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ABSTRACT

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: HOW CHANGES IMPACT ATTITUDES TOWARD JOB SATISFACTION

by

R. Michael Browder

The purpose of the study was to examine how a shift in elements of organizational culture impacted attitudes toward job satisfaction in a medium-sized, consumer-owned electric utility over a period of 13 years. The unit of analysis was a municipal utility distributing electrical energy to approximately 27,000 customers.

Data collection included the Science Research Associate Employee Inventory, a review of the organization's documents, and a subjective Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. A one-tailed z-test was performed to test whether or not the proportion of employees answering favorable in one survey was greater than the proportion answering favorable in the other survey. It was also used to analyze certain cultural changes. The elements of job satisfaction assessed were: job demands, working conditions, pay, employee benefits, friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees, supervisor/employee interpersonal relations, confidence in management, technical competence of supervision, effectiveness of administration, adequacy of communication, security of job and work relations, status and recognition, identification with the company, and opportunity for growth and advancement. Elements assessed depicting culture were attendance, safety, United Way participation and turnover.

Conclusions of the study emphasized that long-term cultural aspects including attendance, safety and United Way participation may be changed positively while maintaining or improving attitudes toward certain aspects of job satisfaction. Areas of attitude improvement were pay, benefits, and effectiveness of administration. It was also concluded that employees with higher education levels and more behavioral training may have higher expectations of their supervisors.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

When the beliefs and attitudes of members of an organization are congruent with the purpose and goals of that organization, the possibility is much greater for success for both the employee meeting his needs and the organization meeting its objectives. This can be seen in both attitude and behavior.

Several thousand employees who are not turned on to their organization and work are unable to accomplish the same work, faster and of higher quality than a group of 100 turned-on employees (Peters & Austin, 1985).

There has been much written recently as to the ways to turn on employees. Deal (1982) expressed the idea that people should relearn old lessons about how culture ties people together and gives meaning and purpose to their everyday lives. He stated that several early leaders of successful businesses saw their role as creating an environment, in effect - culture, in their companies where
employees could be secure and thereby do the work necessary to make the business a success.

Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) wrote, in *Re-inventing the Corporation*, that the most important resource of a re-invented company is people - human capital. They said, "The new, re-invented corporations stress inordinate regard for the two most important types of people in an enterprise: employees and customers" (p. 14). They emphasized, "It is not a question of being nice to people. It is simply a recognition that human beings will make or break a company" (p. 15).

Peters and Waterman (1982) stated, "Without exception, the dominance and coherence of culture prove to be an essential quality of the excellent companies" (p. 75). It becomes more and more evident that if an organization is to be successful, it must have a strong culture and that culture must have a strong bias toward people, both employees and customers. There is evidence that an organization which does not presently have a strong people bias will become less and less successful, to the point of
failure, unless it changes.

To succeed, organizations must change their internal social structure in a manner which simultaneously satisfies competitive needs for a new, more fully integrated form and the needs of individual employees for the satisfaction of their individual self-esteem (Ouchi, 1982).

It appears that there should be a relationship between the job satisfaction of the members of an organization and the culture of that organization.

Statement of the Problem

Changes in corporate or organizational culture over time may impact levels of job satisfaction in a specific organizational setting but it is not clear from the research how or what to expect.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine how a shift in elements of organizational culture impacted attitudes toward job satisfaction in a medium sized consumer-owned electric utility over a period of thirteen years.
Significance of the Study

A better understanding of attitudes towards job satisfaction and changes in organizational culture will provide information to help analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture.

Even though this study took place in a single organization setting, the findings have relevance for similar organizations with a need to improve employee attendance, safety and community participation. The findings should be especially helpful in understanding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture in those similar organizations.

Research Questions

The following research questions were submitted for this study:

1. What were the differences between the employee attitudes towards job satisfaction in 1976 and 1989?

2. What cultural changes took place in the organization within the 13-year period?
3. What changes in attitudes towards job satisfaction of individuals within an organization were related to the evidences of changes in the culture of the organization?

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were submitted for this study:

H1. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with job demands between 1976 and 1989.

H2. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with working conditions between 1976 and 1989.

H3. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with pay between 1976 and 1989.

H4. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with employee benefits between 1976 and 1989.

H5. There will be a significant difference in the
attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees between 1976 and 1989.

H6. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with supervisor/employee interpersonal relations between 1976 and 1989.

H7. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with confidence in management between 1976 and 1989.

H8. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with technical competence of supervision between 1976 and 1989.

H9. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with effectiveness of administration between 1976 and 1989.
H10. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with **adequacy of communications** between 1976 and 1989.

H11. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with **security of job and work relations** between 1976 and 1989.

H12. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with **status and recognition** between 1976 and 1989.

H13. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with **identification with the company** between 1976 and 1989.

H14. There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with **opportunity for growth and advancement** between 1976 and 1989.
H15. There will be a significant difference in turnover of members of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

H16. There will be a significant difference in safety of members of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

H17. There will be a significant difference in absenteeism of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

H18. There will be a significant difference in United Way participation of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

Assumptions

1. The survey instrument accurately reflected the attitudes of the members of the organization.

2. The sample of communications and documents reviewed was representative of all communications, interventions, feelings and attitudes of all members of the organization.

3. The communications and documents were complete and accurately reflected the true feelings of the employee/author.
Limitations of the Study

1. The attitude study was limited to the employees of Bristol Tennessee Electric System in May 1976 and October 1989 and was based on data from an attitude survey administered by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on those dates.

2. The study of the communications and interventions was limited to written data in Bristol Tennessee Electric System records between January 1975 and July 1992.

3. The behavioral study was limited to employees of Bristol Tennessee Electric System employed during the period January 1975 to December 1977 and the period January 1988 to December 1990.

Definition of Terms

Organizational Culture was the sum total "of knowledge, experience, meanings, beliefs, values, attitudes, power and wealth that is acquired by an organization" (Veninga, 1982, p. 19).
Cultural Change was a change in the elements of culture, as identified in the research literature and measured in this study through communications and document analysis. Job Satisfaction was the attitude of an organization member toward levels of satisfaction of certain job-related elements as measured by a National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) survey (see Appendix A for complete information). The elements of this survey were job demands, working conditions, pay, employee benefits, friendliness and cooperation, supervisor/employee interpersonal relations, confidence in management, technical competence, supervision, effectiveness of administration, adequacy of communications, security of job and work relations, status and recognition, identification with the company, and opportunity for growth and advancement. Components of these elements of job satisfaction were obtained in groupings of questions from the NRECA survey (see Appendix A for complete information). Turnover was the comparison of employees separated from the organization in 1977 and in 1990.
Safety was the comparison of employees' lost-time accident safety records of 1977 and 1990.

Absenteeism was the comparison in the number of missed work days by employees, other than vacation, in 1977 and 1990.

United Way Participation was the comparison in the level of employee financial participation in The United Way in 1977 and 1990.

**Procedures**

1. The current literature was reviewed.

2. A copy of the results of the surveys conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association analyzing the attitudes of the employees of Bristol Tennessee Electric System in May 1976 and in October 1989 was obtained and reviewed.

3. A review was conducted of the historical documents of BTES of the intervening years. The documents were analyzed to identify changes and causes of changes in the culture of the organization as depicted by certain behavioral changes.
4. Statistical procedures were applied to the survey data and the behavioral data.

5. The results were summarized and reported.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters.

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, significance of the study, the hypotheses, the limitations, the assumptions, the definition of terms, the procedures, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 3 contains a description of the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter 4 contains a presentation and analysis of the data.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

The most important component of a successful organization is its people. Thomas J. Watson, Jr. stressed an important value which he believed helped build International Business Machines (IBM). He said that the real difference between success and failure in a corporation can be traced to how well the organization brought out the great energies and talents of its people (Watson, 1963). To bring out these great energies and talents, an organization should have a group culture that supports this process (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Organizations do develop cultures that affect, in a major way, how members of that organization think, feel, and act (Schein, 1985).

Former great American business leaders such as Watson of IBM, Harley Proctor of Proctor & Gamble, and General Johnson of Johnson & Johnson believed that a strong culture within their company was necessary for success. This
culture included creating an environment in which employees could be secure and, thereby, do the work necessary to make their business a success (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). An organization increases its probability for success when a culture is formed where the success of the company is compatible with the success of the employees. When employees link their own self-interests to that of the company, the norm is toward higher productivity (Lesieur, 1958).

Kluckholm characterized culture as "the set of habitual and traditional ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting that are characteristic of the ways a particular society meets its problems in particular point and time" (cited in Ernest, 1985, p. 49).

Culture spells out how a person is to behave (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Deal & Kennedy stated that behaviors observed to be similar over time may be classified as being cultural, whereas, according to Katz (1960), attitude is the predisposition to evaluate a symbol, object or aspect in a favorable or unfavorable manner. Katz also stated, "When
specific attitudes are organized into a hierarchical structure, they comprise value systems" (p. 168). According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), it is very difficult to predict behavior from attitudes and values but there is a greater probability of predicting values or attitudes from behavior.

Behavior changes that are consistent over time can be indicative of cultural changes (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). When these changes take place in an organizational setting, there may be changes in attitudes that relate to job satisfaction (Costello & Zalking, 1963).

Cultural changes are usually brought on by a tension that continues to focus on the important aspects of the planned new culture and this tension is usually consistent over time (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). In an organization, one evidence of tension for change may be found in documents of the organization. Documents such as memos, newsletters, written performance appraisals and promotion data are good sources of information to determine tension created to influence certain behavior by determining key values where
attention is focused (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). As the culture makes a transformation, it is likely to have an impact on attitudes toward job satisfaction. Changes in culture, as evidenced by long-term behavioral changes, could be juxtaposed with changes in the attitude toward job satisfaction as evidenced by what employees say they think and feel (Porras & Berg, 1978).

Organizational Culture

An organization can be a subculture within the larger culture but it is not apart from it (Light & Keller, 1985). Even though an organization's culture is a subculture of a larger culture, it, itself, is also a culture. Culture, as Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defined it, is "the integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thought, speech, action, and artifacts and depends on man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations." The essence of organizational "culture" should be reserved for the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization,
that operate unconsciously, and that define the basic taken-for-granted fashion an organization views itself and its environment (Schein, 1989).

Organizations "develop cultures that affect in a major way how the members think, feel, and act" (Schein, 1989, p. 3) and culture also has a major effect on the success of the business (Deal & Kennedy, 1987).

Culture is the "learned product of group experience" (Schein, 1989, p. 7) and is learned from those within close proximity (Wolcott, 1982, p. 78).

Culture is learned from two types of situations. They are "positive problem-solving situations" and "anxiety-avoidance situations." With the positive problem situation, there is positive reinforcement if an attempted solution worked. With the anxiety-avoidance situation, there is positive reinforcement if anxiety is reduced or if potentially negative consequences are avoided (Schein, 1989).

Light and Keller (1985) divided the elements of culture into three areas. They are norms, values, and symbols.
Norms are shared rules and guidelines that specify appropriate and inappropriate behavior in the relationship of people to one another. They apply to how people are supposed to act in specific settings or situations. Norms include rewards and punishment sanctions that occur as a result of particular behaviors. Values are the general ideas that members of a group share about what is good or bad, right or wrong, desirable or undesirable. Values are broad, abstract concepts and usually provide the foundation on which norms are based. "In sum, norms constitute rules for behavior; values provide the criteria or standards we use for evaluating the desirability of behavior" (p. 60). Culture from a symbolic prospective is a shared definition or meaning of an object, gesture, sound, color, design, or a frequently encountered event. The sum of these elements of culture -- norms, values, and symbols -- "has important effects on the way we think and behave" (p. 63).

Organizational culture, according to Schein (1989), could be defined as,

a pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered,
or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 9).

**Culture - Transmitted or Transformed**

Light and Keller (1985) defined enculturation as "a process by which an initially novel behavior pattern becomes embedded in the lifeways of a social community" (p. 74).

Organization enculturation takes place in two ways. First, when a new member is brought into an organization, he is confronted with that organization's culture. Over time, if he adopts norms, values, and symbols that are a part of that culture as his own and they become part of the way he thinks and acts, then enculturation has taken place (Wolcott, 1982). Second, a person, such as a manager or leader, may set out to change the behavior of the members of an organization. If the old behaviors and the new behaviors
are based on different elements of culture, then it would be necessary to go through an embedding process where new norms, values, and symbols are taught and learned. As the members of the organization began to accept these new elements of culture, then they have been enculturated into the new culture (Schein, 1989).

New employees can be enculturated using new employee indoctrinations by someone who has good understanding and strong feeling for the organization's culture, especially its norms and values (Deal & Kennedy, 1987).

If one wants to make changes in behaviors and attitudes of members of an organization, he must confront the elements of culture. It is only when members of the organization have adopted new norms and values that their attitudes change (Schein, 1989).

Leaders should be constantly striving to embed the organization's desired norms and values in its new employees through its hiring and new employee orientation and indoctrination program. Leaders should also strive to embed desired new norms and values through the use of rewards and
sanctions. These rewards and sanctions have to be consistent and predictable to become part of the culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1987).

Forming Attitudes

Since group culture is a habit pattern, it lends security to helping people cope (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Habit patterns are behaviors that tend to be consistent over time. Many times behaviors are deemed to be reflective of attitudes and vice versa. Even though this is true in many cases, it is not always true. There can be a major inconsistency between attitudes and behavior (Freedman, Sears & Carlsmith, 1978).

"Attitude is the predisposition of an individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner" (Costello & Zalkind, 1963, p. 353). There are two schools of thought concerning attitudes and behaviors. One says that attitudes precede behaviors and actions. The other reverses that logic (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Harvard psychologist Jerome
Bruner (1973) indicated that behaviors could precede attitudes when he said, "You are more likely to act yourself into feeling than feel yourself into action" (p. 24).

The inconsistency between attitude and behavior was demonstrated in a study by a white professor, LaPiere (Freedman, Sears & Carlsmith, 1978). He, his wife and a young Chinese student toured the United States. This was in 1934 during a time when there was a strong bias against Chinese in the United States. They stopped at 184 restaurants and 66 hotels and motels. They were never refused service at a restaurant and all but one of the hotels or motels gave them space. Later, a letter was sent to each of these establishments asking if they would accept Chinese. Ninety-two percent indicated they would not accept Chinese as guests. Almost all of those in this study behaved in a tolerant fashion, but indicated an intolerant attitude when questioned. LaPiere interpreted this to indicate there can be a major inconsistency between attitudes and behavior.

A change in behavior usually precedes a change in
attitudes. "Evidence shows that a rule or a law can bring about changes in behavior, and then in turn, attitudes change" (Costello & Zalkind, 1963, p. 287). Also, positive reinforcement usually causes behavioral change in the intended direction. It shapes behavior, teaches and, in the process, enhances our own self-image (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

According to Costello & Zalkind (1963), behaviors change as a means to reaching desired goals or avoiding undesirable ones. This leads to acquiring beliefs as these changed behaviors lead to satisfying certain needs. These acquired beliefs help form attitudes. Attitude gives a frame of reference for understanding our relationship to happenings in our environment. The definiteness and stability of our attitudes are largely provided by the norms of our culture. If the norms change, then those persons who respond will, over a period of time, have attitudinal changes that correspond with the norm change. This, in turn, leads to a cultural change.
Embedding Culture

According to Schein (1985),

The most powerful primary mechanism for culture embedding and reinforcement are (1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; (2) leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises; (3) deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching by leaders; (4) criteria for allocation of rewards and status; (5) criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication (p. 224-225).

The focus of a corporate culture is primarily on the people who do the communicating and the mechanism for productivity can be found in the beliefs, action, and behavior of managers and employees (Schein, 1986). Managers should treat employees seriously and keep them continually informed (Meussling, 1987). Employees have a need to talk back and ventilate their frustrations in a face-to-face encounter with management (Morse, 1987). Continual
communication concerning company goals tends to quell rumors and generate greater respect and credibility for management (Kanter, 1986).

Since corporate culture is the cumulative knowledge, experience, meanings, beliefs, values and attitudes of its members (Veninga, 1982), it is important that the building of these attributes over a period of time be consistent. Organizations that develop distinct local cultures tend to hire for the lowest positions and make promotions from within the company (Schein, 1989). Also management goes to considerable efforts in screening the applicants to ensure that the new hires already possess certain values and orientations in common with those fostered in the organization (Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983). On the first day of employment, a new employee orientation session is an opportunity to positively affect a new employee's behavior (Megginson, 1977) and satisfaction (Marion & Trieb, 1969) for the rest of his career (Megginson, 1977). Sharing information at this time is very important (McAdams, 1988). Posting a notice on a company bulletin board welcoming the
new employee exhibits his importance to the organization (Bucher, 1974). Showing him on an organization chart where and how he fits into the company (Scheer, 1971), discussions about the overall activities of the company, fringe benefits, attendance, teamwork, additional education and training, participation in company social functions and activities could mean the difference between success or failure in being a productive, satisfied employee (Meggison, 1977).

For an organization to bring out the great energies and talents of its people, there must be employee involvement (Deal & Kennedy, 1987). The ultimate success of employee involvement depends on a supportive management behavior (Pace & Suojanen, 1988). They said, "Managerial support for employee involvement is gained through training, communication, persuasion, and when positive approaches fail, negative consequences" (p. 36). Supportive management should strive to develop "a sense of teamwork and trust that fosters a we're-all-in-this-together attitude" (McAdams, 1988, p. 103). Showing trust in employees and giving them
freedom to perform may even evoke a self-fulfillment prophecy of commitment (Schatz & Schatz, 1986).

Performance-based reward systems are seen as aiding in the process, as well as making an organization more productive, flexible and competitive (McAdams, 1988). Failure to diligently measure individual performance and to tie pay to the accomplishment of objectives may meet with employee resistance and less than optimum results (Beatty, Omens, Kheidri, & Beatty, 1983). Therefore, compensation administration is an important managerial function. It affects workers' absenteeism, productivity, and turnover (Lawler, 1981). Harrington (1987) pointed out that "salary should be directly related to both the level of the job the employees have and how well they are performing their responsibilities...the yearly performance appraisal evaluation provides an ideal way to relate the employee's salary to their performance" (p. 124).
Job Satisfaction

Many studies have been performed comparing particular aspects of the work environment with job satisfaction. Some of the comparison studies included work performance and turnover intentions (Shore & Martin, 1989), appraisal instrument, feedback and goal setting (Tziner & Latham, 1989), formal induction process (Zahrly & Tosi, 1989), work and non-work stress (Lance & Richardson, 1988), change, nature of task and education or training (Yaverbaum & Culpan, 1990).

Income satisfaction was analyzed by Sweeney, McFarlin & Inderrieden (1990), in a multi-study examination. Four large samples of respondents and various measurements were used to compare and predict satisfaction with pay. The researchers found that workers were dissatisfied with their income when they felt their pay fell short of that of similar others. Also, they were dissatisfied with their income if they felt their last pay increase was lower than they deserved and that they were worse off financially now than they were a year ago.
Sweeney et al. (1990) used data collected under the same general research project. Data were collected with a survey sample of a completely different group. Sweeney et al. (1990) found that dissatisfaction with income resulted when past expectations of the workers for income were not met. They also found that a significant predictor of dissatisfaction by the workers was a sense of earning less than what was deserved. Finally, dissatisfaction with their income increased as the perceived gap increased between their earnings and that of similar others.

Using data from another of the four surveys, Sweeney et al. (1990) found "the greater the discrepancy between salaries and desired salaries and the more that people viewed that discrepancy as undeserved, the less satisfied they were" (p. 429). Sweeney et al. (1990) also found that the more the interviewees believed that comparison others had higher salaries and the less optimistic they were about their own future pay increases, the more dissatisfied they were with their pay.
As a fourth part of this research project, analyses were made by Sweeney et al. (1990) of completed surveys from employees of a large mid-western bank. The findings included a strong correlation between respondents feeling that comparison others had higher salaries than they and the decrease in satisfaction with their own pay. Also, the less the employees felt they were being paid compared to what they felt they deserved, and the less their future expectations were for receiving deserved pay, the less they were satisfied with their pay. The lower the level of personal responsibility that the employees felt for their job outcomes, the less satisfied they were with their pay. Findings according to Sweeney et al. (1990) included "to the extent respondents felt similar others earned more, dissatisfaction with income and pay resulted" (p. 430).

Zeitz (1990) reported, in a study of federal employees, that if "... rewards are seen as inconsistent with contribution, the tendency is to construct a rather negative view of managerial confidence and the reward distribution system" (p. 433).
Folger and Konovsky (1989), examined the reactions of employees to decisions about pay raises. They found that procedures used in determining pay raises made a contribution to the employees' organizational commitment and their trust in their supervisor. Employee commitment to an organization and trust in its management was affected by the perceived fairness of the means used to determine pay raises.

It is apparent from these studies that pay level alone does not explain pay level satisfaction. Also from these studies it can be concluded that pay level satisfaction can be influenced by satisfaction with other organizational factors, such as how well a worker is paid compared to another worker in a comparable job. Pay satisfaction is impacted by consistency with job contribution of workers, procedures used in determining pay raises, and expectations. Pay procedures impact a worker's organizational commitment and trust of their supervisor and management.

Procedures used to orient a new employee affects job satisfaction (Zahrly & Tosi, 1989). They compared the
induction mode of a new employee to job satisfaction. The study was conducted in a manufacturing facility. They found a relationship between induction mode and job satisfaction. "The organizational decision to impose a particular mode of induction is a powerful tool for influencing future attitudes and behaviors of its members" (p. 71).

Education and training was found to have an impact on job satisfaction (Yaverbaum & Culpan, 1990). They studied computer end-users to determine the impact, including job satisfaction, of education and task differences on change. They found that the users of change or technology experienced increased feelings of satisfaction and perceived motivation. They also found that "managers and professional employees do not receive a high degree of job motivation with the introduction of technology" (p. 451). It was their conclusion that management and professional employees may perceive technology as a threat. Research indicates that education should be a concern of management because employees receiving training are generally more satisfied with their jobs (Yaverbaum & Culpan, 1990).
Training not only includes technological and task procedural training but it also includes behavior and process training.

A worker's level of job satisfaction is impacted by how he is paid compared to others with similar jobs (Sweeney et al. 1990). Education and training impact job satisfaction (Yaverbaum & Culpan, 1990). Trained workers are more satisfied with their jobs and their pay. The new employee's induction into the organization affects future job satisfaction (Megginson, 1977). High satisfaction with pay appears to be a good indicator of total satisfaction. When pay and all other areas are satisfactory, there is satisfaction with pay (Sweeney et al. 1990). But when there is dissatisfaction with any other measured aspect, there is a high correlation with pay dissatisfaction (Sweeney et al. 1990).

**Change Impacts Satisfaction**

To affect a systematic planned organizational change, organizational development-type interventions may be used to
impact tasks and behavioral processes within the organization.

According to French and Bell (1984) organization development is a,

top-management-supported, long-range effort to improve an organization's problem-solving and renewal processes, particularly through a more effective and collaborative diagnosis and management of organization culture—with special emphasis on formal work team, temporary team, and intergroup culture—with the assistance of a consultant-facilitator and the use of the theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including action research (p. 17).

Porras and Berg (1978) researched 160 assessments of planned organizational change projects. Of the 160 assessments, 35 used interventions that met the definition of organization development (OD).

Porras and Berg used the following set of activities to categorize the OD interventions studied:
(1) laboratory training with a process emphasis,
(2) laboratory training with a task emphasis,
(3) managerial grid,
(4) survey feedback,
(5) complementary techniques.

They found that of the various satisfaction variables, only satisfaction with pay, the company, and job security changed positively more than 50% of the time. General satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervisor, job, or work group, changed positively less than 50% of the time.

Over a period of time as training continues in the area of behavior processes, employees become more cognizant and organizational expectations change (Golembiewski, Billingsley & Yeager, 1976). This can lead to changes in levels of employee expectations. As a result, there can be improvements in areas of specified elements of satisfaction but, at the same time through training, there can be increased expectations from these same areas. Therefore, an
attitude survey on elements of satisfaction could show no change or even a decrease in satisfaction, even though there may have been many improvements in the area of these elements of satisfaction.

Other variables such as absenteeism, turnover, productivity, and safety can indicate change in work force characteristics. Porras and Berg (1978) found that about half the time there was a statistically significant improvement in these areas. The studies that had used managerial grid as the dominant intervention reported the most frequent positive impact on outcome variables. Included were satisfaction variables, work force characteristic variables, and economic performance variables.

According to Blake and Mouton (1978), the 9,9 grid approach, or orientation to behavioral processes, made a true difference in the effectiveness of corporations and in the lives of individuals. The 9,9 orientation was where there is a high concern for people and a high concern for productivity. This approach involved the attraction of
achieving important life goals and outcomes, with and through others, which in turn aids them to be effective and happy as well. This type motivation is sometimes referred to as egotistic altruism, enlightened self-interest or self-fulfillment. This orientation avoids defeat such as occurs when a person views a situation in such a way as to see no gain or possibility of making a contribution. If an organization is operating within this orientation, its reward system and benefit program will reflect these motivations (Blake & Mouton, 1978).

Job satisfaction and morale are impacted by interpersonal skills (Sage & Stahl, 1987). "Incorporating interpersonal skills into policies and procedures provides the only opportunity to change behaviors that can interfere with the overall quality of an employee's performance" (p. 5). Creating positive interpersonal skills many times means changing attitudes and behaviors. "Bringing about a shift in attitudes and behaviors often requires significant changes in a organization's culture" (p.6). To change organizational culture, the new expectations should be
apparent in employee relations, philosophies and policies. They should be incorporated into job descriptions, performance standards, new employee orientations, and training components, as well as in recognition programs and merit pay systems (p. 7).

Summary

The degree of success or failure of an organization depends on how well the energies and talents of its people are brought out. It is dependent on how they think, feel and act. The success of the employees should be compatible with the success of the organization. Self-interest of employees, when linked to the interests of the organization, leads to a more productive workforce.

An organization has a culture that is linked to the habitual and traditional ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting that are characteristic of the preponderance of the ways its members meet its problems. It includes the integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thought, speech, action and artifacts. Organizational culture
includes the dependable and predictable reactions that its members exhibit when faced with a particular problem or situation. It spells out how a person is to behave when the behaviors of members are observed to be consistent over time and, if attitudes are consistent with behavior, then this behavior may be classified as cultural. Culture includes: (1) how people are supposed to act and the rewards and punishment resulting from those actions, (2) ideas that members share concerning good or bad, right or wrong, desirable or undesirable, and (3) how members share definition or the meaning of an object, gesture, sound, color, design, or event.

Organizational enculturation takes place two ways: (1) a new member of an organization adopts the cultural aspects of the organization as his own, or (2) a person sets out to change the behavior of the members of the organization.

The first case happens most often with a new employee. The new employee indoctrination before and after hiring is useful to instill the norms and values of the organization. The more consistent the culture of the organization with the
cultural background of the new employee, the easier the enculturation process effectively proceeds.

In the second case, a new leader may be brought into the organization with the desire to change the behavior of its members thereby changing its culture. This is a long and difficult process especially when the existing organization and its culture are several years old.

Part of the enculturation process includes adopting the values of the organization's culture. This may involve changing the new employee's attitude which is more likely to take place when certain behaviors consistently bring rewards or punishments. As the employee begins to feel good and comfortable with the behaviors and the reward system, his attitudes and values tend to become consistent with the behaviors.

Corporate culture tends to be primarily influenced by the people who do the communicating and the behavior of managers and employees.

Culture embedding is primarily (1) what leaders pay attention to, (2) leader reactions to situations, (3) role
modeling and coaching, (4) rewards and status and (5) selection, promotion and ex-communication. Communication of company goals and generally desired actions also assist in embedding culture.

The most effective approach to embedding culture is the indoctrination of new employees. This is an opportunity to completely submerge them in the organization's culture at a time when they are very receptive. Usually, they are happy to have received the new employment and are in a positive frame of mind to be indoctrinated. Also written documents concerning attendance, teamwork, employee expectations, education and training and other aspects of the organization and expectations are receptively received at this time.

Job satisfaction measurements tended to measure an attitude or value and is not necessarily a predictor of behavior. Job satisfaction measurements tended to be relative to some predetermined scale as perceived by the employee. For instance, pay satisfaction correlated with how they felt their pay compared to similar others or how much pay increase they received compared to what they felt
was deserved, or how well it met past expectations. The largest single area of correlations tended to be how well their pay was compared to others with similar positions.

Confidence in management and the reward distribution system were perceived to be negative when rewards were seen to be inconsistent with contribution to the organization. The induction mode for new employees was found to influence future attitudes and behaviors in their degree of employee satisfaction. Also training and education, both technological and behavior, had a positive influence on job satisfaction.

The culture of an organization can be changed. An effective way to bring about this change is with OD type interventions. Managerial grid-type interventions were reported to have the most frequent positive impacts in areas such as absenteeism, turnover, productivity, and safety and produced a higher recorded change in satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the company, and satisfaction with job security. These interventions included behavior processes that were high concern for people and productivity.
As improvements are made in an organization, the employee expectations may also increase, primarily as a result of behavioral and technical training. Therefore, even though many positive improvements may have taken place, the new knowledge and expectations becomes new norms or standards to measure by. Because of higher expectations, there may not be corresponding improvements in the elements of job satisfaction being measured.
CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures

Chapter III contains a description of the unit of analysis, research design, instrumentation, procedures followed in collecting the data and data analyses.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis was the Bristol Tennessee Electric System (BTES), a municipal utility distributing electrical energy to approximately 27,000 customers in Bristol, Tennessee; Sullivan County, Tennessee; and a small portion of Washington County, Virginia. BTES is governed by a five-member power board appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Bristol Tennessee City Council. BTES buys the electric power it distributes from the Tennessee Valley Authority, the nation's largest generator of electricity.

Research Design

The study presented herein is a case study as Yin (1989) described:
A case study is an empirical inquiry that: 

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context; when 
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are clearly evident; and in which 
- multiple sources of evidence are used (p.23).

Data used were those collected for management of BTES by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) to assess the attitudes toward job satisfaction of the employees of BTES in May 1976 and again in 1989. These dates are used to ascertain the change in attitudes toward job satisfaction during this period of time.

Documents such as employee newsletters, attendance records, accident records, promotion records, news articles, memos and board minutes over the past 13 years were reviewed to determine the number of times anything giving reference to the areas of attendance, safety and United Way were mentioned in written communications. This was to ascertain if there was sufficient consistent attention and expectation placed on certain behaviors to expect a shift in employee
behavior, over time, that could be considered a change in culture. Systematic consistent paying attention to certain things is a powerful way to bring about a change in culture (Schein, 1989).

The Elements of Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Appendix F) was used to compare and contrast the 1976 and 1989 surveys. The Questionnaire contained all of the elements and statements included in the surveys. It was completed by all employees who were employed at the time of the 1976 and 1989 surveys and still employed at the time of the 1992 Questionnaire.

Instrumentation

The Science Research Associates (SRA) Employee Inventory was administered by NRECA for BTES to measure the attitudes of members of the organization toward levels of job satisfaction in 1976 and 1989. The SRA Employee Inventory provided a measure of employee attitudes toward the work environment. It was a diagnostic instrument identifying attitudinal levels for individuals and groups in such areas as job demands, working conditions, pay, employee
benefits, friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees, supervisor/employee interpersonal relations, confidence in management, technical competence of supervision, effectiveness of administration, adequacy of communication, security of job and work relations, status and recognition, identification with the company, and opportunity for growth and advancement.

Both individual and group reliability have been determined by the test-retest method with an interval of one week between the test administrations (Miller, 1970). A sample of 134 employees showed a product moment correlation of .89. Group reliabilities ranged from .96 to .99 with reliability greater for groups of 50 or more employees.

Good correspondence was found to exist between the inventory results and the considered judgments of experienced observers. In three of the companies surveyed, validity was established by conducting non-directive interviews among a cross-section of the employees (Miller, 1970, p. 253).

The instrument questions are included in Appendix B.
The elements of job satisfaction assessed were:

1. job demands
2. working conditions
3. pay
4. employee benefits
5. friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees
6. supervisor/employee interpersonal relations
7. confidence in management
8. technical competence of supervision
9. effectiveness of administration
10. adequacy of communication
11. security of job and work relations
12. status and recognition
13. identification with the company
14. opportunity for growth and advancement

Data Collection Procedures

A copy of the reports from the SRA Employee Inventory for Bristol Tennessee Electric System, Bristol, Tennessee was secured. The first survey was completed May 1976. The second survey was completed October 1989.
Autonomy of each respondent was assured since there were no names or identifying marks on the reports.

Permission was requested (see Appendix C) for the researcher to review the survey data and to review board minutes, company newsletters, memos, accident reports, attendance reports, and other documents that might contain information useful for this study. Permission was granted (see Appendix D). The Director of Management Services for BTES was requested (see Appendix E) to review the BTES documents to provide a reliability check for the research findings coming from the document review. This request was granted and the reliability check was made. The Director of Management Services made an independent document review. The results were compared with the researcher's results. Consensus agreement was reached on the small differences in conclusions. There were no differences that were of any consequences. In addition to evidence of stimuli to change and/or embed culture, evidence was sought that would indicate behavior and cultural shifts.

Finally, in July 1992, the 19 employees that were employed at BTES during the 1976 survey and the 1989 survey
were requested to complete a job satisfaction questionnaire (Appendix F). This questionnaire included the 14 areas of the SRA Employee Inventory and had three questions relative to each area. They were (A) How do you feel about your job demands now? (B) Has this changed since 1976? and (C) Why do you believe it has changed?

Analysis of the Data

In this study, data from the 1976 and 1989 studies were compared to determine if there was a difference in responses in the two studies. Since there was a desire to see if there was an improvement in attitudes in the several areas, a one-tailed z test (Freund, 1979; Spiegel, 1975) was performed to test if there had been improvement in the proportions of "favorable" responses in the stated areas of attitude from the 1976 study until the 1989 study.

Each aspect of job satisfaction was measured by having respondents answer "agree", "neutral" or "disagree" to four to eight questions relative to that aspect of job satisfaction. SRA reported the answers of the survey as "favorable", "neutral" and "unfavorable" for interpretation
of the results.

In addition to the data from the SRA Employee Attitude Inventory, the one-tailed z test was performed on change in four areas of employee behavior. They were employee turnover, safety, absenteeism and United Way participation. These were perceived to be part of the organizational culture.

On the basis of the one-tailed z test at the level of significance of .05, the null hypothesis $H_0$ would be accepted if the z score was between -1.645 and 1.645 inclusive.

The 1992 Elements of Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was analyzed to give a richer assessment of the comparison between the results of the 1976 and 1989 SRA studies.

Summary

The research methodology and procedures were presented in this chapter. The attitude inventory instrument used for the study was the Science Research Associates Employee Inventory as administered by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which had been used in 1976 and 1989.
to measure the attitudes of employees of the organization toward job satisfaction.

The entire employee population of the organization was chosen to complete the instrument in each survey. Eighty-seven percent of the employees completed the instrument in the 1976 survey and eighty-five percent of the employees completed the 1989 survey. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistical analyses. Specifically, the z-score was used to test the difference between responses to questions in the two surveys.

Documents were reviewed for evidence of behaviors of management that were consistent with those that bring about organizational culture change. The areas of investigation were attendance records, safety records, United Way participation, and employee turnover. Management behaviors reviewed were written documents that emphasized, recognized, encouraged, or discouraged behavior in the area of safety, attendance, and United Way participation. Since culture is formed by what leaders pay attention to, it was expected that if these areas were strongly emphasized, behaviors
would change over time such that there would be a significant decrease in absenteeism, lost-time accidents, and a significant increase in United Way participation. Behaviors that were consistent for a large part of a group were deemed to be part of that group's culture. Employee turnover was compared as another indicator of job satisfaction. Attendance, safety, United Way participation, and employee turnover were analyzed using the one-tailed z test to verify those cultural changes. The results of the analysis are presented in Chapter IV.

Data gleamed from the 1992 Elements of Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were analyzed and incorporated into the discussions in the summary of each element of job satisfaction. Every employee who was employed at the time of the 1976, the 1989, and the 1992 surveys also completed the Elements of Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction

The results and findings obtained from the data gathered in this study are presented in this Chapter. The research questions posed in Chapter I are addressed, and the results of the one-tailed z test for determining if one population is greater than another are presented. The research questions submitted for this study are:

1. What are the differences between the employee attitudes toward job satisfaction in 1976 and 1989?

2. What cultural changes have taken place in the organization within the 13 years?

3. What changes in attitudes toward job satisfaction of individuals within an organization can be related to the evidences of changes in the culture of the organization?

In 1976, 63 of 72 employees, or 87.5%, were available and participated in the survey. In 1989, 51 of the 60 employees, or 85%, were available and participated in the
survey. The target population was composed of all BTES employees on the date of each survey.

The analysis of data in Chapter 4 begins with a presentation of the demographic data for all respondents at the 1976 \( (n=63) \) and the 1989 \( (n=51) \) surveys.

This is followed by a presentation of the demographic data for the 1992 Questionnaire. All 19 employees responded.

The results of the document review are next. One hundred fifty-seven copies of the company's employee newsletters were reviewed. Awards displayed were counted. Types and descriptions of the 76 awards were recorded. Seven hundred eighty-three annual employee attendance sheets were reviewed. One hundred fifty-six monthly board minutes were reviewed.

Eighty-six performance appraisals by supervisors and self-appraisals by employees were reviewed. Scrapbooks containing articles about BTES published in newspapers were reviewed.

Documents such as employment applications, new employee orientation guidelines, bulletin board notices, Quality
Circle minutes, apprentice review meeting minutes, and awards banquet agendas were included in the document review.

Following the demographic analysis, the statistical analysis of each question is presented with the statistical analysis of each hypothesis relating to the survey data (H1- H14).

Next is included a summary of responses from the 1992 Questionnaire.

This is followed by findings from the document search.

**Demographic Data for 1976 and 1989 Survey Respondents**

The target population was all employees of BTES at the time of each survey. Total returns were as follows: 63 of 72 (87.5%) of those employed in 1976; and 51 of 60 (85%) of those employed in 1989.

The education levels of the respondents ranged from six years to 17 years, with a standard deviation of 2.87 and a mean of 12.1 years, for the respondents to the 1976 survey. It ranged from 10 years to 18 years, with a mean of 13.1 years and a standard deviation of 1.97 for the respondents to the 1989 survey.
The education levels of the respondents were listed in seven levels. Table 1 illustrates the educational levels of all respondents.

Table 1

Summary of Education Level of All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10th grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th grade plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school plus 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school plus 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison of all respondents by sex, mean age, median age and age range were listed for both the 1976 and 1989 surveys. The ages of the respondents to the 1976 survey range from 21 years of age to 59 with a mean of 38.4, a median of 38 and a standard deviation of 10.53. The age of the respondents of the 1989 survey ranged from 22 to 63 with a mean of 38.0, a median of 37 and a standard deviation of 11.33.

Table 2 illustrates this demographic data.

**Table 2**

**Comparison Of All Respondents By Age And Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number responding</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (years)</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of ages</td>
<td>21-53</td>
<td>21-59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of years of employment at BTES was ascertained. The years employed at BTES of the 1976 respondents ranged from 1 to 29 years with a mean of 10.1 and a standard deviation of 10.53. The 1989 respondents ranged from 0 to 37 years with a mean of 12.6 and a standard deviation of 11.33. Table 3 illustrates the years of BTES employment of all respondents.

Table 3

Comparison Of All Respondents By Years Employed At BTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (years)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (years)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>1-29</td>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>1-33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting Analysis of the Hypotheses

The one-tailed z test was used to test the null hypothesis of whether the 1976 survey results were equal to the 1989 survey results versus the alternative hypothesis that results of one survey were greater than, or less than, the other.

Hypothesis 1 through Hypothesis 14 dealt with the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of job satisfaction. Each aspect of job satisfaction was measured by having respondents answer "agree", "neutral" or "disagree" to four to eight questions relative to that aspect of job satisfaction. SRA reported the answers of the survey as "favorable", "neutral" and "unfavorable" for interpretation of the results. Group totals for each aspect of job satisfaction were tested. If the z score was greater than 1.645, it was concluded that the results of the 1976 survey were more positive to the 0.05 level of significance. If the z score was less than -1.645, it was concluded that the results of the 1989 survey were more positive to the
0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 1

H1 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with job demands between 1976 and 1989. Five questions (1, 27, 28, 53 and 54) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with job demands between 1976 and 1989. Table 4 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (78.7%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (72.2%). The z score was 1.822. The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the 1976 survey were more positive since the z score is greater than 1.645.
Table 4 - Summary of Responses for Job Demand items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[data] The hours of work are O.K.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[data] I often feel worn out and tired on my job</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[data] They expect too much from us around here</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[data] My job is often dull and monotonous</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[data] There is too much pressure on my job</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[data] Group Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [data] 1976: 62 Favo, 1 Neut, 0 Unfa; 98% Favo, 2% Neut, 0% Unfa
- [data] 1989: 46 Favo, 5 Neut, 0 Unfa; 90% Favo, 10% Neut, 0% Unfa
- [data] 1976: 41 Favo, 7 Neut, 15 Unfa; 65% Favo, 11% Neut, 24% Unfa
- [data] 1989: 31 Favo, 12 Neut, 8 Unfa; 61% Favo, 24% Neut, 16% Unfa
- [data] 1976: 45 Favo, 4 Neut, 14 Unfa; 71% Favo, 6% Neut, 22% Unfa
- [data] 1989: 34 Favo, 10 Neut, 7 Unfa; 67% Favo, 20% Neut, 14% Unfa
- [data] 1976: 56 Favo, 2 Neut, 5 Unfa; 89% Favo, 3% Neut, 8% Unfa
- [data] 1989: 46 Favo, 2 Neut, 3 Unfa; 90% Favo, 4% Neut, 6% Unfa
- [data] 1976: 44 Favo, 10 Neut, 9 Unfa; 70% Favo, 16% Neut, 14% Unfa
- [data] 1989: 27 Favo, 18 Neut, 6 Unfa; 53% Favo, 35% Neut, 12% Unfa
- [data] Group Total: 248 Favo, 24 Neut, 43 Unfa; 79% Favo, 8% Neut, 14% Unfa
Hypothesis 2

H2 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with working conditions between 1976 and 1989. Six questions (2, 3, 29, 30, 55, 56) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with working conditions between 1976 and 1989. Table 5 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (82.4%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (82%). The z score was -0.116. The null hypothesis was retained with there being no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 5 - Summary of Responses for Working Condition items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management does everything possible to prevent accidents in our work.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is doing its best to give us good working conditions.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For my kind of job, the working conditions are O.K.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the working conditions here are annoying.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the right equipment to do my work.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3

H3 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with pay between 1976 and 1989. Four questions (4, 5, 31, 57) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with pay between 1976 and 1989. Table 6 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (67.2%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (50%). The z score was -3.687. The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the 1989 survey were more positive since the z score is less than -1.645.
Table 6 - Summary of Responses for Pay items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
<td>Favo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion the pay here is lower than in other companies.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should do a better job of handling pay matters here.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm paid fairly compared with other employees.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay is enough to live on comfortably.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4

H4 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with employee benefits between 1976 and 1989. Four questions (6, 32, 58, 59) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with employee benefits between 1976 and 1989. Table 7 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (93.6%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (87.3%). The z score was -2.252. The null hypothesis was rejected with the results of the 1989 survey being significantly more positive since the z score is less than -1.645.
Table 7 - Summary of Responses for Employee Benefits items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976 Favo</th>
<th>Neut</th>
<th>Unfa</th>
<th>1989 Favo</th>
<th>Neut</th>
<th>Unfa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand what the company benefit program provides for employees.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm satisfied with the way employee benefits are handled here.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company's employee benefit plan is O.K.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 5

H5 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees between 1976 and 1989. Four questions (7, 33, 34, 60) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with friendliness and cooperativeness of fellow employees between 1976 and 1989. Table 8 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (81.9%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (79.0%). The z score was -0.772. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 8 - Summary of Responses for Friendliness and Cooperation items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few of the people I work with think they can run the place.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with get along well together.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with are very friendly.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 6

H6 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with supervisor/employee interpersonal relations between 1976 and 1989. Eight questions (8, 9, 10, 35, 36, 61, 62, 63) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with supervisor/employee interpersonal relations between 1976 and 1989. Table 9 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (75.4%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (69.4%). The z score was 2.034. The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the 1976 survey were more positive since the z score is greater than 1.645.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is too interested in his/her own success to care about the needs of employees.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is always breathing down our necks; my supervisor watches us too closely.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gives us credit and praise for work well done.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor has always been fair in dealing with me.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gets employees to work together as a team.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor really tries to get our ideas about things.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor ought to be friendlier toward employees.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor lives up to his/her promises.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 7

H7 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with confidence in management between 1976 and 1989. Seven questions (11, 12, 37, 38, 39, 64, 65) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with confidence in management between 1976 and 1989. Table 10 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (72.8%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (71.4%). The z score was 0.426. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 10 - Summary of Responses for Confidence in Management items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management here does everything it can to see that employees get a fair break on the job.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone up the line.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of management.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management here is really interested in the welfare of employees.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the higher-ups are friendly toward employees.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management here has a very good personnel policy.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management ignores our suggestions and complaints.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 8

H8 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with technical competence of supervision between 1976 and 1989. Six questions (13, 14, 40, 41, 66, 67) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with technical competence of supervision between 1976 and 1989. Table 11 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (82%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (72.9%). The z score was 2.864. The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the 1976 survey were significantly more positive since the z score is greater than 1.645.
Table 11 - Summary of Responses for Technical Competence of Supervision items

| Item                                                                 | 1976 | 1989 |
|                                                                     | Favo | Neut | Unfa | Favo | Neut | Unfa |
| My supervisor sees that employees are properly trained for their jobs. | 46   | 10   | 7    | 34   | 15   | 2    |
|                                                                     | 73%  | 16%  | 11%  | 67%  | 29%  | 4%   |
| My supervisor sees that we have the things we need to do our jobs.   | 53   | 3    | 7    | 37   | 13   | 1    |
|                                                                     | 84%  | 5%   | 11%  | 73%  | 26%  | 2%   |
| My supervisor keeps putting things off, my supervisor just lets things ride. | 53   | 4    | 6    | 35   | 14   | 2    |
|                                                                     | 84%  | 6%   | 10%  | 69%  | 28%  | 4%   |
| My supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us.           | 53   | 5    | 5    | 34   | 14   | 3    |
|                                                                     | 84%  | 8%   | 8%   | 67%  | 28%  | 6%   |
| My supervisor knows very little about his/her job.                   | 59   | 3    | 1    | 46   | 4    | 1    |
|                                                                     | 94%  | 5%   | 2%   | 90%  | 8%   | 2%   |
| My supervisor has the work well organized.                           | 46   | 11   | 6    | 37   | 11   | 3    |
|                                                                     | 73%  | 18%  | 10%  | 73%  | 22%  | 6%   |
| Group Total                                                           | 310  | 36   | 32   | 223  | 71   | 12   |
|                                                                     | 82%  | 10%  | 9%   | 73%  | 23%  | 4%   |
Hypothesis 9

H9 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with effectiveness of administration between 1976 and 1989. Five questions (15, 16, 42, 68, 69) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with effectiveness of administration between 1976 and 1989. Table 12 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (86.7%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (75.9%). The z score was -3.247. The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the 1989 survey were significantly more positive since the z score was less than -1.645.
Table 12 - Summary of Responses for Effectiveness of Administration items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management here is really trying to build the organization and make it successful</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management here sees to it that there is cooperation between departments.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management fails to give clear-cut orders and instructions.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company operates smoothly and efficiently.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management really knows its job.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 10

H10 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with adequacy of communication between 1976 and 1989. Six questions (17, 18, 43, 44, 70, 71) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with adequacy of communications between 1976 and 1989. Table 13 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (71.2%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (69.3%). The z score was 0.536. The null hypothesis was retained with there being no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 13 - Summary of Responses for Adequacy of Communication items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management tells employees about company plans and developments.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They encourage us to make suggestions for improvements here.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how my job fits in with other work in this organization.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have a poor way of handling employee complaints here.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can say what you think around here.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 11

H11 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with security of job and work relations between 1976 and 1989. Seven questions (19, 20, 45, 46, 47, 72, 73) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with security of job and work relations between 1976 and 1989. Table 14 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (64.9%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (61.6%). The z score was 0.941. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 14 - Summary of Responses for Security of Job and Work Relations items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often bothered by sudden speed-ups or unexpected slack periods in my work.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes are made here with little regard for the welfare of employees.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long service really means something in this organization.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can get fired around here without much cause.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You always know where you stand with this company.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When layoffs are necessary, they are handled fairly.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Totals</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 12

H12 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with status and recognition between 1976 and 1989. Six questions (21, 22, 48, 49, 74, 75) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with status and recognition between 1976 and 1989. Table 15 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (79.4%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (75.9%). The z score was -1.085. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 15 - Summary of Responses for Status and Recognition items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other employees, we get very little attention from management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel that my job counts for very little in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have plenty of freedom on my job to use my own judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody in the organization tries to boss us around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very much underpaid for the work that I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 13

H13 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with identification with the company between 1976 and 1989. Four questions (23, 24, 50, 76) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with identification with the company between 1976 and 1989. Table 16 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1989 (84.3%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1976 (82.9%). The z score was -0.394. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 16 - Summary of Responses for Identification With the Company items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
<td>Favo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The longer you work for this company, the more you feel you belong.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of interest in this company and its future.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel part of the organization.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm proud to work for this company.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Totals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 14

H14 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization toward levels of satisfaction with opportunity for growth and advancement between 1976 and 1989. Four questions (25, 26, 51, 52) were used in the survey to determine the members' attitudes in this area.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the attitude of members of an organization towards levels of satisfaction with opportunity for growth and advancement between 1976 and 1989. Table 17 depicts the result of the two surveys. The proportion favorable in 1976 (68.7%) was greater than the proportion favorable in 1989 (63.7%). The z score was 1.108. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between the two surveys.
Table 17 - Summary of Responses for Opportunity for Growth and Advancement items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
<td>Favo</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Unfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have little opportunity to use my abilities in this organization.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn a great deal on my present job.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Totals</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 15

H15 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in turnover of members of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

Turnover is the number of full-time employees who left BTES employment during the year. The turnover decreased from five of 65, or 7.7%, in 1976 to three of 56, or 5.4%, in 1989. The z score was -0.540. The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference even though there was a favorable change between 1976 and 1989.

Hypothesis 16

H16 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in safety of members of an organization between 1976 and 1989. There was one lost-time accident in 1976 and none in 1989. The change was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level and, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 17

H17 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in absenteeism of members of an organization

Employees having zero absenteeism, who were employed the entire year, increased from 18 of 65, or 27.7%, in 1976 to 34 of 56, or 60.7% in 1989. The improvement was significant at the 0.5 level with z score of -3.930. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The 1989 absenteeism rate was significantly better than 1976.

Hypothesis 18

H18 was as follows: There will be a significant difference in United Way participation of members of an organization between 1976 and 1989.

Employees making United Way fair share (one hour's pay per month for the year) contributions was 33.8% in 1976. It increased to 94.7% in 1989. This improvement was significant at the 0.05 level with z score of -6.920. The null hypothesis was rejected. The 1989 contribution rate was significantly better than 1976.

Employees' United Way contributions, as a percent of potential (potential being one hour's pay per month for all employees for 12 months), increased from 54.2% of potential
in 1976 to 98.0% of potential in 1989. This increase was significant at the 0.05 level with a z score of -6.620. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The 1989 contribution as percent of potential was significantly better than 1976.
Demographic Data for the 1992 Questionnaire Respondents

The target population of the 1992 Questionnaire was all individuals employed at the time of the 1976 and 1989 surveys and still employed at the time of the 1992 survey. One hundred percent (n=19) of the target population completed and returned the survey.

The education level of the 19 respondents had a range from 11 to 18 years with a mean of 12.9, and a median of 12 with a standard deviation of 1.89.

The age of the respondents at the time of the 1992 Questionnaire had a range of 40 to 62 years with a mean of 49.68, a median of 49 and a standard deviation of 6.49.

The years of employment of the respondents at BTES was a range of 17 to 38 years with a mean of 22.47, a median of 21 and a standard deviation of 5.59.

1992 Questionnaire Results

Results of the 1992 Questionnaire about Job Demands indicated that the hours of work were generally acceptable. Not as much overtime was required in 1992 as was in 1976.
but, due to storms and the nature of the electric utility business, long hours were still required during emergencies.

Several employees noted that due to system improvements the electric system was better able to withstand storms, reducing required overtime.

Uneven work loads were caused by customers moving at the first of the month and a large influx of customers because of their receiving social security checks. These work load fluctuations caused stress even though they were accepted and expected to be part of the job.

Several employees mentioned that each day was different, not dull and monotonous. There was good flexibility and, even though stressful, the variety was appreciated. One stated, "The job is demanding but this makes it interesting." There was a general feeling that everyone must be more productive now because there are more customers and fewer employees.

Better construction equipment and the addition of computers had reduced manpower requirements making it possible to give better service. Employees were better
trained and worked together as a team not only within departments, but the cooperation between departments has improved.

Several respondents noted that getting older had an impact on their endurance. They also noted that they accomplished more because management provided better equipment, provided and encouraged additional education and training, gave employees more decision-making latitude and encouraged cooperation between all employees.

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that Working Conditions were very good. They indicated that there was an excellent safety program, up-to-date equipment and that management was doing its best to provide good working conditions. It was noted that when several people worked in an office, some thought the temperature was too hot and others thought it was too cold, each thinking the working conditions were uncomfortable. This made some employees feel less positive about working conditions.

One employee said, "Through research, understanding of employee needs, hard work and logic, I have seen a
substantial change in working conditions. There is no conflict or bickering. Employees are excited about their work. We feel we serve a real purpose."

Another employee's answer seemed to sum up the rest, "Just because something was traditional or a certain procedure was followed, doesn't mean it is correct. There is a constant elimination of unproductive practices and a constant study of how we can work 'smarter and not harder.' The management team is truly dedicated to the customer as well as the employee."

Results of the 1992 survey indicated that most felt their pay was comparable to others doing similar work. Pay was perceived as being fair among employees as related to responsibility, abilities and education. There was a general feeling that the compensation program was fair and fairly administered.

Respondents indicated that they felt their pay had kept pace with the cost of living over time and that having a fair, consistent pay plan had been good. One respondent seemed to sum it up best, "BTES goes to great lengths to
hire top-quality employees and invest a lot of time and money in training new employees. A BTES employee knows that only top quality performance is acceptable if he or she works here. If an employee is willing to perform to the best of his ability, he will be rewarded accordingly."

Results of the 1992 Questionnaire showed that employees were satisfied with Employee Benefits which were consistently described as good, very good, and excellent.

Benefits regularly mentioned in the questionnaire included health insurance, dental insurance, 401(k) retirement programs, holidays, sick leave, vacation and emergency leave.

One employee said, "I think we have good benefits. It has changed for the better. I think that management cares more about their employees than they use to. Also, it helps keep a good competent work force."

Employee social events such as picnics, awards banquets, children's Christmas parties and retiree events were mentioned several times.

Several work programs were also positively mentioned
such as Quality Circles, Employee Task Force, teamwork and the BTES Business Plan.

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire generally agreed that there was a higher degree of **Friendliness and Cooperation of Fellow Employees** now than ever before. They perceived themselves as being a friendly group and as being helpful to one another.

One respondent stated "We have better qualified people in their jobs. People think more about pulling together to make the whole company better. They take more pride in their work."

Another respondent said, "I think BTES employees work more as a team now than in 1976 and I think the change is because of the selection of employees we now have and management's desire to have us work as a team."

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that generally employees feel good about their **Supervisor/Employee Interpersonal Relations**. It appears that most negative responses in this area centered around praise and credit for a job well done. Two respondents felt they did
not get proper credit and praise for work well done. It was noted that there appeared to be a change since the Situational Leadership Course was conducted, which was attended by all supervisors and others (this was after the 1989 survey). Most respondents felt they were not over-supervised and that their supervisor provided needed support.

There were positive comments relating to teamwork, Quality Circles, and Employee Task Force. One said, "I have never felt too closely watched. While we may think praise is sometimes used sparingly, I do feel that when it is given, it is genuine."

A respondent summed up by saying, "Through training sessions and seminars for both supervisors and employees, our management has taught us how to better relate to one another."

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that there was a high level of **Confidence in Management** and that management was open to suggestions and interested in the welfare of the employees. Respect for the decisions of
management was also indicated. One stated, "I feel management is very honest. I can tell management anything and know the information will be in confidence." Another stated, "I think that from first-line supervisor through top management, they have tried to build employee confidence and it shows." Another stated, "I feel I can talk to management."

The greatest decrease in favorableness of any question in this group was, "If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone up the line." There were two references from the 1992 respondents concerning going above their supervisor with a complaint. These indicated that there could be a price for "going above your supervisor." They indicated that it could be done but you have to weigh the benefits before doing so.

To the question, "How has this changed since 1976?" Answers ranged from "It was good then" to "I think confidence has improved since 1976." One stated, "I have always talked to management but now I feel like someone is listening." Another stated, "I think it is because there is
a closer relationship between management and employees."
One seemed to sum up the rest with, "There is an open door policy. I feel my opinion is meaningful. Management sets good examples. If there is a problem, they will come to you and do everything they can to resolve it."

To the question, "Why do you think it has changed?" Answers ranged from "I had high confidence in management previously and I'm not sure it has improved in this area," to "Things have changed and improved over time," "Someone is interested in doing a better job," and "There is more personal interest in employees' needs and opinions."

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that they felt good about the Technical Competence of Supervision. They said their supervisors were very competent and well trained. There was a general feeling that supervision was continually studying methods of doing things and several respondents indicated that their group worked as a team. Generally, respondents indicated their supervisor had the technical competence necessary to do the job.
In response to the question, "How has this changed since 1976?" Most respondents said their supervisor was more competent than in 1976, that technical knowledge had improved as well as supervision skills. One respondent did note that his supervisor, "puts off too much until a rainy day." Most respondents believed that it had changed because of additional training and education. One said, "The management has realized that better technical competence of both the supervisor and employee are important to getting the job done." Another said, "Management stresses the importance of a continuing education. We are encouraged to keep abreast with the latest technologies. Support and advice we receive from management increases employee effectiveness." Another attributed improvement to keeping lines of communication open. Another respondent said, "Management keeps up to date on what is happening in the industry and what is happening with employees." Two respondents attributed the difference to having a different supervisor in 1976.

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that
there was Effectiveness of Administration. They indicated that administration was very effective in keeping employees and customers informed. Comments included: "I think management knows their job because this company operates efficiently and smoothly." "I think management does a great job making needed changes" and "I think this is evident in our success - low rates, productivity, standing in the community, financial strength, etc."

Respondents said they were more efficient and took care of a lot more customers and facilities than in the past year. The most overwhelming area of discussion was cooperation. One said, "Management continually stresses cooperation between the departments." Another indicated that formally, departments seemed to work more independently with their supervisors being concerned only with their departments. Now there is much more cooperation. Others noted more cooperation between employees and management.

The reason for the change was perceived to be management's insistence that all departments, employees and supervisors work together for the benefit of the total
organization and of the customer. Putting the customer first, management's desire for having lower rates, and leadership from the top were noted as other reasons for change.

Responding to the questions on *Adequacy of Communication*, the respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire overwhelmingly reported communication to be good. One respondent said, "I believe there is an effort made to keep the employee informed through the use of memos, Telowatt, bulletin boards, and employee meetings. Also, our supervisor passes along information to us from time to time." Another said, "I feel communications are always open. We're always brought up to date on things within the company." This statement was made, "In my position, I can't remember the last time I felt blindsided by some information." There was only one respondent who felt negative about communications. He said, "I feel communication is weak at my level."

Respondents reporting on how communications have changed since 1976 included "more two-way communications
now" and "not being left in the dark on things." They also reported getting information faster and changes in programs and policies being discussed more. Other things mentioned were more employee meetings and being kept better informed. Better communications between departments was also reported. One reported, "Back in 1976 I was afraid to say much of anything." The one negative respondent in this area felt that his suggestions were taken in consideration by his supervisor in 1976 better than now.

Answers to the question, "Why do you believe it has changed?" One respondent said, "I believe the company is more employee oriented now." Another said, "Someone has caused it to happen." There seemed to be a consensus that to give good customer service, it was necessary to have good communication and to keep employees informed. The one negative respondent felt that his supervisor in 1976 was a better communicator than his present supervisor.

Responding to the questions on Security of Job and Work Relations, the respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire generally reported that they felt secure as long as they
worked together and did their jobs. They reported a link between their security and production. One reported that employees who had lost their jobs brought it on themselves. There was a general consensus that job security had not changed since 1976.

Responding to the questions on Status and Recognition, the respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire reported getting positive attention from management, getting equal attention from management, and having freedom to use their own judgment. Statements were made, "I feel good about my job," and "I'm proud of what I do." In this area, respondents reported taking pride in their work and feeling that their job was important to the organization.

Two respondents from one department indicated that their department did not get enough status and recognition but they still reported feeling good about their job and knowing how important it is to the organization.

To the question, "How has this changed since 1976?" One respondent reported, "Management wants us to be proud of our jobs, ourselves, and our company." Other observations
included sensitivity of management to the needs and feelings of employees and the realization from other employees that each job was important. Respondents reported having more confidence and experience and the realization that their jobs were important, as being reasons to why this area has changed for them.

Respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire were very positive about Identification with the Company. They reported being proud to work for BTES and being a good representative for BTES. Several made statements referring to the company and employees as being like family. One respondent said, "I think we now have an organization of 'we and us' as opposed to 'they and them' and this is a good feeling."

Respondents reported that their pride has grown over the years and that they feel closer to the people they work with. They reported being more aware of the importance of their roles in the community. They also pointed with pride to the company's reputation in the community.

Reasons for change included continuous hard work,
management's awareness of the team concept and that management invests much energy in human relationships. In the 1992 Questionnaire there were no negative responses in this area.

Several respondents to the 1992 Questionnaire indicated that they felt there was plenty of Opportunity for Growth and Advancement. Others reported that because of the small size of the company, there was limited opportunity for advancement. Several respondents reported that through education and training, there was always opportunity for personal and professional growth.

Respondents reported that changes had taken place because of educational opportunities and challenges from management. More of the top positions had been filled from within and more training was being provided to help prepare people for promotions when vacancies did become available. One respondent reported, "I feel management has more confidence in the abilities of BTES personnel."
Document Review

There was found to be consistent, but increasing, emphasis on certain values with the passage of time. This was evident in the selection and orientation of new employees and periodic, but not less often than once per year, performance appraisals. The monthly employee newsletter, "Telowatt News", highlighted such areas as employee training and education, safety, community involvement (especially concerning the United Way), employee promotions, and attendance. These areas were found to be consistently treated as important.

Culture Embedding with Orientation

A review of the new employee selection and orientation process was found to be consistent with certain cultural aspects. There was extensive communication about BTES, its goals and expectations. This included addressing the importance of the customer. Education, skills and abilities to perform the job are stressed to be important. Adaptability and being able to fit in as a member of the
The BTES team was also stressed. The term "BTES team" was found in many written documents including self appraisals written by employees, even relatively new ones. During the orientation, it was pointed out that employees not only work hard as a team on the job but play hard during company sponsored social events and certain community activities.

During the new employee orientation, the employee was shown how he fits into the organization by referring to an organization chart and a list of employees in his department. A copy of his job description outlining the job responsibilities as well as company sponsored benefits were explained. This included enrollment in the insurance and retirement programs.

The employee handbook and customer handbook which outlined various employee and customer policies, programs, goals and expectations were presented and explained.

Copies of the last 12 issues of the employee newsletter, the "Telowatt News" were provided to help the new employee have a better understanding of the type programs and projects in which BTES was involved. These
included work projects, employee recognition and awards, safety programs, educational programs and awards, United Way, community participation by BTES employees, Quality Circles, attendance recognition and articles on new employees, social events such as picnics, Christmas parties, and Service Awards banquets, etc.

Copies of the quarterly customer newsletter, "BTES News", were given to the new employee to provide even more information. It was again stressed that it was important for the employee to be a good BTES customer representative and that he needed to know as much as possible about the organization and its mission.

Attendance was stressed very highly. It is explained that there are only approximately 60 employees to serve almost 28,000 customers, therefore, each employee was needed on the job every day. Even though BTES employees received one day of sick leave for each month of service, it was pointed out that it was used like insurance, only if it was absolutely necessary because of illness. He was told that each employee is needed and if he was not at work, another
co-worker had double duty. Recent attendance statistics were shared with the new employee such as for the year 1991, 73 percent of the BTES employees did not miss one day requiring sick leave. The new employee was told that attendance was an item evaluated on the performance appraisal and without regular attendance, he could not be a part of the BTES team.

Safety was another highly-stressed factor in the orientation process. A new employee was told that, as of the end of 1992, BTES employees had reached 10 years without a lost-time accident. Due to the dangerous nature of the electric utility business, this was an outstanding record as evidenced by the many safety awards received from State and National Associations such as the American Public Power Association. He was told about the monthly employee safety meetings and how he would be participating as a safe employee. He was encouraged to attend the CPR and first aid training courses that are offered to all employees each year.

Copies of the two-month, five-month, and annual
performance appraisal forms were reviewed with the employee to prepare him for regular discussion concerning his performance. The employee was made aware that he, too, would be completing the same forms to assess his own performance to compare with the supervisor's assessment. At the same time, the job description would be reviewed and recommended changes discussed.

The new employee was given information concerning educational opportunities available for any employee who wants to further his education. This included seminars, the four and one-half year apprentice program and additional educational opportunities leading to other educational degrees.

The new employee was told that all of the citizens of the community were customers of BTES and that it was important for each BTES employee to be active in the community as a good citizen. Participation was encouraged in some community service such as a volunteer working with Little League, church, United Way agencies, etc. It was very important to let BTES customers see that its employees
were civic minded. He was told that most of the BTES employees were fair share, or above, contributors to the United Way. The United Way was the one collective employee program.

The new employee was told that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers represents a number of the employees, but were all one team working to get the job done for the customers without respect to position or affiliation.

This basic process for orienting new employees had been used for the past 15 years, but with modification from time to time. Over two-thirds of the present employees had gone through this orientation process.

**Culture Embedding with Recognition**

Employees of BTES were encouraged to continue their education. Short courses that expand and enhance job skills as well as courses leading to other educational degrees useful to BTES were promoted. Participation in electric utility and public power organizations that benefit BTES and its customers was encouraged. Assisting in community and
economic development activities was encouraged and supported.

Evidence was found of recognition and awards given to employees for participating in these activities. A review of the BTES employee newsletter, the "Telowatt News", was found to be used extensively to recognize employees for their participation in these programs. From 1975 through 1991, employees were recognized 247 times for completing certain educational requirements. These included such things as supervisory training, lineman training, environmental management training, regulator/recloser training, training in utility work-order accounting, utility accounts classification, right-of-way acquisitions and the law, electrical metering, hydraulic systems, selling electricity and ourselves, utility law for executives, power quality training, protective metering, etc. This was just a sample of the education and training courses that employees were recognized for having completed.

Extensive recognition was given employees for completing first aid and CPR training and customer relations
training. Each year employees who did not have an on-the-job accident, while driving a company vehicle, were recognized in a safe driving recognition program.

Several employees were recognized for the important role they played in the rescue of a citizen in "First Aid Bulletin" the official publication of the Virginia Association of Volunteer Rescue Squads. Several employees received Cycle and Save promotions awards. This was for their outstanding performance in promoting TVA/BTES load management devices installed on customers' water heaters. BTES employees received an Appreciation Award from the American Association of Blood Banks for their outstanding participation in the Bristol Regional Medical Center blood drives.

During this time, BTES won three Keep Bristol Beautiful Awards. One was received for remodeling and landscaping the Edgemont Avenue office, one for an addition to and landscaping the Volunteer Parkway office and one for remodeling and landscaping the Shelby Street substation. These were all reported in the "Telowatt News".
The TVA Achievement Award for providing free energy surveys to over 15 percent of the residential customers was received by BTES employees. Two employees were recognized for receiving the Professional Secretaries International Executive of the Year Award. An employee received the American Public Power Association James D. Donovan Individual Achievement Award and the Kramer Preston Personal Service Award.

Virginia Governor Baliles, who was chairman of the Southern State's Energy Board, appointed an employee to serve on the Southern State's Energy Board Advisory Committee on TVA.

Utility industry affiliations by BTES employees that were recognized in the "Telowatt News" included: Chairman, APPA Customer Accounting and Services Committee; Chairman, APPA Engineering Operating and Safety Committee; Officer, Tennessee Municipal Electric Power Association Engineering and Operating Committee; President, Tennessee Municipal Electric Power Association; President, Eastern District Power Distributors Association; Electric Power Research
Institute; Power Systems Planning and Operations Task Force; Tennessee Valley Public Power Association Board of Directors; Tennessee Valley Public Power Association Rates and Contracts Committee Chairman in addition to others.

Employees were recognized in the "Telowatt News" for their participation in community and economic development activities. These included: Junior Achievement Advisor Award, Appalachian District Civitan Award for Outstanding Work, Civitan of the Year Award, Tri-City Industrial Commission Chairman, Greater Bristol Area Chamber of Commerce Chairman, Upper East Tennessee Chapter of the American Society of Personnel Administration President, Kiwanis Club of Bristol President, Rotary Club of Bristol VA/TN President (two employees), Bristol Jaycees Outstanding Young Man, Bristol Jaycees Outstanding Young Woman.

Employees were recognized at the Greater Bristol Area Chamber of Commerce High School Career Days for participating in instruction of Red Cross Multi-Media, First Aid, and CPR courses within the community.

These examples indicated the extent of recognition
given employees for participation in continued education, electric utility industry, community and economic development activities.

Safety

The review found safety to be an area that was highly emphasized. Almost every monthly edition of the "Telowatt News" contained an article on safety. Also displayed in the employee auditorium were safety awards. BTES employees have received safety awards from American Public Power Association; Bureau of Safety; Burke, Powers and Harty; Job Training and Safety; National Safety Council; and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. Records showed that there had not been a lost-time accident by BTES employees since 1982. The American Public Power Association awarded BTES a second place safety award in 1977. There was at least one lost-time accident in 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1982. There had not been a lost-time accident from December 14, 1982 through 1992 when the last records were examined.

A search of records did not reveal another electric utility with as many employee hours worked per
year as BTES that had two consecutive years without a lost-time accident during this ten-year period. Each month employees attend a safety meeting which is usually led by a State of Tennessee Safety Consultant. Safety is also an area reviewed in each employee's performance appraisal. This was one of the areas also covered in the new employee orientation.

**Attendance**

Employees were recognized each year for their attendance records. Every employee who completed a calendar year with no absences caused by personal or family illness were recognized for their perfect attendance. Attendance was an area reviewed at the annual employee appraisal. Attendance was also addressed other times when there appeared to be a problem. Each supervisor kept an attendance record for the year and there was an explanation written for any absence. Attendance was also discussed in the new employee orientation. Forty employees did not miss any days because of sickness in 1991. This is 73 percent of the employees not taking any sick leave during the year.
The sick-leave average for the 55 employees who were full-time employees all year was 2.6 days.

United Way

The United Way was a community organization. Its united fund raising provides operating funds for several service organizations within the community. The majority of the funds were given by the employees of businesses and industries within the community. Some of its recipients included: Boys Club of Bristol, Bristol Family YMCA, Bristol Life Saving Crew, Bristol Regional Rehabilitation Center, Girls Incorporated of Bristol, Janie Hammit Children's Home, The Salvation Army, and YWCA. This was the one unified community assistance effort in which all employees were encouraged to collectively participate at the United Way Fair-Share level which is one hours' pay per month. At least three articles each year were found in the "Telowatt News" explaining and supporting the United Way and at least one celebrating employee participation.
**Turnover**

BTES generally had a favorable turnover rate. There appears to be an improvement in this area even though it was not statistically significant. For the years 1975, 1976 and 1977, there was a total of 20 employees who left BTES employment. For the years 1988, 1989, and 1990, there was a total of 11 employees who left BTES Employment. This indicated that there was improvement in this area even though it is not statistically significant.

This chapter contained an analysis of data and the document review.
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

This study focused on the relationship of organizational culture to elements of job satisfaction. Basically, the problem was to explore how changes in corporate or organizational culture over time impacts levels of job satisfaction in a specific organizational setting.

In a review of literature conducted for the study, it was determined that certain elements of organizational culture impacted attitudes toward job satisfaction. The literature cited examples of studies conducted in education, business and industry. No studies could be found directly comparing job satisfaction, organization change and culture change, even though much has been written about organization change and culture and many similarities existed comparing certain aspects of job satisfaction. There were examples which indicated that change in certain behaviors impacted
attitudes toward job satisfaction. These studies of behavior changes were studied over a relatively short period of time. For organizational behavior changes to be considered organizational culture changes, the change needs to remain constant over a significant period of time.

Data used to measure the change in attitude toward job satisfaction was data relative to levels of satisfaction of certain job-related elements as measured by NRECA surveys of BTES employees. The data were from two surveys taken 13 years apart, in 1976 and 1989 (see Appendixes A & B).

The 19 persons employed at the time of both surveys and still employed in July 1992, also completed an extensive essay-type questionnaire relative to these elements. They indicated their feelings about whether there had been organization changes, what had changed and why the changes had happened.

Data were gathered from BTES records in four areas to investigate behavior change. It was assumed that if certain behavior changes were consistent over time and if there were data indicating these behavior changes were expected,
consistent and accepted, then they fit the criteria for culture changes.

Data gathered from the two BTES/NRECA surveys were analyzed on the basis of a one-tailed z test at the 0.05 level of significance. It was hypothesized that there would be a difference in the two surveys. If the proportion of employees who responded in a favorable way to a question was different in the two surveys, the hypothesis would be rejected if the z score was between -1.645 and 1.645 inclusive. The favorable results of the 1989 survey would be considered significantly better than the 1976 survey if the z score was less than -1.645. The favorable results of the 1976 survey would be considered significantly better than the 1989 survey if the z score was greater than 1.645.

The 1992 questionnaire was a subjective essay-type questionnaire which requested the respondent to compare and contrast the areas of job satisfaction included in H1 - H14.

Demographic data gathered included respondents' education level, age, and number of years at BTES.

The population was identified as being all employees of
BTES at the time of the surveys and all employees employed at BTES at the time of the 1976 and 1989 surveys who were still employed at the time of the 1992 Questionnaire.

Documents of BTES were reviewed to determine certain employee behavior, changes in behavior and written evidence of stimuli that was assumed to encourage behavior changes. These expected areas of changes were in attendance, absenteeism, United Way participation and turnover.

Behaviors that were shown to have consistent long-term change were considered to be cultural changes if there was stimuli for the change. Evidence of stimuli for culture changes were researched in written documents of the organization. Documents such as employment applications, new employee orientation guidelines, bulletin board notices, Quality Circle minutes, apprentice review minutes, and award banquet agendas were included in the document review.

Findings

The study had three research questions. The questions and the findings follow:
1. What are the differences between the employee attitudes toward job satisfaction in 1976 and 1989?

(a) In the following group the proportion favorable in the 1976 survey was greater than the proportion favorable in the 1989 survey to a 0.05 level of significance: job demands, supervisor/employee interpersonal relations and technical competence of supervisor.

(b) In the following group the proportion favorable in the 1989 survey was greater than the proportion favorable in the 1976 survey and was significant at the .05 level: pay, employee benefits and effectiveness of administration.

2. What cultural changes have taken place in the organization within the 13-year period?

(a) The number of full-time employees who left BTES employment (turnover) in 1989 was three of 56. In 1976 it was five of 65. This was a decrease from 7.7% to 5.4%. The number not leaving BTES employment, even though decreasing, was not significant. The z score was -0.54.
(b) The 1976 Safety Record was good as there was only one short-term lost-time accident. A second-place safety award was received from American Public Power Association for 1976. The lost-time accident was early in the year. In 1989 there was not a lost-time accident and there had not been one since 1982. There were lost-time accidents in 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1982. The difference between 1976 and 1989 was not significant to the .05 level.

(c) In the area of absenteeism, the improvement in attendance in 1989 over 1976 was significant to the .05 level.

(d) The improvement in United Way participation in 1989 and 1976 was significant to the .05 level in two areas of comparison. Fair share contributors changed from 33.8% of employees in 1976 to 94.7% in 1989. The z score was -6.92. The contributions as a percent of potential changed from 54.2% in 1976 to 98% in 1989. The z score was -6.62.

3. What changes in attitudes toward job satisfactions of individuals within an organization can be related to
evidences of changes in the culture of the organization?

The findings of the document review indicated that administration placed much emphasis on the areas of safety, attendance and United Way participation. There was a significant improvement in attendance and United Way participation in the results of the 1989 survey over the 1976 survey and there were no lost-time accidents for the ten-year period 1982-1992.

During the period 1976-1989 there was a significant increase in favorable responses in the areas of administration, pay and benefits.

Conclusions

The conclusions that were drawn from the results of the research study are contained herein. Data from the two attitude surveys indicated an improvement in attitudes concerning pay, benefits and effectiveness of administration. It may be concluded that there was an improvement in the overall work attitude (Sweeney et al., 1990) especially when considering the comments of the 1992
Questionnaire.

It may also be concluded that there were higher expectations of supervisors by employees because of the higher education level and more behavioral training of the employees (Golembiewski, Billingsley & Yeager, 1976).

It may be concluded that since there was much emphasis placed on attendance, safety and United Way participation over a long period of time, and since there were long-term changes in behavior, cultural changes did take place in these areas (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Sage & Stahl, 1987; Schein, 1985, 1987; Wolcott, 1982).

It is also concluded that a different scale of measurement might better measure attitudes because even when the favorable results of the 1989 survey decreased, the unfavorable results also decreased. The neutral area increased.

In conclusion, efforts were made to change areas (such as attendance, safety and United Way participation) by recognizing privately and publicly those behaviors that were desired. Expectations were communicated to new employees
during orientation and in the areas of attendance and safety, both positive and negative as appropriate, communications and sanctions were administered. It may be concluded that there has not been a negative impact from these employees because of the positive changes in attitudes toward pay and administration. If employees feel negative, it is concluded there would not have been a positive change in attitudes toward pay and administration (Sweeney et al., 1990).

**Recommendations**

As a result of this study, it is recommended that further research be conducted to compare changes in organizational culture with the attitudes of members of organizations toward levels of satisfaction with certain on-the-job attributes. Other recommendations based on the findings of this study are as follows:

1. A study should be conducted on the population analyzed in this study to see if the observed behavior of the respondents is consistent with their attitudes because attitudes are not always congruent with behavior (Freedman,
Sears & Carlsmith, 1978). Additional organizational development or organization transformation may be in order if attitude and behavior are not congruent.

2. A different instrument should be used to conduct a similar study to determine whether results consistent with this study could be found.

3. A study should be conducted in another organization to determine if there have been changes in culture and, if so, determine how those changes impact job satisfaction.

4. An ethnographic study should be conducted on this population by a trained ethnographer to determine whether the results consistent with this study could be found.

Finally, the study could be used by similar organizations to enhance job satisfaction using the following approaches:

1. By conducting a new employee orientation session welcoming the new employee and outlining, again, the expectations and goals of the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1987; Light & Keller, 1985; Megginson, 1977; Wolcott, 1982).

2. By having discussions in the employee interview
process pertaining to company expectations which include attendance, safety, United Way participation, importance of being a teamworker, participation in employee functions and community activities, educational opportunities and expectations, etc. This should be done so that the interviewee can be informed as to the organization's norms, values and expectations, or culture. If the interviewee is offered a job and accepts it, he has, in effect, agreed to the boundaries of the culture of the organization (Light & Keller, 1985; Schein, 1989; Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983).

3. By having job descriptions and a fair pay plan that is consistent over time and takes into consideration pay of others with similar skills and training, levels of productivity and cost effectiveness (Kanter, 1986; McAdams, 1988; Meussling, 1987; Schein, 1985; Sweeney et al., 1990).

4. By celebrating successes such as Quality Team and business project completions; crisis situations met and conquered; attendance, safety and United Way goals met or exceeded; or other individual recognition or celebration (Costello & Zalkind, 1963; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Pace & Suojanen, 1988; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985).
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

ELEMENTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
Elements of Job Satisfaction

I. JOB DEMANDS

1. The hours of work here are O.K.

27. I often feel worn out and tired on my job.

28. They expect too much of us around here.

53. My job is often dull and monotonous.

54. There is too much pressure on my job.

II. WORKING CONDITIONS

2. Management does everything possible to prevent accidents in our work.

3. Management is doing its best to give us good working conditions.

29. Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work.

30. For my kind of job, the working conditions are O.K.

55. Some of the working conditions here are annoying.

56. I have the right equipment to do my work.
III. PAY

4. In my opinion the pay here is lower than in other companies.

5. They should do a better job of handling pay matters here.

31. I'm paid fairly compared with other employees.

IV. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

6. I understand what the company benefit program provides for employees.

32. Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good.

58. I'm satisfied with the way employee benefits are handled here.

V. FRIENDLINESS AND COOPERATION OF FELLOW EMPLOYEES

7. The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.

33. A few of the people I work with think they run the place.
34. The people I work with get along well together.

60. The people I work with are very friendly.

VI. SUPERVISOR/EMPLOYEE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

8. My supervisor is too interested in his/her own success to care about the needs of employees.

9. My supervisor is always breathing down our necks; my supervisor watches us too closely.

10. My supervisor gives us credit and praise for work well done.

35. My supervisor has always been fair in dealing with me.

36. My supervisor gets employees to work together as a team.

61. My supervisor really tries to get our ideas about things.

62. My supervisor ought to be friendlier toward employees.

63. My supervisor lives up to his/her promises.

VII. CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT

11. Management here does everything it can to see that employees get a fair break on the job.
12. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone up the line.

37. I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of management.

38. Management is really interested in the welfare of employees.

39. Most of the higher-ups are friendly toward employees.

64. Management here has a very good personnel policy.

65. Management ignores our suggestions and complaints.

VIII. TECHNICAL COMPETENCE OF SUPERVISION

13. My supervisor see that employees are properly trained for their job.

14. My supervisor sees that we have the things we need to do our jobs.

40. My supervisor keeps putting things off, my supervisor just lets things ride.

66. My supervisor knows very little about his/her job.

67. My supervisor has the work well organized.
IX. EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMINISTRATION

15. Management here is really trying to build the organization between departments.

42. Management fails to give clear-cut orders and instructions.

68. This company operates efficiently and smoothly.

69. Management really knows its job.

X. ADEQUACY OF COMMUNICATION

17. Management tells employees about company plans and developments.

18. They encourage us to make suggestions for improvements here.

43. I know how my job fits in with other work in this organization.

44. Management keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know.

70. They have a poor way of handling employee complaints here.

71. You can say what you think around here.
XI. SECURITY OF JOB AND WORK RELATIONS

19. I am often bothered by sudden speed-ups or unexpected slack periods in my work.

20. Changes are made here with little regard for the welfare of employees.

45. Long service really means something in this organization.

46. You can get fired around here without much cause.

47. I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work.

72. You always know where you stand with this company.

73. When layoffs are necessary, they are handled fairly.

XII. STATUS AND RECOGNITION

21. Compared with other employees, we get very little attention from management.

22. Sometimes I feel that my job counts for little in this organization.

48. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgment.

49. Everybody in the organization tries to boss us around.
74. I am very much underpaid for the work that I do.

75. I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.

XIII. IDENTIFICATION WITH THE COMPANY

23. The longer you work for this company, the more you feel you belong.

24. I have a great deal of interest in this company and its future.

50. I really feel part of the organization.

76. I'm proud to work for this company.

XIV. OPPORTUNITY FOR GROWTH AND ADVANCEMENT

25. I have little opportunity to use my abilities in this organization.

26. There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead.

51. The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them.

52. I can learn a great deal on my present job.
XV. REACTION TO THE INVENTORY

77. Filling in this inventory is a good way to let management know what employees think.

78. I think some good may come out of filling in an inventory like this one.
APPENDIX B

EMPLOYEE LETTER AND ATTITUDE SURVEY
Dear Employee:

This brief survey is designed to find out how you and others feel about your organization as a place to work. This data will provide your own organization with some of the information they will need to better understand how people feel about the quality of working life.

If this questionnaire is to be useful, it is important that you answer each question frankly and honestly. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions, since we are interested in what you think and feel about your work.

Your answers to these questions are completely confidential. All questionnaires will be taken to NRECA headquarters for analysis and safekeeping. No one in your organization will ever have access to your answers. It will also be impossible to "trace" any specific answers back to you. Your organization will only see a "Statistical Overview" of the collected answers.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance. We hope you find the questionnaire interesting and thought provoking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The hours of work here are O.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management does everything possible to prevent accidents in our work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management is doing its best to give us good working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my opinion the pay here is lower than in other companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They should do a better job of handling pay matters here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I understand what the company benefit program provides for employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My supervisor is too interested in her/his own success to care about the needs of employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor is always breathing down our necks; my supervisor watches us too closely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor gives us credit and praise for work well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Management here does everything it can to see that employees get a fair break on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone up the line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor sees that employees are properly trained for their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My supervisor sees that we have the things we need to do our jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Management here is really trying to build the organization and make it successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Management here sees to it that there is cooperation between departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Management tells employees about company plans and developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>They encourage us to make suggestions for improvements here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I am often bothered by sudden speed-ups or unexpected slack periods in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Changes are made here with little regard for the welfare of employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Compared with other employees, we get very little attention from management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel that my job counts for very little in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The longer you work for this company, the more you feel you belong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I have a great deal of interest in this company and its future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I have little opportunity to use my abilities in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I often feel worn out and tired on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>They expect too much from us around here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>For my kind of job, the working conditions are O.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I'm paid fairly compared with other employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>A few of the people I work with think they run the place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The people I work with get along well together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My supervisor has always been fair in dealing with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My supervisor gets employees to work together as a team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Management here is really interested in the welfare of employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Most of the higher-ups are friendly toward employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My supervisor keeps putting things off, my supervisor just lets things ride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Management fails to give clear-cut orders and instructions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I know how my job fits in with other work in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Management keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Long service really means something in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. You can get fired around here without much cause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Everybody in the organization tries to boss us around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I really feel part of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I can learn a great deal on my present job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My job is often dull and monotonous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. There is too much pressure on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Some of the working conditions here are annoying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I have the right equipment to do my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>My pay is enough to live on comfortably.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I'm satisfied with the way employee benefits are handled here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>The company's employee benefit program is O.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>The people I work with are very friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>My supervisor really tries to get our ideas about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>My supervisor ought to be friendlier toward employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>My supervisor lives up to his/her promises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Management here has a very good personnel policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Management ignores our suggestions and complaints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>My supervisor knows very little about her/his job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>My supervisor has the work well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>This company operates efficiently and smoothly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Management really knows its job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>They have a poor way of handling employee complaints here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>You can say what you think around here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>You always know where you stand with this company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>When layoffs are necessary, they are handled fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>I am very much underpaid for the work that I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>I'm proud to work for this company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Filling in this inventory is a good way to let management know what employees think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>I think some good may come out of filling in an inventory like this one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
79. **PLEASE RATE YOUR SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH THE FOLLOWING BENEFITS AND PROGRAMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied Nor Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Leaves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Safety Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Disability Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Call (Standby Pay)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
80. If you were visiting with a customer who asked you about the following information, how would you respond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know Nothing About It</th>
<th>Know Something About It But Need More Training</th>
<th>Feel Very Confident In Discussing This Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Off-peak rates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ground source heat pump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Air-to-air heat pumps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. High efficiency gas furnace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Budget billing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Load control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Load factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Nuclear generation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. KW Demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. KWH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Disconnect policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Coal generation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Dual fuel heating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. Do you think load control and load management programs are a good idea?  __ Yes.  __ No.  __ Don't know anything about them.

82. Do you think your electric utility should be selling energy equipment such as water heaters, heat pumps, air-conditioners and electric furnaces?  __ Yes.  __ No.

83. Do you think your electric utility should be selling satellite television services?  __ Yes.  __ No.  __ Don't know anything about this service.

84. Do you think your electric utility should be involved in community/economic activities which promote additional jobs in the communities?  __ Yes.  __ No.  __ Maybe.
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

BRISTOL TENNESSEE ELECTRIC SYSTEM
June 3, 1991

Mr. Glenn Irwin
Chairman, Power Board
Bristol Tennessee Electric System
Bristol, TN 37620

Dear Mr. Irwin:

As you know, I am currently enrolled in the doctoral program at East Tennessee State University. I have chosen for my dissertation topic a study that will compare changes in employee attitudes toward job satisfaction, cultural changes that have taken place in the organization, and what changes in attitudes towards job satisfaction of individuals within an organization can be related to the evidence of changes in the culture of the organization.

I need permission from you to use data from two employee surveys and to do a correspondence and document review to determine cultural aspects of the organization. This will help me attempt to correlate any changes in employee attitude toward job satisfaction.

Thank you again for your support concerning my educational requirements to complete my dissertation in leadership and policy analysis.

Sincerely,

R. Michael Browder
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD - BTES
Mr. R. Michael Browder  
P. O. Box 549  
Bristol, TN  37621  

Dear Mr. Browder:

You may use the data from the two employee surveys and do a document and correspondence review at Bristol Tennessee Electric System.

Good luck with your dissertation and if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Glenn E. Irwin, Chairman  
Bristol Tennessee Electric System Power Board
APPENDIX E

MEMORANDUM TO DIRECTOR OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
MEMORANDUM

TO: Linda Parker, Director of Management Services
FROM: Mike Browder
DATE: June 9, 1992
SUBJECT: Doctoral Dissertation Data Reality Check

As you know, I have completed all of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at East Tennessee State University except the dissertation.

I am soliciting your help in providing a data reliability check for the research findings coming from my document review to see if we reach the same conclusions concerning BTES.

Your help will be greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX F

LETTER AND JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

TO SELECTED EMPLOYEES
Dear Employee:

You have participated in several employee surveys in the past. In order for BTES to continue to improve job satisfaction, we need your input on the attached survey.

Would you complete it at home this weekend and return it to me by Tuesday, July 28.

Please answer each question as honestly as you can. Only Mike Browder and I will see your responses.

Thank you for helping us and for your interest in BTES being the best it can be.

Sincerely,

Linda T. Parker
ELEMENTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE _______________ NAME ______________________

I. JOB DEMANDS - (The hours of work here are okay. I often feel worn out and tired on my job. They expect too much of us around here. My job is often dull and monotonous. There is too much pressure on my job).

(a) How do you feel about your job demands now? ______________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ______________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ______________________

II. WORKING CONDITIONS - (Management does everything possible to prevent accidents in our work. Management is doing its best to give us good working conditions. Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work. For my kind of job, the working conditions are okay. Some of the working conditions here are annoying. I have the right equipment to do my work).

(a) How do you feel about your working conditions now? ______________________
III. PAY - (In my opinion the pay here is lower than in other companies. They should do a better job of handling pay matters here. I'm paid fairly compared with other employees. My pay is enough to live on comfortably).

(a) How do you feel about your pay now? ____________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ______________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ____________
IV. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS - (I understand what the company benefit program provides for employees. Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good. I'm satisfied with the way employee benefits are handled here. The company's employee benefit program is okay).

(a) How do you feel about your employee benefits now?

(b) How has this changed since 1976?

(c) Why do you believe it has changed?

V. FRIENDLINESS AND COOPERATION OF FELLOW EMPLOYEES - (The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot. A few of the people I work with think they run the place. The people I work with get along well together. The people I work with are very friendly).

(a) How do you feel about the friendliness and cooperation
of fellow employees now? ______________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ___________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ___________

VI. SUPERVISOR - EMPLOYEE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS - (My supervisor is too interested in his/her own success to care about the needs of employees. My supervisor is always breathing down our necks; my supervisor watches us too closely. My supervisor gives us credit and praise for work well done. My supervisor has always been fair in dealing with me. My supervisor gets employees to work together as a team. My supervisor really tries to get our ideas about things. My supervisor ought to be friendlier toward employees. My supervisor lives up to his/her promises).

(a) How do you feel about your supervisor - employee interpersonal relations now? ________________
VII. CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT - (Management here does everything it can do to see that employees get a fair break on the job. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone up the line. I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of management. Management is really interested in the welfare of employees. Most of the higher-ups are friendly toward employees. Management here has a very good personnel policy. Management ignores our suggestions and complaints).

(a) How do you feel about your confidence in management now? __________________________________________________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? __________________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? __________________________
VIII. TECHNICAL COMPETENCE OF SUPERVISION - (My supervisor sees that employees are properly trained for their jobs. My supervisor sees that we have the things we need to do our jobs. My supervisor keeps putting things off, my supervisor just lets things ride. My supervisor lets us know exactly what is expected of us. My supervisor knows very little about his/her job. My supervisor has the work well organized).

(a) How do you feel about the technical competence of your supervisor now? ______________________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ______________________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ______________________________

IX. EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMINISTRATION - (Management here is really trying to build the organization and make it successful. Management here sees to it that there is cooperation between departments. Management fails to give clear-cut orders and
instructions. This company operates efficiently and smoothly. Management really knows its job).

(a) How do you feel about the effectiveness of administration now? ____________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? _______________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? _______________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

X. ADEQUACY OF COMMUNICATION - (Management tells employees about company plans and developments. They encourage us to make suggestions for improvements here. I know how my job fits in with other work in this organization. Management keeps us in the dark about things we ought to know. They have a poor way of handling employee complaints here. You can say what you think around here).

(a) How do you feel about the adequacy of communication now? ____________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
XI. SECURITY OF JOB AND WORK RELATIONS - (I am often bothered by sudden speed-ups or unexpected slack periods in my work. Changes are made here with little regard for the welfare of employees. Long service really means something in this organization. You can get fired around here without much cause. I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work. You always know where you stand with this company. When layoffs are necessary, they are handled fairly).

(a) How do you feel about your security of job and work relations now? ____________________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ________________
XII. **STATUS AND RECOGNITION** - (Compared with other employees, we get very little attention from management. Sometimes I feel that my job counts for very little in this organization. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgment. Everybody in this organization tries to boss us around. I am very much underpaid for the work I do. I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job).

(a) How do you feel about your status and recognition now?

(b) How has this changed since 1976?

(c) Why do you believe it has changed?

---

XIII. **IDENTIFICATION WITH THE COMPANY** - (The longer you work for this company, the more you feel you belong. I have a great deal of interest in this company and its future. I really feel part of the organization. I'm proud to work for this company).
(a) How do you feel about your identification with the company now? _____________________________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ______________________

(c) Why do you believe it has changed? ______________________

XIV. OPPORTUNITY FOR GROWTH AND ADVANCEMENT - (I have very little opportunity to use my abilities in this organization. There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead. The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them. I can learn a great deal on my present job).

(a) How do you feel about your opportunity for growth and advancement now? ______________________

(b) How has this changed since 1976? ______________________
XV. REACTION TO THE INVENTORY - (Filling in this inventory is a good way to let management know what employees think. I think some good may come out of filling in an inventory like this one).

(a) How do you feel about your reaction to the inventory now?

(b) How has this changed since 1976?

(c) Why do you believe it has changed?
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