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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the levels of job satisfaction in several specific areas of the work situation and how those feelings tend to affect attitudes toward collective negotiations.

A survey was given to two groups of more organized, professional, public employees -- firefighters and police -- and asked general questions about their feelings toward their jobs and toward the use of collective negotiations to make changes in those jobs.

It was found that four areas of the work situation were significant in determining job satisfaction: work conditions and physical surroundings; relations with employees; security and finances; and, emotional involvement in the job.

It is suggested by these findings that simple solutions, such as pay raises, are not adequate to solve any problems of discontent in this particular situation. The results suggest much deeper, underlying human problems which must be analyzed thoroughly and solved from within by these specific organizations, but other similar groups should take note in order to gain from this experience.
JOB SATISFACTION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS BY FIRE AND POLICE PERSONNEL
CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

Research on the effect of job satisfaction on attitudes toward collective negotiations is both relatively recent and scarce. As public employees continue to compare their jobs, salaries, and benefits to corresponding ones in the private sector and find their jobs lacking, they increasingly turn to the idea of collective negotiations, although this is an avenue of last resort for some. As a result, public administrators must re-evaluate the goals and policies of their organization as well as their personal feelings and the possible conflict between the two. Administrators must be aware of the nature and degree of their employees' job dissatisfaction, their attitudes toward collective negotiations, and the linkage between the two.

The goal of this research is to look at two groups of public employees at the local level, namely police and firefighters, in an attempt to investigate the relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and satisfaction with their jobs.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

During the 1960's a trend in which public employees began to question their jobs, salaries, benefits, career
mobility, voice in decision-making, and other working conditions intensified. Most public employees had accepted such job aspects passively as part of being a "civil servant". Now many were unwilling to accept the earlier ideal that dedication to their jobs and professionalism somehow made up for the monotony, the low salaries and benefits, and, often, even daily dangers. No longer were teachers, firefighters, and police, with their increasing levels of education and training as well as increasing sense of professionalism, willing to accept being among the lowest paid of professional groups and being treated as sub-professionals. Turnover in these fields is high as a result, and quality sometimes questionable, which may ultimately prove to be very damaging to the system itself due to the lack of continuity and resulting expertise.

Changes in individual as well as group personalities have created some problems, but so has the nature of the work itself. Work in general has become more technologically automated and impersonal.¹ In public service jobs the problem is the same, but possibly not as visible as in the private sector due to the difficulty of measuring the productivity and value of a product which is strictly labor intensive. Technology itself is partially responsible for this new style or attitude toward work because it has done away with the strict pyramidal bureaucratic framework, and required more of a teamwork effort.² This trend has been resisted by bureaucrats who are entrenched within the
The government has been more secure than private sector places of employment -- once you are in, getting out is usually a voluntary move except in very extreme cases. Upward mobility is based on time spent rather than quality of work in a job, providing little incentive for increasing work productivity. Merit increases are used somewhat more in the public safety sector because of the nature of their work, but even less than normal in the teaching profession where promotion, as a teacher, is non-existent to the extent that it is largely confined to pay increases rather than different jobs and/or responsibilities.

Much has been written on the growth of organized employee groups and the resulting impact on policy in a governmental unit. As stated before, these public employees are in a pivotal position of dealing directly with their clientele, and according to Michael Lipsky, are perceived as being very influential in the lives of these people even when they are not. These individuals do not make policy as such, but they do interpret and apply it to each case, and many times, due to lack of resources, ambiguous job expectations, or actual physical or psychological threats, they end up developing a "shorthand" response which ignores the individuality of that particular problem. As a result, employees are dissatisfied and workers are dissatisfied, leading to a spiral of discontent.

Mass communication, a facet of technology, but significant in influencing public opinion and perceptions of government. The mass media are important in shaping public attitudes towards government and public officials. They play a role in democratic processes by informing citizens about government actions and decisions, allowing them to make informed decisions. However, the media also have the potential to manipulate public opinion by selectively presenting information and framing issues in a particular way. This can lead to a lack of critical thinking and an overreliance on superficial information, which can affect decision-making processes. Therefore, it is crucial for citizens to engage in media literacy and critical thinking to make informed judgments about government actions.
cant enough to be mentioned separately, has aided in the spread not only of information but also of values. Both societal standards and protest of these norms spread rapidly, clashing where they conflict, but nonetheless influencing larger numbers of people in less time. Without mass communications not only would united effort be stymied, but the spread of knowledge of other's discontent would be slow or virtually impossible. An individual might feel personally responsible for his discontent unless he knows that there are others who feel as he does.

The Civil Rights movement has added increased emphasis on not only an end to employment discrimination, but on affirmative action to increase minority employment in those jobs. Some of the techniques of affirmative action have been severely questioned, sometimes with due cause, but more women and other minorities are demanding that equal pay and benefits be given for equal job accomplishments. No longer are they willing to accept long-standing job-hiring and firing practices as well as pay discrimination, and this has caused or called for major revamping or administrative policies.

Timothy Stinnett finds that a major source of teacher unrest has been the erosion and loss of identity due to the enlargement and consolidation of school districts. This trend can easily describe and account for worker dissatisfaction in other public places as well. Centralization has been the key to most recent organizational changes,
increasing agency size and resulting in impersonality of identity by workers. Unfortunately, this increasing feeling of anonymity by workers and the tendency of supervisors to view their organization as an efficient machine has not helped the situation, because "... workers are not machine parts, totally controlled, fully predictable, and easily replaceable".

A final source of unrest which cannot be ignored is the transformation of the professional environment to a more "unionized" setting. Unions have proliferated in many professions and occupations, as the concentration of management power has led to the perceived need by employees to organize. The changing nature of public employment itself has made it difficult, if not impossible, to isolate it from these feelings. More and more public worker organizations, if not affiliated with or called unions, are being formed. Also, more efforts by labor unions to organize white collar workers, as well as worker concern over the shaky economic situation in recent years, have given impetus to the rise in the number of unions.

Although Virginia has no statutes providing for collective negotiations between public employers and employees, organizations representing public employees are becoming more visible and must be taken into consideration. However, the General Assembly has acknowledged the desires of public employees to join together to communicate their personal and vocational needs through such resolutions as:
... it is the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia that the public policy require every public employer to promulgate and implement such rules or policies as will provide to its employees an opportunity to contribute to the development of policies which directly or indirectly affect the working conditions of the employees.  

To ignore this situation could potentially be dangerous. Although this study is not made to promulgate public employee unionism, it is wise to be aware of the trends. A Ford Foundation consultant warned the Norfolk City Council that "... collective bargaining is coming and cities should begin to prepare to deal with it effectively."
CHAPTER 2.

This chapter will identify some of the various aspects of jobs in several public services areas, identify the hypotheses to be tested, list some of the major general arguments for and against collective negotiations, and finally look at the literature regarding attitudes toward collective negotiations, job satisfaction levels, and the relationship between the two.

INTRODUCTION

Obviously jobs differ greatly from public service to private industry. Not only are the jobs themselves different in many ways, but so are the attitudes held by those in supervisory positions (and the public) towards those jobs and the workers who hold them. Private industry has a much easier task in identifying the product itself, the best means of production, and the value and profit of the article. Measurement can be done in visible numbers and worker productivity can be measured in the same manner. As a result, job incentives and evaluation are much easier to accomplish. Unfortunately, even in private industries, the incentives may not always work, especially if limited to larger amounts of money. Wage increases have been
shown to placate workers for short periods of time, but then unrest erupts eventually due to this method's failure to reach or solve real, underlying problems. As a result, more emphasis has been given to "humanizing" the work situation, e.g., flexible work hours, work teams, voice in management decisions, and less supervision.

On the other hand, public sector jobs are a different case altogether. As stated before, productivity, efficiency, and value are difficult to measure. Unfortunately, because the public is very much involved in the methods which private industries use to measure, they demand something similar from the government. The government attempts to oblige them when they cannot and should not feasibly do so. It attempts to measure what it can, leaving out what it cannot, and painting a distorted picture to the people. All things considered, it is no wonder that governmental units look and are considered to be very inefficient and wasteful.

Ronald Corwin has outlined the contrasts in the organization between a "bureaucrat", as many governmental employees are described, and the newly-recognized "professional employee", the classification to which many of today's public employees aspire. (Table 1.1) It is with these new professionals that this study is concerned.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

More literature on the topics of worker dissatisfaction, humanization of the workplace, attitudes toward
Table 1.1
Contrasts in the Bureaucratic and Professional-
Employee Principles of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
<th>Bureaucratic-Employee Expectations</th>
<th>Professional-Employee Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine of work</td>
<td>Stress on uniformity of clients' problems</td>
<td>Stress on uniqueness of clients' problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of procedure</td>
<td>Stress on records and files</td>
<td>Stress on research and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity of rules</td>
<td>Rules stated as universals; and specific</td>
<td>Rules states as alternatives; and diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of division of labor</td>
<td>Stress on efficiency of techniques; task orientation</td>
<td>Stress on achievement of goals; client orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis skill</td>
<td>Skill based primarily on practice</td>
<td>Skill based primarily on monopoly of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Basis of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collective bargaining, and differences among workers themselves is being published everyday. But empirical data is still scarce on the linkages between job satisfaction and collective bargaining. There is more data on teachers in this area than other public employees, such as firefighters and the police, about which there is virtually no information at all.

The purpose of this study, as presented earlier, is to determine what the relationship is between public employees, job satisfaction, and collective negotiations.

There are several important questions to be answered here. First, what are the attitudes of these groups of public employees (firefighters and police) toward collective negotiations? Second, do demographic factors make a difference, i.e., do age, sex, marital status, etc., explain differences in support for collective negotiations? Third, what are the levels of job satisfaction? Fourth, what are the relationships among these factors? And, finally, what are the policy implications for government-public employee relations?

BACKGROUND OF COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS OF TEACHERS, FIREFIGHTERS, AND POLICE

In order to better understand the inherent nature of and differences in these jobs under consideration, a review of relevant literature is in order and should provide a helpful background to the reader. Included in this review is information on the largest single group of public
employees, teachers, due to the relative abundance of literature on such and because of their similar roles and problems in local government.

Teachers

According to Moskow, Loewenberg, and Koziara, education ranks second to national defense and foreign relations as a governmental function in terms of public expenditure. Unlike the police and fire departments, 93.7 percent of local school districts operate independently of the governing body of the locality. This gives them a good deal more independence and freedom than other local employee groups. An additional difference lies in the administration itself, in that the administrators (namely the school board) are lay people, and teachers and supervisors are prohibited from membership.

Public education is one of the fastest developing sectors involved in collective negotiations, with the most dramatic changes coming between 1962 and 1969 when school boards began to negotiate with teachers and written negotiation procedures began appearing. Now, both the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA) have made changes in their policies to favor collective negotiations.

All public employees, including teachers, firefighters, and the police are specifically excluded from federal labor legislation, but the statutes passed on the state level vary
widely (Table 2.1). Changes continue to be resisted by many state legislatures, including the General Assembly of Virginia, but changes do continue to occur in other states.

The NEA and AFT have major differences which could account for the possible success of collective negotiations in this sector. The NEA has a very loose structure — it does not actively charter locals, as do labor unions; it enrolls people directly and individually; it allows administrators as well as teachers to join; and its local staffs are largely unpaid and voluntary; therefore, the NEA does not have strong direct control over its membership and can provide assistance only when requested. Local units can even act independently of the parent organization.

The AFT is concentrated mainly in the large urban areas, particularly in those states which allow collective negotiations, and it is an affiliate of the AFL-CIO. As of today, it has received more support, both morally and financially, than any other local union. It also attempts to make no distinction, as does the NEA, between bargaining in the public and private sectors by the use of different terminology. Today, these two organizations are closer than ever in their bargaining attempts, with little difference, other than basic structure, being noticeable.

Educational decisions, for the most part, are a local function, but unlike other public employees, educators are hindered in their collective negotiation process by certain state legislation. Examples are numerous and they
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Administrative Machinery</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Dispute Provisions</th>
<th>Strikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>State and local</td>
<td>Governmental subdivisions</td>
<td>Required to &quot;meet and confer&quot;</td>
<td>Rules left to subdivisions</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>State Labor Relations Board (SLRB) and Board of Mediation and Arbitration (BMA)</td>
<td>Duty to negotiate</td>
<td>SLRB determines</td>
<td>BMA mediates and factfinding</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>All except teachers</td>
<td>State Dept. of Labor and Industrial Relations; State Mediation Service</td>
<td>State and county - duty to negotiate. Municipalities - independent decision</td>
<td>SDLIR determines. Exclusive representation</td>
<td>SMS mediates.</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>All local</td>
<td>State Labor Relations Commission; State Board of Conciliation and Arbitrators</td>
<td>Duty to negotiate.</td>
<td>SLRC determines. Exclusive representation</td>
<td>SBCA factfinding</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All state</td>
<td>State Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Duty to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>State and local</td>
<td>Division of Labor Conciliation (DLC)</td>
<td>Required to &quot;meet and confer&quot;</td>
<td>DLC determines, informal recognition to majority organizations, informal to others</td>
<td>DLC mediates. Adjustment panel for findings</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include such areas as: minimum and maximum salary scales; duty-free lunch periods or, as called by many, "right to eat laws"; grievance procedures; minimum and maximum school hours and days; class size; tenure after probationary employment; required courses to be taught and passed; required textbooks; minimum school terms; textbook adoption; et cetera. As a result, teachers have had to concentrate their efforts in lobbying at the state level as well as working at the local level. This created a drain on energies and coordinated, concentrated negotiations.

Most collective negotiation agreements in education tend to be patterned after private employment agreements. They tend to include: a recognition statement of an exclusive bargaining representative, re-statement of the statutory school board authority, rights of the teacher organization, clauses detailing working conditions, grievance procedures, and the length of time for which the agreement is good, at the end of which the agreement must be renegotiated.

Strikes by teachers are generally illegal, although increasingly used in recent years. Sanctions have been developed to use as pressure tactics by teachers against school boards and include such things as: censure through public notice (media, journals, et cetera), severance of relationships with an organization, "professional holidays", work stoppage when students are not present, picketing, refusal to participate in extra-curricular activities,
"work to rule" device as a slowdown, and packing school board meetings. Impasse procedures have been developed but are rarely used.  

**Police and Firefighters**

Law enforcement and fire fighting involve many difficult activities -- assignments outdoors and around the clock, hazardous assignments which require a great deal of judgment and technical skill, jobs that are dirty, et cetera. According to Robert Walsh, the police and firefighters are the "government after dark", and they are the target of much social unrest, not directly, but because they are symbols of authority despised by the militant groups. A recent work-study shows that there are an average of 69 deaths per 100,000 firefighters and 44 deaths per 100,000 police per year. For many years firefighters seem to have enjoyed a more favorable public image than the police, but this may be changing. In 1967, during the summer, New York City firefighters were the target of nine shootings, and 70 incidents of brick, stone, and bottle throwing. In general, public support for the police and firefighters has declined during the past two decades, partially in response to the conditions cited by Lipsky and others. Of course, many people recognize these public employees as professional, skilled workers, but the preceding viewpoint is prevalent enough to be a concern.
Today's policeman must be part lawyer, part sociologist, and part sleuth. He also must be a technician in weapons and knowledgeable in the area of drugs, evidence, identification, and investigation. He should understand something about crowd and riot control, and he is sometimes called upon to be an ambulance driver with a working knowledge of first aid. Actually, a policeman spends 70 percent of his time performing public services and only 30 percent preventing and fighting crime. Recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court make it evident that today's policeman will have to become even more of a technician if he is to continue as a crime fighter and still not deprive a citizen of his constitutional rights.

A firefighter must have a working knowledge of fire control, fire prevention, and rescue techniques. Each of these areas requires a certain amount of specialized skill, including the use of a variety of power tools, the manipulation of hydraulic controls in complex pumping equipment, the operation of gas and radiation detection instruments, and the use of first aid and life-saving methods and equipment. Today's firefighter must also be familiar with the great number of potentially dangerous plastic and chemical products in use. Universities are beginning to offer courses in specialized fields of police work and in fire science and fire engineering.

According to Mollie Bowers, a research consultant to the International Chiefs of Police, one of the major problems in the public safety service organization, whose structure is bureaucratically pyramidal, is the lack of a defined management. There is no real dividing line, for collective negotiations purpose, between labor and management. Determining just who is the management is decided, not by rank but by role on a case basis. Most of the management level personnel comes from the rank-and-file membership on the basis of test scores and education. Bowers finds that not enough job enrichment accompanies pay increases, and this is a major source of discontent. The
lack of managers is also attributed to the lack of financial incentives and management training.

As previously stated, police and fire departments have a strict pyramidal hierarchy and are considered to be paramilitary and authoritarian organizations. The final authority rests with the chief or commissioner. Not only are work orders handed down from above, but all disciplinary procedures are handled within the department. Employment in these departments always, regardless of skill and possible experience, begins at the lowest level, and advancement is slow. The tight job market has caused the police and fire departments to be viewed in a different light by the unemployed. Recruits today tend to be younger and better educated, and it is felt, because of this, they do not accept the traditional authoritarian structure. Civilian employment for mechanical and clerical jobs has helped to ease the labor shortage, but is not popular within these groups. It is felt that the police and firefighters somehow "distrust" these staff people because of their "outsider" status. Recruitment entrance criteria have always been very strict, e.g., height, weight, age, eyesight, but these things are in the process of being challenged today in the courts as being discriminatory. The only jobs where lateral entry is permitted is among the very top jobs where appointments are used. Much pride is taken in the fact that all police, for example, have the common experience of starting out in the lowest position in the hierarchy and working their
way up. Patronage and political interference in job promotions and discipline are still prevalent in these two job areas. Other outside interference may come, in various states, from state legislation, civil service commissions, and civilian review boards.

Something must be said, too, about the personality of the police, as individuals or a group, and many of these attributes are found in the firefighter personality as well. A recurrent theme of occupational sociology is the effect of one's work on his outlook on the world in that one develops distinctive ways of perceiving and responding to his environment. One of the biggest problems the police face is a form of public relations in that the society that a policeman serves does not make him feel accepted socially. The citizenry appears to harbor a general feeling of resentment towards the law enforcement officer (as well as the teacher and firefighter) because of his power of constraint (restraint) over them either physically, morally, or both. Police are seen to enforce a code of morality that he might not adhere to strictly himself. One of the chief complaints by police revolves around their lack of public support and public apathy and the fact that they do " . . . not believe that his [police] specialization relieves the general public of citizenship duties." The view by the citizenry " . . . envisages the professional as a bureaucrat, almost a machine calculating alternative courses of action by a state's program of rules, and possessing the technical
ability to carry out decisions irrespective of personal feelings."

This stress on technical ability has stemmed from many sources, one of which being the increasing call for "professionalism". According to James Q. Wilson,\textsuperscript{15} "... a professional police department is one governed by values derived from general, impersonal rules which bind all members of the organization and whose relevance is independent of time, place, or personality." This management view emphasizes rationality, efficiency, and impersonality.

But the combination of danger and authority inherent in these positions combine to frustrate procedural regularity. This danger yields a self-defensive, therefore emotional, conduct, and this conduct lends to what is referred to as social isolation. Police constantly find themselves in highly vulnerable situations where they are exposed to physical danger and hostility.\textsuperscript{16} The citizenry is seen to project its feelings in general about government onto the nearest visible symbol, usually the police, and minor confrontations such as giving a traffic ticket becomes a potentially hostile situation.\textsuperscript{17} As their authority is perceived to decrease, the internal solidarity of police tends to increase and strong feelings of empathy, clannishness, and team work are exhibited. Police rank highly on scores of gregariousness, but this tendency tends to be stifled by the nature of the job, and they tend to
turn inward organizationally for their social life. Internal affairs are where one can "let go" and are methods through which one may cope with the perceived social rejection. Some police personnel and their families have even admitted to lying about their occupation in social situations in order to avoid the underlying ostracism.\(^\text{18}\)

On the whole, police tend to be very conservative emotionally and politically and support the status quo since that is inherent in their jobs. This usually involves an initial natural coolness toward the concept of labor militancy.\(^\text{19}\)

Both police and firefighter organizations have evolved from social and benefit societies, but with the firefighters' organization having a somewhat smoother road. The purpose of these organizations was to provide pensions and welfare benefits to its members in the absence of any institutionalized programs. Most organizations were formed to improve working conditions but were relatively unsuccessful at first.\(^\text{20}\)

Firefighters applied for AFL affiliation and were accepted on an individual basis. In 1915, the AFL formed a national union of firefighters, the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF). Not widely accepted at first because firefighters generally rejected the strike clause, this was soon resolved with the deletion of the provision. Their chief method of attempting to improve conditions still involves political pressure and lobbying, but the AFL is felt to have given the organization more of a voice in labor
procedures. Firefighters are now the most highly organized group of public employees with 83 percent of firefighters members of a national union or professional organization. The closest competitor to the IAFF for membership is the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). The no-strike clause remained in effect until 1968. The dues are the lowest union dues in the U.S., and the IAFF remains very decentralized with strong local control.21

The police began quite the same as the firefighters in their organizational quest, but have encountered a rocky road. First of all, the police are felt to be much different psychologically from other public employees and believe basically that organizational membership could be inconsistent with their military and authoritarian nature. Early organizations, and even those of today, must contend with this situation. Police organizations applied to the AFL, as did other public employee organizations, because of its craft orientation, but timed it badly. They were turned down because of a public relations push by the AFL to legitimate its interests, and accepting the police was thought by the union to possibly be detrimental to their interests. Also, even though the AFL changed its position later, the police themselves hurt their movement when the Boston police went on strike in 1919. Major crime resulted, along with three deaths and a condemnation was issued by President Wilson. A major setback, to say the least, but fraternal organizations like the Fraternal Order of Police
(FOP) continued to appear. AFSCME began the movement again, and now police are the second most extensively organized group among public employees. AFSCME has been outnumbered in its membership lately by the International Brotherhood of Police Officers (IBPO). It is felt, in general, that the police are not as cohesive or homogeneous a group, that they have been slow to change their attitudes, and this has fragmented their organizational efforts.22

The public safety sector of local governments have turned to these labor organizations for many reasons: growth of urban area, centralization, and a corresponding lack of intimacy; insulation of politicians from employee pressures; the institution of civil service rather than political machines; the absence of grievance procedures which work; loss of social and political status; declining wage and benefits when compared to other blue-collar groups and increasing inflational competition with other municipal groups for funds; and, the widespread civil unrest of the 1960's.23

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

Public sector collective bargaining is distinguished from the private sector in that it does more than just reallocate resources because it is so inextricable intertwined with the political process. Harry K. Wellington and Ralph K. Winter, Jr. take up the issue of how powerful unions would be if collective bargaining were instituted on a full
scale in the public sector. Wellington and Winter argue that this would "institutionalize" the power of these unions which would leave competing groups at a distinct disadvantage. This argument is based on the unique types of services performed: one, any prolonged disruption of such services involves actual danger to health and safety; two, the demand for these services in "inelastic" and not subject to changes in price ("elasticity" of demand is seen as a determinant of union power); and, three, the extent of inconvenience experienced by voters will determine how much they will "punish" the party in power at the polls.

Recent events, to say the least, have not shaken our conviction that collective bargaining in the public sector raises problems of a different order than in the private sector and is radically restructuring the allocation of political power in our large cities. We believe that the evidence of the last five years demonstrates that a number of factors all contribute to making municipal unions far more powerful than those in the private sector. These include the complexity of municipal budgets, the difficulty in laying off public employees, the availability of funds from other branches of government to pay the costs to later administrations (as in pensions), and the need of municipal officials to give undue attention to the short-run inconveniences caused by public employee strikes. Collective negotiations has been opposed by many on the basis of both theoretical as well as practical considerations. The following are what is seen to be the major arguments against collective negotiations:

1. Conflict must be generated continually, artificially is necessary, so that adversaries will be forced to change positions.
2. Progress occurs frequently when conflict is stimulated because uncompromising parties are stimulated to alter positions.

3. Laws, the social culture, and the membership of political bodies are imbalanced in favor of the establishment. The adversary relationship is necessary to restore equal standing between or among the parties.

4. Labor and management seek different goals which are largely irreconcilable. Domination and compromise offer the only solution to this conflict. This forces each party to distrust the other.

5. Each party views the other as providing minimal contributions for improvement of service delivery. If the other party's power were reduced, the organization would be better.

6. Each party perceives itself as proving major contributions for improvement of service delivery. It should be permitted the leadership role.

7. It provides a countervailing force to other vested groups regarding salaries and financial support for quality services.

8. It provides channels for increasingly competent workers to gain a significant voice in the decision-making process.

9. It provides a solution to the conflict created by professionals functioning within a bureaucratic structure.

In order to make a valid presentation, both sides of any argument must be aired and taken under consideration. The major arguments against collective negotiations as offered by most management and others generally opposed to such include:

1. A democratic society is built upon laws, values, and an ethos permitting decision-making by assumed rational persons.

2. Labor and management are honorable people desirious
of discharging their responsibilities capably.

3. Labor and management possess the common goal of improving humanity, and this basic unanimity transcends their differences.

4. Labor and management possess unique capabilities for making improvements in service delivery. The quality of this delivery is enhanced when the knowledge, experience, and power of labor and management function interactively.

5. When labor and management share in the development of policies and procedures, the commitment to common goals becomes more unified.

6. Cooperative decision-making by labor and management offers a solid approach to integrating organizational goals and employee needs and thereby maximizing the satisfaction of all parties.

7. The doctrine of sovereign immunity.

8. The doctrine of illegal delegation of power.

9. The assumption that bargaining requires a right to strike.

10. Many issues which public employees wish to negotiate are statutorily fixed.

11. Public employers cannot legally bargain exclusively with a representative of a portion of the employees.

12. Negotiations create an adversary relationship which hinders the accomplishment of mutual goals.

13. Negotiations promote competition between employee organizations which stimulates internal conflict.

14. Negotations set up rules and regulations which increase bureaucratization.

Review of Research on Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

It must be pointed out at the beginning that, unfortunately, most available material or studies which have been done on the attitudes of public employees toward collective
negotiations, as well as job satisfaction, have been done on educators. This information has relevance and importance to the study of other public employees such as those under consideration here, and attempts will be made to generalize the information.

In studies made by Carlton and Phillips it was found that labor was more receptive to collective negotiations than management, and that attitudes differed with regard to position and sex in that males were found to support negotiations more strongly, and this has been found to be true, with varying degrees, in most other studies.

Fisher separated the collective negotiations instrument into the two subscales of general attitudes toward bilateral bargaining and attitudes towards sanctions and found a favorable response toward the former while showing an increasing neutrality towards the latter.

Diandomenico looked at the relationship between "perceived need deficiency and 'militancy' or attitude toward sanction activities." He found a significant relationship, and two of the better indicators were feelings of self-fulfillment and opportunity for participation.

Cooper found that even if collective negotiations are endorsed support decreases as more participation is demanded of the participants.

Urich has found that demographic differences have certain effects on attitudes toward collective negotiations. He found that rural and urban personnel had common attitudes
while central city employees had different attitudes. 

Kienast  \(^{34}\) looked at how historical events and structural features affect the development of employee organizations. He found that after 1919 the police diversified among many organizations while fire personnel became dominated by the single AFL-CIO affiliate. Similarities between the two organizations include:

1. policemen and firefighters are the most highly organized group of municipal employees
2. both organize on craft lines
3. normally superior officers and rank-and-file employees are in the same organization
4. the structure of the police and fire employee organization is decentralized and nonbureaucratic
5. both groups prefer mutual alliances over those with nonprotective service work.

Major differences are:

1. more competing organizations exist in the police service
2. most police organizations are not affiliated with the AFL-CIO
3. there is a greater tendency for status cleavages (e.g., rank and race) to be reflected in the structure of the police employee organizations
4. there is a lower rate of participation by police superior officers in employee organizations
5. police organizations have lower dues and are less bureaucratic than firefighter organizations.

Lyle Ball  \(^{35}\) conducted research on the acceptance of existing and proposed public employee collective negotiation provisions, finding that:
1. A majority of all status groups in the general public favored granting teachers the right to negotiate collectively. Age, level of education, and sex did not appear to have an effect on attitudes toward this proposition. Only school board members favored coverage of teachers under a comprehensive public employees statute.

2. The respondents' level of education is highly significant when associated with their attitudes toward the effectiveness of collective negotiations; the higher the level of education, the less support for this proposition.

3. The status groups did not give majority support to the use of a public employment relations board to administer the negotiations process.

4. Teachers are more convinced of the need for the use of arbitration than are other status groups. Board members strongly opposed this process. A majority of the teachers and parents indicated support for the establishment of a court to try employment cases.

5. Members of education administration associations strongly supported teachers' right to strike. When considering status, a majority of the teachers, administrators, and parents supported this right. Age, level of education, and sex did not appear to have an effect on attitudes toward the proposition.

6. With the exception of Wisconsin, administrators, board members, and parents, all status groups indicated dissatisfaction with their respective state teachers' collective negotiation laws.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has many different elements or dimensions, and our survey intends to look at fourteen of them. Other studies done in this area have viewed this problem in much the same way, i.e., that one's satisfaction
with or in a job cannot be described by only a few variables.

Generally, in most surveys studied, it is important to note that salary usually is not highest on the list of complaints. It normally ranked about mid-way in the various lists, substantiating the notion that increased salaries only placate for a while without reaching the deeper problems. Most dissatisfaction seemed to stem from such areas as policy and rules made by management, recognition and job status, voice in decisions, and other related unmeasurable qualities.

The major determinants of satisfaction or dissatisfaction at work consist of:

1. Occupation and status: The higher the status of an occupation the more satisfied are the people who engage in it. Researchers reason that the major variables are prestige, control over conditions of one's work, cohesiveness of one's work group and ego gratification from the challenge and variety of the work itself.

2. Job content: Intrinsic factors such as challenge appear to affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction most substantially. The aspects of job content that appear most consistent in their negative effects are fractionation, repetition and lack of control, or, in positive terms, variety and autonomy. Workers in all occupations rate self-determination highest among the elements that define an ideal job. Content of work is generally more important than being promoted.

3. Supervision: High worker satisfaction is associated with considerate and thoughtful behavior among employers. Satisfaction is also associated with supervisory behavior that shares decision-making with subordinates. The delegation of authority (participative management) has positive effects.
4. Peer relationship: Most people are more satisfied to work as members of a group than in isolation. Workers prefer jobs that permit interaction and are likely to quit jobs that prevent congenial peer relationships.

5. Wages: High pay and high satisfaction with work tend to go together. However, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which high wages in themselves produce sustained high levels of satisfaction, and the extent to which the higher levels of satisfaction that are typical of higher paid jobs reflect the variety, substantive interests, and autonomy that are also typical of such jobs. Moreover, even among highly paid workers, variations in job control make a difference in the degree of job satisfaction. But in a culture in which wages constitute the major source of income for most workers, wages undoubtedly determine a portion of job satisfaction. Certainly, a level of wages that will support an adequate standard of living is of primary importance. Beyond that point, workers tend to measure their wages in terms of "equity", i.e., in a relationship to the contributions that their fellow workers are making to the enterprise, and the salaries they are receiving.

6. Mobility: More than three-quarters of all workers queried by the Survey of Working Conditions said that it was important or somewhat important to them that their chances for promotion should be good. Also, large percentages of workers strongly resent being trapped in a job.

7. Working conditions: Bad physical conditions (long hours, temperature, ventilation, noise, et cetera) can make any job unbearable. Involuntary night shift work also causes low job satisfaction -- probably because it interferes with other valued activities such as marriage, child rearing, and friendships.

8. Job security: Older workers, in particular, find that security of employment is a prerequisite for other sources of satisfaction.

Kornhauser's study of blue-collar workers looked into the relationship between job satisfaction and mental health. He found that high skill level, interesting, non-repetitive,
challenging, good-paying jobs contribute consistently to good mental health and job satisfaction. Work was the most measureable of institutions in the lives of the workers, even ahead of family and leisure, but he found that only 25 percent would choose the same kind of job again. The study also showed that workers with the lowest mental health and job satisfaction scores were often escapist or passive in their non-work activities in that they watched television and did not vote or participate in community organizations. Self-esteem was found to correlate strongly with positive mental health and satisfaction.

Robert Quinn, along the same lines, found that job satisfaction and mental health were poorer when a worker feels "locked-in" to a job with little chance for mobility, status, and probability of getting a job elsewhere.

In a study by Erdman Palmore, job satisfaction was found to be the strongest predictor of longevity with a second factor being overall "happiness".

Sheppard and Herrick, in looking at who is dissatisfied, found that the older worker is more satisfied as well as the higher income personnel, except for those higher-paid individuals under 30 years of age. Blacks are twice as likely to be dissatisfied regardless of income. The higher one's educational level the more likely is that person to be dissatisfied. Women tended to be more dissatisfied due perhaps to existing hiring, promotion, and pay discrimination. And, marriage tended to increase an individual's
satisfaction with his life and job.

Harold Sheppard's case study of blue-collar workers found that job aspirations not realized were reflected in a reduced sense of political efficacy. Jobs that rate high on variety, autonomy, and use of skills were found to be low on measures of political and personal alienation.

In a study done by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan workers at all occupational levels ranked the following qualities in the order of importance:

1. interesting work
2. enough help and equipment to get the job done
3. enough information to get the job done
4. enough authority to get the job done
5. good pay
6. opportunity to develop special abilities
7. job security
8. seeing the results of one's work

Robert Kahn writes that self-esteem and its relation to job satisfaction cannot be described simply, and it is his feeling that,

For most workers it is a choice between no work connection (usually with severe attendant economic penalties and a conspicuous lack of meaningful alternative activities) and a work connection which is burdened with negative qualities (routine, compulsory scheduling, dependency, etc.). In these circumstances, the individual has no difficulty with the choice; he chooses work, pronounces himself moderately satisfied, and tells us more only if the questions become more searching. Then we learn that he can order jobs clearly in terms of their status or desirability, wants his son to be employed differently from himself, and, if given a choice, would seek a different occupation.

Hershey's study dealt with the question of the emergence of a new breed of civil servant in the 1960's. He
theorized that the new worker would have higher needs and would feel greater alienation and engage in more protest to challenge tradition. He found that the prime goal was to establish the right of government employees to speak out on social and political issues, and therefore these protest activities were neither conceived of nor represented a radical attack on existing government policies, institutions, or authority.

Chase found that areas where satisfaction was high were differentiable from low satisfaction systems by a greater chance to participate in planning.

Leiman found that participators possess a higher level of satisfaction, a more positive attitude toward the management, and more self-esteem than nonparticipators.

Attitudes toward Collective Negotiations and Job Satisfaction

Dull looked at militancy and found a significant relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and "material inducements," agreement with goals and policy, and ability to influence policy.

In the study done by Hopkins, Rawson, and Smith which dealt specifically with public employees on a state government level, the work situation was divided into two categories: intrinsic, which include income, resources, promotions, job movement, and repetition; and, extrinsic, described as supervision, discrimination, job security, job quality, and job freedom. The study found that higher
levels of job satisfaction were positively related to: the employee's perception that he can control his own life, perception of good promotional chance, the sense of being upwardly mobile and having reached or exceeded the same occupational level as one's father, high quality supervision, job freedom, and, surprisingly enough, some recognition that discrimination on the basis of age, sex, or race exists. Age seemed to be positively related to job satisfaction while education was inversely related. Union membership, as well as union contracts, was not seen to increase job satisfaction, but the authors stated that there was no evidence that it lowers it either. In fact, the stronger the union becomes, the less members tend to participate. This research also touched on the effects of length of service. The traditional relationship between job satisfaction and the length of service has been shown to be curvilinear where satisfaction shows a "dip" in the middle years. But, public jobs were not shown to follow this rule and long tenure was negatively related to job satisfaction.

Most other studies have yielded rather inconclusive evidence for use in discussing the relationship between job satisfaction and attitudes toward collective negotiations. It is hoped that the present study can begin to add to this.

HYPOTHESES

The major hypothesis underlying this study is that as
the level of job satisfaction decreases, favorable attitudes toward the process of collective bargaining increase. But this study will attempt to take this question farther. This study will attempt to look at some of the underlying or more specific reasons for workers' attitudes toward collective negotiations, job satisfaction, and their interrelationship.

To accomplish this, this hypothesis has been broken down into subhypotheses in order to determine more specific relationship between the various dimensions:

**Hypothesis 1.** As mental and physical exertion required by the job increases, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will become more favorable.

**Hypothesis 2.** As workers view the physical surroundings and working conditions to be less than favorable, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

**Hypothesis 3.** As the "fairness" of employer practices is perceived to decrease, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

**Hypothesis 4.** As relations with other employees becomes less than satisfactory, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

**Hypothesis 5.** As satisfaction with advancement, security, and financial incentives decreases, attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

**Hypothesis 6.** As a worker's perception of his interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job declines, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.
Hypothesis 7. As job status and job information are seen by the employee to be less than optimum, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

Hypothesis 8. As workers perceive their future, goals, and progress towards those goals to be impeded or stymied, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

Hypothesis 9. As workers find their evaluation of their jobs in retrospect to be less than satisfactory, job satisfaction will decrease and attitudes toward collective negotiations will be more favorable.

These subhypotheses state certain measureable independent relationships between job satisfaction and attitudes toward collective negotiations as have been defined in this study.
CHAPTER 3.

A random sample survey is the critical tool with which this study looks at the abstract theory of job satisfaction, how it relates to attitudes toward various levels of collective negotiations, and how these concepts relate to public employees. The employees studied share many common traits including being considered professionals, serving in a full-time capacity, sharing a common element of danger inherent in the job, and having basically the same clientele with which to deal on a daily basis.

The survey was divided into three sections dealing with levels of satisfaction with one's job, attitudes toward collective negotiations, and various demographic characteristics.

The term "collective negotiations"\(^1\) is a compromise term which some use in place of "collective bargaining" and "professional negotiations" to distinguish it from the labor sector in private industry. It is used in many studies along this line, and so it will be used here. Collective negotiations would involve a group effort to formally bring about changes desired by employees. The survey looks at not only general attitudes, but specific attitudes which fall into two categories: bilateral bargaining procedures and
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sanctions to enforce bargaining agreements.

The survey on collective negotiations was taken from the *Collective Action Scale* by Patrick Carlton. The questions were divided so as to provide some breakdown between favoring or disapproving the concept of collective negotiations, with a neutral category also including those who might be somewhat favorable to the concept but who might not approve of sanctions and strikes as tools with which to accomplish the desired results. Persons being surveyed were given five choices of answers consisting of: strongly approve, approve, uncertain, disapprove, and strongly disapprove. A copy of this survey and instructions appear in Appendix I.

Satisfaction is defined as "... the extent to which and individual's needs are satisfied (gratified) and the extent to which the individual perceived satisfaction (gratification) as stemming from his total job situation." Levels of job satisfaction were measured by answers to an abbreviated form of the *Job Satisfaction Scale* by George Johnson. The following work areas were covered by the questionnaire: physical and mental exertion; physical surroundings and working conditions; relations with employers; relations with other employees; advancement, security, and finances; interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job; job status and job information; future, goals, and progress towards those goals; and, evaluation in retrospect. Those being surveyed were given a choice, as indicated by the directions, of answers consisting of "Yes", "No", or
"?" (to be used only if the question did not apply to that person).

Demographic control factors included: age, marital status, race, sex, occupational department, income, years of job experience in the profession, years of job experience in that locality, educational background, whether one's income was considered primary or secondary, and membership in employee organizations. The demographic factors were used only as controls.

The questionnaire was composed in such a way that it occupied only four pages thus making it appear more manageable. It was self-administered, and the questions were designed for easy and quick response. A self-addressed, stamped envelope accompanied each survey for ease of return by the employee. It was not intended that any employee use work time to complete the survey, since one week was allowed for them to return the form, nor should any expense be incurred.

In order to get the information needed for this study a survey was done within Henrico County, Virginia, a suburban community with full-time paid professionals in the law enforcement and fire services departments. This one political jurisdiction was chosen for various other reasons as well. The nature of the area provided diversity as well as many common bonds among its inhabitants. The police and firefighters possessed a high percentage of membership in their respective employee organizations, although they are
always subject to the constrictures of the laws on collective negotiations in the State of Virginia. Another consideration was one of practicality due to the desire for an area relatively convenient to the researcher.

After the initial contact was made with the employee groups and the surveys passed out, several contact were made with the group as a whole. Approximately 200 surveys, 100 to each department, were handed out to the personnel, of which 90 were returned. Response rate, therefore, was approximately 45 percent. The fire personnel returned a total of 54 while the police returned 36 of the questionnaires completed.

In analyzing the resulting data, each question was given a numerical weight (e.g., a question which was answered in such a way as to indicate high satisfaction with that element of one's job was numbered "1"), and this was multiplied by the number of questions in that particular group to give a score on that topic. Example: In looking at the element of job satisfaction dealing with relations with other employees there were three questions on the survey; if one was highly satisfied in that area, he could have scored a "1" on all three questions and therefore had a total score of "3" on that element. Questions on collective negotiations were weighted similarly and then broken down into three large categories of: favor, neutral, or oppose collective negotiations. These scores were then cross-tabulated according to the nine job satisfaction elements.
The process of analyzing the results was accomplished in several steps. The first step involved computing a mean score for each of the job satisfaction variables, thus establishing a "high" and a "low" level of satisfaction to correspond with either a favorable, neutral, or opposing position on collective negotiations. Each variable had an almost equal distribution among the three levels of attitudes toward collective negotiations. The neutral category, besides including those who stated or had no strong feelings in either direction, was interpreted to also include those who might favor the concept of collective negotiations but who might also disagree with the use of sanctions to gain leverage in such situations. In public employment this particular group might be larger in size than in other situations due to the unique character of the particular jobs and the socialization concerning one's attitudes toward strikes and other such sanctions which is inherent to some extent in these jobs.

The second step involved setting up a table using these "high" and "low" categories and subjecting these results to a statistical method known as the chi-square test in order to determine the probability that the variables in a given table are actually associated and to what degree they are associated. This test is used to test the questions: whether the observed results are very likely to be different from chance; the association, or the strength of the relationship; and, validity, which deals with the question of
whether one is truly measuring the desired relationship or not.

Data Results

The survey elicited a generally, though by no means overwhelmingly, positive response to questions of satisfaction with the aspects of the employees' jobs. Satisfaction with job information, training and status, and with progress toward the employee's future goals were particularly high as was satisfaction with the physical and mental exertion required by the job. (See Table 3.1) Conversely, the employees seemed especially unhappy with security, advancement and finances, and with their physical work environment and conditions.

Generally, satisfaction levels differed little between the police and fire respondents (Table 3.2). The police tended to be slightly less happy with their job characteristics, especially in relations with their employers and interest in their job. On the other hand, the firemen's positive job evaluations did not extend to the question of security, advancement and finances, where nearly two-thirds indicated a low level of satisfaction.

Henrico County's firemen and police officers reflect the historic differences between these two types of public employees on the question of support for collective negotiations. Police officers were more likely than fire fighters to oppose such actions. No clear demographic
patterns of support or opposition emerged (Table 3.3).

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Job</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mental and physical exertion</td>
<td>High: 67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical surroundings and working conditions</td>
<td>High: 46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relations with employers</td>
<td>High: 52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relations with employees</td>
<td>High: 64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security, advancement, and finances</td>
<td>High: 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interest in, liking for, and emotional</td>
<td>High: 58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement in job</td>
<td>Low: 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job information, training, and status</td>
<td>High: 75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Future goals and progress towards those goals</td>
<td>High: 71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation of job overall</td>
<td>High: 57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 42.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Job</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mental and physical exertion</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical surroundings and working conditions</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relations with employers</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relations with employees</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security, advancement, and finances</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in job.</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job information, training, and status</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Future goals, and progress towards those goals</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation of job overall</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOGRAPHICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, separated, or</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-15,000</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-20,000</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-25,000</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience in locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school degree</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical school</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4.

After applying the chi-square test to each of the nine variables dealing with the levels of job satisfaction, it was determined that these were significant in the following descending order of importance:

1. work conditions and physical surroundings
2. relations with employers
3. security and finances
4. emotional involvement in the job
5. physical and mental exertion
6. relations with associates
7. job information and training
8. future goals and progress towards those goals
9. evaluation of the job in retrospect

Only the first four of these factors, the questions of work conditions and physical surroundings, relations with employers, security and finances, and emotional involvement in the job, proved to be significantly related to support for collective negotiations. Thus it would appear that in this case, the last five variables bear little relationship to support for or opposition to collective negotiations.

Generally, there did occur one consistent finding in
that the police respondents tended to be more satisfied, less organized, and less militant than the fire protection personnel. This does follow general trends noted in other studies done throughout the country and can be reasonably explained by the nature of the job itself. Police continue to serve in a position that requires strict authoritarian behavior which would conflict somewhat with the idea of professional organizations. They are entrusted to maintain the status quo which naturally would involve an acceptance of such to a certain degree. But, the differences between these two groups is not that great so as to entail a detailed analysis. Police organizations have historically lagged behind the organization of other public employees and probably will continue to do so with varying degrees.

The following tables are descriptions of the responses to various questions in four different areas of the work situation which were found to be the most significant in measuring job satisfaction. The tables list the number of people responding in a given way as well as the overall percentages. Below the table will be found the chi-square test results information. A chi-square test result of .05 is usually considered the minimum level of acceptable significance and ranges to a high of .001.

**Work Conditions and Physical Surroundings**

Although most individuals who desire to work in the fields of fire or police protection are probably much more
aware of what the job generally entails with regard to work location and conditions associated with the nature of the work, dissatisfaction/satisfaction here dealt mostly with the internal surroundings of the job. Being aware of and keeping up with those job requirements necessary to do one's work and having input into the organization are felt to be crucial for satisfaction to result.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction with Working Conditions and Physical Surroundings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>17 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( x^2 = 9.84, \text{ df } = 2, \ p > .01 \)

Relations with Employers

This area of job satisfaction ties in closely with the first area in its impact on the working conditions. How workers perceive the attitudes and capabilities of one's superiors is crucial to the overall picture of satisfaction. Here we dealt with areas such as: feelings of having too many diverse levels of management; feelings of being required to do things one dislikes in order to get promotions, including some feeling of office favoritism.
or "office politics" occurring on occasions; a lack of understanding between the levels with regard to job requirements and policies which can lead to misinterpretation of decisions; in all, a tendency not to respect the position of one another simply due to a lack of knowledge about such.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction with Employer Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>19 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 8.62, \text{df} = 2, p > .02\)

Security, Advancement, and Finances

The third area showing significance in this study is the most likely one to appear - security and finances - but, it is interesting to note that, true to many studies and contrary to popular opinion, money is not the top priority item in dealing with aspects of job satisfaction. The questions here also dealt with promotions and resulting pay increases so it is likely that dissatisfaction with the promotional procedures, as demonstrated in the last section, might have some carry-over here. A feeling of lack of appreciation by the clientele for the dangerous
jobs they perform as reflected in what these workers perceive as "fair" pay also might tend to "color" the issue.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction With Security, Advancement and Finances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>8 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>17 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x^2 = 6.76, df = 2, p > .05)

Emotional Involvement in the Job

The last topic considered to be of measureable significance deals with the difficult aspect of one's emotional involvement in the job. It would be easy to accept that those individuals who apply for jobs such as these are likely to have a certain amount of interest in and dedication to that particular career. The questions in this area revolved around two themes: whether the job gave a feeling of personal satisfaction; and, if given a choice, whether that individual would choose that particular job or profession again. The questions also discussed, along those lines, the feeling of monotony derived from the duties associated with a position.
Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction with Emotional Involvement in job</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>13 (14%)</td>
<td>17 (19%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (14%)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>22 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 (58%)</td>
<td>37 (41%)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 6.46, \: df = 2, \: p > .05\)

Summary

The responses to this survey indicate a significant relationship between four aspects of job satisfaction and support for collective negotiations. As expected these areas are job aspects most likely to be affected by and through collective negotiations. While the physical and mental exertion required of a policeman or fireman cannot be changed without radical job restructuring or technological advances, and relations with associates are as easily controlled by the employee as the employer, three of the four job aspects which relate significantly to support for collective negotiations are those which are most often seen as the subject of such discussions.

The significance of the last variable may simply reflect the difficulty of becoming emotionally involved with a job in which working conditions, financial considerations and employer relations are unsatisfactory.
CONCLUSIONS

The implications of union or organized professional group involvement in policies and the policy-making process are significant. The direction of change is dependent on the interpretation and attitudes of those who are in charge, whether they be public administrators or union leaders. It is recognized by most objective observers that frequent and effective communications between these two groups is essential, and, while both groups have different needs and methods through which to obtain them, moderation and cooperation seem to be the key words. As Stephen Halpern points out, the opposing forces here have (or should have) a mutual dependency on maintaining a good, solid relationship in order to keep communications open. It is to the advantage of both sides to keep leadership changes to a minimum once a working relationship has been developed. It has also been suggested, that, due to the entirely subjective nature of those factors which seem to be the most important or significant to this particular study, that new forms of informal communications be developed which could utilize a system to uncover the small, festering problems among the personnel which would not otherwise be formally reported. Small favors or accommodations which take on a personalized character may be a method of assuaging the potentially discontented employee, leaving the major problems in a position to be dealt with more objectively. Many problems are interrelated and cannot be totally separated,
but most can be pared down to workable proportions.

As stated previously, this study does not intend nor attempt to argue either for or against collective negotiations, but, while unionization may enhance the feeling of dignity, security, and sense of satisfaction by workers, and also provide outlets for feelings of dissatisfaction so as to relieve some pressure on administrators, it in no way can be considered a "cure-all". At the same time, these public administrators are entrusted with the government of a locality and the well-being of all of its citizens and should not want to relinquish total control over the content or the procedure of formal policy. But, although the problems in this particular case have been generally stated, no specific answers will be attempted. Administrators and employees alike must use these only as guidelines while attempting to dig below the surface to find the real cause of their unique problems. The particular people, the present and past policies, and the current history of the locality as well as the state and the nation as a whole -- all these factors must be dealt with utilizing input from all factions in order to deal successfully with the problems at hand.
APPENDIX I

PART I: Instructions: The following questions concern your feelings and attitudes regarding your work and your plans. They are specific and require that you circle the "yes" or "no" -- whichever is the answer appropriate for you. If you are doubtful, make the best answer you can, but answer either "yes" or "no". Your should circle the "?" only if the question does not apply to you. Some of the questions are very similar but have somewhat different meanings, so answer every question even though you may feel that it has already appeared on the list.

1. Does your job give you more real personal satisfaction than the things you do in your spare time? Yes ? No

2. Does your present job help you toward the occupational goals you have set yourself? Yes ? No

3. If you had a choice, would you choose a job in your present line of work over one in any other line of work? Yes ? No

4. Do you feel that your job detracts from your status in the community where you live? Yes ? No

5. Do you expect your job to give you more satisfaction the longer you have it? Yes ? No

6. Do you feel that others could make your work easier if they cared to do so? Yes ? No

7. Are the policies and problems of the people under whom you work adequately explained to you? Yes ? No

8. Is it necessary for you to do things you dislike in order to get promotions? Yes ? No

9. Do you think your work suffers because you have too much to do? Yes ? No

10. Do the people under whom you work make available the materials, information, and assistance you need to do your best work? Yes ? No

11. Do you feel you have had adequate preparation for the job you now hold? Yes ? No
12. Do you feel less satisfied with your work as time goes by?  
   Yes? No

13. Do you feel that there should be more people to help with the work you are doing?  
   Yes? No

14. Do you feel you are paid a fair salary for the work you do?  
   Yes? No

15. Does your present job tire you too much physically?  
   Yes? No

16. Does your job give you enough varied experiences?  
   Yes? No

17. Are there too many people telling you what to do at present?  
   Yes? No

18. Are you satisfied with the degree to which your present job gives you opportunity to express your own ideas?  
   Yes? No

19. Do you believe other people advance ahead of you by unfair means such as special influence or politics?  
   Yes? No

20. Do you feel you have made a success of your job thus far in your career?  
   Yes? No

21. Do you think your work is worthwhile and important?  
   Yes? No

22. Do you think your job gets more difficult for you each year?  
   Yes? No

23. Is your income sufficient to meet your financial obligations and support your family?  
   Yes? No

24. Do you feel that your associates stimulate you to do better work?  
   Yes? No

25. Do you get restless during working hours, and feel that the day is dragging endlessly?  
   Yes? No

26. Do you feel your work ties you down or restricts your freedom too much?  
   Yes? No

27. Have you been able to get the promotions and pay increases which you feel you deserve?  
   Yes? No
28. Do you feel that you have an adequate understanding of what is expected of you in your present job? Yes ? No

29. If you could start over again, at 18, would you choose a different line of work? Yes ? No

30. Would you like to secure a different job, either in the same or another occupation? Yes ? No

31. In general, do you get along well with the persons with whom you work on your present job? Yes ? No

32. Do you feel that you are really interested in your present job? Yes ? No

33. Is your present job in the area of work (not necessarily the same job) you wish to remain in permanently? Yes ? No

34. Do you feel respect and regard for the people under whom you work? Yes ? No

35. Do you often feel that your work is monotonous and boring? Yes ? No

36. Do you feel that your job requirements change too often for you to keep up adequately? Yes ? No

PART II: Instructions: The following questions concern your feelings and attitudes toward various aspects of collective negotiations. Please attempt to answer all the questions in order for the findings to be complete, using the "Undecided" category only if absolutely necessary. The answer choices will be abbreviated throughout the survey, but they are explained below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SA)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS
1. Employee organizations should participate in the selection of new supervisors.

2. Employee organizations should have responsibility in the choice of new employees.

3. Employees should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the locality cannot be reached.

4. Collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding of services.

5. Public employees should be able to organize freely and bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.

6. Public employee organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair practices through the media, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.

7. I believe that collective negotiations by public employees is a conspiracy against the country.

8. I feel that strikes on the part of public employees are an undesirable consequence of collective negotiations.

9. I believe militant public employee groups are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.

10. Public employees should not strike in order to enforce their demands.

11. I feel that the good public employee can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective negotiations.

12. I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiations, is beneath the dignity of the public employee.
13. I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitrations, or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.

14. I feel that the public employee cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.

15. I feel that collective negotiation is chipping away by inches at local control and should be resisted.

16. I think collective negotiations can help to unite my profession into a cohesive body.

17. I think collective negotiations by public employee organizations may lead to totalitarianism in local government, a kind of dictatorship by public employees.

18. I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby public employees gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.

19. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power-seekers who do not have the best interests of my profession at heart.

20. The local public employee organizations should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new employees.

21. I think public employees have a right to impose sanctions on administrations under certain circumstances.

22. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of public employee responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to an effective program of service delivery.
23. I believe sanctions are a means of improving opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.  

24. I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for public employees to use.  

25. I feel that the traditional position that public employees, as such, may not strike is the only defensible position of a sensible local administration to take.  

26. I don't feel that the services of public employees are so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of their right to strike.  

27. I believe that any public employee sanction or other coercive measure is completely unprofessional.  

28. All attempts to infringe upon county authority in the selection and adoption of work-related materials should be resisted.  

29. I believe that when the locality denies the reasonable requests of public employees, the employees have a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates in other areas.  

30. I think collective negotiation can bring greater order and system to my profession.  

PART III: Instructions: The following few questions involve personal information which is systematic for such a survey as this and will in no way be used to identify you. Your survey cannot be used if this information is not completed, and so I ask that you please fill in this section so that I may have the information necessary to complete this study.
Please check the appropriate response. DO NOT SIGN THIS SHEET.

Sex: Male ___
     Female____
Race: White ____
      Black ____
      Other ____
Age:  20-29 years ____
      30-39 years ____
      40-49 years ____
      50-59 years ____
      60 or over ____
Marital status:
     Single ____
     Married ____
     Divorced, separated, or widowed ____
Occupational department:
     Fire ____
     Police ____
Salary at present:
     $5,000 - 10,000 ____
     $10,000 - 15,000 ____
     $15,000 - 20,000 ____
     $20,000 - 25,000 ____
Do you consider your income as your primary source of family income? Yes ____ No ____
Are you a member of any professional employee organization? If so, please list here__________________________
Years of Experience:
(In this profession):  
Less than 5 ____  
5 - 9 ____  
10 - 14 ____  
15 or more ____  
(In this locality):  
Less than 5 ____  
5 - 9 ____  
10 - 14 ____  
15 or more ____  

Level of Education:
High school degree ____  
Some college ____ or technical school ____  
Bachelor's degree ____ plus ____  
Master's degree ____ plus ____
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