends may have convinced them that monotony is unavoidable. Monotony's association with preferences for other work would lead one to conclude that the solution is external to the job. Other areas were identified as having possible solutions. The issues advanced by the workers outline some differences amongst the groups.

After 'don't know', the manner of supervision was the next most important category. For males it was a more salient issue than for the females; but it was particularly important for the skilled workers. Eight of the eleven skilled men mentioned supervision as an area requiring change.

The skilled workers in one department were quite upset with their recently appointed supervisor. Previous to his promotion he

had been a union steward whom the men said they greatly respected. Since his promotion to foreman he has become difficult to work with. He stands over the men telling them what to do and, sometimes taking over for them while they are doing their work.

These skilled workers take great pride in their training and their ability to solve problems with the equipment. They enjoy the responsibility that comes with making their own decisions about repairing broken machinery. It would appear that what they wanted most from this supervisor was to be left alone so they could get on with the job in their own way. They seemed to resent his interference and the lessening of their autonomy which resulted.

As was noted previously, supervision and atmosphere were rated highly as reasons for preferring one's present job. The combination of so many workers mentioning good supervision as a reason for preferring one's job and so many offering it as an area requiring change illustrates the importance of this issue for the workers. What makes this interesting is that women gave supervision as the reason for preferring their work while men saw it as the aspect of their job that needed changing. Perhaps, for men supervision only becomes salient when it is not working as they would like it to.

No other change was quite so significant for the men as supervision. For the women, on the other hand, three issues stand out. They are the organization of work, the physical conditions, and hours. Agassi (1982, 66) concluded that the women in her study

were more interested in the issues of good physical conditions and work hours than were the men. There is, however, a consistency in the women choosing these issues. Women were excluded from certain jobs in the factory. All the warehouse workers, truck drivers, process workers, and craftsmen were males. These were the best jobs and best paying jobs in the company. Furthermore, these were the jobs that required overtime. It was rare that women would be asked to work overtime.

The factory was segregated into male and female jobs. The division resulted in two distinct groups of workers, male and female, with a hierarchy of rewards. At the top were the skilled workers who were the best paid, had the highest status, and had other attractive aspects of work such as freedom of movement.

The process workers were next in line and these were all male. Whether it was mixing chocolate or sauce this worker made these decisions on his own. He was in charge of the equipment and the gauges and knew when something was wrong. It was his decision when to call in assistance. Granted it was not a complex job, but it did involve esoteric knowledge of the equipment and the material which was particular to the worker concerned. However, this worker had some freedom of movement and some discretion over the pace at which he worked. The job also was not as fragmented as many of the jobs performed by the women which often involved very limited actions. A lower percentage of semi-skilled workers than unskilled workers claimed their work was monotonous.

The women, on the other hand, mostly held jobs which kept them rooted to the same spot. The work came to them either on a conveyor as in the candy, jams, and sauces departments or was brought to them as in the case of the vegetable and berry cutters. They had to work at the pace of the machinery whether they were inspectors or packers. Either standing in the same position for long periods or lifting heavy boxes and trays, the women had heavy physical work.

There were two aspects to the complaint women had about hours of work. First, women had little access to overtime and since they were already earning less money than the men, this loss of earnings had a serious effect on the women. One of the explanations offered for the different conditions governing men's and women's work was that men needed more money given their familial responsibilities. Women were given heavier work not because they were being discriminated against but because such jobs did not provide the income men needed. This explanation fails to take into account the arbitrary (arbitrary in the sense that women were excluded from the decisions) social definitions which ordain some jobs as demanding more skill than others and, as a result, deserving of more pay.

What was needed was an analysis of how some jobs came to be designated lower skilled and lower paying and thus women's work. The role played by the unions which are dominated by men should also be analyzed. It must be noted that, in line with European

Economic Community guidelines to which Ireland had to comply since 1972, a consulting firm was conducting a study in this firm to determine the comparable worth of women's work. The purpose was to eventually provide equal pay for work of equal value.

Although many of these women were single, they were not without responsibilities. Many of them had parents or siblings to support. A common justification for paying women less has been the myth that they don't need the money as much since they are either married or have only themselves to support.

The second issue relating to hours concerns the workload of these women. In a traditional country like Ireland, housework is considered a women's preserve. These women, when they left the factory, had to head home to begin their second job. Thus, when they complained about hours some were thinking of the difficulties which they faced in doing two jobs. This double workload, of course, was made worse by the more physical work generally done by women in the factory. Wickham points out that the hours of operation of most factory work in Ireland is designed around the interests of men (1986, 87).

Consequently, we can see the consistency in the women's complaints. The work was organized so that the men had the best jobs, both with higher pay and overtime, while the women had the most physical work at lower pay and without overtime. Women were systematically excluded from the most rewarding positions in the factory. It is easy to understand the saliency of these issues for

women and the relative unimportance for men of these same issues, at least in the sense of wanting changes made.

While it is interesting to note the differences between the males and females, it is also worthwhile pointing out that only one worker mentioned pay as something he would like to change. Of course, the women had indicated that they would like a change in pay but this was through changes in work organization and overtime distribution. Pay is an extrinsic element of the job and one would believe that workers with an instrumental orientation would place high emphasis on this aspect of the job.

On the evidence presented, there are four notable points. First, forty-five of the workers desired no change whatsoever. This, possibly, is an indication of their satisfaction while, on the other hand, it might be an indication of their resignation. Second, the skilled workers are unhappy with the supervision they are subject to. They resent intrusive supervision which conflicts with their desire to control their environment.

Third, women have far more concerns than do men with the way work is organized They are especially concerned that they have the lower paying, more physical jobs. Fourth, only a minority of workers seek changes which would increase intrinsic rewards. Perhaps, as has been suggested most do not have any expectations of intrinsic rewards from these jobs. It could also be a reflection of the question itself. Workers were limited to responding with one

change they desired and the lack of intrinsic rewards may not be as important as other features of the job.

Discussion

The workers, on the whole, were satisfied with their work. It seems reasonable to interpret this satisfaction as contentment with their overall work situation. They have a decent job with an established company that has treated them well. There are, however, areas where the needs of some workers are not being met.

It seems useful at this point to recall some of the points made earlier. The workers were questioned about four possible areas of deprivation: monotony, pace of work, how physically tiring the work was, and how absorbing their work was. These results were then measured against their responses to their preferences for previous work in the same firm and for another job in the same firm, both considered indirect questions on job satisfaction. Only 18% per cent of workers preferred a previous job in the same firm while 15% would like another job in the same firm.

Analysis showed that monotony was related to both of these preferences while physically tiring work was associated only with a desire for some other shop-floor. Being physically tired was clearly demonstrated to be a deprivation in the reasons given by women for preferring one's present job and in the changes they would like to see.

Neither the pace of work nor the lack of fully absorbing work appear to be deprivations. Workers who found the work too fast were less interested in changing jobs or leaving than were other workers. And while 78.5% of workers find they can think of other things while working, most of them are quite satisfied with their present position.

It was also proposed that the social aspects of the job are enhanced as the work does not absorb the workers full attention. The female workers had mentioned the social atmosphere as an important reason for liking their present job. Evidence will be presented later which supports the view that the social world played an important role in worker satisfaction. The intense level of interaction among workers reduced the desire to change jobs.

Supervision was also shown to play an important role in worker satisfaction. Women mentioned it as a reason for being satisfied, while men, especially skilled workers, proposed it as an area in need of improvement. Supervision and peer interaction are essential elements in the performance of work for these employees. To this extent, it seems reasonable to include it as an intrinsic element of the workers' job. Agassi (1982, 70) makes the same point.

Overall, the results indicate a high level of satisfaction on the part of all the workers. They, however, do not explain this satisfaction in instrumental terms. Nor do they state that material benefits are an area of dissatisfaction.

There are no significant differences between the men and women or amongst the skilled groups. A minority of workers are unhappy with their work while many other workers have specific dimensions they would like changed.

While Goldthorpe began with the idea that three of these four variables (excluding physical conditions) were deprivations and subsequently identified them as such in his study, it is clear from the results obtained here that this is not always the case. Because of this, the workers in this study do not demonstrate the same degree of dissatisfaction he found in his groupings.

Goldthorpe further claimed that dissatisfied workers were not more likely to have thought of leaving than other workers. They would put up with these deprivations because of the economic benefits they receive from the firm. Their willingness to stay for economic reasons, despite the drawbacks, indicates an instrumental orientation.

On the contrary, it would seem that workers who voice dissatisfactions are exemplifying the opposite of an instrumental attitude. It would appear that for an attitude to be instrumental there be two essential components. First, the worker would work for economic returns in a job lacking intrinsic content, and, second, the worker would not be concerned about these deprivations. Staying in a job for economic reasons can hardly be considered an indication of an instrumental orientation without reference to the question of concern for the lack of intrinsic elements.

Goldthorpe identifies his workers as affluent, a definition which could be challenged. Many of his men had left lower paying, more intrinsically satisfying work, for their present jobs. The desire to provide a better standard of living for one's family, even if it involves deprivations, does not make a worker instrumentally oriented. It may be an indication of the few alternatives given these workers to obtain both decent and well-paying work. These men were blue-collar workers and while they may have earned more than other such workers, as well as some white-collar ones, this did not necessarily make them affluent. They could not expect to get rich doing this work.

But his workers also voiced concerns about their less than intrinsically satisfying work. This demonstrates that they are not instrumentally oriented. They wanted many changes to their work and indicated preferences for previous jobs in the same firm and for other jobs as well. That many chose to stay for better economic conditions points out their unenviable situation, not their instrumental orientation.

Thought of leaving firm

The workers in this study were also questioned to determine their attachment to their present work as a validation of the instrumental orientation thesis. They were first asked if they had ever thought of leaving the company. The results are in Table 24.

Twenty-four per cent of all workers had thought of leaving their job at some time.

Unfortunately, this question lacks precision in that it does not specify how long ago it was that workers had thought about this. With so many of the workers having had more than one job with the same firm, it becomes difficult to compare the reasons they offer for leaving with their present job conditions. However, for the sake of simplicity it will be assumed that the workers were referring to recent times. As the company had already informed the employees that they were relocating, perhaps many of them had reflected on their position with the company.

The 76% of workers who had not thought of leaving fits in well with the other results obtained so far on questions of job preference where 70% said they liked their present job and 82.6% stated they did not prefer another job in the company. The overall level of satisfaction appears to be higher than that of Goldthorpe's sample and some of this is reflected in the lower number who considered leaving. In his sample it was 43% of all workers who thought of leaving.

There is no difference between the unskilled and semi-skilled workers on this question while a higher percentage of skilled workers had considered leaving. These workers, however, are not as restricted as the others when it comes to finding other jobs. Their skills are more marketable and are not industry or job specific. Their training is prior to their taking of this job whereas the other

workers have learned their tasks on the job. Men and women showed no difference in predilection for leaving.

Reasons for thinking of leaving

The workers who had thought of leaving were asked why they had thought of doing so. The reasons are presented in Table 25. There does not seem to be any particular reason which stands out above the rest. However, it should be noticed that three of the four skilled workers who had thought of leaving did so because of supervision. It is also interesting that although women mentioned that they were dissatisfied with the physical conditions of their work none offered it as a reason for leaving.

Analysis of the results did not show that those workers who found the job physically tiring had thought of leaving more than their fellow workers (Table 26). However, a greater percentage of workers who had time to think of other things thought of leaving compared to those who had little time to think of other things (Table 27). Of course, this might have more to do with having time to reflect than to any real dissatisfaction with the job.

Further analysis also reveals that 32.8% of workers who said their work was monotonous thought about leaving (Table 28). Only 15.0% of workers who did not find the work monotonous pondered quitting. This contrasts with Goldthorpe's findings where monotony did not affect the workers' thinking about leaving. He interpreted

this response as an indication of their instrumental attitude. The workers were willing to endure this negative aspect of their job in return for their high wages.

In this study, those who found the pace of work too fast (27.5% of all workers) were more likely not to have given leaving any thought which supports the view that a fast pace may be seen as a positive aspect of work under some conditions (Table 21). It may be possible that a fast pace of work allows the day to pass quickly, but is not at such a pace to warrant resigning. There may be a threshold beyond which the pace of work may be considered unbearable to the point of wanting to quit, but it would appear from these workers responses that this threshold had not been reached.

Only one person offered low pay as a reason for thinking of leaving. This would seem to indicate that the workers were generally satisfied with their level of pay. Other evidence which will be presented later supports this position.

The results illustrate that these workers did not possess an instrumental orientation. Although, on the whole, they were satisfied, they expressed dissatisfaction on particular issues which were different for men and women and sometimes for the skilled men compared to everyone else. It must be remembered that there are only 11 skilled men in the sample.

Those who found their job monotonous were more likely to express their dissatisfaction through their preference for other work or through having ideas about quitting the company altogether.

Skilled men who were unhappy with supervision wanted this aspect of their work changed and also offered poor supervision as their reason for having thought of leaving the firm. Those who found their job physically tiring were more likely than others to want another job in the plant, and also expressed a desire to have this situation changed.

There does not seem to be support for the position that these workers are instrumentally oriented given the two dimensions of the definition proposed earlier. It is first of all clear that what were considered deprivations in Goldthorpe's study are not all deprivations in this study. Secondly, the workers do not appear to be working in jobs entirely devoid of intrinsic interest, especially if one includes the social atmosphere as part of the definition.

Where they have difficulties with their tasks and environment they express their dissatisfaction and voice the changes they would like to see. And as the answer to the next question will show, these workers did not consider the economic returns as the most important reason for staying where they were.

What keeps you here?

The workers were asked what it was that kept them in this company. The results are classified in Table 29. The pay, benefits, and security comprised 28% of all responses given. This was the single most important response along with good workmates. It

should not be surprising, however, to find some blue-collar workers, who have a reasonably good job in a traditionally poor economy, saying they stay at their work for the money. The wonder is that it comprises only 28% of the total responses.

On the face of it, it would seem that if you asked most people why they worked, they would answer that they did it for the money. It may not be the whole reason, but in our type of political and economic system that is the way things work. It would seem to be a little disingenuous to conclude that workers who answered this way were instrumentally oriented.

Goldthorpe felt that workers with this orientation wanted to maximize economic returns. There is no evidence to substantiate that claim with this group of workers as most of their responses related to non-material benefits.

The answers given, however, reveal some interesting differences between the men and the women. Women were far less likely to give instrumental reasons for staying compared to the men. For the men these categories totaled 46% of their responses compared to only 23% for the women. However, both groups contrast strongly with the British workers who chose material rewards 67% of the time on this question.

On the other hand, there is an astonishing difference between the men and women on good workmates as a reason for keeping one's job. Of the thirty-six people who answered good workmates, only one was a man. It was mentioned previously that social relations

were more important to the women and this finding is supported by Burstein (1975, 61).

The work atmosphere and supervision received the second most replies along with habituation to the work and the nature of the work. Men were more likely to say supervision than were the women, but this difference was accounted for by the skilled men. Five of the eleven craftsmen claimed good supervision as a reason for remaining.

It must be remembered that the craftsmen who were interviewed were in two different groups. One was very dissatisfied with its supervisor whom they found overbearing and interfering, while the other group felt its foreman was very good. The net result, however, is whether good or bad, supervision is an important variable in determining the attitudes and work experience of craftsmen.

Women were far more likely than the men to say they stayed because they were used to the work. Women were less likely to want change than were the men and later evidence will bear this out. It is also important to notice that the proximity of the factory to home was important only to the women. As homemakers, as well as workers, this would be a concern to women. The closer to home the less time spent in travel before they have to begin their second job. Several women mentioned that they were able to scoot home at lunch. The move to a new plant outside the city would disturb this

hidden benefit to many women and add an extra burden to their heavy workload.

Preference for a previous job elsewhere

Another question designed to support the instrumental orientation thesis looked at workers preference for previous jobs in another firm. In Goldthorpe's study 55% of workers preferred a previous job, mainly because the jobs were more intrinsically rewarding. They, however, left those jobs for more money at their present firms.

Many of the workers in this study had worked at other companies before taking their present job. Table 30 shows that ninety-two people had worked elsewhere and thus most workers were in a position to compare their present position with a previous one. The workers were asked whether they preferred a previous job to the one they currently held. Nine workers expressed no opinion on this question. The results for the remaining workers are presented in Table 31.

Only fifteen of the eighty-three workers (18.1%) preferred previous work at another company. The low number interested in previous work indicates that for the majority their present job is an improvement. There is no evidence that the improvement is related to material benefits.

Women were more likely to prefer their current situation. Of the twenty-seven men who expressed a preference, thirthy-seven said they would chose their previous employment over the present one compared to only 8.9% of the women. For the ten men, four of whom were skilled, the greater intrinsic interest, the greater variety, and the opportunity to use their skill were the reasons they preferred their previous work. It must be remembered that 55% of the skilled workers said their jobs were monotonous. Three of the five women mentioned supervision as a reason for selecting their former jobs. The reasons for preferring these jobs are given in Table 32.

Once again, monotony was associated with a preference for a previous job with 27.9% of those finding their work monotonous as opposed to only 7.5% of those who did not prefer a previous job (Table 33). However, only 18.1% of all workers were predisposed towards a previous job. The workers who found their work physically tiring choose a previous job less often than those who did not find the work tiring (Table 34).

The results do not establish that a significant number of workers have left a better situation for monetary reasons. A majority are satisfied with their present situation which accords with the previous responses on job satisfaction.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the job satisfaction of blue-collar workers in a food processing plant. On all questions a significant majority of workers said they were satisfied with their work. The lowest indicator of satisfaction was 70%. There was no difference in job satisfaction between the sexes nor amongst the different groups of workers based on skill.

The workers, while satisfied in general, had some issues they would like resolved. Over 50% of workers found their work monotonous while the women were unhappy with the physical demands of their work. There was a high level of dissatisfaction amongst many of the skilled men with their supervision. There was, however, only a small number of skilled men in the sample.

The workers do not appear to have a predominantly instrumental orientation. Obviously, economic issues would be high on their list but there is no indication that this is their exclusive reason for working at their present job. These workers have other attachments to their work which includes satisfaction with their work and a sense of social belonging. This attachment to their group will be examined in the next chapter.

It appears that these workers do not have a negative orientation towards their employer. Most see their employer in a positive light as evidence will prove later on. There is not the bonding that one finds in work communities characterized by mining

towns, but this is not an all or nothing scheme. There are varying degrees of attachment and these workers social relationships are to be found somewhere between the alienative community of Goldthorpe and the solidaristic one of the mining town.

The following chapters will examine further these workers orientation to their workplace. Their relationship to their fellow workers, their company, and their union will reflect the findings which have illustrated that their orientation cannot be characterized as instrumental.

Chapter 5

The Worker and The Work Group

Work Relations

This chapter aims to examine some of the attitudes that the workers have towards their fellow employees by focusing on work relations. As many writers have pointed out there are severe limitations to the 'human relations' model in explaining work relationships. The technological determinists also have failed to deal with the subjective aspects of the workers' definitions of the workplace.

Goldthorpe accepts that technology does impose some limitations on the interaction of workers and on the formation of solidary work groups, but he contends that the technological explanation is inadequate in accounting for the work relationships he found in his study. For him, the orientation of the workers to the workplace, which they bring with them to the plant floor from the outside, can substantially explain the nature of the work relations in the factory.

As was discussed earlier, Goldthorpe interpreted the workers' answers to questions on job satisfaction as indicating an instrumental orientation on the part of the workforce he studied. Subsequent questioning on work relations with their fellow

workmates, supervisors, and their union confirmed his interpretation.

As indicated previously, this researcher found different results amongst the workers and, also, had a disagreement with Goldthorpe's interpretation of his results. Perhaps, however, the data collected on questions relating to work and union relations will more closely mirror his. However, indications from the previous chapter would lead us to believe that these workers will not respond in the same way as those in Goldthorpe's sample.

Again we have to be mindful of the major difference between the sample as a whole, and that is that the majority of workers in this study are female. We will want to report the results for the whole sample, while at the same time paying close attention to the responses of the males alone.

The questions to follow were designed to test the strength of workers' attachment to one another or to their immediate work group. The amount of time workers spent interacting with each other both on the job floor and outside the workplace are considered good indicators of the nature of their attachment according to Goldthorpe. Workers who talked little with their workmates, who felt little concern about changing departments, who had few good friends at work, and who rarely socialized outside the plant would be considered as workers with an instrumental orientation.

How often do you talk to your workmates?

The first question asked the workers how often they talked to each other on the job. A high number of workers responded by saying that they talked to their fellow workers a good deal. Almost 77% of workers said they spoke a good deal, but what is significant is the difference between this sample and Goldthorpe's. Only 47% of his sample indicated that they talked a good deal. Results are in table 35.

Furthermore, 86.8% of the men in this study responded in this fashion compared to only 72.3% of the women. The jobs that the men had, of course, allowed them to engage in conversation more than the women. As can be seen from the results, the more skill a worker had, which was also an indication of the amount of restrictions placed on a worker, the more a worker was likely to engage in conversations a good deal. In addition, only two workers (1.6%) answered that they talked 'rarely' compared to the 12% in Goldthorpe's sample.

The previous section illustrated that the women had more physically demanding jobs and worked in noisier environments. They also had less freedom of movement as many were tied to the machines they were working on or were rooted to the spot while the work came to them. When asked when it was they talked, it is clear that the women were under more restrictions than the men. The

results are presented in Table 36. Only one man, compared to fifteen of the women, claimed he had time to talk only at breaks.

Thus, the technology placed more restrictions on the women than it did on the men. This cannot be seen as a result of technology alone. The very differentiation of certain roles as belonging to men and other roles as more fitting to women is not a technological imperative. In this plant, as in Irish society, certain jobs were reserved for men and were closed off to women. This was particularly true for skilled jobs. This restriction meant that women were forced into the least attractive and lower paying jobs in the plant. These jobs also offer less opportunity for women to engage each other in conversation while working than do the jobs occupied by the men. That women occupy these particular roles on the job is a result of social and cultural factors not and is not due to technology. It is the combination of the technological and socio-political factors which affect the amount of interaction that takes place.

While it is true that the technology employed places different constraints on the ability of workers to engage in conversation, it must be remarked that this high level of conversation can only take place with a certain acquiescence by management. What is not clear is whether this was a deliberate strategy on the part of management or not. However, given the frequency of interaction of the workers it would appear that management at least tacitly approved of this behaviour.

There is the possibility that management perceived that the interaction which took place was not an impediment to production and that, in fact, it was helpful in achieving that goal. In this instance, one would view social interaction as an intrinsic aspect of the work and not an extrinsic aspect as Goldthorpe contends.

Agassi (1982, 70) supports this view when she argues against Herzberg's classification of the social aspects of work as extrinsic characteristics. Friendly relations, both with management and workers, are 'tied up with the division of labor and the division of jobs in the work organization.' She contends that such relations are important for what she calls constructive cooperation. Salaman (1986, 100) concludes that management may tacitly condone the informal culture in return for a certain amount of worker goodwill. It may even be a conscious strategy on the part of management. Burawoy (1979, 80) takes the approach that management gains the consent of the workers by concealing the conflict inherent in the relationship. Management permits the workers to engage in their behavior in order to get the work done.

This question dealt with the frequency of interaction and not the intensity of that interaction. With workers interacting as much as they did, it would seem reasonable to conclude that this interaction was important to them. It is not technology combined with management's acquiescence that creates the interaction. Those two factors combine to make it possible. It, however, is the workers' desire to engage in conversation that makes it happen. The

question then becomes how important are the particular relationships which these workers have established. The next question attempts to deal with this issue.

How upset would you be?

Workers were asked how upset they would feel if they had to move to another part of the factory (Table 37). There are sharp differences between the results for men and women. None of the men said they would be very upset at a move to another part of the factory while 38.6% of women said they would be very upset. Another 27.7% of women claimed they would be fairly upset, a number almost equaled by the men at 26.3%. Thus two-thirds of women stated that moving to another part of the factory would upset them compared to only one-quarter of the men. This supports the data found in Table 29 A wherein it was noted that 35 women said they stayed at the company because of their workmates while only 1 man answered this way.

It is interesting to note that the results for men in this sample are virtually identical to those in Goldthorpe's study. Twenty-seven per cent of his sample said they would be upset with 68% saying they would not be bothered by a move, which matches the 68.3% of the men in this study.

Perhaps this reflects the orientation that these workers bring with them from the outside as Goldthorpe suggests. He ascribes this

lack of solidary feeling on the part of the men in his study to their instrumental orientation. There are other possible interpretations of this attitude. It may be part of their orientation to work not to be bothered by a move elsewhere but this attitude may be a result of the work they do and the conditions they work under. In the Irish plant the conditions under which the men and women worked were very different and may account for their different responses.

Men's work

The skilled workers who were the least likely to be upset at a move also would hardly be affected by a change in work location. As it was, these workers operated all over the plant. The electricians, plumbers, and fitters went to wherever there was a problem. They were assigned specific machines in the plant but, nonetheless, they were able to work over a large area. As such, these men, who usually worked in pairs, were not likely to form strong group ties.

They would, by nature of their itinerant work, come into contact with many other workers. They spoke to these workers but did not, as a result, enter into any primary ties with them. They did identify with their skilled confreres and spent their break time together. These skilled workers were accompanied by a helper who, while not enjoying the same status as the skilled man, was able to share this aspect of the work. As mentioned beforehand, these helpers were males.

The process workers essentially worked alone preparing their food for processing. As this was an old plant much of the equipment required intervention by these workers. The machinery was not completely automated, and this placed greater responsibility and demanded more judgment from these men. They were able to move over a small area and had contact with their assistants, skilled workers, the men who brought them supplies, and their supervisors. They were not involved in formal work groups, and, consequently had little opportunity to develop strong informal group ties.

Other male workers, such as the suppliers, had a good deal of freedom of movement. They worked in the same department and could easily engage each other in conversation. This was true of their contacts in general. They were not under the same pressure as workers who had to keep pace with their machines, and could take the time to have a few words wherever they went.

Women's work

The working conditions for women were entirely different. Women worked at fixed stations and in more or less permanent groups. Those who worked on machinery could engage in conversation with the persons next to or opposite them. The most important factor in determining how often conversation took place was the level of noise the workers were subjected to.

The noisiest, and oldest, machinery was located in the older of the two buildings and this was the candy making machinery. While the mixer was in operation, conversation was virtually impossible other than with one's immediate neighbor. There was, however, opportunity to talk with a wider group of workers once the run had been completed. There was a shutdown of the mixer for at least a half an hour while the next batch was prepared. In other departments there was less noise and thus more opportunity for conversation.

The pickle department and the fruit preparation department had the greatest opportunity for interaction. There were no machines involved in these departments. All preparation of fruits for jam making, and pickles and onions for pickle products, were done by hand. Women stood around large tables and hand-cut the food. There was very little noise other than that emanating from machinery elsewhere throughout the plant, which allowed for an easy exchange amongst the female workers.

But what distinguishes the women's work from the men's were the two aspects of restriction of movement and of working in groups. Because the men were more likely to be working alone (the process workers) or in pairs (the craftsmen) and because they were freer to move around, the male workers were unlikely to form solidary relationships the way the women did.

Sources of orientation

The question remains as to whether the differences between the men's and the women's attachment to their workmates can be ascribed to orientations to work which they imported to the workplace or whether it has to do with the technology which allows men more freedom of movement, and the social structure which segregates the work into men's and women's work so that the women have the more stationary, group focused work.

One reason the women would be more upset than the men at moving might have to do with their group determined work. As women do not move from place to place while working, they have had less opportunity to develop relations with other workers throughout the plant, and those relationships that they have formed have been restricted to their immediate work group. Because they interact more frequently with these workers day in and day out, the relationships they have established may have significant meaning for them.

The men, on the other hand, have had ample opportunity to engage in relations with workers from other areas. A move to a different department for many men may not involve much change in personal relations. They may still interact with most of the same workers. Further, not having relationships of the same intensity as the women, and being aware that interaction with different workers brings its own satisfactions, moving to another part of the plant

does not signify an important disruption for these men. For many men, movement would mean a continuation of the kinds of patterns of interaction they have had all along. For women, it would mean a serious change in their relationships as they would have to integrate themselves into a new work group.

It would seem that the different experiences of men and women at work colour their attitude towards moving to another section of the factory. Although a majority of men stated that a move would not disturb them, this does not necessarily indicate that work relations are not significant for them.

Their experience at work has taught them that the jobs for men throughout the plant are similar and the rewards are not much different. There would not be a dependence on a group of workers as happens for women. Social rewards would be much the same in most jobs. They are assured that there would be little disruption in the satisfactions to be obtained from their interactions with other workers. These satisfactions do not depend heavily on talking to the same coterie of workers all the time. Their relations are more diffuse than most of the women's and could stand a break more easily.

Number of close friends

Goldthorpe feels that workers who have solidary ties to each other would express these relations outside the plant as well. In

other words, where workers received substantial affective rewards from their workmates, one would also see them associating with each other outside work.

The overall numbers for the sample are equivalent to those obtained by Goldthorpe. In both studies, 45% of workers replied that they had no close friends, with the remainder stating that they had at least one close friend at work. However, the results in this study revealed a difference between these men compared to Goldthorpe's (Table 38). Here, 60% of the men claimed to have no close friends.

Where do you see them?

Follow-up questions indicate that there was not a great deal of socializing with each other after work hours (Table 39). Only one man claimed to have entertained workmates at home. For those men who did see workers outside work, the most common form of socializing was of a semi-casual sort. This would include going to the pub after work and attending sporting events.

This would seem to indicate that these male workers were more instrumental in their approach to work than those from his sample. However, that is too facile a conclusion. While it is true that these men saw little of each other away from the plant, it is not clear that not doing so is evidence of an instrumental orientation.

Clearly the women had developed more affective relations than the men. The social structure of the workplace, as well as to the technology employed, are partly responsible for these relations amongst the women. In addition, they carried these stronger relations to life outside the plant. Sixty-one per cent claimed to have close friends at work and women were far more likely to have other women over to their homes compared to the men. Of the 51 women who claimed at least one close friend, 24 had friends over to their house (47%) while only 1 man out of 15 did so (6.6%). The intensity of the women's relations while at work helps explain why more women than men cultivated relations outside the plant.

Part of the difficulty with this question about close friends is the meaning of the word close. Goldthorpe himself presents a cautionary note on reading too much into this question. However, then he proceeds to do just that. Less than half of the men claim mates as close friends and few entertain these friends at home. Goldthorpe interprets these actions as indications of the instrumental orientation of these men.

He further interprets the situation of the white-collar worker in a way that substantiates his viewpoint about blue-collar instrumental orientation. The argument states that white-collar workers are even less likely to have close friends at work, but that when they do they are more likely to see them at their homes. White-collar workers have 'a more selective and deliberately

cultivated kind of relationship'. They, unlike the blue-collars, have friends 'for their own sake'.

This argument has problems. First, if not having close friends at work is an indication of an instrumental orientation, then white-collar workers are more likely to be instrumentally oriented. Second, perhaps the more cultivated relationship of the white-collars is a more 'calculated' relationship and reflects the organization man personality, the upwardly mobile worker who values his 'friendships' because they might advance his career. This would be a true example of instrumental orientation.

A minority of workers in this study saw workmates outside of work. Of the one hundred twenty-one workers only fifty-four spent time together off the plant premises. Women were far more likely to do so but this was still in the minority. However, when one considers the amount of interaction that these workers engaged in, it does not seem unreasonable that they would not see each other outside of work. Most stated that they could talk a good deal while working. In addition, many of the male workers spent nearly fifty hours a week on the job. This did not leave them with much time nor energy to socialize off the job. Given the level of interaction on the job, the interest in spending time together away from work appears high.

When asked what it was they conversed about, virtually all replied that they talked about non-work matters. This indicates that their relationship was far from formal. Given that these

workers spent so much time talking with each other on a daily basis, it would perhaps be more unusual if they did see each other outside of work. The point is that, of those workers who said that they did have close friends, most of them saw each other after work hours in some fashion.

Which is most important?

The researcher posed a direct question to these workers about which was most important, good workmates, good bosses, or money (Table 40). Only 11.6% of these workers chose money. While more men than women said that money was most important, this was still a small minority of the men (18.4%). This distinct lack of emphasis on money and the support for personal relations indicate that these workers value the interactions they have with their fellow workers.

While these relations do not extend beyond the workplace in all cases, it is clear, nonetheless, that they are significant for these workers. There is no doubt that these workers have an orientation to work which is affected by their life outside of the plant. That orientation would include those that they work with.

But, it is also evident that these same workers are influenced by the relations they have with their co-workers and that these relations have meaning for them. For some, there appears to be little room for outside interaction, but this is no indication of an instrumental orientation towards their friends at work. The

majority of workers interact a good deal with their workmates and see these relations as more valuable than money.

There are important differences between the men and the women (48% of whom chose good friends as the most important compared to 28.9% of the men), but some of this difference can be explained by the technological and social structure of the workplace.

Doubtless part of the orientation is explained by differences in orientation of the male and female workers, but this may be a different perspective on friendship rather than a calculation of its worth. Females may expect and seek friendly relations at work more than the men do. Some of this may be based on their previous work experiences where they have learned that the more interesting and challenging jobs go to the men.

Socialization may also explain why women are more interested in social relations. Cues are picked up from others as to what rewards women can expect at work, and friendship is one of them. Men, on the other hand, while not valuing friendship less than the women, do not see it as the essential element of their work experience. They have more opportunities than the women for advancement and generally have the best jobs in the plant. They expect more from work than friendships.

When asked which they thought was most important more workers answered good bosses than answered money. In fact, while 18.2% of workers responded by saying good bosses, a further 27.3% of them considered good bosses and good workmates equally

desirable. Thus, a full 45.5% of workers felt having good supervisors was important. Fifty per cent of the men compared to 43.4% of the women felt this way.

And as was noted in the last section, craftsmen placed more emphasis on this point than did any other group with 8 of the 11 skilled workers emphasizing good bosses. However, the last section revealed that good supervision or the lack of it was important to these workers, both male and female.

Relations with supervisor

Goldthorpe found that the majority of his workers got on well with their supervisors, but that an important reason for doing so was the lack of interaction between worker and foreman. Personal skills were not valued, which for Goldthorpe was a further indication of an instrumental orientation.

The workers in this study also claimed, to a large extent, to get along well with their foreman (Table 41). All told, 81% of the sample said they had good relations with their supervisor. However, 23.7% of the men compared to only 10.1% of the women did not fare so well with their bosses. Of the 9 men who did not get along well, 5 of them were skilled workers. This confirms the evidence presented in the previous chapter where skilled workers mentioned supervision as an area needing improvement.

The workers said that they got along well because of the personal skills of the foreman more than for any other reason (Table 42). This contrasts sharply with Goldthorpe's results. Whereas infrequent interaction accounted for 54% of all reasons given for getting on with foremen in his study, in this study this reason accounted for only 16.8% of all reasons for getting along.

There are differences between men and women on this question. For the men, little contact amounted to 25.9% of all reasons offered, while this was true only 15.5% of the time for women.

For those who did not have good relations with their supervisor, lack of personal skills accounted for 50% of the reasons given (Table 43). The foreman's personal skills, either as a positive characteristic or as a negative one, stand out as the single most important reason for getting along with one's supervisor. The workers in this study value personal relations both with their fellow workers and with their supervisors.

Nearly all workers converse a great deal with their workmates, and while most get along well with their supervisors, those who do not would like to. The interpretation of the results here does not support the hypothesis of an instrumentally oriented workforce. When asked directly what their attitude was, only a minority of workers chose money over good relations with other workers and supervisors.

The orientation of these workers may not be instrumental, but whether it is a consequence of out-of-plant factors or in-plant ones has not been answered. Workers no doubt enter their job with a certain orientation, but how much of their present orientation is mainly due to their external experiences and relations and not to the shop-floor experiences and relations is unclear.

Unless there was some way of measuring the workers' attitudes before they entered the plant and then measuring, in isolation of all other influences, the in-plant variables, it would be impossible to determine which is more important in explaining these workers' orientation. It seems unlikely that workers who place so much emphasis on personal relations are not affected in some serious way by these relations at work which, in turn, influences their orientation.

Chapter 6

The Worker and the Firm

Attitudes Towards the Company

This particular chapter looks at the attitudes that the workers had to the firm which employed them. The previous two demonstrated that these workers do not have an instrumental orientation to their work.

Studies by Blauner and others claimed that the technology employed by the firm affects the degree of alienation workers experience. For Blauner, the chemical industry with its highly automated processes would have little alienation. However, as Halle points out there are many jobs in that industry which involve little or no automation but which pose a great deal of danger to the workers involved. Nonetheless, the conclusion for Blauner was that process workers would be less alienated than other workers. For these writers, the workers' experience of technology has much to do with the attitudes and behaviour they will exhibit. There should be more discontent in assembly line factories than in process factories.

Goldthorpe argues that the shop-floor experience of workers is not the crucial variable in explaining workers' attitudes and

behaviour. For him, the critical variable is the orientation which the workers bring to the plant from the outside. His conclusion is that this orientation is an instrumental one and reflects the type of orientation to be expected more in the future.

According to the hypothesis advanced by Blauner, the workers in this study would exhibit varying degrees of integration with the women least likely to be integrated. However, technology is not an independent variable. It must be applied within an existing social structure by a management with certain attitudes and values towards its workforce.

Women had physically more demanding jobs, with less freedom of movement, but also with greater opportunity to develop group relations. The heavy work was of concern to the women involved, but the relationships they formed were important to them. The technology cannot be looked upon solely in terms of the job demands that it places on the workers.

Many of the craftsmen, whom one would consider to be the least constrained by technology, were quite unhappy with their supervision. However, their skills were not employed in a vacuum. There were constraints on these men which were imposed both by the limits of the job itself and by the type of management they had to contend with. Technology is not the only variable affecting these workers. It is not an isolated element having independent effects on workers. Technology must be applied and the relations which govern

its application may be of greater significance than the technology itself.

Technology has been presented as an autonomous force but, as others have demonstrated, it is part of the social relations of not only the particular firm or industry but also the society in which it is applied. One must guard against reifying technology and, at the same time, recognize the interests behind its development, selection, and implementation.

Thus, the issue of orientation to technology itself is a complex one. Workers do not passively accept new technology, but what becomes difficult is determining the roots of the orientation which workers bring into play in any resistance to, or acceptance of, the work environment they are involved in. The very relations which workers establish at work and the culture they create with its particular values, norms, and behaviour must play a role in any efforts at resistance or integration in which these workers engage. Not only the technology, but also these social elements influence how these workers view their company.

How does this firm compare to others?

The first question on attitudes toward their present employer asked workers how it compared to other firms they knew about. The results are not what one would expect if Blauner's hypothesis were true. The results are in Table 44.

Women were more likely to see this company as a better place to work for than were the men. Just over 60% of the men in this study said it was a better firm than most, compared to 84.3% of the women. Men were far more likely to see their company as average (34.2%) compared to the women (6%). Overall, the results reveal that the workers are generally satisfied with their employer with only 1.7% claiming that it was worse than most others.

The other point of significance is that the skilled workers are split evenly on whether the company is better than most or about average, with five of them siding with each alternative while one skilled worker had no opinion. A clear majority of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers viewed the company as better, while only 45% of the skilled workers held the same opinion.

According to Blauner, the craftsmen should have the most positive attitudes towards the company. It would appear that technology is not the critical variable in determining attitudes toward one's firm. The least restricted group, the craftsmen, are evenly divided between better and average, while the most restricted, the women, have overwhelmingly chosen 'better' as the term which best describes their firm.

How do you see management-worker relations?

Much the same results were obtained in response to the next question which had to do with the workers perception of worker-

management relations (Table 45). Burawoy (1979, 80) points out that management must hide the essential conflict between itself and the workers, which has to do with the inherently exploitative relationship, if it is to be successful in avoiding conflict. In order to reach its production goals, no matter how automated the plant, management always relies on at least some minimal cooperation from its workers.

In this company, automation was not at a high level and workers had to interact quite often, as well as intervene manually in the process, if the operation was to work. Some operations, such as the pickle department, were almost completely manual. Workers worked close together and engaged in a significant amount of conversation. The extent to which management can get workers to view the work as a cooperative effort will effect the incidence of conflict in the plant.

A significant majority (82.6%) of the workforce saw the relations between the two groups as a team effort. Only 15.7% perceived the two groups as being on opposite sides. The skilled workers who had problems with overbearing supervision were less likely to see the relationship in cooperative terms with 36.4% of them claiming it to be an antagonistic relationship.

Women, again, were more favorably disposed toward the relationship than were the men. A substantial majority (89.2%) of the women chose teamwork as the model compared to 68.4% of the men. The results for men are very similar to those obtained by

Goldthorpe where 67% of the workers saw the effort as a cooperative one. The answer to this question can be interpreted in the same way as the answer to the first in concluding that the relationship between technology and attitudes towards one's firm is not as Blauner predicted. Those with the worst jobs are not more likely to view the company negatively.

In the previous section it was demonstrated that technology does affect some aspects of the worker's experience on the shop-floor. The freedom of movement, the intensity of work, and the amount of control the worker has are heavily influenced by the technology employed. However, while it may influence these aspects of a person's work, technology does not have the same relationship to a worker's attitude towards the employer.

Effects of monotony

Although the physical demands of the work have been discussed as a negative aspect of the job, workers who found their work physically tiring were, in fact, more likely to see this firm as better than most (Table 46). Most of the workers who found their job tiring were female and only 6 per cent of females found the company to be average when compared to others. Nor did this variable affect the workers' perception of management-worker relations (Table 47). However, there were some aspects of work which colored workers attitudes toward their firm.

While no particular group was more likely to find their job monotonous compared to any other group, monotony itself was related to the view workers had of their company. About 20% of those who felt their work was monotonous said the company was average compared to only 12.1% of those who reported that their job was not monotonous (Table 48). And 23.7% of those claiming monotony as a feature of their work saw worker-management relations in antagonistic terms compared to only 8.3% of those who did not view their work as monotonous (Table 49). And as will be seen below, monotony is also related to other negative attitudes about the firm (Table 50). In addition, those who found the pace of work too fast were also more likely to see the relationship in oppositional terms (Table 51).

What is different here from Goldthorpe's study is the relation between a negative experience of the job and a negative attitude towards one's employer. Goldthorpe found no such relation, and for him this was a further indication of the instrumental orientation.

But workers in this study have not demonstrated an instrumental orientation; they have, on the other hand, shown that for a minority of workers monotony and physically demanding work are sources of dissatisfaction and that they have not bartered these for a more materially rewarding job. They would like to see changes made.

This was the point made at the beginning. The majority of workers like their work while at the same time they have grievances

for which they would like a solution. What is also important to keep in mind is the economic vulnerability of most of these workers in a fragile economy. These workers are not interested in jeopardizing the job they have for another that is more than likely not out there.

Much of their satisfaction with work may reflect a satisfaction with working when so many are unemployed. This may account for the large number of workers who see the relationship between themselves and management in cooperative terms. They clearly understand that there is a minimal basis of cooperation necessary if both they and the company are to survive.

As a result, there has been only one incident that anyone can remember which resembled industrial action. There was a one day walkout many years previous over the suspension of a worker. Industrial relations have been good otherwise. The workers were asked why they thought this was so.

Reasons for good relations

About a quarter (28%) of the workers had no opinion on this question which is an indication of the involvement that most of them had in union-management issues (Table 52). Of those that did express an opinion, most (74%) credited the good industrial relations to positive factors. These were good cooperation between the two groups, fair management, and a strong union. Only fourteen people

(11.5%) concluded that it was because the union was weak or the workers were unwilling to strike.

It would appear that although there are differences in the types of work that workers are engaged in, which can be attributed to technology (or the lack of it), these differences do not seem to affect the attitudes that these workers have towards their firm along the lines suggested by Blauner.

Where there is no clear-cut effect, Goldthorpe concludes that the shop-floor experience does not sufficiently explain the attitudes of the workers toward their employer. However, as was mentioned in the previous section, the technology employed, along with management practice, permitted the workers to engage in a lively social life on the job. To this extent, the technology in place influences the experience of the workers, and their satisfaction with their social arrangements may explain partly their positive attitudes toward their firm.

The shop-floor experiences of most workers are reported as satisfactory, but this satisfaction has not been tied to an instrumental orientation beyond the basic economic nexus which supplies the worker with his livelihood. The majority of workers are satisfied both with their job and with the firm. The one crucial variable is monotony. As was seen previously, this factor was related to job dissatisfaction and to a lower evaluation of the company.

Thus, one can see a relationship between shop-floor experience and attitudes toward the firm. However, the tie between technology and this satisfaction is less clear. Those workers who experienced monotony were not more likely to come from one level of skill rather than another.

Part of the difficulty here is the use of the term technology. Some jobs are seen as more technologically advanced than others. While this may be the case on the face of it, the actual work that employees do may be tedious and offer little in the way of variety even for those in the most technologically advanced jobs. The technology may be in the equipment, not in the worker. More needs to be done in looking at the work that workers actually do.

The range of skills required for even the 'unskilled jobs' may reveal that there is not the gap between them and the formally designated 'skilled jobs' that the superficial definitions would indicate. Unskilled work may be more skilled than is believed while skilled work may be less skilled than is supposed. In this case, women's work may not be as different from men's work as the pay levels and other rewards would indicate.

Direct questions on firm

These workers were asked other direct questions to examine more closely their orientation to their firm. The basic question becomes one of measuring their level of instrumental orientation.

As Goldthorpe sees it, workers who have negative attitudes toward the work itself but who do not have negative attitudes toward the firm hold these attitudes because they are instrumentally oriented. Workers who are interested in work primarily for the economic benefits it can provide, so that they can live well outside of work, have this instrumental orientation. The workers in this study have not demonstrated such an orientation and have in fact shown, at least for a minority, that there is a link between certain attitudes toward their work and a negative attitude towards the firm.

Do other firms offer the same advantages?

A substantial majority of these workers did not chose pay as a reason for staying with the firm nor as something preferable to good companions and supervisors. With this in mind, they were then asked if they thought there were many other firms offering the same advantages (Table 53). Fourteen per cent of the workers expressed no opinion on this question. More men than women felt other companies gave the same advantages, but the important difference between these two groups was really in the response of the skilled workers.

Nine of the eleven skilled men concluded that other firms gave the same advantages. Of course, it must be remembered that the skilled workers are not tied to this company the way other workers are. Their skills are not company or even industry specific. They

are governed by a contract which would give them the same working conditions in many other companies as their contract is negotiated industry wide. These workers have more flexibility than do other workers in the plant.

Nonetheless, more men than women saw other companies as offering the same advantages. Only 14.5% of women had this opinion compared to 42.1% of the men. This might be considered surprising when one considers the heavy work that these women do and the lower reward they receive for that work. However, since the women expressed such high interest in social rewards and since so many were reluctant to even move to another department, it is not unexpected that few would see advantages in other firms. The men did not reveal the same attachment to their social groups and, as a result, would not be looking at the same variables in making a comparison.

Goldthorpe considered the low percentage (25%) amongst his workers who thought other firms offered the same advantages as an indication of instrumental orientation. Also, a large percentage of his workers had chosen their present employers because of the higher pay and other benefits.

The men in this study did not indicate that they had the same reasons for preferring their present work, nor did as many of them see their company as offering exclusive benefits to the same degree.

The workers in this plant have a realistic assessment of their own firm. They recognize that, given all factors, this company is

better than most. For some employees who have difficulties with the work they do, this company is the same as others. However, their own negative experience on the job leads them to believe that such is the case. Those who find their work monotonous are more likely to have other negative attitudes about the firm. Their orientation to the firm is affected by their work situation. That is not to say it is solely a product of such experience, but that it is heavily influenced by it.

Attitudes towards work study

Most of the workers in this company recognize that their interests are not always synonymous with management's. They were asked how they saw the role of work study personnel, that is, people who conduct time and motion studies (Table 54). As Ireland had recently become a member of the European Economic Community, it was expected to fall into line with many of the workplace standards in effect throughout the community. To this effect the company had engaged a consultant to conduct a study to determine the content of each shop-floor job with an eye to rectifying the differences between men's pay and women's pay. It was a first step towards equal pay for equal work. The consultant was undertaking his work while this researcher was conducting this study, thus the workers were familiar with this process. The workers make a clear differentiation between their answer to this question and the

previous one about whether relations between management and worker could be viewed as teamwork or as antagonistic.

Whereas most saw relations between the two groups as cooperative, the majority viewed the work-study people in a negative light. This apparent contradiction is not quite what it seems. The workers realize that while the two groups need each other, management also has the goal of increasing productivity by making them work faster. The survival of the firm depends on both groups doing their part, but they do not always have the same interests.

Almost half (48.8%) of the workers held the view that work study people tried to make things go faster. Those who found their work physically tiring were more likely to think that the goal was to make them work faster (Table 55). However, generally the workers were able to accept this as a normal part of relations and did not seem to harbour any negative feelings toward the company as a result. Many had mentioned that they saw the union as the protector of their interests. This will be looked at later.

The skilled men once again stood apart from the other workers in their opinions. While 30% of unskilled, and 51% of the semi-skilled, thought work-study personnel made things run smoother, only 9% (one of the eleven skilled men) felt the same way. Fewer of them also viewed management-worker relations as cooperative and fewer saw the company as offering better advantages compared to other firms.

Can company pay more?

Another area of potential conflict is that of 'a fair day's pay for a fair day's work'. About 74% of Goldthorpe's workers felt they were being underpaid relative to the profits that the company earned. He attributed the workers' belief to their instrumental orientation.

On the other hand, only 24.8% of the people in this sample felt that the company could have paid more (Table 56). This is consistent with the conclusion that these workers have not demonstrated an instrumental orientation. It does not mean that the workers were satisfied with their income, but that was not the question. It would be unusual if people who are on the low end of the pay scale in society were not concerned about their income. It was mentioned previously that some women had complained that they were not eligible for overtime and the extra money it brought.

The very fact that men willingly worked overtime is an indicator that the regular pay was not sufficient for their needs as they saw them. Even though these workers did have concerns about money, they did not think that the company could afford to pay more. This attitude may be an indication of these workers experience as working class people outside the plant. They were well aware of the few job opportunities available.

It is possible that their orientation to the firm on this issue is a reflection of their awareness of the precarious position of many

firms in Ireland. This company was a wholly owned subsidiary of one of the world's largest food companies. Its construction of new facilities gave some confidence to the workers that their jobs were secure. However, these workers recognized that many like themselves were unemployed or were in danger of losing their jobs. In such an environment, security of employment counts for more than monetary compensation itself.

On the other hand, their feelings that the company could not pay more may relate to their in-plant experiences as well. Their relations with the company, both personally and through their union, may have convinced them that there was little more to be taken from the company.

The point is that these workers did not exemplify an instrumental orientation on this question any more than they did on others. It is possible that their belief that the firm was paying its share influenced their orientation in a manner which muted any expression they might have had on monetary questions. Perhaps if they believed that the company could pay more, they may then have placed more emphasis on the pay they were receiving. Pay was not as salient an issue for these workers because they did not think there was any more money to be had. Whereas the men in Goldthorpe's sample, believing they were not given their share, were more likely to stress this aspect of their working life.

It is again interesting to note that workers who found their job monotonous were also more likely to think the company could

afford to pay more (Table 50). A majority of skilled workers also felt the company could pay more. This was not true of the other two groups.

Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, it is relevant to note that the differences that these workers manifest do not seem to be related to technology, at least not in the manner proposed by Blauner. For the most part, the women in this plant have the least rewarding, most difficult jobs, while the craftsmen supposedly have the most interesting and most rewarding jobs. However, the women rate the company higher than do the craftsmen (and men in general).

Men, particularly the skilled workers, are more likely to think that other companies offer similar advantages. Almost 35% of men (but 45% of skilled men) compared to only 6% of women think the firm is average. Further, 31% of men (36% of skilled men) compared to only 8% of women feel that management and workers are on opposite sides. Only 9% (one person) of skilled workers felt the purpose of work study was to make things run smoother compared to 30% of unskilled and 51% of semi-skilled workers.

On the issue of whether the company could pay more, the skilled workers were the only group in which a majority thought the company could afford to be more generous. It should always be kept in mind that the number of skilled workers is very small and to this

degree the differences between them and the other groups may be exaggerated.

But given the differences that do appear between men and women and skilled workers and other workers, it is important to offer reasons for those differences. Part of the explanation may lie in the orientation of these groups to their work which is developed outside the plant.

Women and men in a sexually differentiated and segregated society like Ireland are socialized to expect different rewards from the workplace. The very structure of the workplace itself is a reflection of the ways Irish society deals with the sexes as workers. Thus, the socialization that women and men undergo before entering the labor market is reinforced by the structure of relations they encounter on the job.

The same is true for the skilled workers. They have a separate education and an apprenticeship which builds an identity based on the differences between them and other workers. It is an identity that is based on sex and skill. Whereas the less skilled workers might identify themselves more with the company, the skilled workers identify themselves with their trade. As they do not owe their training to a specific company or industry, they are less likely to feel an allegiance to their employer.

It must also be added that the skilled workers could expect similar working conditions in other companies for the most part. Their unions negotiate contracts for trades across the country and

not for the individual company. An important difference between skilled workers and other less skilled workers is that the skilled men experience lower unemployment than do the unskilled and one result is that the skilled workers emigrate in lower numbers than unskilled workers (Peillon, 38). Skilled workers have been among the primary beneficiaries of Ireland's efforts to industrialize since the 1950's (Courtney 1986, 37)

Another important aspect of the differences between the skilled workers and other workers relates to their identity as autonomous, responsible tradesmen. As many of them experienced oppressive supervision, they would likely offer a less positive appraisal of the company. Freedom from close supervision is a salient issue with skilled men. Close supervision is an attack on their self-image and self-worth. They enter the plant with a specific identity cultivated in trade school.

This identity is perhaps fostered even earlier as young people in Ireland are aware of the differences in pay and status which are accorded to skilled workers contrasted with those given to unskilled or semi-skilled ones. As well, skilled workers make great efforts are through their strong unions to maintain and even enhance these differences.

The organization and design of work strengthen this identity on the job. The skilled workers are male, have their own unions, and are in separate departments with their own supervisors. The dual segregation based on sex and skill reinforces their distinctiveness.

Both the experience on the job and the orientation of the workers before they enter the plant affect their attitudes towards their employer. Ireland, although it has been industrialising, has not made much room for women on the labor market. The percentage of women participating in the labor force had hardly changed in the period between 1951 and 1983. In 1951, this rate was approximately 30 per cent, whereas in 1983 it had increased only slightly to 31.5 per cent. There are pressures for women to remain outside the job market in Ireland and when they do participate they find that the good jobs are closed off to them (Wickham 1986, 88). However, with so few jobs available to women in Ireland, it may account for the reported high level of satisfaction with their employer as those who do have work are grateful for having a job at all.

Women have had to face an ideology of the family in Ireland that has had a serious impact on their ability to participate fully in the labor market. The expectation for Irish women to leave the labor force once they are married has been quite strong. This is not only a social norm but many organizations have institutionalized this policy as well. Teachers, bank workers, and civil service workers had to leave their jobs once they married (Beale 1986, 140).

This has meant that there are fewer jobs available for married women who might wish to work or who need to work for financial considerations. This increases downward pressure on the wages which women can expect in the marketplace. The lack of jobs in teaching, banking, and the civil service also means fewer good jobs

are accessible and this has confined many women to the secondary labor market with its lower paying, less secure jobs.

Women's pay has lagged far behind that of men's even when doing the same work. In 1970, women's hourly earnings were approximately 56 percent of men's earnings in the industrial sector (Beale, 146). This is because women have been relegated to working in low-paying industries in the lowest paying jobs. In addition, the market has organized these jobs around the needs of men.

Women enter the plant aware of the inferior jobs available to them. The availability of overtime is one example of how the labor market favors men. As many women are responsible for domestic work as well as the job they hold outside the home, it is nearly impossible for them to engage in overtime work. In this factory, many of the men worked nearly 50 hours a week. This schedule can only be possible in a society where these men have someone to look after their needs at home as well as their children. This rigid work schedule militates strongly against the needs of many women who may have a parent, sibling, or children to look after. Women need a more flexible schedule to accommodate to their needs but this has been rare in Ireland.

There has also been a shortage of part-time work in Ireland that best suits the needs of mothers of young children. The trade unions have not been very active in promoting this area of work as they have been more concerned with the rights of full time workers who are predominantly male. However, the unions are not alone in

their lack of attention to the issues which concern women. Ireland has few day-care facilities available for women who need them, nor are there politicians pushing for the type of legislation that would grant women the maternity leave they require to both look after their child properly and to protect their place in the workforce.

In this factory, all union stewards are male as are all mangers. Women's lack of participation at the top of either organization confirms their experience prior to entering the plant. Women cannot expect too much from work. As a result, many seek rewards in other areas such as social relations. Women's work is so organized as to permit the development of strong social ties and this strengthens the expectations they may have had before their employment. The type of work they do with its inferior rewards and heavy workload also confirms their expectations of less rewarding work. At the least, women, whatever their orientation before their employment, have to adapt to the way the work is organized and seek whatever rewards the job may offer.

It would appear that the stress Blauner and others placed on technology as an explanatory variable is not supported. Goldthorpe's emphasis on an orientation developed prior to entering the plant deserves some attention. However, the experience of work on the job cannot be ignored.

While Goldthorpe's emphasis on an out-of-work orientation is supported, there does not seem to any support for a conclusion that these workers have an instrumental orientation. The workers were

generally satisfied with their company and this satisfaction does not appear related to material benefits.

The experience, however, of most working people in Ireland before joining the labor force must, in some way, shape the attitudes of these workers to their jobs. Approximately 42 per cent of the working population in Ireland during the 1970's was made up of working class people (Peillon, 35). The majority of these workers are either unskilled or semi-skilled having little formal training or education. Most of these workers have not received post-primary education and some have not even completed their primary education.

This large group of workers has for a long time been particularly vulnerable to the twin afflictions of unemployment and emigration. It would not be surprising to find that this group of workers would be more interested in a good, steady job rather than an insecure one paying higher wages. The workers are not alone in their thinking as Irish unions, reflecting the aspirations of their members, seek industrial and economic development with the primary aim of providing employment. In addition, the large majority of female workers in this plant, who are even more vulnerable to the vagaries of the labor market, are very much concerned about their job security.

Workers, particularly in the private sector, are unwilling to engage in actions which would threaten their jobs. They are aware of the precarious nature of their jobs and, as a result, support the

goals of the bourgeoisie which favor economic growth and the expansion of employment opportunities.

Chapter 7

The Worker and the Union

The next area of concern is the relationship of these workers to their unions. In Ireland, there exists a national trade union body known as the Irish Congress of Trade Unions. There are more than ninety trade unions affiliated to the ICTU, and while the goal of this body may be to unite all workers in common pursuit of certain goals there are many obstacles in the way. There are many divisions amongst the various unions, some of which have even led to strikes not against the employer but against one another. The decisions of the Congress are not binding on the individual member unions until and unless the individual unions ratify these decisions. However, it does exercise some considerable moral authority and has been able to intervene successfully in some inter-union disputes (Trade Union Division 1982, 8).

The craft unions have never identified themselves with other manual workers, but rather strive to maintain the differences both in income and status. These unions do not see themselves at the vanguard of a working class movement but are far more interested in protecting their own interests. Thus, the ICTU is made up of many small unions each pursuing its particular interests, while the

general body attempts to formulate policy to the benefit of Irish workers as a whole.

The trade union movement is particularly concerned with the issues of wages, benefits, and employment. Employment through increased economic activity is the key issue for unions as this has long been a serious problem in Ireland. To this end the unions put pressure on the State to intervene in the economy to boost production and investment. However, this does not mean that the unions do not see a role for private enterprise. The Irish unions are generally supportive of the Irish bourgeoisie and reserve their anti-capitalist sentiments for the foreign investor (Peillon, 72). They also support state aid to Irish companies in difficulty rather than takeovers as a solution to economic woes.

The Irish unions see themselves as partners in the development of Ireland's economy and to this end participate in many state bodies working toward this goal. They are less interested in ideas about industrial democracy or worker ownership than they are in the economic project of the Irish bourgeoisie. They themselves do not present a radical alternative to the development and improvement of the Irish economy.

In this company all workers belonged to a union as a matter of course. The factory operated as a closed-shop. Once a person joined the factory, they automatically became a member of one of the unions.

There were several different unions operating in this factory, but most of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers belonged to the same one. The skilled workers were represented by different unions depending on their skill. Their contract was negotiated by their craft union which attempted to set nation-wide standards for all its members. Thus, there were different unions for the boiler men, the electricians, the machinists, the plumbers and other skilled workers.

The transportation workers, who were not involved in this study, had their own union as well. All union leaders in this factory were male. This was the case for the representatives of the eighty-three female workers in this plant.

Goldthorpe concluded that the workers in his study had little interest in union affairs beyond the goal of improving their economic well being. He attributed this attitude to the instrumental orientation which they brought with them into the factory. They showed little interest in the union as an instrument of class consciousness and for him this marked an important change in the way workers have traditionally viewed their unions.

This is a questionable assumption. It is not at all clear that workers have seen their union as an instrument for much more than improving their economic situation. Perhaps those in leadership roles have advanced revolutionary themes, and to the extent that their unions exercised real power, this has led to the belief that these were the views of all members.

Goldthorpe was not asking his workers questions about class consciousness, but was interpreting answers to questions about participation in union affairs as indications of class consciousness. It is quite possible that these workers have come to a realistic understanding of the limited role that their union can play given the structure of power in their society. Experience may have taught them what they can expect their union to do for them. As well, even if these workers were quite clear about their position in the class hierarchy, they may not see their union as the principle revolutionary force, if they even desired such a revolution.

Olson (1965, 86) offers an explanation for the low level of involvement in union affairs by Goldthorpe's workers. He says that low participation in union affairs is normal and consistent with members overwhelmingly supporting their unions. The workers may not attend meetings themselves but are fervent in the belief that others should attend. Each individual feels that there is little to gain economically by assisting at a union meeting while at the same time realizes that whatever gains are made by the union will be dispersed to all. The union member also feels that his or her personal participation will have little effect on the outcome of the union's positions.

But what Salaman (1986, 87) and Sabel (1982, 188) have pointed out is that workers who appear to have no interest in union affairs can, given the right circumstances, become quite militant and conscious of their shared interests. Workers do bring their own

orientation to the job which affects the participation they have in union issues. However, experience may change that orientation and allow for disparate points of view to be overcome in order to achieve a common purpose. Also, Rinehart (1978, 10) mentions that the workers in Goldthorpe's study did go out on strike not long after his study was completed.

There are certain elements which Giddens (1982, 160) identifies as being influential in the development of class consciousnes These include the experience of authority at work, opportunity f mobility, and the division of labor. However, these factors only low for a potential development of shared interests; they are not nough in themselves to assure a class consciousness.

Sabel 982, 187) pointed to the expectations which different groups broug t with them to the factory. Their experience as peasants, for example, gives them a different orientation than urban bred craftsmen. The workers' outlook is a critical element in the growth of any solidarity amongst disparate groups. However, Sabel adds that it is through experience that workers learn how to realize their ambitions (p. 188). In this factory, as has been demonstrated, there are important differences in outlook between the men and women.

In Ireland, the role of women is primarily one of being a wife, mother, and homemaker (Wickham, 87); and the perceptions that women bring to the workplace must be molded by this preparation.

The point is that workers bring their own identities to work which may be further developed by the structure of the workplace. The relationships at work may serve to increase rather than decrease the divisions amongst workers who may see this split as serving their own particular interests.

Although workers may appear to the outsider to be occupying the same place in the organizational and societal world, the workers may see it quite differently. Differences, though small, may be significant, and are often quite rigorously fought for and preserved. While management may benefit from, and even encourage, the divisions among work groups, it should be noted that these groups are often the most resistant to changes which would see differences disappear or even narrow.

The skilled workers in Ireland have traditionally been well organized, but have not seen their interests as synonymous with those of other less skilled workers. The craft unions have strenuously defended the wage differential between themselves and other unions. Further, they have militated against national union movements in order to preserve their independence (Peillon 1982, 69).

Class consciousness cannot be taken for granted. The existence of such consciousness amongst a group of workers is an issue to be investigated. The divisions of skill and sex within this company present a barrier to common attitudes and the development

of consciousness. Sabel (p. 18) says that it is in a common struggle that classes form.

But, generally, in Ireland the trade union movement does not present itself as a force for radical change. It fights for the economic rights of workers but not with the goal of replacing capitalism, or of instituting some sort of workers' control.

Reform of capitalistic society is the goal so that the economic benefits may be shared by all. At the same time, however, there exist strong divisions amongst the unions themselves which make it difficult to achieve this reform. The orientation of workers to their union cannot be separated from the orientation of the trade union movement as a whole to Irish society.

Socialism is not well received in many quarters of Irish society, and while the Labor Party draws most of its support from the working class, this working class is more likely to vote for the conservative Fianna Fail. The Church is vehemently opposed to socialism, although it supports programs which would benefit the underprivileged. Thus, the view of unions and industry as working towards the same goal is supported throughout Irish society.

Most sectors are in support of the goal of economic growth within the capitalistic framework. The unions, who share this orientation, are aware of the conflict over the division of rewards. Their purpose is to increase the share going to the working class. The trade union movement itself is hardly ideologically motivated

and, consequently, it would be surprising to find workers interested in their union for ideological reasons.

As has been mentioned before, unemployment has been a traditional problem in Ireland. One solution has been emigration. However, this has serious effects on families throughout the country. For this reason, Peillon considers that the main principle underlying union activity in Ireland has to do with job creation and job protection. Although the unions recognise their divergent interests from those of the capitalists, they support and co-operate both with the State and private enterprise in the crucial area of economic development. In this atmosphere, while relationships between management and union are not always harmonious, there does not exist a division in which one side considers the other an enemy.

Peillon (p. 56) says that the industrial class favors organized industrial relations believing that strong, responsible unions can work out agreements which benefit all. The willingness to accept unions is reflected in the high number of unskilled workers who are unionised (72%). One would expect in this social atmosphere for workers to have a practical rather than ideological approach to their union. Because of the co-operation amongst the companies, the State, and the unions in the goal of economic development, one would not expect the workers to have an orientation which stressed conflict as a means of achieving their goals.

The union orientation is an instrumental one, but so is that of everyone else. Economic betterment both to decrease unemployment and to have more to share is a common goal. However, where there is so much agreement on the societal project, could one expect a great deal of involvement on the part of the workers?

The workers in this study do not reveal any strong ideological commitment to their unions either. Halle (p. 175), found little participation in union affairs amongst the group of workers he studied. The men were, however, prepared to back up their union when it was necessary. Halle (p. 204) points out that his men clearly saw themselves as differentiated from the middle class and the rich. The workers in this study often referred to themselves as 'working men', clearly making a distinction between themselves and others. Low participation in union affairs may not be representative of a lack of class consciousness, but may be an indication of the practical exigencies which working people have to struggle with everyday.

Union work takes up time, and, particularly for women, this is in short supply. Further, it would appear that a low participation in union matters would indicate a low level of an instrumental orientation. It would seem that it would be harder to mobilize people to fight for abstract ideals, and a lot easier to arouse their interest in concrete matters, such as pay. Those workers who are instrumentally oriented, having concrete goals, should be more involved in union affairs.

This is particularly important when one considers that Goldthorpe's workers felt that the company they worked for had substantial profits and was underpaying them. However, the participation of Goldthorpe's men in union affairs was not very high, and to conclude that this is an indication of an instrumental orientation is curious.

In this study, most workers felt their company was paying what it could afford. There would be little point in agitating for more of what is not there. When one combines their satisfaction with the firm's fairness with their understanding of the societal project, one could not expect large participation in union matters.

Attitudes Toward Union

Reasons for joining a union

The questions in this section are not questions about class, but are questions about union participation and purpose. Although these workers worked in a company in which everyone had to be a member of the union, they were asked why they became members of the union (Table 57). A majority of the women (60%) and 42% of the men said they joined because they were asked to or because they had to. Only 5% of them reported that they joined out of a belief in unionism, while 25.6% said they joined for protection. The men were twice as

likely to say they became union members for reasons of protection than were the women.

There does not seem to be an ideological basis for becoming union members, although to be really certain a different question would have to be posed. Since their membership was mandatory, it is not surprising that so many gave that as their reason for joining the union. Perhaps a direct question on whether they thought workers had a duty to be union members or not would be a fairer indication of their commitment to unionism as a principle. In addition, they might have been asked whether they thought they could do as well without their union as a sign of their belief in its efficacy.

However, the argument presented above on the role of unions in Ireland concluded that the union movement itself was not ideologically motivated. With so many workers in Ireland being unionized, it does not involve the same kind of struggle and commitment that being a unionist does in other countries. The movement itself is not under attack in Ireland but is accepted by the State and industry as a legitimate part of the economic project. Peillon (p. 73) states that, in 1970, unions had representatives on over ninety committees and boards in Ireland.

Nonetheless, 39.5% of the men said they joined the union for protection. This fits in with the goals of the union movement which is to protect the jobs of workers. To the degree that job security can be considered to be an instrumental orientation, then one would

have to conclude that many of these men had an instrumental orientation. However, this would be stretching the definition too far. No matter what a worker's orientation to work is, good social relations, personal development, or money, none of this can be achieved without paid work. It is the *sine qua non* of any orientation. The interesting point is the difference between the men and women on this question.

Perhaps in a society where work is mainly considered the preserve of men, while family is considered the domain of the women, it is not surprising that more men than women seem concerned about their job. A man's definition of himself in Ireland is more tied up with his ability to earn a living for himself and his family. Women, in Ireland, are expected to carry out a traditional role of mother and homemaker. However, many women in this firm had responsibilities both as primary wage earner and as homemaker. This explains why 20% of the women offered protection as a reason for becoming union members.

Attendance at union meetings

The workers interest in union affairs was tested by asking questions on their attendance at union meetings and in participation in voting for union officers (Table 58). Few workers attended shop meetings regularly. Only 12.4% of them reported attending meetings on a regular basis with another 9.1% saying they attended

occasionally. A large majority (78.5%) of workers said they rarely or never attended union meetings. However, this should not be that surprising. These workers have not demonstrated a willingness to support their unions for reasons of principle. They also said they were satisfied that the company was treating them fairly as far as pay was concerned. Without issues, there is little motivation for workers to invest their time in their union.

This does not mean that they do not support their union. Given the right conditions workers may back their union. The memory of the workers in this plant was that they had engaged in a one day walkout many years previously over the suspension of a worker. However, other than this there had been no issue which had galvanized the workers into action. The results presented earlier indicated that nearly all workers said they were satisfied with their job. That there has been so little union activity by way of strike action may be considered a further sign of that satisfaction.

Reasons for not attending union meetings

Those workers who reported attending meetings only rarely or never were asked why this was so (Table 59). A fair number (42%) of the men and women replied that they had no interest in union affairs. There was no difference between the men and women on this issue. However, on the aspect of meetings being held at a bad time there was a large gap between the sexes. Only 3 of the 24 men

said time was a factor, while 32 of the 71 women said that time was the major reason they did not attend union meetings. The women, of course, had little time for meetings held after work when so many had to go home to start their second job.

Peillon (p. 38) points out that it is traditional for male workers to spend little time in household work and he mentions that the burden of housework falls on the shoulders of the worker's wife and daughters. While they engage in their household tasks he is free to journey to the pub or venture to a union meeting. In addition, while most of the workers in this factory were female, all of the shop stewards were male. This was the case throughout the union movement. Unionism is mainly a male preserve.

Another measure of participation is voting in shop steward elections. In this case, there was no participation as it had been so long since there had been an election. It appears that interest in union office is quite low, and union officers run unopposed. It must be remembered that since women were virtually excluded from running for office, there was not a large number of people to select candidates from.

Talking to Workmates About Union

As was the case in attending union meetings, the majority of workers spent little time talking to their fellow workers about union affairs (Table 60). Almost half of all workers (49.6%) said

they rarely talked to their workmates about union matters. A further 28.1% reported talking only now and then about union concerns.

There was, however, a difference between the sexes in talking to fellow workers. Although still a minority, 39.4% of men indicated talking at least a good deal to their workmates. Women showed much less interest with only 14.4% of them saying they talked a good deal or very often.

There was little change when it came to discussing union matters with shop stewards (Table 61). Nearly 80% of workers had little contact with their union representative. Fewer men discussed union issues with stewards than with workmates. While almost 40% talked with other workers only 31.6% talked with shop stewards.

One reason men conversed more often about union affairs may have been due to their concern about job security. As has been noted job security is a more salient issue for men. The impending relocation of the firm may have stimulated increased concern on the part of the men about their security. Although the company had guaranteed everyone's jobs, and the unions and workers supported the move to a modern facility, there was an awareness on the workers part that the new technology required fewer workers. Several men remarked that they knew that the company planned for a smaller workforce because there were fewer lockers in the new plant than workers being relocated. Still, a majority of both sexes (77.7%) rarely or never spoke to their stewards about union matters.

For the most part, union issues seem far removed from the daily concerns of these workers. This may be a reflection of the high level of satisfaction that the workers reported earlier. Also, the general consensus about the role of unions in Ireland leaves little room for debate. If the main goal of job protection was being met, there may have been little impetus to rock the boat.

Union Purpose

Perhaps the clearest indication that these workers do not manifest an instrumental orientation, while at the same time mirror the orientation of the unions and other organizations in Irish society in their concern for job protection, is their response to the question on union purpose. The workers were given a choice between their union being concerned with the position of the firm or being concerned with workers' interests only (Table 62).

A substantial majority (78.5%) of the men and women said that they favored the position of the firm as being most important. Only 16.5% thought the union should be looking after their interests only. It is interesting that almost 90% of the men chose the former goal compared to 73% of the women. This coincides with the impression gained from the first question as to why they joined the union. More men than women said they had joined for protection; and women have not been as well looked after when it comes to benefits.

In addition to this question, workers were asked to chose between having the union work for more pay or a greater say in management (Table 63). There are some difficulties with this question. The workers have been given a choice of two items for which they may have no particular preference. All previous questions have demonstrated a low level of interest in pursuing more money. It might have been better to ask the workers if they thought the union should be seeking more money. Adding the choice may have led them to select the management option even though they may have had no preference for it in reality.

A clear majority of men (65%) preferred the union seek more say in management. This was true of 48% of the women. However, 42% of the women felt that they would like to see the union work for higher pay. This compares to the 26% of men who felt this way. Perhaps this answer reflects the inferior economic position of women in the company.

At the same time, the high number of workers choosing more say in management, both males and females, may be an indication of the workers concern with job security. It might reflect their belief that a say in running things may be a better guarantee that their particular interests were being taken into account.

Although there is some doubt about the efficacy of this question, it does support previous findings. The men are more conscious about job security and the women are more concerned about pay. The overall result, however, is that as a group these

workers show less interest in monetary concerns than those in Goldthorpe's study where 52% of the men chose more pay as the union goal compared to 40% for more say in management.

Conclusion

The men and women in this research did not demonstrate strong participation in the activities of their unions. The evidence indicates that a clear majority of workers pay little attention to union affairs. There has not even been a vote for shop stewards that anyone could remember. Attendance at union meetings is very poor while even away from the formal setting of the meeting few workers talk to each other about union issues. Workers were far more interested in looking after the security of the firm than their own interests.

Of those who were interested in union affairs, men were more likely to attend meetings than women. Men were also more likely to engage their shop stewards in conversation about union issues. Protection was of greater concern to men while women were more interested in money matters. However, it must be remembered that it was a minority who paid active attention to union matters.

It was suggested that one reason workers were so little interested in their unions was because they were satisfied with the way things were. Most workers were achieving what they wanted from their work so there seemed little need to involve the union in

changing things. That there had been no strike other than a one day affair in anyone's memory was also seen as an indication of satisfaction. The low participation, however, was not seen as an indication of disaffection with the union. The workers did not make disparaging remarks about their union when commenting on any aspect of it. There was no movement to quit the union.

Women had little time for union activity which reflects both the role they are expected to play in Ireland and their place in the union movement. Women carry the burden of housework in Ireland. After work, most had to dash home to begin their second job which left no time for union meetings. In addition, union work was segregated along the sexual divide. All the shop stewards were male which mirrors the situation in unions throughout Ireland. (It should be noted that all foreman and upper management in this company were male). Unionism is a male preserve in Ireland, and the poorer working conditions of women are both a result of this and a contributing factor to it. Irish society does not encourage activism on the part of women and this attitude is carried over to the plant.

The major reason, however, for the low level of activism on the part of union members may be explained by the orientation of unionism which is supported by other sectors of the economy as well. Unions see their prime goal as providing protection of existing jobs and of encouraging economic growth to increase employment, all with the view to curbing emigration. This goal is to be accomplished for the most part within the existing set of

arrangements. While the unions may object to the division of the rewards, there is no attempt to dismantle the capitalist approach to economic development.

The State and the capitalist class welcome responsible unions as partners in the growth of the economy. This acceptance of the union movement has resulted in the unions participating in a large number of cooperative bodies along with the state and business. It has also meant a high rate of unionism amongst the working class. The ready acknowledgment of the role that unions can play in the societal project has meant that on many issues there is little disagreement amongst the parties involved. The orientation of the unions coincides with that of the society at large, and as a result, has to affect the attitudes and behaviour of the union membership.

Workers enter the company aware that for many of them the alternative is unemployment or emigration. For them a job means being able to pursue one's livelihood in Ireland, an important value to Irish people. By extension, an important part of Irish workers' satisfaction may be that they can chose their country of work.

The workers in Ireland may have an orientation to work which places a high value on remaining in one's country of birth. This cultural value of being able to live with one's own people explains why these workers place so little emphasis on monetary issues. Their specific orientation supports the view of Sabel who felt that one's cultural and geographical origin can markedly influence one's orientation.

Thus, the low participation of these workers in union affairs is partly due to the single-mindedness of the society in its pursuit of one project: job creation and job protection. Everyone agrees, so there is little need for ordinary members to become actively engaged in union matters.

Burawoy (1979), Nichols and Beynon (1977), Halle (1984), and Salaman (1986) showed in their research that workers can exercise control over their work in various ways. Burawoy wrote of the informal patterns of working (games) that the workers had developed to get the job done (p. 79). Attempts by management to have the workers follow the formal procedures resulted in a breakdown of the production process.

Nichols and Beynon looked at the ways men in a chemical company acted against management as a means of gaining some control over their work.

Halle (p. 119) demonstrated the different kinds of knowledge that the workers have gained which enables them to exercise some control over their work. Salaman (p. 107) pointed to the patterns of relationships which enabled workers to resist efforts by management to change their work structure.

Much of the behaviour that workers engage in takes place outside of their relationship to their union. They create a culture at work which, while not always antagonistic to management, and sometimes in harmony with it, allows the workers to structure the

workplace to meet their needs. Thus, much of the activity that takes place at work is designed to take care of immediate problems.

Workers endeavor to make their work environment tolerable, and the consciousness that develops is not so much a class consciousness as an awareness that they have territory to protect. The line may not be stationary, and in some cases may be tolerated or encouraged by management which sees value in this type of structure. However, management has to be careful lest it step too far over the boundary and allow the potential for enlarged consciousness to be unleashed. Workers divided along sex, geographical, skill, or other lines may find common bonds.

But the major point is that workers do have a consciousness of themselves as different from the bosses. They see that they have separate interests from management and that the union is but one tool in their struggle to protect those interests. However, also the culture they have created at work gives them some protection. The examination of their relationship to their union is not a reflection of class consciousness, but only of their present viewpoint of the role they see the union playing in protecting their interests.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

This study had as one of its purposes examining the attitudes these workers had towards their job, their workmates, their company, and their union. Goldthorpe found that although his workers expressed dissatisfaction with the intrinsic nature of their jobs, most were satisfied with their job as their material needs were being met. He further concluded that these workers had an instrumental orientation which reflected itself in the attitudes these workers had towards one another, the company, and their union. The results in this study are quite different.

The Job

First, the overall level of satisfaction amongst this group of workers is higher than amongst Goldthorpe's sample. Several questions were posed to the workers to determine how attached they were to their present jobs. The lowest level of satisfaction expressed on any of these questions was 70%. In this study 18% of workers preferred a previous job in the same firm, while 22% of the workers in Goldthorpe's work indicated such a preference. While there is little difference between the two groups of workers on this

question, on others there is substantial variation. Only 15% of Irish workers expressed a desire for another shop-floor job which compares favourably with the 34% in the Luton study.

In Goldthorpe's study, 55% of workers said they preferred a previous job in another firm, while only 15% of the workers in this study said they did. And while 43% of his workers had thought of leaving their present job, only 24% of the workers in this study did so.

A concern might be that the presence of women in the Irish study skewed the results so that the Irish workers appeared to be more satisfied than the British workers all of whom were male. However, the Irish men and women differed little in percentage terms on these questions of preference or having thought of leaving. Although the percentage of workers who expressed the view that they preferred a previous job in another company was small, it was the one variable on which men and women differed significantly. While only 8.9% of women preferred a previous job, 34.6% of men did so. The percentage was 55% for the British workers.

There were some differences amongst the workers based on their level of skill on these questions. Skilled men were more likely to have preferred previous work elsewhere and to have thought of quitting their job compared to the other two skill groups. The number of skilled workers is quite low, however, and it is difficult to compare their attitudes to those of the other workers.

Other differences were apparent, however, in the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. For women, physical working conditions, the organization of work, good workmates and social relations, habituation to work and hours of work were salient issues. Women appeared to be no less satisfied than men even though their working conditions are poorer than the men's. Supervision, especially for the skilled men, and security were important issues for the men.

While a large majority of workers said they were satisfied with their present work situation, this did not mean that the workers had no concerns. Monotony and physically tiring work were important negative aspects of these workers lives. Just over 50% of workers stated their jobs were monotonous. Monotony was negatively associated with many variables measuring job satisfaction.

Workers mentioned other dissatisfactions and spoke of changes they would like to see to improve their situation. Skilled workers were quite concerned about the type of supervision they had and it affected their attachment to the firm.

Women, who worked at the inferior jobs, had several complaints as a result of this. Their dual role as chief wage earner and homemaker placed them in a difficult position. They worked at physically demanding jobs for much lower pay and without the opportunity to work overtime. At the same time women were very attached to their job for social reasons. They enjoyed the relationships of their workmates. Both men and women found the social atmosphere and the supervision an important reason for liking their work.

There are no doubt some workers who are instrumentally oriented as Goldthorpe defined it, but they are in a minority here. If these workers were to be interested in maximizing economic returns, they failed to demonstrate it in the issues they raised. The workers ignored pay as a reason for liking their jobs or as an aspect of their work that needed changing. When they were asked what kept them at this job, only 20% replied it was the pay. In addition, when workers were asked what reasons they had for having thought of leaving this job, only one worker offered pay as the reason.

The workers were also asked if they thought the company could afford to pay them more. Just under 25% of this sample thought the company could pay more, which is very different from the 74% response Goldthorpe received to the same question. The skilled workers in this sample were more likely to think the company could pay more with 55% of them saying yes.

A last indication of the difference between this group of workers and those in the Luton sample concerns the question of the role of the union. Fifty-two per cent of the Luton workers felt the union should be concerned with getting more pay while only 37% of these workers did so. What was interesting in this question was that women were more interested in the union pursuing more pay than were the men. No doubt this is a direct reflection on their inferior economic position, not only in this firm, but in Irish society.

Goldthorpe emphasized that orientation to work affects the satisfaction of workers. It was his contention that this orientation is

prior to the job. The world outside the workplace assuredly has some effect on the meaning a worker will derive from his work and on the attitudes he or she will bring to the job; but the approach a worker takes to his work is just as surely derived from the rewards, conditions, and atmosphere of the workplace. Whatever orientation a worker brings to the workplace is bound to be modified and shaped by the realities found there.

There is no clear indication of the orientation these workers might have brought into the factory. It was suggested, however, that these workers were influenced by the economic conditions of the country. There has been a continual wave of emigration from Ireland dating back to the 19th century. There are few opportunities for employment and the unemployment rate is usually over 10%. The satisfaction of these workers and their low emphasis on monetary matters might reflect their overall appreciation with having work at all in Ireland.

The Work Group

There was no support for Goldthorpe's thesis when we looked at the relationship of the workers to each other or to their firm. The workers in this study did not betray an instrumental attitude toward one another.

These workers engaged in conversation for a great deal of the time they were at work. Men did it more often than did the women. This was not of course due to the less gregarious nature of the women, but was due to the nature of the work that divided men from

women. Men were more free to engage in conversation as they were less governed by machines in doing their work. Also, many of the women worked in noisy locations and had less opportunity to move around. The skilled workers had the greatest opportunity to talk with his fellow workers and generally took full advantage of it. Only two workers answered that they rarely spoke with other workers.

Although the men had more opportunity to talk than did the women, there was a significant difference in the way they viewed their relationships. More than twice as many women than men said they would be upset if they had to move to another department. It would appear that the women have formed stronger bonds with their workmates than have the men with theirs.

As well, more women than men claimed to have close friends amongst their workmates. The differences between the men and women can be explained by the orientation that men and women bring to the workplace. Women have been socialized to expect much less from work than men and, in the case of this company, this has proved true.

Women's expectations are confirmed by the structure of the workplace. They are paid much less than the men, have no access to overtime, and have the heavier, dirtier, and noisier jobs. One of the few benefits the women can derive from work is the friendships they can develop. While the technology places restrictions on women's ability to move around, and to engage in conversation free

of noise, it is clear that technology itself is not responsible for the women's position. That some jobs are designated as women's jobs and others are designated as men's jobs is a social and political decision.

The men in this company may not have been as upset at the prospect of moving as the women because they have more rewards in their jobs. Women who have good friends at work have more to risk by moving elsewhere in the factory.

What is important, though, is that these workers spent a lot of time interacting with one another and in groups where possible. They enjoy these relations and it cannot be concluded that they have an instrumental attitude toward each other. They chose good workmates and good bosses by a wide margin over money as the most important aspect of a good job.

The relations these workers have with one another at work is possible, of course, partly through the latitude of the management. If management were not so conciliatory in its approach to the workers, there would be a lot less conversing taking place. However, perhaps this is an example of Burawoy's thesis at work. For him, management manufactures consent by obscuring the conflicts between itself and the workers. By letting the workers engage in conversation, the management assures itself of getting the work done. Talking is an intrinsic aspect of the work under this scheme of management.

The Firm

The majority of the workers in this company also had a positive attitude towards their company. More than 76% thought the firm was better than others they knew of, and 82% of the workers saw management and workers operating as a team. Again there were some differences between the women and the men as the women were generally more positive than the men.

As has been pointed out, the women have the more difficult work. It is more determined by machinery than is the men's work, and where it is not, it is more labor intensive. Women have more complaints about the heavy physical demands on them, but this has not coloured their attitude toward the company.

This leads to a curious conclusion about the relationship of technology to the attitudes a worker has towards their company. One would expect the women who had the fewest rewards from their jobs to be less positive about the company than were the men. This was not the case. Men were much less likely to see the relations between management and workers as that of a team, and far more of them felt the company was only average as compared to other companies they knew about. In particular, the skilled men had the most negative attitudes, although it was still a minority who felt this way.

On one question the skilled workers concluded that this company was no better than many others while the other workers

clearly felt the opposite. The skilled workers answered that many other firms offer the same advantages. Of course, given that their skill entitles them to the same working conditions and pay almost no matter almost where they work, it is easy to see why they replied thus. The other workers have no such protection or even such options.

For Goldthorpe, that there was no association between his variables of deprivation (monotony, pace of work, etc.) and attitudes towards the firm was a clear indication of the workers' instrumental orientation. In this study, however, monotony is associated with more negative attitudes towards the firm. Moreover, it should be added that workers were no more likely to come from one skill group over another. Workers who found their jobs monotonous were more likely to see management and workers on opposite sides.

A key question was whether the employees thought the company could afford to pay more. While a majority of skilled workers said yes (54%), altogether only 24% of workers thought so. This contrasts sharply with the 74% of the men in Goldthorpe's study who felt the company could pay more. Once again, this confirms the conclusion reached previously that this group of workers does not have an instrumental orientation.

The Union

The workers in this company have little involvement in union affairs. Only 12% attended union meetings on a regular basis, with 76% attending rarely or never. Men attended meetings more often than did the women.

Women complained that time was a factor in their not attending meetings. For many women, meetings held after work are out of the question when so many have to head home and begin their second job. It is not only for men to attend these meetings, but the meetings are also run by men. None of the stewards in this factory were women. Women were cut off from union affairs both by the structure of the unions and by the organization of its affairs.

But although little interest has been shown by the members in union affairs this did not mean that their sole interest in the union was an instrumental one. Most of the workers (78.5%) when asked whether the union should look after the position of the firm or the members' interests only chose the position of the firm. In addition, only 37% of workers said the union should seek more pay contrasted with 52% of the Luton sample. On these two particular questions, the male workers showed themselves to be more conservative than the female workers. A higher percentage of men thought the union should be more interested in the company's position than did the women.

Interpretation

Although the workers in this study do not appear to have an instrumental attitude, it remains to be explained why it is they are relatively satisfied with their jobs. The workers are not without complaints and there are many areas which could be improved upon, particularly in the working conditions of women.

As has been suggested throughout the paper, the workers do bring an orientation with them to the factory which is developed outside the factory walls. This orientation, however, is not the sole explanatory variable in determining the orientation of these workers.

In the introduction, the ideas of Gramsci and Althusser were mentioned and it would be useful to look at them once again. They proposed that there are key sectors in the society such as the schools, the church, the state, the media, and even trade unions which socialize the working class to accept their position in society. This is mainly done without force, although the key organizations of social control such as the police are not reluctant to use it.

Consent is usually secured, if not willingly, at least grudgingly, in most cases. And the workers, through their unions, often participate in their own submission. The trade schools in Ireland do an excellent job of preparing its skilled workers both in terms of giving them the necessary technical skills they need but

also in giving them the right combination of attitudes and values which make them such good workers. The unions are very involved in these trade schools.

Peillon points out that there is a wide consensus in Ireland amongst all significant sectors in society for one particular project: industrial growth. The State, the bourgeoisie, the Church, and the unions agree that the promotion of the economy is essential to the well-being of Ireland.

To this end, a great deal of negotiation has gone on to create a consensus amongst all important groups in the society. Ireland has had a bitter legacy of unemployment and its concomitant, emigration. The workers in this study are not unaware of either of these two outcomes.

These men and women know well that there are few options for most of them. Remaining in Ireland is an important value for Irish people and this value is reflected in the efforts of the various sectors to work together. Thus, the overall goal of the society can influence the orientation of these workers on the job.

The satisfaction of these workers may be explained partly by their contentment with their good fortune at having work when so many do not. As was pointed out, women in Ireland participate in the workforce at a rate of approximately 30 per cent. There is not much room in the economy for working women in Ireland and the jobs that are available tend to be poorly paid and in the secondary labor market where layoffs are more frequent. However, there are few

real differences between the men and women in this study on questions having to do with pay.

The inclusion of women in the sample has not skewed the results away from those of Goldthorpe. More women than men thought the union should be concerned with pay and with the position of the members rather than the firm's. Although in both instances it was a minority of workers who felt this way. However, the real satisfactions which these people gained from their work cannot be ignored either. As well, these men and women are employed by a long established firm which has recently made a large investment, a fact which gives them increased confidence and security.

Burawoy stressed the interior environment and its influence on workers' behavior and attitudes. He contended that the exterior environment was of much less importance in determining a workers' actions. Although he seems to have gone too much the other direction away from Goldthorpe, he does raise the interesting point of how management engages the workers' consent. The consent which Gramsci talks of prior to the worker entering the factory, Burawoy contends is secured inside it.

In the case of these Irish workers, management operates in an easy going fashion. However, both they and the workers are well aware of the economic situation. These workers do not have to be scolded into work as they know the consequences of failure. Management is able to gain their consent without having to resort to heavy-handedness. There is an awareness on the part of the workers

about the necessity for the firm to survive and it is reflected in their answers to many questions. Most chose the firm's well being over their own as a union goal.

Thus, there is a certain convergence of interests which leads these workers to accept less than ideal working conditions without much complaint. Management, the State and their own unions agree on the importance of industrial development. The stakes are high in a small, economically dependent country like Ireland. To this extent the workers have submerged some of their own interests for the sake of the greater goal of having work.

This issue raises questions about the attitudes of workers elsewhere now that so many have to compete in a world market. Perhaps other countries will find themselves moving in the same direction as Ireland and, perhaps, workers will not develop the instrumental orientation as predicted by Goldthorpe. The proto-typical worker may be less instrumentally oriented rather than more.

Tables

Table 1. Distribution of sample by skill and sex

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	%
UNSKILLED	8	55	63	52 1
SEMI-SKILLED	19	28	47	38.8
SKILLED	11	0	11	9.1
TOTAL	38	83	121	100
%	31.4	68.6	100	

Table 2. Pay levels for employees (in Irish pounds).

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	SKILLED (N=121)
Basic Wage Per Week	35.86	27.37	46.05
Overtime Wages	15.69	- - - -	28.03
Bonus Earned	19.72	10.94	8.11
Average Per Week	71.27	38.31	82.19

Table 3. Had done other jobs in the same firm.

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	95.2 (60)	91.5 (43)	0	85.1 (103)
NO	4.8 (3)	6.4 (3)	0	5.1 (6)
DNA	0	2.1 (1)	100 (11)	9.9 (12)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 3 A. Had done other jobs in the same firm.

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
YES	57.9 (22)	97.6 (81)	85.1(103)
NO	10.5 (4)	2.4 (2)	5.0 (6)
DNA	31.6 (12)	0	9.9 (12)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 4. Preference for a present job in comparison with other jobs previously held in the same firm.

	UNSKILLED (N=60)	SEMISKILLED (N=43)	SKILLED (N=0)	ROW TOTAL (N=103)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	68.3 (41)	72.1 (31)	0	69.9 (72)
NO	20.0 (12)	16.3 (7)	0	18.4 (19)
D.K.	11.7 (7)	11.6 (5)	0	11.7 (12)
COLUMN TOTAL	58.3 (60)	41.7 (43)	0	100 (103)

Table 4 A. Preference for a present job in comparison with other jobs previously held in the same firm.

	MALE (N=22)	FEMALE (N=81)	ROW TOTAL (N=103)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	77.3 (17)	67.9 (55)	69.9 (72)
NO	18.2 (4)	18.5 (15)	18.4 (19)
D.K.	4.5 (1)	13.6 (11)	11.7 (12)
COLUMN TOTAL	21.3 (22)	78.7 (81)	100 (103)

Table 5. Reasons for preferring present job.

	Unskilled (N=41)	Semi-skilled (N=31)	Skilled (N=0)	ROW TOTAL (N=72)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
A. INTRINSIC				
Opportunity for use of skill	1	1	-	2
More variety in work tasks	4	2	-	6
More autonomy	3	3	-	6
More intrinsic interest	2	7	-	9
B. PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT				
Better physical conditions	5	3	-	7
Supervision, atmosphere	16	8	-	24
C. EXTRINSIC REWARDS				
Better pay	1	1	-	2
Habituation to work	13	8	-	21
Other	7	3	-	10

Table 5 A. Reasons for preferring present job.

	Males (N = 17)	Females ((N = 55)	ROW TOTAL (N = 72)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
A. INTRINSIC			
More opportunity for use of skill	1	1	2
More variety in work tasks	0	6	6
More autonomy	1	5	6
More intrinsic interest	2	7	9
B. PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT			
Better physical conditions	2	5	7
Better supervision, atmosphere	3	21	2 4
C. EXTRINSIC REWARDS			
Better pay	1	1	2
Habituation to work	6	15	2 1
Other	3	7	1 0

Table 6. Preference for another job in the same firm

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	17.5 (11)	14.9 (7)	0	14.9 (18)
NO	77.8 (49)	85.1 (40)	100(11)	82.6 (100)
D.K.	4.8 (3)	0	0	2.5 (3)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 6 A. Preference for another job in the same firm

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	18.4 (7)	13.3 (11)	14.9 (18)
NO	78.9 (30)	84.3 (70)	82.6 (100)
D.K.	2.6 (1)	2.4 (2)	2.5 (3)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 7. Reasons for preferring another job in the same firm

	UNSKILLED (N =11)	SEMISKILLED (N =7)	SKILLED (N =0)	ROW TOTAL (N =18)
		NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
variety	2	2	0	4
intrinsic	4	3	0	7
interests				
physical	5	2	0	7
conditions				
COLUMN TOTAL	11	7	0	18

Table 7 A. Reasons for preferring another job in the same firm

	MALE (N =7)	FEMALE (N =11)	ROW TOTAL (N =18)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
variety	2	2	4
intrinsic	4	3	7
interests			
physical	1	6	7
conditions			
COLUMN TOTAL	7	11	18

Table 8. Find work physically tiring

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	55.6 (35)	34.0 (16)	0	42.1 (51)
NO	44.4 (28)	66.0 (31)	100 (11)	57.9 (70)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 8 A. Find work physically tiring

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	23.6 (9)	50.6 (16)	42.1 (51)
NO	76.4 (29)	49.4 (31)	57.9 (70)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 9. Effect of a physically tiring job on preference for a previous job in the same firm.

	FIND JOB PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES (41)	NO (50)	ROW TOTAL (91)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PRESENT JOB	82.9 (34)	76.0 (38)	79.1 (72)
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	17.1 (7)	24.0 (12)	20.9 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	45.1 (41)	54.9 (50)	100 (91)

Table 10. Effect of a physically tiring job on preference for another job in the same firm.

	FIND JOB PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(49)	NO(69)	ROW TOTAL (118)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER ANOTHER JOB	20.4 (10)	11.6 (8)	15.3 (18)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	79.6 (39)	88.4 (61)	84.7 (100)
COLUMN TOTAL	41.5 (49)	58.5 (69)	100 (118)

Table 11. Find work monotonous

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	55.6 (35)	42.6 (20)	54.5 (6)	50.4 (61)
NO	44 4 (28)	57.4 (27)	45.5 ((5)	49.6 (60)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 ((11)	100 (121)

Table 11 A. Find work monotonous

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
YES	50 (19)	50.6 (42)	50.4 (61)
NO	50 (19)	49.4 (41)	49.6 (60)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 12. Effect of monotony on preference for a previous job in the same firm

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES (46)	NO (45)	ROW TOTAL (91)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PRESENT JOB	69.6 (32)	88.9 (40)	79 1 (72)
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	30.4 (14)	11.1 (5)	20 9 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	50.5 (46)	49.5 (45)	100 (91)

Table 13. Effect of monotony on preference for another job in the same firm.

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(59)	NO(59)	ROW TOTAL (118)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER ANOTHER JOB	20.3 (12)	10.2 (6)	15 3 (18)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	79.7 (47)	89.8 (53)	84.7 (100)
COLUMN TOTAL	50.0 (59)	50.0 (59)	100 (118)

Table 14. Can think about other things

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	81 (51)	72.3 (34)	90.9 (10)	78.5 (95)
NO	19 (12)	27.7 (13)	9.1 (1)	21.5 (26)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 14 A. Can think about other things

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	86.8 (33)	74.7 (62)	78.5 (95)
NO	13.2 (5)	25.3 (21)	21.5 (26)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 15. Effect of being able to think of other things on preference for a previous job in the same firm.

	CAN THINK OF OTHER THINGS		
	YES (71)	NO (20)	ROW TOTAL (91)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PRESENT JOB	77.5 (55)	85.0 (17)	79 1 (72)
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	22.5 (16)	15.0 (3)	20.9 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	50.5 (71)	49.5 (20)	100 (91)

Table 16. Effect of being able to think of other things on preference for a previous job elsewhere

	CAN THINK OF OTHER THINGS		
	YES(69)	NO(14)	ROW TOTAL (83)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	17.4 (12)	21.4 (3)	18.1 (15)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	82.6 (57)	78.6 (11)	81.9 (68)
COLUMN TOTAL	83.1 (69)	16.9 (14)	100 (83)

Table 17. Effect of being able to think of other things on preference for another job in the same firm.

	CAN THINK OF OTHER THINGS		
	YES(92)	NO(26)	ROW TOTAL (118)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER ANOTHER JOB	15.2 (14)	15.4 (4)	15.3 (18)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	82.9 (78)	84.6 (22)	84.7 (100)
COLUMN TOTAL	78.0 (92)	22.0 (26)	100 (118)

Table 18. Pace of work too fast

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	35.5 (22)	17.0 (8)	27 3 (3)	27 5 (33)
NO	64.5 (41)	83.0 (39)	72 7 (8)	72.5 (88)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 18 A. Pace of work too fast

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	28.9 (11)	26.8 (22)	27.5 (33)
NO	71.1 (27)	73.2 (61)	72.5 (88)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 19. Effect of finding pace of work too fast on preference for a previous job elsewhere

	FIND PACE OF WORK TOO FAST		
	YES(24)	NO(58)	ROW TOTAL (82)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	8.3 (2)	22.4 (13)	18.3 (15)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	91.7 (22)	77.6 (45)	81.7 (67)
COLUMN TOTAL	29.3 (24)	70.7 (58)	100 (82)

Table 20. Effect of finding pace of job too fast on preference for another job in the same firm.

	FIND PACE OF WORK TOO FAST		
	YES(33)	NO(84)	ROW TOTAL (117)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER ANOTHER JOB	9.1 (3)	16.7 (14)	14.5 (17)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	90.9 (30)	83.3 (70)	85.5 (100)
COLUMN TOTAL	28.2 (33)	71.8 (84)	100 (117)

Table 21. Effect of finding pace of job too fast on having thought of leaving present job

	FIND PACE OF WORK TOO FAST		
	YES(33)	NO(87)	ROW TOTAL (120)
	PERCENTAGE		
THOUGHT OF LEAVING			
YES	12.1 (4)	28.7 (25)	24 2 (29)
NO	87.9 (29)	71.3 (62)	75 8 (91)
COLUMN TOTAL	27.5 (33)	72.5 (87)	100 (120)

Table 22. Effect of finding pace of job too fast on preference for a previous job in the same firm.

	FIND PACE OF WORK TOO FAST		
	YES (28)	NO (62)	ROW TOTAL (90)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PRESENT JOB	75.0 (21)	82.3 (51)	80.0 (72)
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	25.0 (7)	17 7 (11)	20.0 (18)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.1 (28)	68.9 (62)	100 (90)

Table 23 Desired changes in job

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
Organization of work	10	4	0	14
Manner of supervision	6	7	8	21
Physical conditions	12	4	0	16
Promotion	2	1	1	4
Hours	7	4	0	11
Other	6	3	1	10
D.K., Nothing	20	24	1	45
Column Totals	63	11	47	121

Table 23 A. Desired changes in job

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
Organization of work	0	14	14
Manner of supervision	14	7	21
Physical conditions	2	14	16
Promotion	3	1	4
Hours	2	9	11
Other	6	4	10
D.K., Nothing	11	34	45
Column Totals	38	83	121

Table 24. Thought of leaving present firm?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	22.2 (14)	23.4 (11)	36.4 (4)	24.0 (29)
NO	77.8 (49)	76.6 (36)	63.6 (7)	76.0 (92)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 24 A. Thought of leaving present firm?

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	23.6 (9)	24.0 (20)	24.0 (29)
NO	76.4 (29)	76.0 (63)	76.0 (92)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 25. Reasons for thinking of leaving

	UNSKILLED (14)	SEMI-SKILLED (11)	SKILLED (4)	ROW TOTAL (29)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
NATURE OF WORK	3	4	0	7
SUPERVISION	0	2	3	5
A CHANGE	3	1	0	4
OTHER	8	4	1	13
COLUMN TOTAL	14	11	4	29

Table 25 A. Reasons for thinking of leaving

	MALES (9)	FEMALES (20)	ROW TOTAL (29)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
NATURE OF WORK	2	5	7
SUPERVISION	3	2	5
A CHANGE	1	3	4
OTHER	3	10	13
COLUMN TOTAL	9	20	29

Table 26. Effect of finding job physically tiring on having thought of leaving present job

	FIND WORK PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(51)	NO(70)	ROW TOTAL (121)
	PERCENTAGE		
THOUGHT OF LEAVING			
YES	25.5 (13)	22.9 (16)	24.0 (29)
NO	74.5 (38)	77.1 (54)	76.0 (92)
COLUMN TOTAL	42.1 (51)	57.9 (70)	100 (121)

Table 27. Effect of being able to think of other things on having thought of leaving present job

	CAN THINK OF OTHER THINGS		
	YES(95)	NO(26)	ROW TOTAL (121)
	PERCENTAGE		
THOUGHT OF LEAVING			
YES	26.3 (25)	15.4 (4)	24.0 (29)
NO	73.7 (70)	84.6 (22)	76.0 (92)
COLUMN TOTAL	78.5 (95)	21.5 (26)	100 (121)

Table 28. Effect of finding job monotonous on having thought of leaving present job

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(61)	NO(60)	ROW TOTAL (121)
	PERCENTAGE		
THOUGHT OF LEAVING			
YES	32.8 (20)	15.0 (9)	24 0 (29)
NO	67.2 (41)	85.0 (51)	76.0 (92)
COLUMN TOTAL	50.4 (61)	49.6 (60)	100 (121)

Table 29 Reasons for staying

	UNSKILLED (63)	SEMI-SKILLED (47)	SKILLED (11)	ROW TOTAL (121)
		NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
PAY, BENEFITS	21	13	2	36
SECURITY	4	7	3	14
NATURE OF WORK	15	10	1	26
FAIR EMPLOYER	2	2	1	5
WORKMATES	26	10	0	36
ATMOSPHERE, SUPERVISION	10	12	5	27
NEAR HOME	7	1	0	8
TOO OLD TO MOVE	4	1	0	5
OTHER	6	9	0	15
COLUMN TOTAL	95	65	12	172

Table 29 A. Reasons for staying

	MALES (38)	FEMALES (83)	ROW TOTAL (121)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
PAY, BENEFITS	10	26	36
SECURITY	11	3	14
NATURE OF WORK	4	22	26
FAIR EMPLOYER	1	4	5
WORKMATES	1	35	36
ATMOSPHERE, SUPERVISION	10	17	27
NEAR HOME	0	8	8
TOO OLD TO MOVE	2	3	5
OTHER	7	8	15
COLUMN TOTAL	46	126	172

Table 30. Previous work experience

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMISKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	77 8 (49)	72.3 (34)	81.8 (9)	76.0 (92)
NO	22.2 (14)	27.7 (13)	18.2 (2)	24.0 (29)
COLUMN TOTAL	52 1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 30 A. Previous work experience

	MALE (N=38)	FEMALE (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	84.2 (32)	72.3 (60)	76.0 (92)
NO	15.8 (6)	27.7 (23)	24.0 (29)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 31. Preference for previous work elsewhere

	UNSKILLED (N=48)	SEMISKILLED (N=34)	SKILLED (N=7)	ROW TOTAL (N=83)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	12.3 (6)	17.9 (5)	57 1 (4)	18 1 (15)
NO	87.7 (42)	82.1 (23)	42 9 (3)	81 9 (68)
COLUMN TOTAL	53.3 (48)	37.0 (28)	9.8 (7)	100 (83)

Table 31 A. Preference for previous work elsewhere.

	MALE (N=27)	FEMALE (N=56)	ROW TOTAL (N=83)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	37.0 (10)	8.9 (5)	18.1 (15)
NO	63.0 (17)	91.1 (51)	81.9 (68)
COLUMN TOTAL	32.4 (27)	67.6 (56)	100 (83)

Table 32. Reasons for preferring previous job elsewhere

	UNSKILLED (N =6)	SEMI-SKILLED (N =5)	SKILLED (N =4)	ROW TOTAL (N =15)
		NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
INTRINSIC	3	3	2	8
VARIETY	1	1	2	4
SUPERVISION	2	1	0	3
COLUMN TOTAL	6	5	4	15

Table 32 A. Reasons for preferring previous job elsewhere

	MALES (N =10)	FEMALES (N =5)	ROW TOTAL (N =15)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
INTRINSIC	7	1	8
VARIETY	3	1	4
SUPERVISION	0	3	3
COLUMN TOTAL	10	5	15

Table 33. Effect of finding work monotonous on preference for a previous job elsewhere

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(43)	NO(40)	ROW TOTAL (83)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	27.9 (12)	7.5 (3)	18 1 (15)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	72.1 (31)	92.5 (37)	81 9 (68)
COLUMN TOTAL	51.8 (43)	48.2 (40)	100 (83)

Table 34. Effect of finding work physically tiring on preference for a previous job elsewhere

	FIND WORK PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(37)	NO(46)	ROW TOTAL (83)
	PERCENTAGE		
PREFER PREVIOUS JOB	10.8 (4)	23.9 (11)	18.1 (15)
PREFER PRESENT JOB	89.2 (33)	76.1 (35)	81.9 (68)
COLUMN TOTAL	44.6 (37)	55.4 (46)	100 (83)

Table 35. How often do you talk to your workmates?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
A GOOD DEAL	71.4 (45)	80.9 (38)	90.9 (10)	76.9 (83)
NOW AND THEN	25.4 (16)	19.1 (9)	9.1 (1)	21.5 (26)
RARELY	3.2 (2)	0	0	1.6 (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 35 A How often do you talk to your workmates?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
A GOOD DEAL	86.8 (33)	72.3 (60)	76.9 (93)
NOW AND THEN	10.5 (4)	26.5 (22)	21.5 (26)
RARELY	2.6 (1)	1.2 (1)	1.6 (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 36. When do you talk to your workmates?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
WORK AND BREAKS	84.1 (53)	89.4 (42)	90.9 (10)	86 8 (105)
BREAKS ONLY	15.9 (10)	10.6 (5)	9 1 (1)	13 2 (16)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9 1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 36 A. When do you talk to your workmates?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
WORK AND BREAKS	97.4 (37)	81.9 (68)	86.8 (105)
BREAKS ONLY	2.6 (1)	18.1 (15)	13.2 (16)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 37 How would you feel about move to another dept.?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
UPSET	65 1 (41)	48 9 (23)	9.1 (1)	53.7 (65)
NOT UPSET	34 9 (22)	48.9 (23)	54.5 (8)	43.8 (53)
D.K	0	2.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	2.5 (1)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 37 A How would you feel about move to another dept.

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
UPSET	26.3 (10)	66.3 (55)	53.7 (65)
NOT UPSET	68.5 (26)	32.6 (27)	43.8 (53)
D.K.	5.3 (2)	1.2 (1)	2.5 (3)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	38.8 (83)	100 (121)

Table 38. Number of close friends

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
NONE	36.5 (23)	55.3 (26)	54.5 (6)	45.5 (55)
AT LEAST ONE	63.5 (40)	44.7 (21)	45.5 (5)	54.5 (66)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 38 A. Number of close friends

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
NONE	60.5 (23)	38.6 (32)	45.5 (55)
AT LEAST ONE	39.5 (15)	61.4 (51)	54.5 (66)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 39 Where do you see them?

	UNSKILLED (N=40)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=21)	SKILLED (N=5)	ROW TOTAL (N=66)
		NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
AT HOME	18	6	1	25
SEMI-CASUAL	18	13	3	34
ARRANGED	6	5	2	13
NO MEETINGS	9	2	0	11
COLUMN TOTAL	51*	26*	6*	33*

Table 39 A. Where do you see them?

	MALES (N=15)	FEMALES (N=51)	ROW TOTAL (N=66)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
AT HOME	1	24	25
SEMI-CASUAL	12	22	34
ARRANGED	3	10	13
NO MEETINGS	1	10	11
COLUMN TOTAL	17*	66*	83*

* Number of times mentioned

Table 40. Which is most important?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
WORKMATES	50.8 (32)	36.2 (17)	18 2 (2)	42 1 (51)
MONEY	7.9 (5)	17.0 (8)	9 1 (1)	11 6 (14)
GOOD BOSSES	12.7 (8)	27.7 (13)	9 1 (1)	18 2 (22)
WORKMATES AND BOSSES	28.6 (18)	17.0 (8)	63 6 (7)	27 3 (33)
D.K.	0	2.1 (1)	0	0 8 (1)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9 1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 40 A. Which is most important?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
WORKMATES	28.9 (11)	48.2 (40)	42 1 (51)
MONEY	18.4 (7)	8.4 (7)	11 6 (14)
BOSSES	18.4 (7)	18 1 (15)	18.2 (22)
WORKMATES AND BOSSES	31.6 (12)	25 3 (21)	27.3 (33)
D.K.	2.6 (1)	0	0 8 (1)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 41. How well do you get on with your supervisor?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
VERY WELL	58.7 (37)	72.3 (34)	54.5 (6)	63.6 (77)
RATHER WELL	20.6 (13)	17.0 (8)	0	17.4 (21)
NOT SO WELL	15.9 (10)	4.3 (2)	27.3 (3)	12.4 (15)
BADLY	0	2.1 (1)	18.2 (2)	2.5 (3)
D K.	4.8 (3)	4.3 (2)	0	4.1 (5)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 41 A. How well do you get on with your supervisor?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
VERY WELL	55.3 (21)	67.5 (56)	63.6 (77)
RATHER WELL	15.8 (6)	18.1 (15)	17.4 (21)
NOT SO WELL	18.4 (7)	9.6 (8)	12.4 (15)
BADLY	5.3 (2)	1.2 (1)	2.5 (3)
D.K.	5.3 (2)	3.6 (3)	4.1 (5)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4(38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 42. Reasons for getting along with supervisor

	UNSKILLED (N=50)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=42)	SKILLED (N=6)	ROW TOTAL (N=98)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
IS LEFT ALONE	5	11	2	18
WORKS WELL	5	4	2	11
PERSONAL	38	27	3	68
SKILLS				
OTHER, D.K.	5	3	2	10
COLUMN TOTAL	53	45	9	107

Table 42 A. Reasons for getting along with supervisor

	MALES (N=27)	FEMALES (N=71)	ROW TOTAL (N=98)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
IS LEFT ALONE	7	11	18
WORKS WELL	4	7	11
PERSONAL SKILLS	15	53	68
OTHER, D.K.	5	5	10
COLUMN TOTAL	53	45	107

Table 43. Reasons for not getting along with supervisor

	UNSKILLED (N=10)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=3)	SKILLED (N=5)	ROW TOTAL (N=18)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
LITTLE AUTONOMY	2	0	3	5
PERSONAL SKILLS	3	6	2	11
OTHER, D.K.	4	2	0	6
COLUMN TOTAL	12	5	5	22

Table 43 A. Reasons for not getting along with supervisor

	MALES (N=9)	FEMALES (N=9)	ROW TOTAL (N=18)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
LITTLE AUTONOMY	3	2	5
PERSONAL SKILLS	4	7	11
OTHER, D.K.	4	2	6
COLUMN TOTAL	11	11	22

Table 44. How does this firm compare to others?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
BETTER	79.4 (50)	80.9 (38)	45.5 (5)	76.9 (93)
AVERAGE	9.5 (6)	14.9 (7)	45.5 (5)	14.9 (18)
WORSE	1.6 (1)	2.1 (1)	0	1.7 (2)
D.K.	9.5 (6)	2.1 (1)	9.1 (1)	6.6 (8)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1(63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (1)	100 (121)

Table 44 A. How does this firm compare to others?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
BETTER	60.5 (23)	84.3 (70)	76.9 (93)
AVERAGE	34.2 (13)	6.0 (5)	14.9 (18)
WORSE	0	2.4 (2)	1.7 (2)
D.K.	5.3 (2)	7.2 (6)	6.6 (8)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 45 How do you see management-worker relations?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
TEAM	81.0 (51)	89.4 (42)	63.6 (7)	82.6 (100)
IN OPPOSITION	15 9 (10)	10.6 (5)	36.4 (4)	15.7 (19)
D K , OTHER	3 2 (2)	0	0	1.7 (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 45 A. How do you see management-worker relations?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
TEAM	68.4 (26)	89.2 (74)	82.6 (100)
IN OPPOSITION	31 6 (12)	8.4 (7)	15.7 (19)
D K , OTHER	0	2.4 (2)	1.7 (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 46. Relationship of finding work physically tiring with attitudes toward firm

	FIND WORK PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(48)	NO(63)	ROW TOTAL(111)
	PERCENTAGE		
FIRM BETTER	93.8 (45)	76.2 (48)	83 8 (93)
FIRM AVERAGE	6.3 (3)	23.3 (15)	16 2 (18)
COLUMN TOTAL	43.2 (48)	56.8 (63)	100 (111)

Table 47. Relationship of finding work physically tiring with views toward management-worker relations

	FIND WORK PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(50)	NO(69)	ROW TOTAL(119)
	PERCENTAGE		
MANAGEMENT-WORKERS			
A TEAM	84.0 (42)	84.1 (58)	84.0 (100)
IN OPPOSITION	16.0 (8)	15.9 (11)	16.0 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	42.0 (50)	58.0 (69)	100 (119)

Table 48. Relationship of finding work monotonous with attitudes toward firm

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(53)	NO(58)	ROW TOTAL(111)
	PERCENTAGE		
FIRM BETTER	79.2 (42)	87.9 (51)	83.8 (93)
FIRM AVERAGE	20.8 (11)	12.1 (7)	16.2 (18)
COLUMN TOTAL	47.7 (53)	52.3 (58)	100 (111)

Table 49. Relationship of finding work monotonous with views toward management-worker relations

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(59)	NO(60)	ROW TOTAL(119)
	PERCENTAGE		
MANAGEMENT-WORKERS			
A TEAM	76.3 (45)	91.7 (55)	84.0 (100)
IN OPPOSITION	23.7 (14)	8.3 (5)	16.0 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	49.6 (59)	50.4 (60)	100 (119)

Table 50. Relationship of finding work monotonous with attitudes towards firm's ability to pay more

	FIND WORK MONOTONOUS		
	YES(47)	NO(47)	ROW TOTAL(94)
	PERCENTAGE		
FIRM PAY MORE			
YES	44.7 (21)	19.1 (9)	31.9 (30)
NO	55.3 (26)	80.9 (38)	68.1 (64)
COLUMN TOTAL	50.0 (47)	50.0 (47)	100 (94)

Table 51. Relationship of finding pace of work too fast with attitudes towards management-worker relations.

	FIND PACE TOO FAST		
	YES(33)	NO(85)	ROW TOTAL(118)
	PERCENTAGE		
MANAGEMENT-WORKERS			
A TEAM	72.7 (24)	88 2 (75)	83.9 (99)
IN OPPOSITION	27.3 (9)	11.8 (10)	16.1 (19)
COLUMN TOTAL	28.0 (33)	72.0 (85)	100 (118)

Table 52 Reasons for good industrial relations

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
COOPERATION	15	18	0	33
STRONG UNION	10	9	3	22
COMPANY FAIR	17	12	3	32
WEAK UNION	3	0	0	3
UNWILLING TO STHIKE	6	3	2	11
OTHER, D.K.	20	11	3	34
COLUMN TOTAL	71	53	11	135

Table 52 A. Reasons for good industrial relations

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
COOPERATION	13	20	33
STRONG UNION	6	16	22
COMPANY FAIR	6	26	32
WEAK UNION	2	1	3
UNWILLING TO STRIKE	4	7	11
OTHER, D.K.	9	25	34
COLUMN TOTAL	40	95	135

Table 53. Are other firms giving the same advantages?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	14 3 (9)	21.3 (10)	81.8 (9)	23.1 (28)
NO	65 1 (41)	70.2 (33)	18.2 (2)	62.8 (76)
D.K , OTHER	20.6 (13)	8.5 (4)	0	14.0 (17)
TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 53 A. Are other firms giving the same advantages?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
YES	42.1 (16)	14.5 (12)	23.1 (28)
NO	47.4 (18)	69.9 (58)	62.8 (76)
D.K , OTHER	10.5 (4)	15.7 (13)	14.0 (17)
COLUMN TOTAL	31 4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 54. Work study men make things go

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
SMOOTHER	30.2 (19)	51.1 (24)	9 1 (1)	36 4 (44)
FASTER	57.1 (36)	38.3 (18)	45 5 (5)	48 8 (59)
D.K., OTHER	12.7 (8)	10.6 (5)	45.5 (5)	14.9 (18)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9 1(11)	100 (121)

Table 54 A. Work study men make things go

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
SMOOTHER	31.6 (12)	38.6 (32)	36 4 (44)
FASTER	44.7 (17)	50.6 (42)	48.8 (59)
D.K., OTHER	23.7 (9)	10.8 (9)	14 9 (18)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100(121)

Table 55. Relationship of finding work physically tiring with attitudes toward work-study

	FIND WORK PHYSICALLY TIRING		
	YES(44)	NO(59)	ROW TOTAL(103)
	PERCENTAGE		
WORK-STUDY			
FASTER	34.1 (15)	49.2 (29)	42.7 (44)
SMOOTHER	65.9 (29)	50.8 (30)	57.3 (59)
COLUMN TOTAL	42.7 (44)	57.3 (59)	100 (103)

Table 56. Do you think the company could pay more?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
YES	33.3 (21)	6.4 (3)	54.5 (6)	24.8 (30)
NO	49.2 (31)	61.7 (29)	36.4 (4)	52.9 (64)
D.K.	17.5 (11)	31.9 (15)	9.1 (1)	22.3 (27)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 56 A. Do you think the company could pay more?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
YES	26.3 (10)	24.1 (20)	24.8 (30)
NO	44.7 (17)	56.6 (47)	52.9 (64)
D.K.	28.9 (11)	19.3 (16)	22.3 (27)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 57. Reason for joining a union

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE			
BELIEF IN UNIONS	3.2 (2)	4.3 (2)	18.2 (2)	5.0 (6)
PROTECTION	25.4 (16)	25.5 (12)	27.3 (3)	25.6 (31)
ASKED TO	25.4 (16)	23.4 (11)	9.1 (1)	23.1 (28)
MATES WERE IN	11 1 (7)	10.6 (5)	9.1 (1)	10.7 (13)
HAD TO	30.2 (19)	31.9 (15)	36.4 (4)	31.4 (38)
OTHER	4.8 (3)	4.3 (2)	0	4.1 (5)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 57 A. Reason for joining a union

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
BELIEF IN UNIONS	7.9 (3)	3.6 (3)	5 0 (6)
PROTECTION	39.5 (15)	19 3 (16)	25 6 (31)
ASKED TO	7.9 (3)	30.1 (25)	23 1 (28)
MATES WERE IN	7.9 (3)	12.0 (10)	10 7 (13)
HAD TO	34.2 (13)	30.1 (25)	31 4 (38)
OTHER	2.6 (1)	4.8 (4)	4 1 (5)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 58. Attendance at union meetings

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
REGULARLY	11.1 (7)	14.9 (7)	9.1 (1)	12.4 (15)
OCCASIONALLY	7.9 (5)	8.5 (4)	18.2 (2)	9.1 (11)
RARELY	22.2 (14)	29.8 (14)	36.4 (4)	26.4 (32)
NEVER	58.7 (37)	46.8 (22)	36.4 (4)	52.1 (63)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 58 A. Attendance at union meetings

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
REGULARLY	23.7 (9)	7.2 (6)	12.4 (15)
OCCASIONALLY	13.2 (5)	7.2 (6)*	9.1 (11)
RARELY	26.3 (10)	26.5 (22)	26.4 (32)
NEVER	36.8 (14)	59.0 (49)	52.1 (63)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 59. Reasons for not attending union meetings

	UNSKILLED (N=51)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=36)	SKILLED (N=8)	ROW TOTAL (N=95)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED			
NO INTEREST	18	19	4	41
BAD TIME	22	11	2	35
GOOD STEWARDS	1	3	0	4
OTHER	11	7	2	20
COLUMN TOTAL	52	40	8	100

Table 59 A. Reasons for not attending union meetings

	MALES (N=24)	FEMALES (N=71)	ROW TOTAL (N=71)
	NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED		
NO INTEREST	14	27	41
BAD TIME	3	32	35
GOOD STEWARDS	1	3	4
OTHER	6	14	20
COLUMN TOTAL	24	76	100

Table 60 How often do you talk to workmates about union?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
VERY OFTEN	4.8 (3)	10.6 (5)	18.2 (2)	8.3 (10)
A GOOD DEAL	15.9 (10)	10.6 (5)	18.2 (2)	14.0 (17)
NOW AND THEN	27.0 (17)	29.8 (14)	27.3 (3)	28.1 (34)
RARELY	52 4 (33)	48.9 (23)	36.4 (4)	49.6 (60)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 60 A. How often do you talk to workmates about union?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
VERY OFTEN	10.5 (4)	7.2 (6)	8.3 (10)
A GOOD DEAL	28.9 (11)	7.2 (6)	14.0 (17)
NOW AND THEN	26.3 (10)	28.9 (24)	28.1 (34)
RARELY	34.2 (13)	56.6 (47)	49.6 (60)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Table 61 . How often do you talk to stewards about union?

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
VERY OFTEN	7.9 (5)	8.5 (4)	18.2 (2)	9 1 (11)
A GOOD DEAL	11.1 (7)	14.9 (7)	18.2 (2)	13 2 (16)
NOW AND THEN	38.1 (24)	27.7 (13)	27.3 (3)	33.1 (40)
RARELY	42.9 (27)	48.9 (23)	36.4 (4)	44 6 (54)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 61 A. How often do you talk to stewards about union?

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
VERY OFTEN	13.2 (5)	7 2 (6)	9 1 (11)
A GOOD DEAL	18.4 (7)	10.8 (9)	13 2 (16)
NOW AND THEN	28.9 (11)	34.9 (29)	33.1 (40)
RARELY	39.5 (15)	47.0 (39)	44.6 (54)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	1 0 0

Table 62 The union should be concerned with the

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
FIRM'S POSITION	76.2 (48)	78.7 (37)	90.9 (10)	78.5 (95)
MEMBERS ONLY	19.0 (12)	14.9 (7)	9.1 (1)	16.5 (20)
D.K.	4 8 (3)	6.4 (3)	0 (0)	5.0 (6)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 62 A The union should be concerned with the

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
	PERCENTAGE		
FIRM'S POSITION	89.5 (34)	73.5 (61)	78.5 (95)
MEMBERS ONLY	7.9 (3)	20.5 (17)	16.5 (20)
D.K.	2.6 (1)	6.0 (5)	5.0 ((6)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6(83)	100 (121)

Table 63. Unions should be concerned with

	UNSKILLED (N=63)	SEMI-SKILLED (N=47)	SKILLED (N=11)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE		
MORE PAY	44.1 (28)	25.5 (12)	45.5 (5)	37.2 (45)
MORE SAY	46.0 (29)	66.0 (31)	45.5 (5)	53.7 (65)
D.K.	9.5 (6)	8.5 (4)	9.1 (1)	9.1 (11)
COLUMN TOTAL	52.1 (63)	38.8 (47)	9.1 (11)	100 (121)

Table 63 A. Unions should be concerned with

	MALES (N=38)	FEMALES (N=83)	ROW TOTAL (N=121)
		PERCENTAGE	
MORE PAY	26.3 (10)	42.2 (35)	37.2 (45)
MORE SAY	65.6 (25)	48.2 (40)	53.7 (65)
D.K.	7.9 (3)	9.6 (8)	9.1 (11)
COLUMN TOTAL	31.4 (38)	68.6 (83)	100 (121)

Bibliography

Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill, and Bryan Turner. 1980. The Dominant Ideology Thesis. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Agassi, Judith Buber. 1982. Comparing the Work Attitudes of Women and Men. Toronto: D. C. Heath and Company.

Anthony, P. D. The Ideology of Work. 1977. London: Tavistock Publications.

Atkinson, T. 1983 "Changing Attitudes Toward Work in Canada." The Canadian Business Review, Spring: 39-44.

Arendt, Hannah. 1959. The Human Condition. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Argryis, Chris. 1957. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row.

Argryis, Chris. 1973. "Peter Blau." In People and Organizations, ed. G. Salaman and Kenneth Thompson, 76-90. London: Longman.

Armstrong, P. 1986. "Management Control Strategies and Inter-Professional Competition: the Cases of Accountancy and Personnel Management." In Managing the Labor Process, ed. D. Knights and Hugh Wilmott, 19-43. Aldershot: Gower.

Aronowitz, Stanley. 1973. False Promises. New York: McGraw Hill.

Banks, J. A. 1969. "Review of: The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior." British Journal of Sociology 20: 90-92.

Beale, Jenny. 1986. Women in Ireland. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Bechhofer, F. 1973. "The relation between technology and shop-floor behavior." In Meaning and Control, ed. D. O. Edge and J. N. Wolfe, 121-142. London: Tavistock.

Bell, Colin and Howard Newby. 1975. "The Sources of Variation in Agricultural Workers' Images of Society." In Working-Class Images of Society, ed. Martin Bulmer, 83-92. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1974. Work and Authority in Industry. Berkley: University of California Press.

Berger, Peter L. 1964. The Human Shape of Work. New York: Macmillan.

Blackburn, R. and Michael Mann. 1979. The Working Class in the Labor Market. London: Macmillan.

Blauner, Robert. 1964. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Braverman, Harry. 1974. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Brown, Richard. 1972. "Approaches to Workplace Behavior." In The Sociology of Industry, ed. S. R. Parker et al, 2nd ed., 85-99. London: Allen and Unwin.

Brown, Richard. 1984. "Work: Past, Present and Future." In Work, Employment, and Unemployment: Perspectives on Work and Society, ed. Kenneth Thompson, 261-275. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Brown, Richard. 1984. "Working on Work." Sociology 18: 311-325.

Bulmer, Martin, ed. 1975. Working-Class Images of Society. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Burawoy, Michael. 1978. "Toward a Marxist Theory of the Labor Process: Braverman and Beyond." Politics and Society 8: 247-312.

Burawoy, Michael. 1979. Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burns, Tom, ed. 1969. Industrial Man. London: Penguin Books.

Burstein, M., N. Tienharra, P. Hewson and B. Warrander. 1975. Canadian Work Values: Findings of a Work Ethic Survey and a Job Satisfaction Survey. Ottawa: Information Canada.

Carey, Alex. 1967. "The Hawthorne Studies: A Radical Criticism." American Sociological Review 32: 403-16.

Child, John. 1973. "Organizational Structure, Environment and Performance: The Role of Strategic Choice." In People and Organizations, ed. G. Salaman and Kenneth Thompson, 91-107. London: Longman.

Chinoy, Ely. 1955. Automobile Workers and the American Dream. Boston: Beacon Press.

Clancy, Patrick, S. Drudy, K. Lynch, and Liam O'Dowd, eds. 1986. Ireland: A Sociological Profile. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Courtney, Damien A. 1986. "Demographic Structure and Change." In Ireland: A Sociological Profile, ed. Patrick Clancy, S. Drudy, K. Lynch, and Liam O'Dowd, 22-46. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Cousins, Jim and Richard Brown. 1975. "Patterns of Paradox: Shipbuilding Workers' Images of Society." In Working-Class Images of Society, ed. Martin Bulmer, 55-82. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Crozier, Michael. 1964. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daniel, W. W. 1969. "Industrial Behavior and Orientation to Work - A Critique." Journal of Management Studies 6: 366-75.

Daniel, W. W. 1971. "Productivity Bargaining and Orientation to Work - A Rejoinder to Goldthorpe." Journal of Management Studies 8: 329-35.

Davis, Louis E. and A. B. Cherns. 1975. The Quality of Working Life. New York: Free Press.

Davis, Louis E. and James C. Taylor. 1976. "Technology, organisation and job structure." In Handbook of Work, Organisation, and Society, ed. Robert Dubin, 379-419. Chicago: Rand McNally.

De Grazia, Sebastian. 1962. Of Time, Work, and Leisure. Garden City: Doubleday.

Dubin, Robert. 1962. "Industrial workers' worlds: a study of the central life interests of workers." In Human Behavior and Social Processes, ed. A. M. Rose, 247-266. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Edwards, Richard. 1979. Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century. New York: Basic Books.

Esland, Geoff and Graeme Salaman, eds. 1980. The Politics of Work and Occupations. Stratford: The Open University Press.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc..1964.

European Communities. 1982. The Trade Union Movement in Ireland. Brussels: The Trade Union Division of the Directorate-General for Information.

Fein, Mitchell. 1976. "Motivation for Work." In Handbook of Work, Organisation, and Society, ed. Robert Dubin, 465-530, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Faunce, William A., ed. 1967. Readings in Industrial Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Fox, Alan. 1980. "The Meaning of Work." In The Politics of Work and Occupations, ed. Geoff Esland and Graeme Salaman, 139-191. Stratford: The Open University Press.

Fraser, Ronald. 1968. Work: Twenty Personal Accounts. London: Penguin.

Friedman, Andrew L. 1977. Industry and Labor: Class Struggle at Work and Monopoly Capitalism. London: Macmillan.

Gallie, Duncan. 1978. In Search of the New Working Class: Automation and Social Integration within the Capitalist Enterprise. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garson, Barbara. 1975. All the Livelong Day: The Meaning and Demeaning of Routine Work. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Giddens, Anthony. 1980. "Class Structuration and Class Consciousness." In Classes, Power,and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates, ed. Anthony Giddens and David Held, 157-174. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1982. "Power, the Dialectic of Control and Class Structuration." In Social Class and the Division of Labor, ed. Anthony Giddens and Gavin Mackenzie, 29-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldthorpe, John H. 1966. "Attitudes and Behavior of Car Assembly Workers: A Deviant Case and a Theoretical Critique." British Journal of Sociology 17: 227-24.

Goldthorpe, John H., David Lockwood, Frank Bechofer, and Jennifer Platt. 1968. The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1955. Wildcat Strike. New York: Free Press.

Gross, Edward and Amitai Etzioni. 1985. Organizations in Society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Hall, Richard H. 1986. Dimensions of Work. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hall, Richard H. 1987. Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

Halle, David. 1984. America's Working Man: Work, Home and Politics Among Blue-Collar Property Owners. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hamilton, Richard F. and James D. Wright. 1986. The State of the Masses. New York: Adline.

Harris, Rosemary. 1987. Power and Powerlessness in Industry. London: Tavistock.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1966. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World.

Herzberg, Frederick, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Snyderman. 1959. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley.

Kalleberg, Arne L. 1977. "Work values and job rewards: a theory of job satisfaction." American Sociological Review 42: 124-143.

Knight, Graham. 1981. "Work Orientation and Mobility Ideology in the Working Class." In Work in the Canadian Context, ed. Katerina L. P. Lundy and Barbara Warme. Toronto: Butterworths.

Krahn, Harvey J. and Lowe, Graham S. 988. Work Industry and Canadian Society. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson.1

Kumar, Krishan. 1984. "The Social Culture of Work: Work, Employment, and Unemployment as Ways of Life." In Work, Employment, and Unemployment: Perspectives on Work and Society, ed. Kenneth Thompson, 2-17. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Littler, Craig. 1982. "Deskilling and the Structures of Control." In The Degradation of Work, ed. Stephen Wood. London: Hutchinson.

Littler, Craig and Graeme Salaman. 1984. Class at Work. London: Batsford.

Locke, Edwin A. 1976. "The nature and causes of job satisfaction," In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, ed. Marvin D. Dunnette, 1297-1350. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lockwood, David. 1975. "Sources of Variation in Working Class Images of Society." In Working-Class Images of Society, ed. Martin Bulmer, 16-31. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lowe, Graham S. and Harvey J. Krahn, eds. 1984. Working Canadians: Readings in the Sociology of Work and Industry. Toronto: Methuen.

Lundy, Katerina L. P. and Barbara Warme, eds. 1981. Work in the Canadian Context. Toronto: Butterworths.

Mackenzie, Gavin. 1974. "The 'Affluent Worker' Study: An Evaluation and Critique." In The Social Analysis of Class Structure, ed. F. Parkin, 237-256. London: Tavistock.

Mackinnon, Malcolm H. 1980. "Work Instrumentalism Reconsidered: A Replication of Goldthorpe's Luton Project." British Journal of Sociology 31, 1-27.

Mars, Gerald. 1982. Cheats at Work: An Anthropology of Workplace Crime. London: Unwin Paperbacks.

Martin, Roderick and R. H. Fryer. 1975. "The Deferential Worker?" In Working-Class Images of Society, ed. Martin Bulmer. London Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marx, Karl. 1964. The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. Edited by Dirk K. Struik. New York: International Publishers.

Marx, Karl. 1977. Selected Writings. Edited by David McLennan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maslow, Abraham H. 1954. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row.

Mayo, Elton. 1933. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization. New York: MacMillan.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. The Human Side of the Enterprise. New York: Mcgraw Hill.

Moore, Robert S. 1975. "Religion as a Source of Variation in Working Class Images of Society." In Working-Class Images of Society, ed. Martin Bulmer, 35-54. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Moorhouse, H. F. 1984. "American Automobiles and Workers' Dreams." In Work, Employment, and Unemployment: Perspectives on Work and Society ed. Kenneth Thompson, 247-260. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Mouzelis, Nicos P. 1967. Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. Chicago; Aldine.

Nichols, Theo and Huw Beynon. 1977. Living with Capitalism: Class Relations and the Modern Factory. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Noble, David. 1978 "Social Choice in Machine Design: The Case of Automatically Controlled Machine Tools." Politics and Society 8: 313-347.

Nosow, Sigmund and Form, William H., eds. 1962. Man, Work, and Society. N.Y.: Basic Books.

Olson Jr., Mancur. 1965. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Parker, S. R. et al. 1972. The Sociology of Industry. 2nd ed. London: Allen and Unwin.

Parkin F., ed. 1974. The Social Analysis of Class Structure. London: Tavistock.

Peillon, Michel. 1982. Contemporary Irish Society: An Introduction. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Penn, R. 1982 "Skilled Manual Workers in the Labor Process, 1856-1964." In The Degradation of Work, ed. Stephen P. Wood, 90-108. London: Hutchinson.

Penn, R. 1985. Skilled Workers in the Class Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Penn, R. 1986 "Where Have all the Craftsmen Gone?: Trends in Skilled Labor in the USA since 1940." British Journal of Sociology 37: 569-580

Perrow, Charles. 1967 "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations." American Sociological Review 32, (2): 688-699.

Perrow, Charles. 1972. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman.

Rinehart, J. W. 1975. The Tyranny of Work. Don Mills: Longman Canada Ltd.

Rinehart, J. W. 1978. "Contradictions of Work-Related Attitudes and Behavior: An Interpretation." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 15: 1-15.

Rinehart, J. W. 1986. "Improving the Quality of Working Life through Job Design: Work Humanization or Work Rationalization?" Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 23: 507-530.

Roberts, K., F. G. Cook, S. C. Clark, and Elizabeth Semeonoff. 1978 The Fragmentary Class Structure. London: Humanities Press

Rose, Michael. 1975. Industrial Behavior: Theoretical Development Since Taylor. London: Penguin.

Roy, Donald. 1967. "Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop." In Readings in Industrial Sociology, ed. William A. Faunce, 311-334. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Roy, Donald. 1969. "Making-Out: A Counter System of Workers' Control of Work Situation and Relationships " In Industrial Man, ed. Tom Burns, 359-379. London: Penguin Books.

Roy, Donald. 1973. "Banana Time: Job Satisfaction and Informal Interaction." In People and Organizations, ed. Graeme Salaman and Kenneth Thompson, 205-222. London: Longman.

Russell, Kevin J. 1975. "Variations in Orientation to Work and Job Satisfaction." Sociology of Work and Occupations 2: 299-322.

Sabel, Charles. 1982. Work and Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salaman, Graeme and Kenneth Thompson, eds. 1973. People and Organizations. London: Longman.

Salaman, Graeme. 1979. Work Organizations: Resistance and Control. London: Longman.

Salaman, Graeme. 1986. Working. London: Tavistock.

Samuelsson, Kurt. 1961. Religion and Economic Action. Stockholm: Bonniers.

Sayles, Leonard R. 1958. The Behavior of Industrial Work Groups: Prediction and Control. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Seeman, Melvin. 1959. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review 24: 783-91.

Shephard, J. M. 1977. "Technology, Alienation, and Job Satisfaction." Annual Review of Sociology 3: 1-21.

Smucker, Joseph. 1980. Industrialization in Canada. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall.

Tausky, Curt. 1984. Working and Society: An Introduction to Industrial Sociology. Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Terkel, Studs. 1974. Working. New York: Pantheon.

Thompson, Kenneth, ed. 1984. Work, Employment, and Unemployment: Perspectives on Work and Society. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Tilgher, Adriano. 1958. Homo Faber: Work Through the Ages. Translated by Dorothy Fisher. Chicago: Henry Regency.

Trist, E. L. and K. W. Bamforth. 1969. "Technicism: Some Effects of Material Technology on Managerial Methods and on Work Situation and Relationships." In Industrial Man, ed. Tom Burns, 331-358. London: Penguin Books.

Walker, Charles and Robert Guest. 1952. The Man on the Assembly Line. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Watson, Tony J. 1980. Sociology, Work, and Industry. London: Routledge Kegan and Paul.

Weber, Max. 1958. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Scribner.

Wedderburn, Dorothy and Rosemary Crompton. 1972. Workers' Attitudes and Technology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wickham, James. 1986. "Industrialization, Work and Unemployment." In Ireland: A Sociological Profile, ed. Patrick Clancy, S. Drudy, K. Lynch and Liam O'Dowd, 70-96. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Wood, Stephen, ed. 1982. The Degradation of Work. London: Hutchinson.

Woodward, Joan. 1958. Management and Technology. London: H.M.S.O.

Woodward, Joan. 1970. Industrial Organization: Behavior and Control. London: Oxford University Press.

Woodward, Joan. 1965. Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice. London: Oxford University Press.

Appendix

Questionnaire

General Information

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Occupation
4. Marital Status
5. Number of dependents

Work History

1. When did you first come to work here?
2. Since then, have you ever left, either of your own accord or because of redundancy.
3. Have you worked anywhere except here?
4. Did you like any of your other jobs more than the one you have now?
5. Why is that?
6. Have you ever thought of leaving your present job?
7. If so, why?
8. What is it that keeps you here?

The Worker and the Job

1. Have you done any other jobs in this company?
2. Do you prefer the job you are doing now to others you have done here?
3. Why is that?
4. Are there other jobs which you would prefer to do rather than the one you have now?
5. If yes, why would you prefer those?
6. Do you find your present job physically tiring?
8. Do you find the pace of the job too fast?
9. Do you find you can think about other things while you are doing your job?
10. If there was one thing you could change about your job what would it be?
11. Which statement would you agree with most:
    1. Having an interesting job and good workmates are the most important things about a job.
    2. The amount of money you earn is the most important thing about a job.
    3. Good bosses and a satisfying job are the most important things about a job.
    4. Good bosses and good workmates are the most important things about a job.

The Worker and His/Her Work Group

1. In your job how much do you talk to your workmates? Would you say

    1. A good deal?
    2. Just now and then?
    3. Hardly at all?

2. Do you talk to them mainly during work or breaks?
3. What sort of things do you talk about? Is it mainly about work or mainly about things outside the factory?
4. How would you feel if you were moved to another job in the factory more or less like the one you have now but away from the people who work near you? Would you feel:

    1. very upset?
    2. fairly upset?
    3. not much bothered?
    4. not bothered at all?

5. How many of the people at work would you call close friends?
6. When do you see this/these persons outside of work?
7. How well do you get on with your supervisor:

    1. very well
    2. pretty well?
    3. not so well?
    4. very badly?

8 Why is this?

The Worker and the Union

1. When did you join a union?
2. Why did you join?
3. How often do you go to union meetings?
    1. regularly
    2. occasionally
    3. rarely
    4. never

4. Why is it that you do not bother with shop meetings?

5. Some people say that unions should be concerned only with getting their members higher pay and better conditions for their members. Others think the unions should try to get workers a say in management. What do you think?

6. Do you think a union should consider the economic position of the firm when pressing for a wage increase (or other benefits) or is its job to concentrate solely on the benefits of its own members?

7. How often do you talk to your workmates about union affairs?
    1. very often
    2. a good deal
    3. now and then
    4. hardly ever

8. How often do you talk to the shop stewards about union affairs?
    1. very often
    2. a good deal
    3. now and then
    4. hardly ever

The Worker and the Company

1. Do you think there are many firms giving the same advantages as this one?
2. How would you compare this firm with other firms you know or have heard about?
    1. better than most
    2. about average
    3. worse than most

3. Do you think work study men are more concerned to make things go smoothly or chiefly to make the worker keep up a fast pace all the time?

4 Here are two opposing views about industry generally. I'd like you to tell me which you agree with more. Some people say that a firm is like a football side because good team work means success and is to everyone's advantage. Others say that teamwork in industry is impossible because employers and men are really on opposite sides. Which view do you agree with more?

5. Do you think the firm could pay you more than it does without damaging its prospects for the future?

6. This firm has a good record of industrial relations. Why do you think this is?