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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In January 1962, supervisors within the Federal Government were suddenly plunged into a new management environment. For the first time in American history the Federal Government had established a positive government-wide policy for employee management relations in the Federal sector. The sudden plunge was caused by President John F. Kennedy when he issued Executive Order 10988--Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service.

To the consternation of many supervisors the order not only instructed them to accept unions but it also insisted on the creation of an environment of cooperation with union employees--specifically it stressed that supervisors would manifest impartiality toward union members and their union activities. During the past fourteen years additional executive orders have been issued that were designed to clarify and expand upon the original order.

In order to acquire the basic knowledge outlined in the various executive orders, and also remain current with the many evolutionary changes, it became necessary for supervisors to engage themselves in a program of continuing
and are they keeping up with the evolutionary changes occurring in that area?

**The Problem**

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of knowledge of supervisors in the Federal Government concerning presidential labor-management relations policies, as outlined in the various Executive Orders, and to determine the relationship of their level of knowledge to their attitude toward unionism.

It was anticipated that the study might also reveal additional data that would help to answer some of the following sub-questions:

1. Do supervisors believe that they have an adequate background in labor-management relations knowledge to work with unions?

2. What efforts, if any, have supervisors made to acquire labor-management relations knowledge?

3. Have supervisors been provided with opportunities for education or training in the area of labor-management relations?

4. If the supervisors have been exposed to labor-management relations training or education, how effective did they believe such programs had been in increasing their knowledge?
5. Of what value have the education programs been in the opinion of the supervisors?

6. Is there a relationship between the level of management at which a supervisor works and his knowledge of labor management relations?

7. Is there a relationship between involvement in grievances and the level of knowledge of labor-management relations?

8. What are the attitudes of supervisors toward unions?

9. In the opinion of the supervisors, what impact does a union organization have upon management's role to accomplish its mission?

10. What is the attitude of supervisors concerning whether a union may benefit both labor and management within an organization?

11. Do supervisors believe that it is appropriate to take employees into their confidence and permit them to share in decision-making?

12. What in general is the attitude of most supervisors toward the Presidential labor-management relations policies?

13. From the survey taken of supervisors in the Federal Government can any conclusions be drawn concerning how they will tend to act or react when dealing with unions or union members?
14. Do supervisors who have been union members have a different attitude toward unions than those who have never belonged to unions?

15. If supervisors have close relatives who belong to unions, do those supervisors appear to be different in their attitude towards unions and their membership than those supervisors who do not have close relatives who belong to unions?

16. Do supervisors respond toward unions in the same manner that their parents did when the supervisors were children growing-up in their family environment?

Research Objectives

1. The main objective of the research was to determine the level of knowledge of Federal Government supervisors in the basics of the Presidential labor-management relations policies and the guidelines for supervisors to follow in their contacts with members of federal unions.

2. A second objective of this research was to attempt to determine whether the attitude of the respondents toward federal labor unions was consistent with the labor-management relations policy and guidelines that had been established by Presidential Executive Orders.

3. A third objective of this research was to analyze the attitudes of supervisors demographically by age, education, family background (father was a union member),
level of supervisory position to determine whether certain
groups of supervisors may need additional or different pro-
grams of labor-management relations education.

4. A fourth objective of the study was to identify
whether or not there is a need for an adult education pro-
gram in labor-management relations and whether or not the
supervisors would accept an adult education program that
would improve their knowledge of labor-management relations.

Definitions

Adult Education:

One of the more accepted definitions of adult edu-
cation was developed by Verner and his definition follows:

Adult education is a relationship between an educa-
tional agent and a learner in which the agent selects,
arranges, and continuously directs a sequence of pro-
gressive tasks that provides systematic experience to
achieve learning for those whose participation in such
activities is subsidiary and supplemental to a primary
productive role in society.¹

Attitude:

Harry Triandis defines attitude as an idea charged
with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a par-
ticular class of social situations.²


²Harry C. Triandis, Attitude and Attitude Change,
Collective Bargaining:
An act in which the employees and the management negotiate their differences concerning a broad range of subjects which are generally related to work conditions and management decisions.

Department of Defense:
That agency of the Federal Government that employs military and civilian personnel to accomplish the mission of maintaining a military defense posture and to conduct warfare as required.

Federal Government:
The government of the United States whose main decision-making body is situated in the Washington D.C. area.

First Line Supervisor:
One who is a section head or comparable to a foreman, who closely supervises the activities of a group of employees. A first line supervisor is normally one who works at the entry level of the management hierarchy.

Labor-Relations:
The influence, authority, prestige, and power that managers and workers bring into the job environment which affects their relations toward each other, and it may be a deciding factor in the survival of an organization and its productivity.
Labor-Management Relations:
The interface that occurs between the managers and the employees in the daily conduct of the mission of an organization, and it involves itself with the decision-making process that impacts primarily upon the employee's working conditions and the cooperative efforts of both management and the employees.

Middle Management:
Those who are responsible to the top executives within the organization and who are responsible for the planning, direction and control of the process by which the resources of the organization are effectively utilized.

Military Managers:
Supervisors who are officers in the armed forces who wear military uniforms, perform military duties and supervise both military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

Staff:
Those individuals with limited authority whose responsibilities are generally limited to accomplishing specialized tasks and advising top management and assisting in the coordination of activities that aid in the accomplishment of an organization's mission.

Supervisors:
For the purposes of this study a supervisor is defined as an individual within the Federal Government who
has been assigned employees whom he must manage, provide
guidance for and be responsible for their product and pro-
ductivity. This person may be either a civilian or a mili-
tary supervisor.

Top Management:

For the purposes of this study top management is
defined as those few personnel at the very top of the
hierarchy of the group surveyed who are responsible for the
performance of a group of managers and who establish the
broad plans, objectives and general policies and motivates,
directs and controls the management of the organization.

Union:

For the purposes of this study a union consists of
those employees who are not supervisors or managers who
belong to an organization whose purpose is to represent
those employees in confrontations with management on labor-
relations problems.

Justification for the Study

The subject of this study may seem somewhat academic
to those who are unacquainted with the potential scope of
the problem. The number of civil servants employed in
August 1976 by the federal government was 2,874,698.\(^3\)

Traditionally, government officials have always opposed

\(^3\)U.S. Civil Service Commission, cited in Wallstreet
government employee unionism. Typical of that attitude is the letter written by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937 and addressed to the Federation of Federal Employees. The first of the letter is quoted below:

All government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into public service. It has its distinct and insurmountable limitations when applied to public personnel management. The very nature and purposes of government make it impossible for administrative officials to represent fully or to bind the employer in mutual discussions with government employee organizations.4

The acceptance of union employees has been particularly difficult for those supervisors employed within the Department of Defense because of the formal military structure in which they must operate. Complicating the problem is the fact that many supervisors, during their careers in the federal government, are frequently reassigned and forced to move to organizations that are located throughout the United States and the entire world. At times the supervisor may work in an all-military organization without unions and immediately thereafter be reassigned to another organization that is predominately composed of civilians, the majority of whom will be union members. Supervisors may attempt to change their assignments if the assignment will require them to supervise and associate with organized union employees. As the union movement has grown, it has

become increasingly difficult for supervisors to transfer to organizations that are lacking in union activities.

Because of the union expansion within the Federal Government, supervisors are increasingly evaluated on their ability to cope on a daily basis with union employees and it has become paramount that supervisors recognize that they must become skilled in the knowledge and techniques of labor-management relations. How effectively a government organization accomplishes its public business may come to depend almost entirely on how capable supervisors are in coping with unions and their membership. It should seem reasonable that periodic surveys of supervisors, within the Federal Government, may become a requirement in order to determine the level of their capabilities and effectiveness in this vital area.

There are always some executives in any bureaucratic organization who manifest the attitude that employees should not question decisions that are made by the supervising managers. A study by Hearn in 1973 revealed that the same attitude still prevailed in many areas of the Department of Defense despite the Presidential Executive Orders to the contrary. Although that study was made several years ago it is possible that the same negative attitude may still prevail.  

---

A problem that exacerbates the situation in the federal government is the requirement for frequent reassignment of supervisors. In industry an organization may take several years of sparring in the arena of collective bargaining before it eventually evolves into a viable arrangement with a union. The same executives or supervisors usually remain in place throughout the evolution of their labor-management relations program, and they acquire background experience that helps them to cope in future dealings with the union. However, in the Department of Defense, the turbulence created by the reassignment of supervisors at all levels of management may compound problems that appear in the arena of collective bargaining and the daily relations with unions.

The problem could become even more aggravated in the near future because large numbers of senior supervisors are retiring from the Federal Government. Some of these supervisors have years of experience and an in-depth understanding of how labor-management relations in the Federal sector have evolved. At the same time that senior supervisors are retiring, the rules for collective bargaining are becoming increasingly complex.

Need for the Study
This study was conducted primarily to seek supporting evidence that would help to determine whether there is
a lack of basic knowledge of labor-management relations on the part of supervisors in the Federal Government and what their attitude in general may be towards unionism. The results of the study should be of benefit to managers within all levels of the Federal Government who may wish to evaluate the effectiveness of their supervisors in the area of labor relations and assist in the evaluation of whether there is a need for additional education in this area.

A second contribution that can be expected to result from this research is the identification of a possible requirement for an appraisal of previous training and educational programs that were designed to teach supervisors the subject of labor-management relations. Although many of the participants in this study had been exposed to some form of training and education in the area of labor relations there were indications that the programs may not have proven as effective as planned. This should in no way be construed as a criticism or reflection on those responsible for the previous training and education for the programs may have been designed to provide highly effective instruction which for some reason the students failed to absorb.

President John F. Kennedy on 22 June 1961 stated that:

The right of the Federal Government to join and participate in the activities of employees organizations, and to seek to improve working conditions and
the resolution of grievances should be recognized by management officials at all levels in all departments and agencies.6

Despite the above statement made fourteen years ago, it is probable that there are a number of supervisors within the federal government who remain ignorant of the complexities of the various Executive Orders that provide guidance for labor-management relations. A review of some of the grievances that have been processed reflects that at least some supervisors continue to look disparagingly upon union activities and appear by their actions to thwart all attempts for serious collective bargaining. This may well be an indication of their lack of understanding, knowledge and empathy for the program and philosophy established by various government directives.

Bakke summarizes management's reaction with the following statement by one management-type individual:

Restriction on management freedom is a big issue. . . . We've got heavy responsibilities for making quick, accurate and effective decisions. Sometimes there are considerations that we can't divulge or that wouldn't be understood if we did. We're held responsible for the success of them, but the union isn't. . . . It's not impossible, but you wonder how long it can go on and leave you able to meet your responsibilities.7

---


The Director of the Civil Service Commission Office of Labor-Management Relations, Tony F. Ingrassia, has stated that:

Like society as a whole, government today can ill afford to brook polarization. It is long past time that we stopped playing the adversary game . . . anti-union and anti-management rhetoric have no place in today's federal labor-management lexicon.8

Scope

The scope of this study was limited to the surveying of two separate and selected groups of supervisors who make up a very small number of the total supervisors who are employed by the federal government.

The research methods and data for this study are limited to those two separate organizations that permitted the survey to be accomplished. Those two organizations can be considered typical of many of the organizations that are part of one of the largest agencies within the federal government. The supervisors (subjects) for this study were selected by organization and were not selected randomly. Generalization of the findings must be based upon logical speculation rather than upon statistical inference.

List of Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the two organizations surveyed were similar to many organizations within the Department of Defense.

2. It was assumed that respondents to the survey questionnaire would make a conscientious effort to answer the questions to the best of their knowledge, and would not willfully select inappropriate responses.

3. The standard selected of seventy percent correct responses was a valid standard for deciding whether a respondent was knowledgeable and/or possessed a negative attitude.

4. It was assumed that respondents to the survey questionnaire were capable of reading and understanding the questionnaire and could distinguish between degrees of likes and dislikes on a Likert type of scale.

List of Limitations

1. The results of this study can only be generalized to the groups who responded to the survey questionnaire.

2. It is unknown how many of those who answered the questionnaire were union members.

3. Because of the Privacy Act it was impossible to arrive at an accounting of those few among the
supervisors who, for some reason, failed to complete their survey questionnaire.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study was guided by three major research questions and three hypotheses.

The following are the major research questions:

1. What is the level of knowledge of supervisors, in the federal government concerning labor-management relations as outlined in presidential executive orders?

2. Are the attitudes of federal government supervisors consistent with the federal government's labor relations policies?

3. Is there a need for improved or additional educational programs for supervisors in the federal government in the area of labor relations?

The following three hypotheses were used to guide the development of the study:

\[ H_1: \] The most experienced supervisors, with the most years of service, will be more opposed to unions and their activities than the younger supervisors with less years of service.

\[ H_0: \] There is no significant difference in attitudes between older and younger supervisors who vary in age and experience.
H₂: The higher a position a supervisor holds in an organizational structure, the less he will know of labor relations.

H₀: There is no significant difference in labor relations knowledge between various managerial levels of supervisors.

H₃: Those supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures possess a more negative attitude towards unions than those who have not been involved with grievances.

H₀: There is no significant difference in attitudes towards unions between supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures and those who have not.

The Plan of Presentation

In order to understand the full significance of the recent impact that unions have made in the area of the public sector the reader requires some understanding of how those unions have evolved, and some view of the impact this may conceivably have upon the nation in the future. Chapter two will address itself to that subject. Chapter three contains a review of the data collection and the
procedures used to develop and analyze the survey questionnaire. Chapter four presents the results of the survey and Chapter five contains the conclusions of this research study.
CHAPTER II

THE EVOLUTION OF THE UNION MOVEMENT
IN THE FEDERAL SECTOR

Introduction

Conflict between labor and management is a struggle to gain an advantage through political and economic power that will force one of the adversaries to retreat from a position and grant the victor that which has been demanded. The fact that such combat can be successfully waged by the laboring class in the arena of labor-management relations is unique in the history of the world.

For centuries many of the laboring class were either slaves or indentured servants with absolutely no control over their working conditions or their work environment. During the middle ages small organizations of guilds or craft unions developed that exerted very limited and often unsuccessful economic pressures in an attempt to create better wages and working conditions for their members. At that same time large numbers of European society were living under a system of serfdom that was only slightly removed from the oppressive work conditions experienced by the slaves throughout previous centuries.
During the industrial revolution workers in the factory system generally were subjected to intolerable work conditions which included long hours of labor in unsafe and unsanitary surroundings for very meager wages. An attempt to organize workers into unions, to bring pressures upon the employers in order to improve working conditions, usually resulted in some form of disciplinary action either by the courts or the employer or both. Beal, Wickersham and Kienast comment as follows:

... until not much more than a generation ago the workers of America, thought by some to be affluent today, were an impoverished class, struggling to be free. They were poor and comparatively uneducated. They faced the power of the political state with its police, its courts, even sometimes its army; and the economic power of capital: factory-owners, bankers, and big business.¹

Forner provides a more vivid description of that period of American history as follows:

Although no legislation was enacted in the United States similar to the English eighteenth century laws against combinations of workmen, British judicial precedent was followed in charging conspiracy to American worker's organizations ... any two or more men who plotted the harm of a third or of the public could be indicted on the criminal charge of conspiracy, and legally punished. In short, workers could not unite to obtain benefits not obtainable by them as individuals.²


During the nineteenth century many attempts were made in America to organize unions, but union activities were often maligned by the press and harassed by employers and the courts. Generally the laboring class in industries could expect little assistance or encouragement from government representatives. Forner provides a picture of the political climate during the 1860s:

The federal government encouraged the importation of foreign labor to break strikes, while Union generals used military force to disperse or to imprison strikers. Labor suffered greatly at the hands of the state governments, several of them permitting employers to use convict labor. . . . Any two or more persons who combined for the purpose of preventing others from working during a strike were liable to a penalty of a fine up to $500 or imprisonment in the county jail up to six months (State of Illinois).3

Labor-management relations is a contest of economic and political power. A nation's laws are often slow in evolving and they are a reflection of social thought and mores. In the early 1800s America was predominately an agricultural society. There was a high premium placed upon independent action and aggressive business activity. The independent farmers frequently looked upon the individual who had migrated to the city to work in industry as someone who deserved whatever miserable lot he might receive. Farmers and entrepreneurs were represented in Congress and those who chose to strike, or in any way interfere with commerce and business, were looked upon as disruptive.

3Ibid., pp. 353-355.
Therefore, numerous laws were enacted to assure that the laboring class would be constrained from any actions that might harm the so-called "free enterprise" system of America. Millis and Montgomery provide a view of that period of American history:

As long as individuals feel that they have reasonable opportunity to become independent producers just so long are they likely to be more concerned in keeping the door to this opportunity open rather than in improving the conditions of the wage earners as a class. One characteristic of American economic evolution, until near the close of the nineteenth century, was the abundance of free land and the opportunity to attain proprietorship status consequent upon it. 4

The development of unions is a story of continuous adaption to changing conditions and problems. As the population of America evolved, changes began to occur and the numbers of those engaged in agriculture was vastly reduced in relation to the large influx of the nation's population into the factories and industries throughout the country. As a result millions of workers found themselves totally dependent upon industry for their jobs and for their incomes to support their families. Forner states that:

Between 1820 and 1860 the population of the United States grew from less than 10,000,000 to 31,000,000 increasing each decade about one-third above the previous one. Cities flourished as trade and industry expanded. The percentage of people living in cities was 4.9 in 1820, 8.5 in 1840 and 16.1 in 1860. In 1790, only six cities had a population of over 8000; in 1860, the number of such cities was 141. In 1860, there were eight cities above that figure.

... By the time the Civil War ended, the factory system had been fastened upon many American workers, whose lingering hope of escaping the wages system by becoming small producers was waning fast. Even the mechanic in the smaller towns found it more and more difficult to compete with the mechanized factories in the industrial cities, whose cheap goods were carried everywhere by the railroads.5

Parker and Whartenby state that:

While the manufacturing sector was small before the Civil War, the rate of growth was high. Gallman estimates that manufacturing production increased by 15 percent per year from 1839 to 1849, and 10 percent per year from 1849 to 1859. In 1839 manufacturing provided only 17 percent of commodity input in the economy. By 1859 this had risen to 32 percent.6

McConnell states that:

In 1910 the farm population was about 35 percent of the total population and received about 19 percent of the national income. By 1973 the farm population had declined to less than five percent of the total and farm income was about 3 percent of the national income.7

For the first time in history thousands of employees became concentrated in small areas where they could begin to apply political and economic actions against their employers. Because of the voting strength of the thousands

---


in this laboring class many politicians began to show some concern for the plight of the workers in industry. Prior to 1935 there were no laws in America that sanctioned or encouraged the organization of unions and their recognition by management.  

In 1935 the Wagner Act was enacted which granted collective bargaining rights to most employees in the private sector and it required management to recognize unions, accept them into their organizations and negotiate with the union's representatives or be subject to legal action in the Federal courts. It is interesting to note, however, that public servants were excluded from that act, and it was not until 1962 that the Federal government granted some form of collective bargaining to its employees.

For some twelve years there was considerable labor strife and conflict as labor took advantage of the Wagner Act and began to organize. A large part of the conflict was caused by labor's attempt to gain recognition and acceptance by management. To achieve their aims labor was often forced to strike.

In 1947 the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted by Congress and this provided certain legal constraints and controls

---


9 Ibid., p. 476.
over strikes. The Taft-Hartley Act also reflected the growing concern of possible strikes by public services for it expressly forbid public servants the right to enter into a strike. Section 305 of the Taft-Hartley Act provides that:

Any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for re-employment for three years by the United States or any such agency.¹⁰

This restraining of public employee's activities was typical of government's attitude, for public employee unions were denied recognition for many years.

**The Beginning of Unions in the Public Sector**

Hanslowe provides some insight into the general attitude of most public administrators with the following:

Benjamin Franklin once stated; A strike of Public employees manifests nothing less than an attempt to prevent or obstruct the operations of government until their demands are satisfied. Such action, looking toward the paralysis of government by those who have sworn to support it, is unthinkable and intolerable.¹¹

At the beginning of this century very strong restraints were placed on government employees by various public officials. For example, an order was issued by ¹⁰Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, first session.

President Theodore Roosevelt on January 25, 1906, and the issuance of that order would make it appear that he was a "rough rider" both astride a horse or behind his desk:

All officers and employees of the United States of every description, serving in or under any of the Executive Departments or independent Government establishments, and whether so serving in or out of Washington, are hereby forbidden, either directly or indirectly, individually or through associations, to solicit an increase of pay or to influence or attempt to influence in their own interest any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its Committees, or in any way save through the heads of the Departments or independent Government establishments, in or under which they serve, on penalty of dismissal from the Government service.12

Despite the anti-union attitudes of government supervisors, unions began to form in the federal sector in the early nineteenth century, and the first employees to organize were in the craft trades in the navy shipyards.13 During the 1800s the so-called "spoils system" was in operation and each time the major political positions changed hands government employees were frequently replaced by the incoming political heads. The strongest and largest union that evolved in the federal sector was the postal employees union.

At first unions tried to influence legislation through the use of lobbies and those efforts were usually

12 Ibid., p. 35.

unsuccessful. In 1861, however, as the result of union pressures Congress enacted the first wage law for workmen in the Navy Department. Eventually a federal wage board system was also established. In 1868, due to government employee's pressure, Congress enacted legislation that established an eight-hour day for federal employees. That legislation provided: that eight hours shall constitute a day's work for all laborers, workmen and mechanics now employed, or who may hereafter be employed by, or on behalf of, the government of the United States. This was at the time when the majority of the working class were working ten or more hours per day and they were striving to reduce their work day to eight hours. For some undetermined reason, the postal workers were not included. Possibly this may have been punishment for their prior union activities. The new law was considered at the time of its enactment to be a great achievement for organized labor.

Labor continued to pressure Congress for the abolishment of the spoils system, and in 1883 the Pendleton Act was enacted. This Act reformed the Civil Service system and led to a stabilization, and in turn contributed to a strengthening of the union's activities, for now it

---

became more difficult to remove government employees and thus weaken their union activities.  

The Theory of Government Sovereignty

Hanslowe comments that government supervisors fought unionism on the grounds that the government could not recognize a union of government employees for purposes of giving unions a voice in determining working conditions, when legal authority to fix those conditions reposed in the government itself. Supervisors questioned if such an action could not be construed as the sharing of government authority with a non-government institution.

Questions concerning collective bargaining in the public employment sector have been answered negatively on the basis of the following analysis:

Government is the collective authority of all its constituent citizens, by whose common consent it exists. Consequently, it must treat all alike, without preference or favoritism—including those whom it employs. The means for avoiding favored treatment of those it employs are committed exclusively to the legislative process through which fair and reasonable terms and conditions for all employees situated are assured. The relationship between government and those it employs is a personal and individual one.

For a full discussion of the Pendleton Act and its impact upon the civil service see Henry Steele Commager, Document of American History (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1968), pp. 561-566.

All participants in the processes of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—are executors of a trust lodged in them by their fellow citizens.17

The thread that runs throughout the theory of sovereignty is the idea that the government is unique from other employers in that it is a sovereign employer. Collective bargaining with organized employees or the striking of government employees would be inconsistent with the government's role as sovereign.

On a number of occasions the subject of union bargaining with the government has been questioned. Even when agreements have been reached between unions and government supervisors the government has been accused of abdicating its power. Such agreements have been considered to be invalid. In 1944 the attorney general of Florida provided the city manager of Miami with the following opinion:

... no organization, regardless of who it is affiliated with, union or non-union, can tell a political sub-division possessing the attributes of sovereignty, who it can employ, how much it shall pay them, or any other matter or thing relating to its employees. To even countenance such a proposition would be to surrender a portion of the sovereignty that is possessed by every municipal corporation and such a municipality would cease to exist as an organization controlled by its citizens.18

17 City of New York, Department of Labor, Recognition of Organized Groups of Employees (1955), pp. 2-3.
Two years later in 1946 another and separate judicial decision stated that:

There is an abundance of authority, too numerous for citation, which condemns labor union contracts in the public service . . . such a contract disables them from performing their duty; that it involves divided allegiance; that it encourages monopoly; that it defeats competition; that it is detrimental to the public welfare; that it is subversive of the public service; and that it impairs the freedom of the individual to contract for his own services.19

Hanslowe has summarized the entire argument for sovereignty in the following:

What this position comes down to is that government power includes the power, throughout law, to fix the terms and conditions of government employment, that this power reposes in the sovereign's hand, that this is a unique power which cannot be given or taken away or shared, and that any organized effort to interfere with this power through a process such as collective bargaining is irreconcilable with the idea of sovereignty and is hence unlawful.20

Hanslowe also points out that the civil service systems are enacted and administered through law. Employment conditions are fixed because of government regulation, budget appropriations or the orders of some public official. How can collective bargaining by public employees be reconciled with the basic fact that the government is the source

19Mugford V. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, opinion November 6, 1944, aff'd, 185 Md. 266, 44 A2d 745 (1946).

and wielder of law and therefore does not collective bar-
gaining constitute insurrection against lawfully consti-
tuted authority?  

In keeping with this philosophy of government sovereignty, the Secretaries of both the Navy Department and the War Department reacted to the 1868 legislation, that provided for an eight-hour work day, by reducing the pay of employees in their departments by twenty percent which was equivalent to the reduction in work hours. When their actions were contested the U.S. Attorney General supported them and produced an opinion that their was nothing illegal in that action.

It was not until four years later that Congress finally enacted legislation that forced the agencies to pay the same wage for eight hours as had previously been paid for a ten-hour work day. The evolution of a nation's laws are a reflection of its social thought and mores which are subject to continuous changes. In today's environment of labor-management relations the entire subject of government's sovereignty is being challenged and Hanslowe comments as follows:

Its difficulty (the sovereignty argument) lies in the circumstance that life has a way of running ahead of logic and that history tends to be more complex

---

21Ibid., p. 7.

than political theory. Implicit in the argument is the idea that the sovereign is absolute, all powerful and always right. The idea is open to question.\(^\text{23}\)

Loewenberg and Moskow are two others who reflect a growing sentiment against the theory of sovereignty for government in the area of labor-management relations and their views are that:

The public service is held to be different from a private profit-making organization. If the latter may be defrocked of its managerial prerogatives without concern, the former must remain fully vested with sovereignty if society is to survive.

Sovereignty as an excuse not to bargain in the public sector is no more a principle than management prerogative is in the private sector, that it is chiefly a source of comfort and convenience to government officials rather than a bedrock on which society rests.\(^\text{24}\)

Loewenberg and Moskow also point out the three levels of objection to public employees collective bargaining: (1) the process has been considered totally impermissible, (2) it is permissible only if specifically authorized by the legislature, and (3) it is permissible only if executed in a certain manner. They point out that the main objection is that it involves an improper delegation to private persons of government authority over the terms and


conditions of public employment. This they state is wrong. In their opinion a public employee does not have to agree to an employee representative's proposals, and they believe that a public employer does not delegate authority to a representative by negotiating a collective bargaining contract. They are convinced that any agreement that results is an exercise of discretion rather than a delegation of authority by the public employer.\textsuperscript{25}

In 1912 Congress began to recognize that previous restrictions imposed upon government employees were not too effective and they became more sensitive to the lobbying pressures of Federal employees and Congress enacted the Lloyd-La Follette Act.

**The Lloyd-La Follette Act**

The Lloyd-La Follette Act established the right for Federal employees to join any organization that did not claim the right to strike against the government. The primary purpose of the Act was to provide government employees the right to form associations and to petition Congress without fear of job loss or pay reductions. The Act provided in part:

\[
\ldots \text{membership in any society, association, club or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike,}\]

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 48.
or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its object, among other things, improvements in the conditions of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or group of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such persons from said service.26

Hanslowe points out that although the Lloyd-La Follette Act became the basis for the principle that Federal government employees may join any organization they choose providing the organization does not claim the right to strike against the government, the act did little to establish a system of collective bargaining. It did nothing to create a system for the joint determination of the working conditions of federal employees. Another weakness of the act was that it was difficult to secure effective judicial scrutiny of claims that a government agency had violated the act's prohibition against reprisals.27

The Growth of Union Membership

Although the Lloyd-La Follette Act was originally applied only to the postal employees it was later applied to all federal employees. The principle that federal

265 United States Code, Par. 652.

government employees might join any organization led then to the formulation of the National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE), in 1917 and later in 1932 the American Federation of Labor (AFL) founded the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).

The AFGE is the largest union of Federal government employees, while the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) is the largest union of state and municipal workers.  

The AFSCME was founded during the depression and in 1935 it merged with the AFGE in an attempt to increase its membership and its bargaining strength. Because their problems were different from those of the Federal employees they split away and in 1936 they were chartered by the AFL as an international union. In 1936 there were genuine merit systems in only eleven states and the AFSCME pushed for civil service protection and lobbied for improved wages and working conditions.

Prior to the enactment of the Lloyd-La Follette Act union membership had primarily attracted "blue collar" workers from the Post Office. Since the Act was passed


29 Ibid., p. 60.

30 Ibid., p. 61.
there has been a steady increase in white-collar membership until today almost two-thirds of the employees represented by AFGE are in the white-collar category. 31

Schuiten and Garnett describe the situation that led increasing numbers of white-collar employees to join the union:

Sporadic attempts were made to organize the "general scheduler," or "white-collar," employees of the Federal government, but little success was gained until 1917. At that time, the Congress attempted to pass legislation which would increase the hours of the basic work day for Federal employees without changing the number of work days per week. Within a few months of this attempt the AFL was able to organize sixty-four union locals and in September 1917, form them nationally into the National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE). 32

In 1931 the NFFE withdrew from the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Many union members, however, were opposed to the withdrawal and they formed a new union that was affiliated with the AFL, and they named it the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE). Today the AFGE can boast a membership approaching 350,000. 33

31 Ibid., p. 56.


Sentiment Begins to Change

Prior to the enactment in 1935 of the Wagner Act, unions throughout the country experienced difficulties because there was no legal requirement for management to engage in collective bargaining. The courts usually expressed the attitude that to force management to rehire those who had been removed because of their union activities would be an interference with the rights of management.

It is interesting to note that both of the first two major acts of labor legislation that were enacted by Congress, the Norris-Labuardia Act of 1932 and the Wagner Act of 1935, excluded government employees from their provisions. As the result of labor legislation in the 1930s the unions in the private sector increased in membership and by 1960, twenty-five years after the enactment of the Wagner Act, there were more than eighteen million employees in the private sector who were members of unions.34

Although employees of the Federal government were not covered by the laws that encouraged those employed in the private sector, government employee unions continued to grow and increase in strength. They also maintained a steady lobbying pressure on all members of Congress. Between the years of 1949 and 1961, as a result of the lobbying efforts of Federal unions, eighty bills

were introduced in Congress that would have provided for
the recognition of civil service unions. None of the bills
were enacted.35

In the 1960s public employees began to make some
progress toward recognition. Loewenberg and Moskow describe
it as follows:

The 1960's were years of change in philosophy for
many academicians, law-makers and public managers.
They began to see the pressures of public employee
unions for bargaining as both desirable and socially
constructive. The general public, which for many years
considered government employment as a service, desir­
able sinecure, now began to realize that salaries, and
fringe benefits lagged behind those in the industrial
sector. The public began to entertain the notion that
public employees had the right to organize and bar­
gain.36

Senator John F. Kennedy had worked closely with the
Civil Service Commission for years and had served for four­
teen years on the House and Senate Labor Committee.37 Soon
after he became President he appointed a task force to
study the employee-management relations that existed within
the federal service. The task force study revealed that

35 Bernard Wray, "Crises in Labor Relations in the
Federal Service: An Analysis of Labor-Management Relations
in the Federal Service Under Executive Order 11491"

36 J. Joseph Loewenberg and Michael H. Moskow, Col­
lective Bargaining in Government (Englewood Cliffs, New

37 Wilson R. Hart, Collective Bargaining in the
Federal Civil Service (New York: Harper Brothers, 1961),
p. 265.
federal employees were not much different from those in the private sector and when antagonized they might be expected to threaten to disrupt public service. The major finding of the task force was that throughout the federal government there was a lack of sound policy for labor-management relations. On November 30, 1961, the task force issued its report. It indicated that the federal government was far behind industry in the area of labor relations, and that public service could be improved by responsible unions.

A portion of the task report reads as follows:

The Task Force studies indicate that some 33% of all federal employees, altogether some 762,000 persons, including 482,224 in the Post Office Department belong to employee organizations. This matches almost precisely the national proportion of organized workers in non-agricultural establishments exclusive of federal employment, which was 32.4% in 1960. It is a proportion half again as great as that of the total labor force in which 23.3% of the workers are organized. A majority of federal employees are either postal employees or blue collar workers. Most of the latter work in industrial establishments much like those in the private economy, and are paid according to rates prevailing in nearby private industry. Union membership is common among these blue collar workers.38

As a result of the study, President Kennedy issued Executive Orders 10987 and 10988 which were signed on January 17, 1962. The Constitution provided the President the authority to issue Executive Orders. Because most Federal departments came under the Executive Branch,

President Kennedy was able to by-pass the Congress and assist the federal unions to make the progress that Congress had consistently blocked for decades.

Basically, Order 10987 required all federal agencies to establish a simple, orderly and speedy system for employees to appeal administrative decisions that adversely affected them. Order 10988 granted federal government employees the right to join or refrain from joining a union. Order 10988, however, denied recognition to any union organization that attempted to promote a strike against the government.

Later, in May of 1963, to constrain and discourage discrimination against government employees, or the exploitation of them, President Kennedy supplemented Executive Order 10988 by issuing a standards of conduct for employee organizations and a code of fair labor practices.39

As a result of President Kennedy's Executive Orders there was a large increase in the number of government employees who joined unions. Former president John F. Griner of the American Federation of Government Employees stated,

No matter that collective bargaining rights (under E.O. 10988) were modified, truncated, almost emasculated, E.O. 10988 was the . . . Magna Charta. The

workers saw their opportunity. They grasped it. They joined the union in droves.  

Loewenberg and Moskow have pointed out that government is the most rapidly growing sector of our economy. Employment in that sector increased by 46 percent from 1960 to 1969 while employment in the rest of the economy increased by only 26 percent. The percentage of the nation's labor force employed by federal, state and local government increased from 9.6 percent in 1920 to 17.4 percent in 1969.  

Loewenberg and Moskow believe the cause of this large growth in public service unions to be due to the following: (1) from 1940 to 1970 the population of the United States increased by 55 percent and this required a large growth in public services, (2) technological progress produced increased requirements for government regulations and controls, and (3) many new programs were added and the concepts of what the Federal government should do changed and moved in a more ambitious direction.

---


41 Ibid., p. 1.

42 Ibid., pp. 1-3.
The AFGE membership increased by 362 percent during the 1960s from 70,300 members to 324,000 by 1970. Government employees joined labor organizations at a faster pace than workers in private employment. From 1943 to 1958, membership in government unions increased 60 percent, compared with a 32 percent increase for all unions. By 1956, nearly 540,000 government employees were added to union membership rolls including 228,000 between the years of 1963 and 1965. In 1964, 900,000 employees of the Federal government were union members, while over 550,000 state and local government employees were organized in national and international unions. It is clear that unionization has advanced in all areas of public employment.

On October 29, 1969, President Nixon issued Executive Order 11491 and that order was the foundation of the current labor relations environment in the Federal service at this writing. The major objective of Executive Order 11491 was to provide an efficient, orderly system for


labor-management relations in the Federal service, enabling employees through their designated union representative, to participate in the formulation of personnel policies and practices and matters affecting working condition; improve the efficiency of Government operations and services to the public and well-being of employees. Decentralized control was abolished for administration and enforcement of the order and three new administrative bodies were created which had centralized control: (1) the Federal Labor Relation Council, (2) the Federal Service Impasse Panel, and (3) an Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor-Management Relations.

Executive Order 11491 eliminated the status of informal and formal recognition that had existed and left remaining only exclusive recognition which was to be arrived at through secret ballot. Order 11491 also required that labor and management negotiate in good faith and it defined areas that were not negotiable and outlined labor practices that were considered to be unfair.

On August 26, 1971, President Nixon signed Executive Order 11616 which amended Executive Order 11491 as the result of recommended changes that he had received. The objective of Order 11616 was to strengthen collective

---

bargaining by broadening the use of the negotiation process, to broaden third-party involvement, and to clarify the status of the exclusive representative—all designed to promote more responsible and stable Federal labor-management relations.47

Once again in May of 1975, as a result of a series of recommendations, Executive Order 11491 was amended by Order 11838 which broadened the scope of negotiations. All agency regulations were deemed negotiable unless the agency could show a "compelling need" not to negotiate. Likewise, all major changes in an agency's personnel policy and practices were made mandatory subjects of bargaining even when a contract was already in force.48

The Executive Order 11616 deleted that part which had previously denied recognition to those unions who would not agree to a no-strike policy. The prohibition of Federal employees striking remains within the Taft-Hartley Act. The principles that have evolved over the years are:
(1) Government employees have the right to organize, (2) strikes cannot be permitted to disrupt vital operations, (3) merit systems must be maintained, and (4) there is a


need for a balanced program of labor relations but the public interest must always be the main consideration. 49

The Strike Issue

Although President Nixon eliminated from his Executive Order 11616 the requirement that Federal employees may not strike against the government, that requirement remains within the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wagner Act. The strike issue remains a festering demand by unions in the Federal sector, and it can be expected that unions will continue to pressure Congress for the right to strike and to bargain collectively on such matters as wage increases, selections and promotions.

The strike issue is following the same path previously followed over the issue of whether Federal employees should be given the right to organize and bargain collectively.

According to Loewenberg and Moskow the work stoppage by over 200,000 postal workers in March 1970 broke many traditions of federal service and introduced new concepts into federal employee collective bargaining. The drama of the eight-day strike may be a prelude to significant change in public employee-employer relationships.

Until the postal strike, the most sacrosanct, inviolate rule of federal employment relations was that employees could not strike against the federal government.  

Governor Rockefeller's Committee on Public Employee Relations viewed the problem thus:

In contrast to the private sector, the right of public employees to strike has never been recognized by the public, legislature, or by governmental authority. . . . Nor does the right of strike in the private sector prevail without limitation. . . . There are solid reasons for the distinction (between the public and the private sector). . . . With few exceptions, there are no constraints of the marketplace. The constraints in the provision of "free services" by government are to be found in the budget allocation and tax decisions which are made by legislators responsive to the public will.  

Hanslowe comments that Presidents Wilson, Coolidge, and Hoover all made statements which in effect held that a strike by public employees amounted to insurrection. Even President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed himself in a similar vein, although during his administration, and apparently with his approval, something like a genuine collective bargaining system emerged among employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The same had been true even


earlier in the Government Printing Office. By the mid-
forties, the movement for change began to gather steam.  

As might be expected George Meany, President of the 
AFL-CIO Union thought differently from those mentioned 
above for in late 1974 at the founding convention of the 
AFL-CIO's new Public Employee Department he stated: "If 
you treat public employees bad enough they will go on 
strike and they'll get the support of the union movement."  
He also stated that; "public workers involved in labor dis-
putes should feel free to strike any damn time they feel 
like going on strike."  

Kheel firmly believes that collective bargaining 
cannot exist if employees may not withdraw their services 
or an employer discontinue them. This is not a statement 
of preference, but a statement of fact. If we believe 
public employees should have bargaining rights, we must 
accept the possibility of a strike and consider how best 
to guard against it. 
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Dahl disagrees and points out that the trouble is if unions are able to withhold labor—to strike—as well as to employ the usual methods of political pressure, they may possess a disproportionate share of effective power in the process of decision making. Collective bargaining would then be so effective a pressure as to show the results of the "normal" American political process. Because strikes in the public sector disrupt essential services many citizens will press for a quick end to the strike with little concern for the cost of the settlement to the taxpayers.56

There are a number of factors that cloud the strike issue from management's view. Increased wages can only come from increasing taxes and those politicians who speak of raising taxes do not remain long in office. Unions can sometimes invade management's domain by electing their members or sympathizers to decision-making groups. Government budgets are made public and unions can demand money from any area that may have excess funds. If ceiling limits are placed on tax levels and at the same time unions pressure for more wages some public services may have to be cancelled to provide the money.

If local budgets require approval at a higher level, the local government may be forced to renege on

56Ibid., p. 271.
increases they previously agreed to before their total dollars for their budget were revealed.

Loewenberg and Moskow provide the view from the union side: One can expect that a government will tend to be niggardly with its employees to avoid the unhappy necessity of tax increases. The consequence is that, on the whole, the incomes of public employees have shared less in the general prosperity than have private incomes. It simply takes more pressure to raise the public remuneration level, given the different nature of the public employer. 57

The government employee's main issue during the past 100 years was that of gaining permission to form unions, to gain recognition, and to engage in collective bargaining with management. It was only by an Executive Order, signed by President Kennedy who sympathized with the employee's goals, that collective bargaining in the Federal government came into being. As of this writing it remains an Executive Order, and it has not been enacted into law by Congress. The entire program could be closed out with the issuance of another Executive Order. It would seem reasonable that because of the increased membership and bargaining power of Federal unions that they will not remain quietly on the sidelines for another 100 years.

57Ibid., p. 15.
while Congress and academicians debate whether government employees should be granted the right to strike. There are now enough government employees located in strategic places in the public service areas who may in time so disrupt those services that Congress will be forced to permit government employees the right to withhold their services and strike, simply because they have no other practical alternative.

Loewenberg and Moskow provide the sobering thought, however, that to concede to any special-interest group a right to bargain for terms which the sovereignty believes contravenes the public interest is to deny the government's single responsibility. The government must remain in possession of the sole power to determine, on behalf of all, what shall be public policy. 58

Summary

Although the continued growth in government employment will vary among levels of government, the growth of public employment can be expected to grow more rapidly than the private sector. Increasing demands for additional government services will cause that expansion. This in turn will cause the government to compete for employees and this will require competitive wages and salary levels. The entire personnel structure of government employees will

58 Ibid., p. 13.
probably be revised and reorganized as unions gain increasing bargaining rights in most of the areas that affect their working conditions.

It can be expected that labor unions in the Federal sector will not be easily persuaded to depart from their goals of increased collective bargaining rights. Sloane and Witney believe there is probably no other option available for union employees and they comment:

It is entirely possible that labor's remarkable staying power has been due to the single fact that to many workers, from the early nineteenth century to the present, there has really been no acceptable substitute for collective bargaining as a means of maintaining and improving employment conditions. Whatever its deficiencies, the labor union has offered millions of employees in our profit minded industrial society sufficient hope that their needs, not only as employees but as individuals, would be considered to warrant their taking out union membership. At the very least, these employees have been satisfied that the only theoretical alternative to collective bargaining--individual bargaining--has for them been no alternative at all from a practical viewpoint.  

Stanley foresees that the government will ultimately be forced to establish a strong labor relations department, part of whose work will be the personnel function as we have known it in the past. With or without such a change in organization, public personnel systems need strong and experienced hands to conduct collective

---

bargaining, to deal with the grievances and to be management's voice in matters which go to arbitration.\textsuperscript{60}

If Stanley is correct then it seems reasonable to assume that this future trend creates the requirement for a management force within the government that is well educated in the techniques of labor-management relations.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to survey a group of supervisors, employed by the federal government, to determine the degree to which they were knowledgeable in the area of labor-management relations; determine their attitudes towards unions, and identify whether there was a need for additional training and education in the subject area. Demographic data were collected to provide background and a profile of the supervisors surveyed. There were three specific variable components that were compared when the data were analyzed—-the respondents' degree of cognitive knowledge; and the nature of his affective and behavioral attitude. If a respondent achieved a score of less than seventy percent on any of the three variables he was considered to be below the standard for that variable component. It was assumed that a score that was below standard implied that the respondent was in need of additional education in labor-management relations or that his behavioral attitude was not consistent with policies previously established by the federal government.
The main stimulus for this study was the research conducted in 1974 by Eversen and McComb in which they surveyed the attitudes of eighty-eight government supervisors, who were employed in a major headquarters within the United States Air Force. They used a questionnaire and surveyed the supervisors concerning their attitude about union activities within the Federal Sector. From their research they concluded that the eighty-eight Air Force Supervisors had attitudes that were inappropriate and inconsistent with policy that had been established by Presidential Executive Orders.\(^1\)

This study was designed to use the same methods of research that were used by Eversen and McComb. This study was expanded to include 413 supervisors and it included supervisors from other services in addition to Air Force personnel. This was accomplished by surveying two Federal Government organizations to which were assigned representatives from the various military branches of the services.

**Survey Method Used**

Survey research frequently utilizes some form of questionnaire for the purpose of collecting standard data from a predetermined group of individuals over whom the

researcher has no experimental control. Survey research has a number of advantages. It is often less expensive in time and money compared to other methods. It may reveal attitudinal data that might not surface with other methods of research. It is possible to gather extensive amounts of data that provide a variety of information which, within limitations, may support some broad general principle of social behavior that may permit the relative comparability between individuals or groups when they are reasonably similar.

One major potential problem in survey research is the failure to receive a sufficient number of returns from the respondents solicited. In this study the return was 70.9 percent and this was assumed to be a sufficient return for the purposes of this study. Other influences can modify the results of a survey. Some respondents tend to agree with statements that they misunderstand while other respondents may consistently disagree with such statements. Some tend to always agree with statements that are positively worded while others may tend to agree with negatively worded statements. Because there were 413 respondents in this study it is assumed that if there were such tendencies that there would have been some balancing out of that factor. Every effort was made in the development of the survey questionnaire to carefully phrase and balance the statements to preclude ambiguity wherever possible.
An additional problem in survey research is the respondent's willingness and ability to respond. If the population surveyed is for some reason hostile to the topic being surveyed, or to those who are directing the survey it is possible that the respondents will intentionally provide incorrect answers. This problem is usually beyond the control of the researchers. However, in the case of this study the project was coordinated with the appropriate top managers. The chief supervisor for each of the organizations surveyed carefully explained the intent and purpose of the survey and stressed, through personal contact, his interest in the results of the survey. Because of the quantity of surveys that were voluntarily completed and returned it was assumed that outright hostility toward the survey or the topic was minimal. Because of the subject matter, however, it probably cannot be assumed that hostility was entirely lacking. Every effort was made to impress upon the supervisors that their privacy would be protected and that their assistance in the survey was greatly appreciated. They were also informed that their cooperation and assistance would hopefully lead to improved educational programs in the future.

This study used the "self-report" survey research method to survey supervisors who were employed by the Federal Government. The survey questionnaire was designed to measure a supervisor's cognitive knowledge of
labor-management relations in the Federal Government, and what their affective and behavioral attitudes were towards unions and union activities in the Federal Sector.

The use of surveys to gather data for problem analysis, or to facilitate decision making has been going on for centuries. Babbie states that survey research was conducted by ancient rulers who took a census of their people for taxation programs or for the purposes of military planning.\(^2\)

Many of the modern techniques of survey research have resulted from the large quantity of survey research conducted in the United States during the past century. Three survey areas in particular have contributed to the growth and evolution of survey research methodology: (1) the marketing surveys conducted by many large business establishments, (2) the numerous census of the American population conducted by the United States Bureau of the Census, and (3) commercial polling activities.

Different methods may be used for conducting surveys:

1. Interviewers may be trained and indoctrinated to seek out a sample of the population and ask a series of standardized questions designed to provide data that will reveal attitudes, intentions, pre-disposition toward

---

certain behavior, social trends and demographic information that will provide useful information to specialists in the areas of marketing, political science and sociology.

2. There are research methods for surveying that are designed to observe how people behave or react to various situations or circumstances and then an attempt is made to evaluate or interpret the results.

3. Some survey methods require that the respondents perform a specific task and sometimes machines are used to measure physical reactions to questions asked by an interviewer.

4. The most widely used method is that of providing individuals with a printed questionnaire which they are asked to read and answer the questions. This so-called "self-report" method is usually designed to measure the respondent's knowledge or attitude concerning some aspect of their social life.

This study used the "self-report" method because it was the only feasible method that could be used to assure absolute anonymity for those who participated in the survey. Because of Federal legislation, referred to as the Privacy Act, a major constraint placed on the survey was that it was mandatory for those who completed the survey to have complete and unconditional anonymity. This requirement prevented any survey method other than the self-report, and Babbie sums the problem when he states that: "every
survey represents a collection of compromise between the ideal and the possible\textsuperscript{3}

Surveys that attempt to measure attitude are often challenged as being unscientific. The wide use of survey questionnaires, however, would seem to place such instruments in a category where they should be judged on the merits of their "utility for inquiry," rather than be maligned for their inability to be measured by some exact and absolute truth. It would be difficult to explain to someone just how frightened an individual may be of snakes. If, however, we solicit answers from several individuals concerning their fears of snakes we should be able to reach some agreement concerning just how frightened one of the individuals is when compared to others. It will not be an absolute finding but it may serve as some indication of how similar individuals with similar backgrounds and attitudes will react. Knowledge of attitudes and the impact that they have upon society may not solve many problems but it can be helpful in the analysis of problems and the search for their solutions.

Babbie believes that the explanatory analysis in survey research is aimed at the development of generalized

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 1.
propositions about human behavior and he states that survey research:

1. Has been used for hundreds of years.
2. Provides the best teaching example for instruction in social science methodology.
3. Is guided by logical constraints.
4. Provides a format that permits a clear and rigorous elaboration of a logical mode, and this clarifies the deterministic system of cause and effect.
5. Promotes replication by others.
6. Collects data about variables which can be qualified and processed by machine.
7. Forces the researcher to be explicit.
8. Provides the researcher the opportunity to use methods which are very specific.
9. Facilitates the openness of science.
10. Provides a permanent body of data and information. 4

The Concept of Attitude

Because much of this study concerns itself with the measurement of attitude some understanding of the term attitude becomes necessary. It seems reasonable to assume that most social and economic problems today are the result of, or are concerned with, attitudes. When

4Ibid., pp. 45-52.
individuals possess different attitudes in a given situation and the situation can, and often does, result in conflict.

The concept that there is something called "attitude" that causes individuals to react in certain ways has been in constant companion of the social psychologist since early in the twentieth century.\(^5\)

According to Allport the concept of attitude first emerged from the extensive analysis of the emigration of the Polish peasant that was conducted by Thomas and Znaniecki in 1918.\(^6\) Their study analyzed the attitude manifested by Polish peasants who settled in America.

Wagner defines attitude as a "predisposition to behave in a particular way towards a given object."

Assuming that man acts according to his predispositions, there is no better way to predict his responses to a stimulus than to know his attitude toward it.\(^7\)

Wagner states that despite the many attempts to define the term attitude it can be said that:


An attitude is composed of affective, cognitive and behavioral components that correspond, respectively to one's evaluation of, knowledge of, predisposition to act toward the object of attitude. If one were to consider for example, a person's general attitude toward a given politician, the affective component would refer to the person's evaluation of the politician, such as how nice a guy he is and how good a job he has done; the cognitive component would include the person's knowledge or beliefs (correct or incorrect) about the politician, such as what legislation he supports; and the behavioral component would refer to the person's predisposition to act toward the politician, such as writing to him or voting for or against him. 8

Triandis reinforces Wagner's views on attitude when he defines attitude as follows: "An attitude is an idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations." 9 This definition, in Trinandis' opinion, suggests that attitudes have three components:

1. A cognitive component, that is the idea which is generally some category used by humans in thinking. Categories are inferred from consistencies in responses to discriminably different stimuli. The category cars can be inferred for example, by determining that people make similar responses to Fords, Chevrolets, etc., and other stimuli that they are capable of discriminating. Statement of the form "cars are . . ." "cars have . . ." are also part of this component.

8Ibid., p. 3.
9Ibid., p. 3.
2. An affective component, that is, the emotion which charges the idea. If a person "feels good" or "feels bad" when he thinks about the category we would say that he has a positive or negative affect toward members of this category. For example, if he feels good when he thinks about cars he has a positive affective component toward them.

3. A behavioral component, that is a predisposition to action, such as driving, using, buying, or admiring cars.\(^\text{10}\)

The question might be posed—what is important about attitudes? Triandis believes that attitudes: (1) help people understand the world around them, by organizing and simplifying a very complex input from their environment, (2) protects a person's self-esteem, by making it possible for them to avoid unpleasant truths about themselves, (3) helps individuals adjust in a complex world by making it more likely they will react so as to maximize their rewards from the environment; and (4) allow them to express their fundamental values.\(^\text{11}\)

Wagner expresses concern that some individuals may experience difficulty in distinguishing attitude from


\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 4.
opinion, belief and values. He believes that an opinion is merely the verbal expression of an attitude; and attitude always includes evaluation of an object (the affective component) whereas a belief does not; value implies an orientation toward a series or class of selected objects and thus, a value is often a collection of attitudes. Since this study attempted to collect survey data on knowledge and attitude, the survey questionnaire was designed to provide data that could be compared for the three variable components described by Wagner and Triandis; namely, cognitive, affective and behavioral.

The question might be posed—of what value is the measurement of attitude for those seeking to understand and improve upon labor-management relations problems that are created by people in their daily interactions with each other? Triandis believes that the manner in which people behave and/or react toward one another reinforces his belief that a social situation is a result of their attitude. He states:

The experiences of people determine their attitudes. As attitudes develop, cognition becomes more differentiated, integrated, and organized, and affect and behavioral intention become associated with these conditions. Attitude is not a necessary or sufficient cause of behavior, but it is a contributing cause. Behavior often changes attitudes, as people develop attitudes that justify their previous behavior.

---

Behavior is the result not only of attitudes but also of norms, habits and expectations about reinforcement.  

The potential conflict that may exist between management and labor in the Federal Sector may stem from a conflict of attitudes. This study was conducted with the anticipation that some new insight might be gained that would possibly lead to a reduction in that conflict.

The Design of the Survey Instrument

The self-report survey instrument used to collect the data for this study contained three separate portions. The first part, the cognitive portion, contained questions that could be answered yes or no. There were also some multiple choice questions. The second portion of the survey instrument consisted of fifty statements that used an ordinal scaling format to measure affective and behavioral attitudes. The third portion of the survey instrument contained questions that solicited demographic information. A cover letter was attached to the survey instrument that contained instructions on how the questions were to be answered. A copy of the questionnaire and the answer key are located in Appendix A.

The survey instrument was developed with the assistance of several experts in the subject area of

---

labor-management relations. One of these experts performed as an arbitrator in the Federal Government and had several years of experience in that capacity. He assisted in the selection, wording and critiquing of the questions for the survey instrument. Another expert had taught the subject of labor relations to Federal Government employees for more than ten years. He performed a review of the questionnaire and offered several critical and constructive comments that improved the final survey instrument. Another person who is a deputy director of personnel, with several years of experience working with unions in the Federal Government, also assisted in the wording and preparation of the questions. Some of the questions designed by Eversen and McComb for their study were used or modified and included in the survey instrument. A naval officer who had a solid background in labor relations education, was asked along with the other panel members to analyze the questionnaire for ambiguity and credibility. It was the consensus of the above experts that the questionnaire consisted of valid questions and it could be expected to achieve the intent for which it was designed.

The questionnaire was developed over a period of about ninety days during which time the various experts reviewed the questionnaire on several occasions and offered suggestions for improving it. The questionnaire was then administered to a group of twenty-five government employees
who were government supervisors, and they were asked for their comments concerning ambiguity or other problems in the questionnaires. Their comments resulted in some additional rephrasing of the questions and the elimination of some questions which they found difficult to understand.

**Reliability**

Certain factors tend to influence the degree of reliability of a measurement instrument. Questionnaires that ask too few questions usually will not be as reliable as those that contain a longer list of questions. However, if the questionnaire is too long the respondents may become bored and fatigued and this too may adversely affect the reliability. The time required to complete the survey instrument in this study ranged from 18 to 27 minutes with the majority of the respondents completing it in about 22 minutes. Those who were administered the pre-test indicated that they found the survey interesting and did not believe that it was too long.

If the group being surveyed is not reasonably homogeneous this too will affect the reliability. The population sampled in this survey was all supervisors who had management backgrounds and were assigned to similar type management jobs within the Federal Government.

In the construction of the survey instrument every effort was made to keep the statements simple and concise.
Anonymity was assured to reduce the possibility of biased responses. It is, however, acknowledged that it may be impossible to completely eliminate this factor. The questions and statements were not difficult to read and each of them had been carefully reviewed by a panel of experts. The items had also been pre-tested by a small group of supervisors and subsequently by a larger group of individuals. The cover letter contained precise instructions and there was an atmosphere of cooperation created by the top managers through their close association with their subordinates.

An item analysis was conducted in keeping with the advice of Likert who states:

One possible check is item analysis which calls for calculating the correlation coefficient of each statement with the battery (index). . . . If a zero or very low correlation coefficient is obtained, it indicates that the statement fails to measure that which the rest of the statements measure. Such statements will be called undifferentiating. . . . By "undifferentiating" we merely mean that the statement does not measure what the battery (index) measures and hence to include it contributes nothing to the scale.14

The test was administered to seventy-five individuals. Sixty percent were military officers who were supervisors in the federal government. The others who were administered the test were employed in various industries

or educational institutions. The results of that survey were analyzed using the Kuder-Richardson statistical model 20 for reliability. The cognitive portion, part one of the questionnaire, showed a reliability of 0.47 while the attitude portion, part two, for the affective and behavioral attitude statements showed 0.94. The item analysis indicated that at least eleven of the statements in the part two portion registered a very low interrelationship.

The item analysis identified those statements that had the highest degree of inclusion coefficient and also those statements whose interrelationship was very low or near zero. Those statements that were low were eliminated.

It was decided to eliminate eleven of the statements from the part two portion of the questionnaire and four of the cognitive questions based upon the comments of those pre-testing the survey instrument and the item analysis conducted with the aid of a computer. When the revised data from the pre-test group was again analyzed using the Kuder-Richardson reliability test, there was an improvement in the reliability and part one equaled 0.75 and part two equaled 0.95. Subsequently the questionnaire was redesigned and shortened to take advantage of the improvement in reliability before it was administered to the two groups of supervisors surveyed in this study.
The Cognitive Section

For the past fourteen years, beginning with President John F. Kennedy, Executive Orders have been promulgated that established specific policy for supervisors within the Federal Government in their management of labor relations. The questions for the cognitive section were developed using as a basis the various Executive Orders. In addition the Federal Government provides correspondence courses for those supervisors who wish to increase their knowledge of labor relations. Some of the cognitive questions were based on examination questions provided in the government's courses. Each of the questions in section one had only one correct answer. These questions could be correctly answered by any supervisor who was knowledgeable about the various government policies.

The Affective and Behavioral Pre-Disposition Section

The fifty statements in the second portion of the survey instrument were designed to measure the affective and behavioral pre-disposition components and they were designed to use a Likert type scale.\textsuperscript{15} Rosenberg states that:

An individual's affective response toward another individual may be inferred from measures of such physiological variables as blood pressure or galvanic

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., pp. 90-95.
response, but is more typically inferred from statements of how much he likes or dislikes him. Similarly how an individual will act toward a given situation may be evaluated by how he does respond when directly confronted with the situation but may also be inferred from what he says he will do in the given situation.16

All of the fifty statements were so worded that the respondent was asked to indicate either how he felt emotionally about unions or he was asked to reveal how he would be inclined to react to a certain situation.

Respondents were provided with five possible answers to choose from that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. In keeping with the normal practice with this type of survey, some of the statements were worded so that strong disagreement implied a positive attitude, while other statements were worded in such a manner that strong agreement indicated a positive attitude. The five separate choices for each statement were weighted by assigning a numerical weight of one through five to each choice. Likert suggests this approach because the variation in attitudes of the respondents can be measured by comparing where they score in relationship to one another on a scale.17


The statements in part two of the survey instrument were so designed that the greatest weight was always indicative of the most positive attitude. Some statements, to be positive, required an answer indicating strongly disagree while others required strongly agree. For example, it could be expected that for the statement: "In my opinion any Federal Employee who joins a union is proving that he is a disloyal employee and he should not be trusted" should reasonably be answered with the highest weighted choice of strongly disagree. A different statement, "In my opinion, a union representative can be a valuable aid in facilitating management changes such as reassignment and reorganizing," should, in keeping with government policy, be answered with the highest weighted choice of strongly agree.

Among the fifty statements in part two of the survey instrument were twenty-nine that were designed to measure affective attitude and twenty-one designed to measure the respondent's behavioral attitude.

The Demographic Section

One of the major purposes of this study was to determine the present level of labor-management relations knowledge possessed by supervisors and to determine if they needed additional training and education in that area. The third section of the survey instrument contained thirty-four questions about the respondent's background and
training. Some of the questions were designed to provide data about the respondent's attitude toward the subject of labor-management relations and whether the supervisor would welcome courses in the subject area. For example, they were asked if they felt comfortable with their present level of knowledge and whether they would welcome an opportunity for additional education and training.

Scoring the Survey Instrument

Two questions in Part I of the questionnaire did not lend themselves to scoring because they asked respondents to identify certain publications that they might have read. In retrospect, it would have been more appropriate if those two questions had been included among the demographic questions in the Part III section of the questionnaire. The remaining twenty questions in the cognitive area, Part I, were scored by allowing five points for each correct answer. Respondents did not receive credit if they answered incorrectly, or if they indicated that they did not know the answer. The failure to mark an answer was scored as an incorrect answer on the assumption that respondents did not know the answer to those questions that they left incomplete.

The affective and behavioral scores in the Part II section of the survey instrument were determined by summing the weights one through five, that had been assigned to each
possible answer. Thus the most favorable answer was given a weight of five points and the least desirable was given a weight of one point.

The Selection of a Standard

A standard of seventy percent was arbitrarily established by the members who assisted in the development of the survey questionnaire. It is recognized that separate and different standards could have been selected for the three components measured and that there may be appropriate rationale for selecting any one of several standard scores for deciding whether the supervisors surveyed were below or above standard in their knowledge and/or attitude. Some standard of evaluation was necessary. The figure of seventy percent was decided upon because throughout most school systems those who score seventy or below are considered to be less than satisfactory in their scholastic performance. In chapter four the tabulated data are displayed that reflect the number of supervisors who scored either above or below the selected standard in various areas that were surveyed. Most of the data provide a comparison of the two groups surveyed. For the purposes of this study it was assumed that those supervisors who scored above the seventy percent standard in the three components
possessed adequate knowledge and had attitudes that were consistent with official policy established by government directives.

**Selecting the Population to be Surveyed**

Because this study was conducted among Federal Government Employees the constraints of the so-called "Privacy Act" were ever-present. An attempt was made to develop a random sample of a very large Federal Government Agency. Several visits were made with personnel at the policy-making level but each manifested concern about the invasion of privacy of the supervisors who would be surveyed.

An effort was made to acquire a list of names and home addresses of supervisors in the government agency from which a random sample might have been developed and the survey questionnaire forwarded to the supervisor's homes. This request was also denied on the grounds that providing such information would be a direct violation of the Privacy Act.

The headquarters of that government agency had, on previous occasions, conducted surveys for other purposes and a computer print-out for a random sample of supervisors was possible. However, this print-out was controlled by the personnel department and because of their work load and their apprehensions about the Privacy Act they were most hesitant to even discuss the possibility of a survey.
The location of a group of supervisors to conduct this study became a problem of searching for a chief supervisor of a large government group who would permit a survey of his employees. In other words, it was necessary to locate a chief supervisor who would sponsor the survey with the acknowledgement that the resulting data might be helpful in determining the attitude of his supervisors and their level of knowledge in the field of labor-management relations.

Two progressive chief supervisors were eventually found who were interested in a survey of their supervisors. One large group had been exposed to a short course in labor-management relations during the preceding twelve months. The chief supervisor of this group was interested in some form of follow-up survey to determine the value of the short course that had been provided to his supervisors. The second progressive chief supervisor was concerned because of the apparent lack of previous training that his supervisors had received in labor-management relations. He had scheduled all of his supervisors to attend a short course in labor-management relations. He agreed to permit the survey questionnaire to be administered to his supervisors just prior to their participating in a short course of instruction. It thus became possible to survey two separate groups of supervisors. One that had been previously exposed to training and the second group that was
just embarking upon such a program. This provided an opportunity that had not previously been anticipated. An opportunity to compare one group that had been exposed to previous training with a group that was about to begin a program of instruction. Although the intent of this study was not to compare the two separate groups, the comparison has been included for those who may be interested.

Although several agencies were approached, all of them, with the exception of the two surveyed, manifested a deep reluctance to permit the surveying of their supervisors. The Privacy Act was frequently cited as well as the concern that some form of union discontent might result from any such survey activities. In order to fully protect those who participated in this study the author has refrained from identifying the two government agencies surveyed.

It can be stated that the two groups that were surveyed are typical of many government agencies that employ large numbers of civilians who are eligible to belong to unions in the Federal Sector. Although the conclusions drawn from the data collected pertain exclusively to the 413 supervisors who responded it is probably not unreasonable to assume that similar data would result from the surveying of other similar type government agencies because
the agencies surveyed are so typical of those found in large government organizations.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter will analyze the responses of the 413 supervisors who completed the survey questionnaire. Among the 413 respondents were 248 supervisors (Group A) who were assigned to an organization that contained a large number of hourly wage earners—often referred to as blue-collar employees. The second group (Group B) consisted of 165 supervisors who were assigned to a different government organization located some 200 miles from Group A. There were no blue-collar personnel assigned to Group B. These two groups, the one with blue-collar personnel and the other without, were viewed as one group to provide a cross-section of supervisors who could be found in many organizations within the Federal Sector where blue-collar personnel might vary from many to few in number.

Population and Sample

Group A consisted of 248 supervisors who had previously attended a short course in labor-management relations. Group B consisted of 165 supervisors who were about to participate in a six-hour seminar in
labor-management relations. The two separate groups were compared to determine whether or not there were differences in the results of the separate survey data that might be attributed to Group A's previous instruction in labor-management relations. An effort was made to determine if there was any comparability between a respondent's knowledge of labor management relations, his behavioral and affective attitude, and certain selected demographic data. This chapter also provides a determination of the support or non-support for the research questions and hypotheses, and a discussion of the findings as they relate to the sub-questions outlined in Chapter I.

Data Collection

There were 415 supervisor positions located in Group A. Some of the positions were vacant at the time of the survey. The Group A organization agreed to distribute the survey questionnaires to supervisors who were available for duty on the day selected to administer the survey. In a government agency the size of Group A there may be, on any given day, as many as fifteen percent of the supervisors absent because of illness, vacation, school attendance, field trips or temporary duty assignments to places remote from their assigned organization. If the above factors are taken into consideration it may be concluded that there were available in Group A, on the day
that the survey was conducted, somewhere between 340 and 350 supervisory personnel.

Because of the difficulty of deciding in advance who would be available for duty on the day selected to conduct the survey, the Group A organization agreed to permit the distribution of 400 survey instruments to its supervisory staff. To assure anonymity the questionnaires were sent through normal distribution channels that are used for interoffice correspondence.

Of the 400 questionnaires distributed 267 were returned. This amounted to a return rate of 67 percent if the figure of 400 is used as the base number. However, if consideration is given for that percentage of supervisors who would be expected to be absent from duty on the day of the survey, the base figure might be assumed to be approximately 350 and that would make the return rate equal to 76 percent.

Among the 267 survey questionnaires that were returned, nineteen were considered to be inappropriate for inclusion in the survey data. These nineteen questionnaires appeared to be incorrectly or capriciously completed. In at least two-thirds of the cases there were entire portions of the questionnaire that had been left unanswered. These nineteen survey instruments were eliminated from the others, and this left a total of 248 survey questionnaires that equaled a return rate of 70 percent--if the
base number of 350 is used for the number of potential respondents.

It was assumed that some supervisors might have forgotten either to complete their survey questionnaire or to forward it to a collection point. A request was forwarded to the supervisory body soliciting their help in returning any survey questionnaires that might be in their possession. This request was made on two separate occasions with little results. It was then assumed that there would be no additional questionnaires other than those that had already been received.

Although the majority of Group A had been exposed to previous training in labor-management relations, those within Group B had not received such training. At the time that the survey was made with Group B, that group was in the process of beginning a six-hour seminar in labor-management relations. The day prior to their scheduled class meeting each supervisor was provided with a copy of the questionnaire and asked to complete it and present it to the instructor immediately upon reporting for class. Those who forgot it, or for some reason had not completed their questionnaire, were asked to do so before the class could begin. Under this arrangement there was a 100 percent return rate for the questionnaires provided to Group B.
The main purpose of this study was to measure the cognitive knowledge and attitude of a portion of supervisors assigned within the Federal Sector. Originally there were no plans for comparing the two separate groups of respondents. However, in the process of collecting the survey data it was discovered that the two separate groups were unique. One group had been exposed to a short course in labor relations, while the other group had not been exposed to such education. It was decided to expand the study to include a comparison of the two separate groups to determine whether or not there was a difference in the scores of the two groups that might be attributed to Group A's previous instruction in labor-management relations.

Because the military occupy only a fraction of the supervisory positions that were located in these two large Federal Government Agencies, there was no effort made to compare military supervisors with civilian supervisors. The intent and purpose of the survey was to survey government supervisors in general and not contrast civilian versus military personnel. There may be those who might assume that the military supervisors would be more anti-union than the civilian and, depending on the composition of the sample, they could skew the data towards the anti-union. Table 1 provides figures that reflect that the military in Group A and Group B composed less than ten percent of
TABLE 1
THE NUMBER OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL
ASSIGNED TO EACH GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group A (248)</th>
<th>Group B (165)</th>
<th>Combined Groups (413)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the high rate of return for the two separate groups the data produced from the survey questionnaire were considered to be reasonably representative of the supervisors assigned to the two separate Federal Government organizations.

Data Analysis

A computer program titled Subprogram "Crosstabs" was used to provide the Chi-Square statistical computations and their mathematical significance.¹ The Chi-Square test

¹This package is explained and outlined in The Statistical Package For The Social Sciences, written by Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, (McGraw-Hill Co., 1975).
was used to compare the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies.

Homburg explains that, the purpose of the Chi-Square test is to provide an answer to the question—how great a departure from the theoretical frequencies under the assumption of independence can be tolerated before we reject the hypothesis of independence? The Chi-Square test provides an answer to the question by comparing observed frequencies within the theoretical or expected frequencies derived under the hypothesis of independence. The test statistics used to make this comparison is known as Chi-Square and is denoted \( \chi^2 \). The smallest value that \( \chi^2 \) can have is zero, therefore, the larger the discrepancies between the observed and theoretical frequencies, the larger \( \chi^2 \) becomes.\(^2\)

**Objectives of the Study**

This study concerned itself with four objectives: (1) whether those supervisors who were surveyed were knowledgeable concerning labor-relations, (2) whether they possessed negative attitudes towards unions, (3) whether they might need additional education in labor-relations, and (4) whether they would be inclined to accept an adult

education program that would be designed to improve their knowledge of labor-relations. Three research questions and three hypotheses were stipulated to assist in this study. The findings for those research questions and the three hypotheses will be reviewed in the remainder of this chapter.

The survey questionnaire was designed to measure three specific variables—the respondent's degree of Cognitive knowledge; his Affective attitude; and his behavioral attitude. If a respondent achieved a score of less than seventy percent he was considered to be below the standard for that variable component.

**Knowledge Level of Supervisors Regarding Labor-Management Relations**

One of the main objectives of this study was to determine the degree to which supervisors in the federal government possessed knowledge concerning presidential labor-management relations policies that have established guidelines for supervisors to follow in their contacts with members of unions in the federal sector.

Table 2 provides a tabulation of the scores achieved by the supervisors in that section of the survey that measured Cognitive knowledge. The table reflects that among the 413 supervisors who responded more than seventy-five percent of them scored below the selected standard of seventy percent ($\chi^2 = 6.775 \quad P < .009$).
TABLE 2
SUPERVISOR RESPONSES FOR COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE COMPARED TO THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Above 70 Percent</th>
<th>Below 70 Percent</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A (248)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B (165)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Groups</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.775 \quad df = 1 \quad p < .009 \]

It is interesting to note that Group A, the group that had been exposed to previous training in labor-management relations, made lower scores than Group B which was just entering into a seminar course. There is no obvious explanation for this variance.

The First Research Question

1. What is the level of knowledge of supervisors in the Federal government concerning labor-management relations as outlined in Presidential Executive Orders?

Findings: There were 82 percent of the respondents in this study who scored below the selected standard of 70 percent established for this study.
Of the 413 supervisors who responded to this study, 339 of them or 82 percent scored below the selected standard in the cognitive component. In Group A, 213 of the 248 supervisors of 86 percent scored below the standard, and in Group B, 125 of the 165 supervisors or 76 percent scored below the standard. (See Table 2.)

It is acknowledged that the number of cognitive questions posed to the supervisors was relatively small. However, some of the questions in the study were basic in nature but were, nonetheless, incorrectly answered by many of the supervisors. The questions were prepared and coordinated by a group whose members are recognized experts in the subject area, and the test questions are typical of those that might be included in an examination of labor relations in the federal sector. The questions were specifically selected to measure information that pertained to unions in the federal sector. The reliability of the survey questionnaire is explained in Chapter III.

The Supervisors' Attitude Towards Labor Unions in the Federal Sector

A second objective of this study was to determine the attitude of supervisors toward Federal Labor Unions and compare that attitude with the labor-management relations policy that has been established by Presidential Executive Orders.
The statistical data displayed in Table 3 reveal that there were 268 of the 413 respondents, or about two-thirds of them, who scored above the selected standard for affective attitude. Group B appears to have scored slightly higher than Group A, however, the chi-square test results were not significant ($\chi^2 = .587$, $P < .44$).

### TABLE 3

**SUPERVISOR RESPONSES FOR AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE COMPARED TO THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above 70 Percent</th>
<th>Below 70 Percent</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A (248)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B (165)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Groups (413)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .587$    df = 1    $P < .44$

Table 4 reveals that 215 of the 413 respondents, or about one-half, scored above the selected standard for Behavioral attitude. Again Group B scored slightly higher than Group A in both the Affective and the Behavioral attitude section of the survey. The results of the chi-square testing did not prove to be significant ($\chi^2 = .857$, $P < .35$).
TABLE 4
SUPERVISOR RESPONSES FOR BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE COMPARED TO THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Above 70 Percent</th>
<th>Below 70 Percent</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A (248)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B (165)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Groups (413)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .857 \quad df = 1 \quad P < .35 \]

The Second Research Question

2. Are the attitudes of federal government supervisors consistent with the federal government's labor-management relations policies?

Findings: In the Affective attitude component there were 65 percent of the respondents who scored above the selected standard in this study, and this indicates that their attitude is consistent with the federal government's labor relations policies. Fifty-two percent of the respondents scored above the standard for the Behavioral attitude component in the survey. However, in each of these attitude areas the mean score was so close to the selected standard of seventy percent that it is difficult to state categorically that the majority of the supervisors
surveyed in this study do not have a negative attitude towards unions. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

**An Analysis of the Need For an Educational Program in the Area of Labor-Management Relations**

Another objective of this study was to identify whether or not there was a need for an educational program in labor management relations and whether or not the supervisors would accept an educational program that would be designed to improve their knowledge of labor-management relations.

**The Third Research Question**

3. Is there a need for improved or additional educational programs for supervisors in the federal government in the area of labor relations?

A series of questions, in the Part III section of the survey, were designed to measure several aspects of the supervisor's background and education in the field of labor-management relations. The purpose of the questions was to measure the degree and the depth of education received, the opportunities for education, if any, the quality of the courses in the opinion of the supervisors, and their opinion concerning whether they needed or wanted additional education in the area of labor-management relations. Question nine, Part III of the survey, asked the
supervisors to indicate whether they had received any training or education in the area of labor relations.

This was assumed to be an important question. Since presidential executive orders have been emphasizing the subject for more than fourteen years it seemed reasonable that all of the supervisors should have been exposed to some minimum education within the area. Table 5 reveals that among the 413 respondents, 150 or 36 percent indicated that they had received no training or education of any kind and another four percent indicated that they could not remember having received such training.

**TABLE 5**

**THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THEY HAD RECEIVED TRAINING IN LABOR RELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Training</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another question, number thirteen in Part III of the survey, asked supervisors if they had personally made any attempt to acquire some education in the area of
labor-management relations. It was assumed that because of the importance and the emphasis created by the executive orders that conscientious supervisors would have made an attempt to increase their knowledge in this vital area. Table 6 reveals that, of the 413 respondents, 294 or 71 percent indicated that they had never made any personal attempt to gain any education in the area of labor relations. Additionally, there was a small group of seventeen who indicated that they could not remember whether they had ever made such an effort.

**TABLE 6**

**SUPERVISORS WHO MADE A PERSONAL EFFORT TO ACQUIRE EDUCATION IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had Sought Education</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question fourteen, Part III of the survey, asked respondents if any of their supervisors had ever encouraged them to enroll in courses that pertained to labor-management relations in the Federal Sector. This question
sought to measure if the subject was being discussed and emphasized throughout the supervisory hierarchy, and whether supervisors were making any effort to train their subordinates in labor management relations. Table 7 reflects that of the 413 supervisors surveyed, 326 or 78 percent reported that none of the supervisors, for whom they had worked, had encouraged them toward efforts to improve their knowledge in labor-management relations.

**TABLE 7**

**THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THAT THEIR SUPERVISORS HAD ENCOURAGED THEM TO ENROLL IN A COURSE OF INSTRUCTION IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Encouraged Enrollment</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question sixteen, Part III of the survey, was designed to probe the subject of student opportunity for educational programs. Previous questions sought to establish if supervisors had made any effort on their own
or had been encouraged by their supervisors to increase their knowledge. Question sixteen, however, asked specifically if the supervisors had ever been offered the opportunity to enroll in a labor management relations course. Question sixteen was designed to measure whether supervisors were not only being encouraged to increase their knowledge, but were they also being provided actual opportunities to attend scheduled classes in labor-management relations.

Table 8 indicates the answers of the supervisors concerning whether they had been offered an opportunity to enroll in a labor relations course. The answers to the question are somewhat confusing, however, since all of those in Group B took the survey questionnaire just prior to beginning a scheduled seminar in labor-management relations. In addition, most of the supervisors in Group A had previously completed a course of instruction in labor-management relations.

There is no explanation why 114, or 68 percent, in group B replied in the negative, and 154 or 62 percent in Group A did the same. It is possible that those who read the question interpreted it to mean a course more structured than the seminar course they had attended or were about to attend. They may have visualized themselves attending a course in an educational institution located some distance from their work assignment. The data in Table 9 reflects
### TABLE 8

**SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT THEY HAD BEEN OFFERED THE OPPORTUNITY TO ENROLL IN A LABOR RELATIONS COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Offered an Opportunity</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9

**THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT THEY WOULD ENROLL IN A COURSE OF LABOR RELATIONS IF OFFERED THE OPPORTUNITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Accept The Opportunity</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that more than two-thirds of the 413 supervisors who responded were of the opinion that they had never been provided the opportunity to enroll in a course in labor-management relations.

Question seventeen, Part III of the survey, was designed to measure the interest that supervisors might have in attending courses in the area of labor-management relations. It may sometimes happen that individuals are not at all interested in attending educational courses. The purpose of the question was to acquire some indication concerning whether there would be sufficient population of interested students to enroll if courses in labor-management relations were developed.

Table 9 portrays the data for supervisors who responded to the question and it reveals that of the 413 supervisors surveyed 277 or 66 percent stated that they would take advantage of any offer to attend a course in labor-management relations. It is also interesting to note that almost 22 percent or 88 of the supervisors stated that they didn't know whether they would accept or not.

Question nineteen, Part III of the survey, asked supervisors if they thought that other supervisors they knew might be interested in a course in labor-management relations. This question was based on the assumption that supervisors might admit that they were personally interested, but based upon their knowledge of other
supervisors' reactions, might give some indication of the interest among the total group.

Table 10 portrays the data for question nineteen. It indicates that for Group B, 92 of the supervisors or 56 percent, replied that they believed that other supervisors would be interested in taking a course in labor-management relations. In Group A, there were only 107 of the supervisors or 43 percent of that opinion. Almost one-third of the supervisors or 134 of them stated that they did not know whether other supervisors would be interested. The data for questions seventeen and nineteen appear to provide support that there would be at least one-half of the respondents who would be interested in future offerings of courses in the area of labor-management relations.

TABLE 10
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT THEIR PEERS MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN A LABOR RELATIONS COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers Would Be Interested</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 18, Part III of the survey, asked supervisors directly—do you think that you need more education in the area of labor-management relations? Table 11 portrays the results of the supervisor's answers. In Group B, 120 of the respondents or 72 percent answered that they thought that they needed additional education and in Group B, 145 respondents or 58 percent thought that they could use additional education. Of the 413 supervisors surveyed, 265 or 64 percent indicated that they needed additional education. It is interesting to note that more than one-third of the supervisors responding to the question answered either no, or that they weren't interested or really weren't certain that they were.

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed Additional Education</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because 64 percent of the respondents indicated that they needed additional education this may be an indication of how receptive these respondents might be to additional education courses in labor relations.

Question twenty-seven, Part III of the survey, was designed to reinforce question eighteen in a reverse manner by asking supervisors if they felt comfortable with their present knowledge of labor-management relations. Table 12 portrays the supervisor's answers to that question. In Group B, 46 of the respondents or 28 percent indicated that they felt comfortable. In Group A, 109 of the respondents or 44 percent replied that they felt comfortable. More than one-half of the 413 supervisors surveyed indicated that they did not feel comfortable with their present knowledge of labor-management relations or that they were not certain that they felt comfortable.

Question twenty-nine, Part III of the survey, was designed to measure the respondent's impression of their supervisor's knowledge of the subject of labor-management relations.

Table 13 portrays the supervisor's answers to that question. It reveals that of the 413 respondents, 150 of them or 36 percent believed that their supervisor had a sound background in labor-management relations, and that they were proficient when confronted with union activities.
TABLE 12
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT THEY FELT COMFORTABLE WITH THEIR PRESENT LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LABOR RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt Comfortable With Knowledge</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO BELIEVED THAT THEIR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR HAD A GOOD BACKGROUND IN LABOR RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Supervisor is Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 158 of the supervisors or 39 percent who answered that they did not know, while another 68 of the supervisors of 17 percent indicated that they thought that their immediate supervisors appeared to be knowledgeable most of the time.

Question twenty-one, Part III of the survey, was designed to measure to what extent the respondents believed the subject of labor-management relations was important in their job environment. Answers to this question might provide some insight into how supervisors might be expected to respond and react in two separate areas: (1) in their relations with union members, and (2) their receptiveness to additional education in this area. It was assumed that if supervisors believed that the subject was not important they would tend to make low scores in both attitude and cognitive knowledge areas of the survey. In addition, they would probably manifest little or no interest in additional education in labor-management relations.

Table 14 portrays the supervisor's answers to question twenty-one. Of the 413 supervisors surveyed, 235 or 57 percent indicated that they believed that the subject of labor relations was very important. Another group consisting of 102 supervisors or 24 percent believed that the subject was of some importance. A group of 67 of the supervisors or 16 percent indicated that they hadn't given much thought to the subject.
### TABLE 14

NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO BELIEVED THAT THE SUBJECT OF LABOR RELATIONS WAS IMPORTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Relations is Important</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Importance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't Given It Much Thought</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question twenty-five, Part III of the survey, was designed to measure feelings of inadequacy of knowledge in labor-management relations on the part of supervisors who had participated in grievance proceedings. Table 15 portrays the supervisor's answers to that question.

A group of 166 of the 413 supervisors surveyed or 40 percent of the total reported that they had not been involved in grievance proceedings, and thus they had not had the opportunity to test their knowledge. There were 105 of the supervisors or 25 percent who indicated that they felt that they would have benefitted from additional information in the area of labor relations.
TABLE 15

THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO THOUGHT THAT INCREASED KNOWLEDGE OF LABOR RELATIONS WOULD HAVE BENEFITED THEM WHEN INVOLVED IN GRIEVANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Have Benefitted</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Was NotInvolved</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question eleven, Part III of the survey, was designed to measure the opinion of the respondents about the quality of previous educational courses that they might have received in labor relations. Table 16 lists the supervisors' answers to that question.

An analysis of the data indicates that the majority of those who took a course of instruction were not displeased with the instruction that they were offered.

Table 17 provides a comparison of the Cognitive scores achieved by the various supervisors and whether or not they believed that they needed additional education in labor management relations.
### TABLE 16

**SUPERVISOR RATING OF PREVIOUS COURSES IN LABOR RELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Course Rating</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Practical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Course Badly Conducted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't Take a Course</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17

**SUPERVISOR ADMITTED NEED FOR ADDITIONAL EDUCATION COMPARED TO THE COGNITIVE SCORES THEY ACHIEVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Need For Education</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Score</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A \( \chi^2 = 7.597 \) \( df = 3 \) \( P < .06 \)

Group B \( \chi^2 = 2.565 \) \( df = 3 \) \( P < .46 \)

Combined \( \chi^2 = 1.422 \) \( df = 3 \) \( P < .70 \)
Among the 413 respondents, 217 or 82 percent of those who admitted that they needed additional education scored below the 70 percent selected standard for Cognitive knowledge. The data in Table 17 reveal that 25 of the supervisors, or 89 percent of those who answered that they were not interested and 49 supervisors or 79 percent of those who answered—no, they didn't need additional education, scored below the selected standard. Table 17 indicates that in all three of the groups there were no significant differences related to the supervisors' admitted need for additional education and Cognitive knowledge scores achieved.

Table 18 reveals that of the 413 supervisors 191 of them, or 72 percent, achieved a score that was above the selected standard for Affective attitude. Table 18 indicates that in Group A and the combined group there were significantly more of the supervisors who admitted a need for additional education who scored above the standard for Affective attitude compared to those supervisors who reported that they did not need additional education. For Group A \( \chi^2 = 18.368 \ P < .001 \) and for the combined group \( \chi^2 = 25.837 \ P < .001 \). In Group B there were no significant differences related to admitted need for additional education and affective scores achieved.
### TABLE 18

**SUPERVISOR ADMITTED NEED FOR ADDITIONAL EDUCATION COMPARED TO THE AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORES THEY ACHIEVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Need For Education</th>
<th>Affective Attitude Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 18.368 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad P < .001 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 7.057 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad P < .07 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 25.837 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad P < .001 \]
Table 19 reveals that of those supervisors who admitted that they needed additional education 153 of them, or 58 percent, scored above the standard for Behavioral attitude. Of the twenty-eight who stated that they were not interested in additional education 17 of them, or 61 percent, scored below the standard for Behavioral attitude. Table 19 indicates that in Group A and in the combined group there were significantly more of the supervisors who admitted a need for additional education who scored above the standard for Behavioral attitude compared to those supervisors who reported that they did not need additional education. For Group A ($\chi^2 = 9.162 \quad P < .03$) and for the combined group ($\chi^2 = 14.169 \quad P < .003$). In Group B there were no significant differences related to admitted need for additional education and Behavioral scores achieved.

Question twenty-one, Part III of the survey, asked supervisors to indicate how important they thought the subject of labor-management relations was in the public sector. Table 20 compares the supervisors' answers to question twenty-one with the Cognitive scores that were achieved on the survey questionnaire.

An analysis of the data portrayed in Table 20 reveals that only 10 of the supervisors indicated that they thought the subject of labor relations had no importance at all and 90 percent of those scored below the selected standard. Of the 235 supervisors who considered the subject
| Admitted Need For Education | Behavioral Attitude Score | | | | | | | | Group A | Group B | Combined Groups |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| | Above | Above | Below | Below | Above | Above | Below | Below | Above | Above | Below | Below |
| Yes | 81 | 65.4 | 64 | 51.6 | 72 | 79.1 | 48 | 64.9 | 153 | 71.2 | 112 | 56.6 |
| No | 23 | 18.5 | 20 | 16.1 | 9 | 9.9 | 10 | 13.5 | 32 | 14.9 | 30 | 15.2 |
| Not Interested | 8 | 6.4 | 13 | 10.5 | 3 | 3.3 | 4 | 5.4 | 11 | 5.1 | 17 | 8.6 |
| I Don't Know | 12 | 9.7 | 27 | 21.8 | 7 | 7.7 | 12 | 16.2 | 19 | 8.8 | 39 | 19.6 |
| Totals | 124 | 100.0 | 124 | 100.0 | 91 | 100.0 | 74 | 100.0 | 215 | 100.0 | 198 | 100.0 |

\[ \chi^2 = 9.162 \text{ df} = 3 \text{ P} < .03 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 4.846 \text{ df} = 3 \text{ P} < .18 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 14.169 \text{ df} = 3 \text{ P} < .003 \]
TABLE 20

THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE SUPERVISORS ASSIGNED TO LABOR RELATIONS COMPARED TO THE COGNITIVE SCORE THEY ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Score</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Importance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't Thought About It</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 1.646$  df = 3  $P < .65$

Group B $\chi^2 = 4.646$  df = 3  $P < .19$

Combined $\chi^2 = 5.102$  df = 3  $P < .16$
very important, 49 or them or 21 percent scored above the selected standard. There were 68 of the supervisors who indicated that they hadn't thought about the subject. Table 20 indicates that there were no significant differences related to the importance supervisors assigned to labor relations and the Cognitive scores they achieved.

The Affective attitude scores achieved by the supervisors were compared to their answers concerning how important they thought the subject of labor relations was. Table 21 compares the supervisors' Affective attitude scores with answers they selected for question twenty-one of Part III of the survey.

An analysis of the data portrayed in Table 21 reveals that for the ten supervisors who indicated that they thought the subject of labor relations had no importance at all, six of them or 60 percent scored below the selected standard. Of the 235 supervisors who considered the subject to be very important, 176 or 75 percent of them scored above the selected standard. Thirty-nine of the supervisors who indicated that they hadn't thought much about the subject or 55 percent of them scored below the selected standard. This data would seem to indicate that those supervisors who thought that the subject of labor relations was a very important subject were more inclined to achieve Affective attitude scores that were above the selected standard.
TABLE 21
THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE SUPERVISORS ASSIGNED TO LABOR RELATIONS COMPAORED TO THE AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORES THEY ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Above Below Below</td>
<td>Above Above Below Below</td>
<td>Above Above Below Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>103 65.2</td>
<td>37 41.1</td>
<td>73 65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Importance</td>
<td>30 19.0</td>
<td>26 28.9</td>
<td>31 27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Importance</td>
<td>3 1.8</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>1 .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't Thought About It</td>
<td>22 14.0</td>
<td>25 27.8</td>
<td>7 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>158 100.0</td>
<td>90 100.0</td>
<td>112 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 13.462 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .004 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 17.478 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .0006 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 25.599 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .0001 \]
Table 21 indicates that in all three groups there were significant differences related to the importance supervisors assigned to labor relations and the Cognitive scores they achieved. For Group A ($\chi^2 = 13.462$ $P < .0004$) and for Group B ($\chi^2 = 17.478$ $P < .0006$), and when the groups were combined ($\chi^2 = 25.599$ $P < .0001$).

The Behavioral attitude scores achieved by the supervisors were compared to their answers concerning how important they thought the subject of labor relations was. Table 22 compares the supervisors' Behavioral attitude scores with answers they selected for question twenty-one, Part III of the survey questionnaire. For those who thought the subject was very important there were 145 or 67 percent who scored above the selected standard. There were 68 supervisors who indicated that they had not thought about the subject and 46 of them, or more than two-thirds, scored below the standard.

Table 22 reflects that in all three groups there was significantly more of those supervisors who placed a high degree of importance upon labor relations who scored above the standard for Behavioral attitude compared with supervisors who indicated that the subject of labor relations was not important. Table 22 indicates that in all three groups there were significant differences related to the importance supervisors assigned to labor relations and the Behavioral attitude scores they achieved. For
### TABLE 22

**THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE SUPERVISORS ASSIGNED TO LABOR RELATIONS COMPARED TO THE BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORE THEY ACHIEVED**

| Degree of Importance | Behavioral Attitude Scores | Group A | | Group B | | Combined Groups | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|
|                      |              | No. | % Above | No. | % Above | No. | % Above | No. | % Above | No. | % Above | No. | % Below | No. | % Below | No. | % Below | No. | % Below | No. | % Below |
| Very Important       |                | 87  | 70.2    | 53  | 42.7    | 58  | 63.1    | 37  | 50.8    | 145 | 67.2    | 90  | 45.7    |
| Some Importance      |                | 16  | 12.9    | 40  | 32.3    | 29  | 31.6    | 15  | 20.5    | 45  | 20.8    | 55  | 27.9    |
| No Importance        |                | 2   | 1.6     | 3   | 2.4     | 2   | 2.1     | 3   | 4.1     | 4   | 1.8     | 6   | 3.0     |
| Haven't Thought About It |            | 19  | 15.3    | 28  | 22.6    | 3   | 3.2     | 18  | 24.6    | 22  | 10.2    | 46  | 23.4    |
| Totals               |                | 100 | 100.0   | 124 | 100.0   | 92  | 100.0   | 73  | 100.0   | 216 | 100.0   | 197 | 100.0   |

- Group A: $\chi^2 = 20.130$, df = 3, $P < .002$
- Group B: $\chi^2 = 19.185$, df = 3, $P < .0003$
- Combined: $\chi^2 = 21.486$, df = 3, $P < .001$
Group A ($\chi^2 = 20.130 \quad P < .0002$) and for Group B ($\chi^2 = 19.185 \quad P < .0003$) and when the groups were combined ($\chi^2 = 21.486 \quad P < .0001$).

Question twenty-seven, Part III of the survey, asked the supervisors if they felt comfortable with their present level of knowledge concerning unions and union activities. Table 23 compares the supervisors' Cognitive knowledge scores with their answers to that question. Before the survey it was assumed that those who thought that they did not need additional education might score below the standard because they would be unaware of how much they were lacking in knowledge about labor management relations.

Table 23 reveals that 123 of the supervisors or 78 percent of those who indicated that—yes, they did feel comfortable with their present level of knowledge, scored below the selected standard. This would seem to support the assumption that some of the supervisors among the 413 respondents appeared to be unaware of their lack of knowledge concerning the subject of labor-management relations. Table 23 indicates that in Group A there was significantly more supervisors who admitted that they were not satisfied with their knowledge about labor relations who scored below the selected standard for Cognitive knowledge compared with those supervisors who reported that they were satisfied with their knowledge ($\chi^2 = 8.153 \quad P < .04$). In
TABLE 23
SUPERVISOR ADMITTED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LABOR RELATIONS COMPARED TO THE COGNITIVE SCORE THEY ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied With Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Scores</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 8.153$ df = 3 $P < .04$

Group B $\chi^2 = 1.490$ df = 3 $P < .68$

Combined $\chi^2 = 4.885$ df = 3 $P < .18$
Group B and in the combined groups there were no significant differences related to admitted satisfaction with knowledge level and Cognitive scores achieved.

Table 24 compares the scores the supervisors achieved in the area of Affective attitude with how satisfied they were with their present level of knowledge about labor management relations. The data reveals that more of those supervisors who stated that they did not feel comfortable with their present knowledge scored above the selected standard than did those who selected a different answer. Table 24 indicates that in Group B and the combined groups there were significantly more of the supervisors who admitted that they were not satisfied with their knowledge about labor relations who scored above the selected standard on Affective attitude compared with other supervisors who reported that they were satisfied with their level of knowledge (Group B $\chi^2 = 15.532 < P .001$ and the combined groups $\chi^2 = 7.690 \ P < .05$).

An analysis of the data in Tables 24 and 25 reveals that a larger percentage of those who answered that they did not feel comfortable with their present knowledge of unions scored above the selected standard for both Affective and Behavioral attitude. In Table 25 there were no significant differences related to the supervisor's admitted satisfaction with level of knowledge about labor relations and Affective attitude scores achieved.
TABLE 24

SUPERVISOR ADMITTED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LABOR RELATIONS COMPARED TO THE AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORE THEY ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied With Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 3.479$ df = 3 $P < .32$
Group B $\chi^2 = 15.532$ df = 3 $P < .001$
Combined $\chi^2 = 7.690$ df = 3 $P < .05$
TABLE 25

SUPERVISOR ADMITTED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LABOR RELATIONS COMPARED TO THE BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORES THEY ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied With Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Behavioral Attitude Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Combined Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No. Below</td>
<td>% Below</td>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No. Below</td>
<td>% Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 2.494$  df = 3  P < .48
Group B $\chi^2 = 5.032$  df = 3  P < .17
Combined $\chi^2 = 6.419$  df = 3  P < .09
Considerable space has been devoted to the analysis of the third research question because it is considered to be an important reason for conducting the survey. If it is assumed that the 413 supervisors who responded are a representative sample of government supervisors, then an analysis of the data outlined in Tables 13 through 33 provides supporting evidence that: (1) there is a lack of labor relations knowledge on the part of government supervisors, (2) many supervisors acknowledge that they need additional education in labor-management relations, (3) they are very aware of their need for additional education in labor relations, and (4) they would welcome the opportunity for enrollment in additional courses in labor-management relations.

The supervisors in this study were employed at various levels throughout the hierarchy of their organizations, and Table 26 presents a breakout of the assignment level of the supervisors who responded to the survey. Chapter I provides definitions for the various levels of supervision. Only eight percent of the supervisors reported that they were performing at the top management level, while more than fifty percent reported that they performed as first line supervisors.

Some of the tables that follow provide data that reflect the relationship between the supervisors' level
TABLE 26

THE MANAGEMENT LEVEL AT WHICH SUPERVISORS INDICATED THEY WERE ASSIGNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mgt.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Mgt.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of assignment, listed in Table 26, and the scores they achieved in the three components that were measured in this study.

Analysis of the Attitudes of Supervisors Compared to Their Years of Experience

Another objective of the study was to analyze the attitude of supervisors compared to their age or years of experience as a supervisor.

The First Hypothesis

H₁: The more experienced supervisors, with the most years of service, will be more opposed to unions and their activities than the younger supervisors with less years of service.
$H_0$: There is no significant difference in attitudes between older and younger supervisors who vary in age and experience.

Findings: The data rejected the null hypothesis.

At the outset of this study it was supposed that those in top management positions, because of their distance of separation from the daily activities of first line supervision, might tend to be ignorant in the area of labor-management relations. It is not unusual for top managers to be protected by their staff from daily labor-management conflicts, and it seemed reasonable that many labor-management relations activities would be administered by staff members.

It was further supposed that many of the top supervisors would be older personnel who might have been supervisors before the advent of unions in the Federal sector. It seemed reasonable to assume that many of these older supervisors would resent the inroads that had been made upon their unilateral management decision-making process and, as a result, they would achieve lower attitudinal scores concerning unions and union activities.

In order to assure respondents total anonymity, a constraint of this study was that respondents could not be asked to provide their age. It is recognized that the analysis would be more meaningful if the total number of supervisors and their individual years of supervisory
service could be listed. Because many of the older supervisors know how many years of seniority some of their associates have, it was considered necessary not to categorize supervisors by years of service to assure the promised anonymity of all the respondents. It can be stated that the majority of the supervisors indicated that they had from five to twenty-five years of supervisory experience.

Because of the Federal Government's system for selection and promotion of personnel, it can be assumed that among the 413 supervisors surveyed, those in top management were older with more years of experience than were those at the first line of supervision.

Table 27 reveals that in the area of Affective attitude twenty-two of the thirty-six top managers, or 61 percent of them, scored above the selected standard. In contrast there were 166 of the 232 first line supervisors, or 71 percent of them, who scored above the standard. In Group A there were 147 first line supervisors and 106 of them or 72 percent scored above the selected standard.

Table 27 indicates that in Group A there was significantly more of the first line supervisors who scored above the standard on Affective attitude when compared with other levels of management ($\chi^2 = 13.769 \ P < .009$). In Group B and in the combined groups there were no significant differences related to organizational level and Affective scores.
### TABLE 27

**A COMPARISON OF SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT AND AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORES WITH THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mgt.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Mgt.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 13.679$, df = 4, $P < .009$

Group B $\chi^2 = 1.989$, df = 3, $P < .58$

Combined $\chi^2 = 6.596$, df = 4, $P < .16$
Table 28 reflects that in the area of Behavioral attitude twenty-six of the thirty-six top managers or 72 percent of them scored above the standard. Of the 243 first line supervisors there were 118 of them or 48 percent who scored above the selected standard.

Table 28 indicates that for the combined group of 413 supervisors there were significantly more of the first level supervisors who scored above the selected standard in Behavioral attitude compared with other levels of management ($\chi^2 = 9.95 \ P < .05$). In Group A and Group B there were no significant differences related to organizational levels of assignment and Behavioral attitude.

Of the 413 supervisors, those in top management appear to have more favorable Behavioral attitudes than the first line supervisors. In the area of Affective attitude there appears to be less difference among the 413 supervisors in this study. The top management supervisors in this study scored higher in the area of Behavioral attitudes when indicating how they thought they would respond to situations involving labor relations problems.

An Analysis of the Cognitive Knowledge of Supervisors Compared to Their Level of Assignment

A second hypothesis was designed with the thought that once again those in the higher levels of management might be inclined to remain aloof from the daily problems
TABLE 28
A COMPARISON OF SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT AND BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORES WITH THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mgt.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Mgt.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 7.933$, df = 4, $P < .095$
Group B $\chi^2 = 4.021$, df = 3, $P < .26$
Combined $\chi^2 = 9.95$, df = 4, $P < .05$
of labor management relations, and as a result they would make little or no effort to acquire the in-depth knowledge that might be expected of those working in first line supervision. They would choose to rely on their staff to advise them and provide the solutions in confrontations that dealt with labor-management relation problems.

The Second Hypothesis

$H_2$: The higher a position a supervisor holds in an organizational structure, the less he will know of labor relations.

$H_0$: There is no significant differences in labor relations knowledge between various managerial levels of supervisors.

Findings: The data rejected the null hypothesis.

Table 29 reveals that three times as many of those assigned to top management positions scored above the standard for Cognitive knowledge when compared to first line supervisors. Twelve of the thirty-six top management supervisors or 33 percent of them scored above the seventy percent standard. Only thirty-one of the respondents who indicated that they were first line supervisors, or 12 percent of them, scored above the seventy percent standard.

Table 29 indicates that for Group B and the combined group there were significantly more first line
### TABLE 29

A COMPARATIVE OF SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT AND THEIR COGNITIVE SCORES WITH THE SELECTED STANDARD OF 70 PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mgt.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Mgt.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 9.37$  \(df = 4\)  \(P < .06\)

Group B $\chi^2 = 9.73$  \(df = 3\)  \(P < .03\)

Combined $\chi^2 = 14.34$  \(df = 4\)  \(P < .001\)
supervisors who scored above the selected standard in Cognitive knowledge compared with other levels of management. For Group B ($\chi^2 = 9.73$, $P < .03$) and for the Combined Group ($\chi^2 = 14.34$, $P < .0001$). In Group A there were no significant differences related to organizational level and Cognitive knowledge.

An Analysis of the Impact of Grievance Activities Upon Supervisor's Attitude Scores

Before the start of this study it was assumed that the more confrontations and conflict that a supervisor might have experienced with union members as a result of grievance activities the more apt would that supervisor be to have developed negative feelings toward unions.

The Third Hypothesis

$H_3$: Those supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures possess a more negative attitude toward unions than those who have not been involved with grievances.

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in attitude scores between supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures and those who have not.

Findings: The data failed to reject the null hypothesis.
Table 30 contains data that indicates the number of supervisors who indicated that they had been involved in grievances. Seventy percent of the 413 supervisors reported that they had not been involved in grievances during the past five years.

**TABLE 30**

**THE NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES THAT SUPERVISORS REPORTED THAT THEY WERE INVOLVED IN DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Grievances Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than Twenty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 reveals that the area of Affective attitude supervisors who had been involved in from one to ten grievances scored about the same as those who reported that they had not been involved in grievances. In both groups about two-thirds of the supervisors scored above the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Grievances Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than Twenty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A \( \chi^2 = 2.66 \) \( df = 4 \) \( P < .61 \)

Group B \( \chi^2 = 3.102 \) \( df = 3 \) \( P < .38 \)

Combined \( \chi^2 = 2.481 \) \( df = 4 \) \( P < .65 \)

TABLE 31
The number of grievances in which supervisors were involved compared with their affective attitude scores.
selected standard in the area of Affective attitude. The chi-square test did not reveal any significant differences that related to the number of grievances a supervisor was involved in and their Affective attitude scores.

Table 32 reflects that in the area of Behavioral attitude supervisors who had been involved in from one to ten grievances again scored about the same as those who had not been involved in grievances. In both groups about fifty percent scored above the selected standard. There were no significant differences related to the number of grievances a supervisor had been involved in and their Behavioral attitude.

Table 33 compares the Cognitive scores achieved by the supervisors with the number of grievances that they claimed they were involved in. The table reveals an upward trend for those who were involved in grievance actions. Table 33 indicates that for the combined group of 413 supervisors there was significantly more of those who had been involved in grievances who scored above the selected standard for Cognitive knowledge compared to those who reported that they had not been involved in grievance actions ($\chi^2 = 9.600 \quad P < .05$). In Group A and Group B there were no significant differences related to the number of grievances that supervisors had been involved in related to Cognitive knowledge.
## TABLE 32

THE NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES IN WHICH SUPERVISORS WERE INVOLVED COMPARED WITH THEIR BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Grievances Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than Twenty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A \( \chi^2 = 1.355 \)  \( df = 4 \)  \( P < .85 \)

Group B \( \chi^2 = 2.151 \)  \( df = 3 \)  \( P < .54 \)

Combined \( \chi^2 = 2.629 \)  \( df = 4 \)  \( P < .62 \)
### TABLE 33

THE NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES IN WHICH SUPERVISORS WERE INVOLVED COMPARED WITH THEIR COGNITIVE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Grievances Past 5 Years</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than Twenty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 8.46$  \(df = 4\)  $P < .07$

Group B $\chi^2 = 4.010$  \(df = 3\)  $P < .26$

Combined $\chi^2 = 9.600$  \(df = 4\)  $P < .05$
There were 292 supervisors among the 413 who responded who reported that they had not been involved in grievances of any kind during the past five years (see Table 30). Table 33 reveals that of the 292, there were 48 supervisors or about 16 percent who scored above the selected standard. However, for those who had been involved in one to five grievances, 26 of those supervisors, or about 24 percent of them, scored above the selected standard. One-third of those who had been involved in from six to ten grievance actions scored above the selected standard.

Those supervisors who had been involved in grievance actions seemed to achieve higher scores in the area of Cognitive knowledge, and their involvement in grievances did not appear to make them more negative in their attitude towards union when compared to those supervisors who indicated that they had never been involved in grievance actions.

A Review of the Sub-Questions

Chapter I contains sixteen sub-questions that the survey sought to answer in addition to the primary hypothesis. The findings for those sixteen sub-questions follows:

Sub-question 1: Do the supervisors believe that they have an adequate background in labor-management relations knowledge to work with union members?
Findings: Many of the supervisors indicated that they did not believe that they had an adequate background. Table 23 reveals that 201 of the supervisors who were surveyed indicated that they did not feel comfortable with their present level of knowledge.

Sub-question 2: What efforts if any have supervisors made to acquire labor-management relations skills and techniques?

Findings: There were 71 percent of the respondents who indicated that they had not made an effort on their own to acquire labor-management relations skills.

Table 6 reveals that 294 of the supervisors indicated that they had made no effort on their own to acquire increased skill in the area of labor-management relations.

Sub-question 3: Have supervisors been provided with opportunities for education in the area of labor-management relations?

Findings: Table 8 reveals that 268, or sixty-five percent of the supervisors indicated that they had not been offered an opportunity to enroll in a labor-management relations course.

Sub-question 4: If the supervisors have been exposed to labor-management relations educational programs, how effective did they believe such programs had been in increasing their knowledge?
Findings: Seventy-two percent of those who had been enrolled in an educational program indicated that they thought it was a good course of instruction. Table 16 reveals that of the 248 supervisors who indicated that they had taken a course in labor relations 178 stated that they thought that they had received a good or excellent course.

Sub-question 5: Of what value have the educational programs been in the opinion of the supervisors?

Findings: Most of the supervisors among the 248 who indicated that they had taken a course in labor relations gave the course a good or excellent rating. Thirty of the supervisors or about six percent who took a course indicated that they thought that the course was poor or impractical. Table 16 provides a tabulation of how supervisors rated the courses that they had taken in labor relations.

Sub-question 6: Is there a relationship between the level of management at which a supervisor works and his knowledge of labor-relations?

Findings: Yes, there appears to be a relationship.

Table 29 reveals that among the 413 supervisors surveyed, the higher the supervisor was assigned within the management hierarchy, the more apt he was to be increasingly more knowledgeable in the subject of labor-management relations.
Sub-question 7: Do supervisors that are most often involved in grievances manifest the least knowledge of labor-management relations?

Findings: There appeared to be some evidence that the more grievance actions supervisors had experienced the more apt they were to score above the selected standard in Cognitive knowledge.

Sub-question 8: What are the attitudes of supervisors toward unions?

Findings: More than two-thirds of the supervisors did not reflect an unfavorable attitude toward unions.

Table 3 reveals that two-thirds of the supervisors of 268 of them scored above the selected standard for Affective attitude. Table 4 reveals that 215 of the supervisors scored above the standard in the area of Behavioral attitude.

Sub-question 9: In the opinion of the supervisors, what impact does a union organization have upon management's role to accomplish its mission?

Findings: Supervisors manifested mixed emotions.

Table 34 reveals that of the 413 supervisors surveyed, 353 of them indicated that they thought that their effectiveness as a manager had been reduced because of a union contract.
TABLE 34

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO BELIEVED THAT THEIR EFFECTIVENESS HAD NOT BEEN REDUCED BY A UNION CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Effectiveness Has Not Been Reduced</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35 reveals that 372 of the supervisors surveyed did not believe that if they were forced to work with union employees that it would destroy the effectiveness of management.

Table 36 reveals that 243 of the supervisors or more than one-half of them disagreed with the statement that managers were becoming mere administrators and were losing control over their work environment.

Sub-question 10: Do supervisors believe that the union's role is such that it can benefit both labor and management?

Findings: Supervisors were generally undecided or were inclined to disagree that unions could perform a useful function and improve the management in a military organization, however, 177 supervisors agreed that unions forced them to do a better job of managing.

Table 37 reveals that only 98 of the supervisors out of the 413 surveyed agreed with the statement that a union could perform a useful function.

Table 38 reveals that 128 of the supervisors who were surveyed were of the opinion that the presence of a union made for a more effective and more pleasant working atmosphere. There were 163 supervisors who were undecided and another 121 who disagreed.

Table 39 reveals that 137 of the 413 supervisors surveyed believed that organized labor unions were a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working With Union Employees Will Destroy Management's Effectiveness</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 36

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO BELIEVED THAT THEY ARE LOSING CONTROL OVER THEIR WORK ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers Are Losing Control of Their Work Environment</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 37
THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO BELIEVED THAT UNIONS COULD PERFORM A USEFUL FUNCTION AND IMPROVE MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unions Can Perform a Useful Function</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 38

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THAT A UNION MADE FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE AND MORE PLEASANT WORK ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Helps Create a Better Work Environment</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 39
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT LABOR UNIONS ARE A REQUIREMENT IN TODAY'S FEDERAL SECTOR WORK ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unions Are Required</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
requirement in today's work environment in the Federal sector. There were 109 supervisors who were undecided while 167 were of the opinion that unions were not required.

Table 40 reflects that 177 of the supervisors surveyed indicated that they did believe that unions forced managers to do a better job of planning and managing. This is an accepted premise for most organizations that work with a union contract. Managers were forced to carefully consider their future plans and decisions because of the problems that may result from confrontations with the union members.

Sub-question 11: Do supervisors believe that it is appropriate to take employees into their confidence and permit them to share in the decision-making?

Findings: The supervisors in the survey indicated that they believed in cooperating with union representatives and implied that union representatives should not be excluded from the decision-making process for those decisions that related to the employees' work environment.

Table 41 provides data that indicates how the supervisors responded to the question concerning whether supervisors should cooperate and work with unions. Of the 413 supervisors surveyed, 379 acknowledged that they thought that supervisors should cooperate with unions, and only 16 of the supervisors indicated that they did not agree that supervisors should cooperate.
### TABLE 40

THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT UNIONS FORCED MANAGERS TO DO A BETTER JOB OF MANAGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers Are Forced Into Better Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Cooperate With Unions</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 41
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO INDICATED THAT THEY THOUGHT THEY SHOULD COOPERATE WITH UNIONS
Table 42 reflects that data for the statement concerning whether a union representative could be a valuable aid in facilitating management changes such as reorganizations and reassignments. These are usually considered to lie in the area of management rights.

Table 43 lists the results of the survey statement that asked supervisors if they should discuss new policy, received from a higher authority, with a union representative before the other employees were informed. Of the respondents 218 indicated that they would discuss it with the union representative, while another 145 said that they would not.

Table 44 reflects that at least 376 of the respondents did not feel superior to the union representatives in the areas of education and status.

Table 45 reveals that 177 supervisors believed that a strong union organization makes a manager's job easier. There were 105 supervisors who disagreed while 130 were undecided.

Table 46 reveals that 259 supervisors agreed that when they made decisions that significantly affected those they supervised that they should first talk it over with their union representatives. There were 123 of the supervisors who disagreed with that approach and 31 who were undecided.


TABLE 42
THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS WHO THOUGHT THAT UNION REPRESENTATIVES COULD BE VALUABLE AIDS IN DECISION MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Representative Can Be An Aid In Decision-Making</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. %     No. %     No. %

13  5.3     3  1.8     16  3.8
43  17.4    35  21.2   78  18.9
27  10.8    21  12.8  48  11.6
139 56.0   91 55.2   230 55.7
26 10.5   15  9.0   41  10.0
248 100.0 165 100.0 413 100.0
Table 43

The number of supervisors who indicated that they would first discuss a new policy with a union representative before adopting it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Discuss Policy With a Union Representative</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44

SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY THOUGHT UNION REPRESENTATIVES WERE LESS EDUCATED AND HAD LESS STATUS THAN THE SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Representatives Have Less Education and Status</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 45

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY THOUGHT A STRONG UNION MADE A MANAGER'S JOB EASIER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Union Makes The Job Easier</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 46
THE RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS CONCERNING WHETHER THEY SHOULD DISCUSS THEIR DECISION-MAKING WITH A UNION REPRESENTATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Making a Final Decision</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Should Talk With a Union Representative</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47 reflects that 352 supervisors thought that they should attempt to solve people problems without getting the union involved. This question may have been misunderstood. Rather than it being an indication of not wanting to cooperate with union officials, it may reflect the attitude of the supervisors that problems should be resolved before they are permitted to develop to the point where the union representative becomes involved.

Table 48 reveals that 296 of the supervisors believed that union members identified with management's problems.

Table 49 indicates that 393 of the supervisors did not believe in making it difficult for unions by not revealing anything to them. Only seven of the total 413 supervisors surveyed indicated that they believed in making it difficult for unions.

Table 50 reveals that 311 of the supervisors surveyed believed that management should solicit and accept advice from union representatives concerning management decisions. There were only 38 supervisors who indicated that they would not accept union representative's advice. Although 311 of the supervisors indicated that they thought managers should solicit and accept advice from union representatives, it might be interesting to study how many of them do actually seek out the union representatives for advice.
TABLE 47

THE RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS CONCERNING WHETHER THEY SHOULD SOLVE PEOPLE PROBLEMS WITHOUT GETTING THE UNION INVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Solve People Problems Without Union's Help</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 48

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY THOUGHT UNION MEMBERS FAILED TO IDENTIFY WITH MANAGEMENT'S PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail to Identify</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 49

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY SHOULD MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR UNIONS BY NEVER REVEALING ANYTHING TO THEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell The Unions Nothing</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 50
THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER MANAGERS SHOULD SEEK THE ADVICE OF UNION REPRESENTATIVES WHEN MAKING DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers Should Seek Union's Advice</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 51 indicates that 130 supervisors believed that supervisors should encourage union members to participate in management decision-making while 211 of the supervisors disagreed. There seems to be a distinction made here between accepting advice and actually permitting the union representative to participate in the final decision-making. Many supervisors indicated that they would accept advice but would reject participative management decision-making.

Table 52 reveals that 366 supervisors did not believe that unions should be kept at arm's length and there were only 18 supervisors who disagreed with them. This seems to provide strong evidence that the 413 supervisors who responded are interested in cooperating with union members and that they are inclined to seek a mutual understanding.

Table 53 reflects that 379 of the supervisors believed that they could communicate with union members because those members were not ignorant of management principles, production problems and economics. There were eight supervisors who thought that union members were ignorant in those areas.

Table 54 indicates that 218 of the supervisors believed that they should forge ahead and arbitrarily issue what they considered appropriate instructions to employees, and then worry about working out necessary adjustments that
TABLE 51
THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER UNION MEMBERS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE IN MANAGEMENT'S DECISION-MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unions Should Be Permitted to Engage in Participative Management</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Be Kept At Arm's Length</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Combined Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Cannot Communicate</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Combined Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 54
THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY SHOULD FIRST CLEAR WITH UNION REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE ISSUING INSTRUCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructions Should Be Cleared With Union Representative</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might arise at a later time with the union. However, there were 218 of the supervisors who disagreed with that approach and they implied that they would not arbitrarily issue instructions that they thought might create problems in the future without first coordinating with a union representative.

Sub-question 12: What in general is the overall attitude of most supervisors towards the Presidential labor management relations policy?

Findings: More than seventy-five percent of the supervisors or 331 of them indicated that they were uncertain what was expected of them and they were uncertain about the policy.

Table 55 reflects that 331 of the supervisors who were surveyed responded that they had read one or more of the government's directives on the subject of labor-management relations in the Federal sector, but they were not certain what was expected of them. There were 79 supervisors who indicated that they did not agree with the policy and only three of the supervisors among the 413 surveyed indicated that they fully understood the policy and were in full agreement with it.

Sub-question 13: From the survey taken of supervisors in the federal government can any conclusions be drawn as to how they will tend to act or react when dealing with unions or union members.
TABLE 55

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S POLICY THAT PERTAINED TO LABOR RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Responses</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am Not Certain I Understand What is Expected</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Do Not Agree With The Policy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Understand The Policy And I Am In Full Agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          |          |                 |
|          | No.      | %        |                 |
|          | 313       | 80.0     |                 |

167
Findings: Answers in the Part II section of the survey indicated that most of the 413 respondents would react in a positive manner when reacting to or dealing with union members and their activities.

Table 56 reflects that 384 of the respondents indicated that they would make no attempt to oppose anyone who attempted to form a union within the supervisor's unit.

Table 57 indicates that 360 of the supervisors were of the opinion that it was possible to maintain good discipline in their organizations despite the fact that they were represented by unions.

Table 58 reveals that 377 of the supervisors did not maintain any strong guilt feelings about their possible failing to oppose a union's actions to organize their units. There were twelve who did believe that they should oppose union organizing activities.

Table 59 reflects that 345 of the supervisors manifested a trusting attitude in their relationship with union members.

Sub-question 14: Do supervisors who have been union members have a more favorable attitude toward unions than do those who have never belonged to a union?

Findings: Of the 413 respondents were 162 supervisors, or 72 percent of them, who reported that they had previously belonged to unions and those supervisors scored significantly higher in Affective attitude.
TABLE 56

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY WOULD OPPOSE ATTEMPTS TO ORGANIZE THEIR UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Oppose Attempts To Organize Their Units</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 57

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY THOUGHT IT WAS POSSIBLE TO HAVE EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE IN AN ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED BY A UNION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is Not Possible To Have Good Discipline In An Organization Represented By a Union</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 58

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY FELT GUILTY ABOUT NOT OPPOSING UNION ORGANIZING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel Guilty For Not Opposing Union's Attempt to Organize</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 59

THE SUPERVISOR RESPONSES CONCERNING WHETHER THEY WOULD DISTRUST THE STATEMENTS OF A UNION NEGOTIATING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Distrust Statements of Union Negotiation Team</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 60 reveals that for those supervisors who acknowledged that they had belonged to unions, 72 percent of the supervisors scored above the standard for Affective attitude compared to 57 percent of those who reported that they had not belonged to unions. Table 60 indicates that in Group B and in the combined groups there was significantly more supervisors who reported that they had belonged to unions who scored above the standard on Affective attitude compared with those supervisors who reported that they had never belonged to unions (Group B $\chi^2 = 5.924$, $P < .01$) and (Combined Groups $\chi^2 = 13.554$, $P < .003$).

Table 61 reveals that the relationship between Behavioral attitude scores for supervisors and their past or present membership in a union. Those supervisors who had previously belonged to unions seemed to score slightly higher than those supervisors who reported that they had not held previous membership in a union. The chi-square test results indicated that for the three groups there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's union membership and Behavioral scores achieved.

Table 62 reveals the relationship between Cognitive scores achieved by the supervisors and their past or present membership in a union. Those who had belonged to unions made lower scores in the Cognitive area than those who had not belonged to unions. There is no apparent explanation for the difference in the Cognitive scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Union Member</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.448 \text{ df} = 3 \text{ P} < .06 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 5.924 \text{ df} = 1 \text{ P} < .01 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 13.554 \text{ df} = 3 \text{ P} < .003 \]
TABLE 61

A COMPARISON OF SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORES
WITH THEIR FORMER UNION MEMBERSHIP IF ANY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Union Member</th>
<th>Behavioral Attitude Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No. Below</td>
<td>% Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A \( \chi^2 = 1.347 \), df = 3, \( P < .72 \)

Group B \( \chi^2 = 0.701 \), df = 1, \( P < .40 \)

Combined \( \chi^2 = 2.073 \), df = 3, \( P < .56 \)
TABLE 62
A COMPARISON OF SUPERVISOR COGNITIVE SCORES
WITH THEIR FORMER UNION MEMBERSHIP IF ANY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Union Member</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \begin{array}{c} \text{Group A} \\ 7.374 \quad \text{df} = 3 \\ P < .06 \\ \text{Group B} \\ 2.338 \quad \text{df} = 1 \\ P < .12 \\ \text{Combined} \\ 9.445 \quad \text{df} = 3 \\ P < .03 \end{array} \]
For Group A and Group B there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's union membership and Behavioral attitude scores achieved. In the combined groups, however, more than half of those who reported that they had not belonged to unions scored above the selected standard ($\chi^2 = 9.445 \ P < .03$).

Sub-question 15: If supervisors have close relatives who belong to unions, do those supervisors appear to be less negative in their attitude toward unions and their membership?

Findings: Supervisors whose close relatives were members of a union were more inclined to score above the selected standard than were those supervisors who had no close relatives who were union members.

Table 63 reveals that there were 59 respondents who reported that they fully approved of their close relative belonging to unions. Among those 59 respondents, 50 of them or 85 percent, scored above the selected standard on Affective attitude. Table 63 indicates that in all three of the groups there was significantly more of the supervisors who approved of their close relatives belonging to unions who scored above the standard on Affective attitude compared with those supervisors who selected a different answer. For Group A ($\chi^2 = 22.660 \ P < .0001$) and for Group B ($\chi^2 = 8.920 \ P < .02$) and for the Combined Groups ($\chi^2 = 28.269 \ P < .0001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Reaction</th>
<th>Affective Attitude Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Are Non-Members</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Do Not Approve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Fully Approve</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 22.660 \text{ df } = 3 \text{ P } < .0001 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 8.920 \text{ df } = 2 \text{ P } < .02 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 28.269 \text{ df } = 3 \text{ P } < .0001 \]
Table 64 reflects that of the 59 supervisors who fully approved of their relatives belonging to unions 49 of them, or 83 percent, scored above the selected standard. There were 77 percent of those who selected a different answer who scored below the standard. Table 64 indicates that for all three of the groups there was significantly more of the supervisors who approved of their close relatives belonging to unions who scored above the standard on Behavioral attitude compared to those supervisors who selected a different answer. For Group A ($\chi^2 = 22.660$ P < .0001) and for Group B ($\chi^2 = 8.092$ P < .017) and for the Combined Groups ($\chi^2 = 28.269$ P < .0001).

Table 65 reflects that of the 59 supervisors who fully approved of their relatives belonging to unions 20 of them, or 34 percent, scored above the selected standard on Cognitive knowledge. Only 20 percent of those who indicated that their close relatives were non-members of unions scored above the selected standard for Cognitive knowledge. Table 65 indicates that in Group B and the combined groups there were significantly more of the supervisors who approved of their close relatives belonging to unions who scored above the standard for Cognitive knowledge compared to those supervisors who selected a different answer. For Group B ($\chi^2 = 5.129$ P < .01) and for the combined groups ($\chi^2 = 10.913$ P < .01). In Group A there were no
TABLE 64

SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE SCORES COMPARED TO THEIR REACTIONS TO THEIR CLOSE RELATIVES BELONGING TO UNIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Reaction</th>
<th>Behavioral Attitude Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Above Below Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Are Non-Members</td>
<td>59 47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>37 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Do Not Approve</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Fully Approve</td>
<td>29 23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 22.660 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .0001 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 8.092 \quad df = 2 \quad P < .017 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 28.269 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .0001 \]
TABLE 65
SUPERVISOR COGNITIVE SCORES COMPARED TO THEIR REACTIONS TO THEIR RELATIVES BELONGING TO UNIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Reaction</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Are Non-Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Do Not Approve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Fully Approve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 5.324 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .14
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 5.129 \quad df = 2 \quad P < .08
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 10.913 \quad df = 3 \quad P < .01
\]
significant differences related to a supervisor's close relatives belonging to a union and Cognitive knowledge score achieved.

Table 66 lists the number of supervisors who indicated that they had close relatives who belonged to unions. There were 199 supervisors, or about one-half of those who responded, who indicated that none of their close relatives did belong to unions.

### TABLE 66

THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SUPERVISORS WHOSE CLOSE RELATIVES BELONGED TO UNIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Union Relatives</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Member Relatives</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 67 lists the various types of relatives that the respondent indicated belonged to unions. There were 199 supervisors, or about one-half of those who responded, who indicated that none of their close relatives did belong to unions. For those who had close relatives who were union members there were 71 or 47 percent of the relatives who were brothers of the supervisors.
**TABLE 67**

THE TYPE OF CLOSE RELATIVE THAT SUPERVISORS INDICATED BELONGED TO A UNION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Close Relative Who Was a Union Member</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-question 16: Do supervisors respond toward unions in a similar manner their parents did when the supervisors were children growing up in their family environment?

Findings: The respondents who grew up in a family environment in which the parents sided with unions, scored much higher in attitude scores than did those whose parents had strong feelings against unions.

Table 68 reveals the Affective attitude scores for the total 413 supervisors who responded and compares
TABLE 68

SUPERVISOR AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORES COMPARED WITH THEIR PARENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS UNIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Reaction</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sided With Unions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detested Unions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A \( \chi^2 = 8.849 \) df = 3 \( P < .03 \)

Group B \( \chi^2 = 5.759 \) df = 3 \( P < .123 \)

Combined \( \chi^2 = 13.272 \) df = 3 \( P < .004 \)
their scores with their report of their parent's attitude towards unions.

In the area of Affective attitude, there were 71 supervisors, or 77 percent of them, whose parents sided with unions who scored above the selected standard for Affective attitude. About two-thirds of those supervisors whose parents reacted unfavorably towards unions scored below the selected standard for Affective attitude. Table 68 indicates that in Group A and in the combined group there were significantly more of those supervisors whose parents had reacted favorably toward unions who scored above the standard on Affective attitude when compared with those supervisors who indicated that their parents did not react favorably towards unions. For Group A ($\chi^2 = 8.849$ $P < .03$) and for the combined group ($\chi^2 = 13.272$ $P < .004$). In Group B there were no significant differences related to the reaction of supervisor's parents towards unions and Affective scores achieved.

Table 69 reflects that in the area of Behavioral attitude, about two-thirds of those supervisors whose parents looked favorably upon unions scored above the selected standard for Behavioral attitude compared to about one-half for those supervisors whose parents reacted unfavorably towards unions and their activities. Table 69 indicates that for all three of the groups there were significantly more of those supervisors whose parents looked
### TABLE 69

**SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE COMPARED WITH THEIR PARENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS UNIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Reaction</th>
<th>Behavioral Attitude Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sided With Unions</td>
<td>34 27.4 16 13.0</td>
<td>28 31.1 14 18.6</td>
<td>62 29.0 30 15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detested Unions</td>
<td>8 6.4 9 7.2</td>
<td>6 6.6 4 5.3</td>
<td>14 6.6 13 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>51 41.1 56 45.2</td>
<td>45 50.1 36 48.1</td>
<td>96 44.8 92 46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>31 25.1 43 34.6</td>
<td>11 12.2 21 28.0</td>
<td>42 19.6 64 32.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124 100.0 124 100.0</td>
<td>90 100.0 75 100.0</td>
<td>214 100.0 199 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.426 \]
\[ df = 3 \]
\[ P < .03 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 8.088 \]
\[ df = 3 \]
\[ P < .04 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 14.932 \]
\[ df = 3 \]
\[ P < .001 \]
favorably upon union activities who scored above the standard on Behavioral attitude compared with those supervisors whose parents reacted unfavorably toward union activities. In Group A ($\chi^2 = 8.426 \quad P < .03$) and in Group B ($\chi^2 = 8.088 \quad P < .04$) and for the combined group ($\chi^2 = 14.932 \quad P < .001$).

Table 70 reveals that in the area of Cognitive knowledge there were 27 of the supervisors who reported that their parents disliked unions. Of those 27 supervisors 20 of them, or 74 percent, scored below the selected standard for Cognitive knowledge. Table 70 indicates that in all three groups there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's parent's emotional attitude towards unions and their Cognitive knowledge score.

The Relationship Between Attitudinal Components

Previously in this chapter the findings of the study have analyzed how the respondents scored, either above or below the selected standard of seventy percent, and how the respondents' performance related to the various components that the survey attempted to measure. The remainder of this chapter will provide an analysis of the data to determine if there is an existing relationship between the three components. Some of the demographic information will also be compared with the various components to observe if there are any correlations between
### TABLE 70

**SUPERVISOR COGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE SCORES COMPARED WITH THEIR PARENT'S EMOTIONS TOWARDS UNIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Reaction</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sided With Unions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detested Unions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Remember</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 3.594$ df = 3 $P < .30$

Group B $\chi^2 = 0.297$ df = 3 $P < .96$

Combined $\chi^2 = 3.646$ df = 3 $P < .30$
the supervisor's background and the various components measured by the survey questionnaire.

Table 71 contains the results of the comparisons of the Behavioral attitude component with the supervisors' Affective attitude. A computer program titled Subprogram "Crosstabs" was used to provide the chi square statistical computations and their mathematical significance.³

### TABLE 71
A COMPARISON OF THE BEHAVIORAL AND AFFECTIVE ATTITUDBINAL COMPONENTS FOR THE 413 SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components Compared</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Below</td>
<td>116 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 94.447$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Above</td>
<td>82 19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71 reveals that 116 of those who scored below the selected standard in Behavioral attitude also scored below the standard in Affective attitude. It also reflects that 188 of the supervisors surveyed scored above the selected standard in both Affective and Behavioral attitude.

³This program is explained and outlined in The Statistical Package For the Social Sciences, written by Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent (McGraw Hill, Co., 1975).
Table 71 indicates that there is a significant relationship in the comparison of Behavioral and Affective attitude components for the 413 supervisors ($\chi^2 = 94.447$ $P < .001$).

Table 72 contains the results of a comparison of the Affective and the Cognitive components for the 413 supervisors surveyed in this study.

**TABLE 72**

**A COMPARISON OF AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE AND THE COGNITIVE COMPONENT FOR THE 413 SUPERVISORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components Compared</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>% Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Below</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Above</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.052$  
$df = 1$  
$P < .01$

Table 72 reveals that 127 of the respondents or 89 percent of those who scored below the selected standard in Affective attitude also scored below the standard in the Cognitive component. The table further reveals that there were 22 percent, or 58 of the respondents, who scored above the standard in both Cognitive knowledge and Affective attitude. The statistical computations for the component comparison indicates that there is a significant
relationship in the comparison of Cognitive and Affective performance among the 413 supervisors surveyed ($\chi^2 = 6.052$ $P < .01$).

Table 73 compares scores on the Behavioral attitude component with scores on the Cognitive knowledge component. The table reflects that 175 of the supervisors or 88 percent of those who scored below the standard for Behavioral attitude also scored below the standard in the Cognitive area. It also indicates that 51 of the respondents or 24 percent of those who scored above the standard for Behavioral attitude also scored above the standard for the Cognitive component. The statistical computations for those two compared components reveal that there is a significant relationship between Behavioral and Cognitive performance ($\chi^2 = 9.462$ $P < .002$).

**TABLE 73**

A COMPARISON OF BEHAVIORAL ATTITUDE AND THE COGNITIVE COMPONENT FOR THE 413 SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components Compared</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Above</td>
<td>No. Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Below</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>% Above</th>
<th>% Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Below</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Above</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There remains one last question that has not been explored—do not those individuals who have been exposed to the most education tend to be more understanding and less negative in their attitude towards unions? Table 74 reflects the number of supervisors who were surveyed and indicates their level of education. Sixty-nine of the supervisors had either advanced degrees or had taken some post graduate work. About one-third of the supervisors indicated that they had only a high school degree. Table 74 lists the educational level of the supervisors surveyed in this study.

**TABLE 74**

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS SURVEYED AND THEIR LEVEL OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post Graduate Work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 75 through 77 contain the data that compares the number of respondents with varying levels of education and how they scored either above or below the selected standard. In the area of Affective attitude there appears to be a decided trend that reflects that 29 of the 36 supervisors with some post graduate education, or 80 percent of those in that category, scored above the selected standard. Of those who had only a high school degree 61 percent or 71 out of 116 scored above the selected standard for Affective attitude. Table 75 indicates that for all three groups there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's level of education and Affective score achieved.

Table 76 reveals that in the area of Behavioral attitude, 64 percent of those with some post graduate education, or 23 out of 36, scored above the selected standard for Behavioral attitude. Among those respondents who had only high school degrees there were 57 out of 116, or 49 percent of them, who scored above the selected standard for Behavioral attitude. Table 76 indicates that in all three groups there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's level of education and Behavioral attitude scores achieved.

Table 77 compares the supervisors' level of education with their scores for Cognitive knowledge. There appears to be only small differences between the various
TABLE 75
SUPERVISOR LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPARED WITH THEIR AFFECTIVE ATTITUDE SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Affective Attitude Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 6.39$ df = 4 $P < .18$

Group B $\chi^2 = 1.226$ df = 4 $P < .87$

Combined $\chi^2 = 5.598$ df = 4 $P < .23$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Behavioral Attitude Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A $\chi^2 = 4.500$ df = 4 $P < .35$

Group B $\chi^2 = 1.550$ df = 4 $P < .81$

Combined $\chi^2 = 5.387$ df = 4 $P < .25$
### TABLE 77

**SUPERVISOR LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPARED WITH THEIR COGNITIVE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Cognitive Knowledge Scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

- **Group A**
  \[\chi^2 = 8.656\] \(\text{df} = 4\) \(P < .08\)
- **Group B**
  \[\chi^2 = 3.500\] \(\text{df} = 4\) \(P < .48\)
- **Combined**
  \[\chi^2 = 4.484\] \(\text{df} = 4\) \(P < .34\)
groups when comparing their education with their Cognitive scores. It is interesting to note, however, that in this category more of those with high school degrees scored above the standard than did those with some post graduate education. This could be because there is the probability that more of the first line supervisors have only a high school degree.

There appears to be no relationship between the length of time spent as a supervisor and/or the number of individuals supervised when compared with Affective and Behavioral attitude. In comparing levels of education there were only small degrees of difference in the scores of those who were high school graduates and those who were college graduates. This seems to reinforce the premise that Behavioral attitudes are often very difficult to change and additional education may or may not have much impact upon ingrained thoughts and behavioral attitudes. Table 77 indicates that in all three groups there were no significant differences related to a supervisor's level of education and Cognitive knowledge scores achieved.

**Correlational Analysis of the Data**

Previously the data in this chapter has concerned itself with how the respondents scored in the various components of the survey compared to a selected standard of
seventy percent. The chi-square test was frequently used to measure the significance of the various frequencies compared.

Another test that may be applied to the data is called a Rank Correlation Coefficient Test which determines the relationship between components by comparing ranking of scores achieved in the various components that were measured. A computer program referred to as the Nonparametric Correlation Program was utilized to arrive at the rank correlation coefficients presented in this study. An outline and description of that program can be found on page forty-four of The Statistical Package For The Social Sciences.  

Table 78 reveals that among the 413 supervisors who were surveyed, there was a larger degree of relationship between the Affective attitude scores and the Behavioral attitude scores than there was between the Cognitive scores and either of the two separate attitudinal scores. This would seem to reinforce the assumption that supervisors' emotional reactions will have an influence upon the manner in which they can be expected to behave.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Vs Affective</td>
<td>0.1331</td>
<td>P &lt; .018</td>
<td>0.3204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Vs Behavioral</td>
<td>0.2465</td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
<td>0.3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Vs Behavioral</td>
<td>0.6903</td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
<td>0.6496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 78 through 80 reveal the relationships between the components and various demographic data. In comparing a supervisor's Cognitive knowledge with his years spent as a supervisor there appears to be a higher level of correlation than there is for some of the other areas measured in this study. It should be noted, however, that there appears to be some relationship in most of the areas compared.

The data presented in this chapter appears to support the following statements:

1. There is a statistically significant but very weak association between the cognitive knowledge a person possesses and his attitude towards labor unions.

2. There is a statistically significant but weak association between a person's cognitive knowledge and how he deals with labor unions.

3. There is a statistically significant and relatively high association between a person's attitude towards labor unions and how effectively he deals with those unions.
### TABLE 79

**SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Vs Yrs. of Performance as a Supervisor</td>
<td>0.3705 P &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3133 P &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Vs No. of Subordinates</td>
<td>0.1427 P &lt; .012</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1379 P &lt; .039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Vs Yrs. of Performance as a Supervisor</td>
<td>0.0443 P &gt; .244</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1091 P &gt; .082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Vs No. of Subordinates</td>
<td>0.3737 P &gt; .124</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1246 P &gt; .055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Pair</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Groups Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Vs Yrs. of Performance as a Supervisor</td>
<td>0.1304</td>
<td>P &gt; .020</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Vs No. of Subordinates</td>
<td>0.1488</td>
<td>P &lt; .010</td>
<td>0.2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. as a Supervisor Vs No. of Subordinates</td>
<td>0.2923</td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
<td>0.1620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1974, Eversen and McComb investigated the attitudes of 88 federal government supervisors toward federal employee's labor organizations. They measured three components of attitude: (1) cognitive (knowledge), (2) affective (emotional reaction), and (3) behavioral (intended behavior). Their conclusions indicated that at least eighty percent of the eighty-eight supervisors scored below standard in attitude and forty-five percent scored below standard in cognitive knowledge. Because of their small sample of eighty-eight supervisors, and because some of the conclusions seemed questionable, further research appeared to be appropriate to confirm or refute their conclusions.¹

Background

Permission to organize and form unions in the federal sector, and the development of a positive government-wide policy for labor-management relations, was first

established in January 1962 by a presidential executive order which was signed by President John F. Kennedy. During the past fifteen years there have been amendments made to President Kennedy's original order and the policies pertaining to labor-management relations in the federal sector have continued to expand and become more encompassing.

Initially there were a limited number of units within the government that were represented by unions but that number has increased until there are now more than two-thirds of the bargaining units within the federal government represented by unions.

This has created a requirement for supervisors within the federal government to acquire a basic knowledge of the labor-management relations policies and this condition also requires the government to maintain a program of continuing education in order for all supervisors to remain current in this area.

**Problem Statement**

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of knowledge of supervisors in the Federal Government concerning presidential labor-management relations policies, as outlined in the various Executive Orders, and to determine the relationship of their level of knowledge to their attitude toward unionism.
Research Objectives

This study was guided by four objectives which were as follows:

1. The main objective of the research was to determine the level of knowledge of Federal Government supervisors in the basics of the presidential labor-management relations policies and the guidelines for supervisors to follow in their contacts with members of federal unions.

2. The second objective of the research was to attempt to determine whether the attitude of the respondents towards federal labor unions was consistent with the labor management relations policy and guidelines that had been established by presidential executive orders.

3. A third objective of this research was to compare the attitude of supervisors by age, education, family background (father was a union member), and level of supervisory position to determine if there was a relationship between selected demographic and experiential variables and the knowledge they had and attitudes they held in labor management relations.

4. A fourth objective of the study was to identify whether or not there was a need for an adult education program in labor-management relations and whether or not the supervisors would accept a program that would improve their knowledge of labor-management relations.
Research Methodology

A self-report survey instrument was used to collect the data for this study. There were three specific components that were compared when the data from the survey instrument were analyzed—the respondent's degree of cognitive knowledge; his affective attitude and his behavioral attitude.

A standard of seventy percent was arbitrarily established for the score on each of the three components. If a respondent achieved a score of less than seventy percent for any of the three variables he was considered to be below the standard for that component. It was assumed that a score that was below standard implied that the respondent was in need of additional education in labor-management relations or that his attitude was not consistent with policies previously established by the federal government.

The self-report instrument consisted of three parts. The first part, the cognitive knowledge section, contained questions that could be answered yes or no in addition to some multiple choice questions. The second part of the survey instrument consisted of fifty statements that used ordinal scales to measure both affective and behavioral dimensions of attitude. The third part of the survey instrument contained questions that solicited demographic information.
An item analysis was conducted for the Part II section of the survey instrument to identify those statements that contributed to the discrimination of the weighted scale used to score the Part II section. Those statements in the Part II section whose interrelationship was statistically proven to be very low or low were eliminated from the questionnaire.

The cognitive section contained twenty questions and they were scored by allowing five points for each correct answer. Respondents did not receive credit if they answered incorrectly, or if they indicated that they did not know the correct answer. The failure to mark an answer was scored as an incorrect answer on the assumption that the respondent did not know the answer to those questions that were left incomplete.

In the second part of the survey instrument were fifty statements designed to measure the affective and behavioral pre-disposition components. This part of the survey instrument used a Likert type scale. All of the fifty statements were so worded that the respondent was asked to indicate how he felt emotionally about unions or he was asked to reveal how he would be inclined to react to a certain situation.

---

Respondents were provided with five possible answers from which to choose that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Some statements were worded so that strong disagreement implied a positive attitude, while other statements were worded in such a manner that strongly agree indicated a positive attitude. The five choices for each statement were weighted by assigning a numerical weight of one through five to each choice. The statements were so designed that the greatest weight was always indicative of the most positive attitude. The affective and behavioral scores in part two of the survey instrument were determined by summing the weights one through five.

Among the fifty statements in part two of the survey instrument were twenty-nine that were designed to measure affective attitude and twenty-one that were designed to measure the respondents' behavioral attitude.

The third part of the survey instrument contained thirty-four questions about the respondents' background and previous education and training.

Reliability

A pre-test was conducted to establish the reliability of the survey instrument before it was finalized. Pre-tests were conducted on three separate occasions and each time the survey instrument was improved upon. When
the data from the final pre-test was analyzed for reliability, using the Kuder-Richardson statistical model 20, the part one section equaled 0.75 and the part two section equaled 0.95. The face validity of the survey instrument was arrived at by using a panel of experts who were for the most part instructors in the field of labor relations.

In this study there were 413 supervisors who responded to the survey instrument and they were located in two separate federal government units. Throughout this study the data for the two separate groups were indicated and the data for the combined groups were also provided.

Group A consisted of 248 supervisors who had previously received some education in labor relations. Group B consisted of 165 supervisors who were about to begin a short seminar in labor-management relations. Data for the two groups have been presented so that separately the two groups could be compared for any relationships that might exist between Group A, which had prior instruction, and Group B that had not previously been exposed to such instruction. Although the intent of this study was not to compare the two separate groups, the comparison was included for those who might be interested in these data. In order to fully protect those who participated in this study the author refrained from identifying the two government agencies surveyed.
The responses to the survey instrument were processed using a computer program titled Subprogram "Crosstabs" which provided the chi-square analysis and the statistical significance. The chi-square test was used to compare the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was applied to measure the correlations between the scores for supervisors on the various components.

Findings of the Study

There were three research questions and three hypotheses designed to investigate the four objectives and there were sixteen additional sub-questions developed. The first research question concerned itself with determining the cognitive knowledge level of the supervisors.

Research question 1: What is the level of knowledge of supervisors, in the federal government, concerning labor-management relations outlined in Presidential Executive Orders?

There were 82 percent of the respondents in this study who scored below the selected standard (P < .009). The evidence indicates that this large number of

3 This program is explained and outlined in The Statistical Package For the Social Sciences, written by Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrener, and Bent (McGraw-Hill Co., 1975).

4 Ibid.
respondents in this study were not as knowledgeable in the area of labor-management relations as might be expected of those who supervise federal employees.

The second research question concerned itself with whether the supervisors' attitude was consistent with that which was expected of government supervisors in their daily encounter with union members and their union activities.

Research question 2: Are the attitudes of federal government supervisors consistent with the federal government's labor relations policies?

Sixty-five percent of the respondents scored above the selected standard and this was an indication that their attitude was consistent with that which was expected of government supervisors (P < .35). Although sixty-five percent of the respondents did score above the selected standard it should be noted that the mean score was only one point above the selected standard.

One of the objectives of this study was to identify whether or not there was a need for an educational program in labor-management relations and whether or not supervisors would accept an educational program that would be designed to improve their knowledge of labor-management relations. The third research question concerned itself with that objective.
Research question 3: Is there a need for improved or additional educational programs for supervisors in the federal government in the area of labor relations?

There was a need identified for additional educational courses and programs in labor-management relations for supervisors in the federal government.

There were 165 of the 413 supervisors who indicated that they had not received prior education in labor-management relations or could not remember ever having received such instruction. About 75 percent of the supervisors indicated that they had made no efforts on their own to gain increased knowledge of labor relations or could not remember whether or not they had made such an effort.

There were 265 of the 413 supervisors or 64 percent of them who indicated that they needed additional education in labor-management relations. Among the supervisors surveyed 277 or 67 percent indicated that they would enroll in a course in labor relations if they were offered the opportunity. The evidence seems to indicate that there was a need for additional education and a large percentage of the population surveyed in this study indicated that they would be interested in attending educational courses on the subject of labor-management relations.

One of the objectives of this study was to analyze the attitude of supervisors compared to their years of experience as a supervisor. Their level of assignment and
Hypothesis 1:

$H_1$: The more experienced supervisors, with the most years of service, will be more opposed to unions and their activities than the younger supervisors with less years of experience.

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in attitude between older and younger supervisors who may vary in years of experience.

The null hypothesis was rejected. (For Affective attitude $P < .16$ and for Behavioral attitude $P < .05$). Of the 413 supervisors who responded to this research, those in top management appear to have more favorable behavioral attitude than the first line supervisors. In the area of Affective attitude there appears to be less difference among the respondents. Top managers in this study scored much higher than lower level supervisors in the area of Behavioral attitude when indicating how they thought they would respond to situations involving labor management relations problems.

It would appear that because of their maturity and years of experience that the top managers, compared to the first line supervisors in this study, may be expected to respond to labor-management relations problems with behavioral attitudes and actions that are considered to be more appropriate and acceptable when measured against
labor relation policies that have been established in the federal sector.

The second hypothesis was designed to identify whether or not managers who were located in the higher levels of the management hierarchy might conceivably be less knowledgeable about labor-management relations because of their separation from the daily contact with employees who were union members.

Hypothesis 2:

H\(_2\): The higher a position a supervisor holds in an organizational structure, the less he will know of labor relations.

H\(_0\): There is no significant difference in labor relations knowledge between various managerial levels of supervisors.

The data rejected the null hypothesis (P < .001). However, there were three times as many supervisors assigned to top management positions who scored above the standard for cognitive knowledge compared to first line supervisors.

In this study the evidence failed to support the conclusion that top management was less knowledgeable than first line supervisors whose daily activities brought them into close contact with union members and their potential labor-management confrontations.

The third hypothesis concerned itself with a search for a relationship between the level of experience of a supervisor with grievance actions and his attitude toward unions.
Hypothesis 3:

\( H_3: \) Those supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures possess a more negative attitude towards unions than those who have not been involved with grievances.

\( H_0: \) There is no significant difference in attitude scores between supervisors who have been involved in grievance procedures and those who have not.

The data failed to reject the null Hypothesis \( (P < .62) \). Although those supervisors who had been involved in grievance actions seemed to achieve higher scores in the area of cognitive knowledge, their involvement in grievances did not appear to be related to a more negative attitude towards unions when compared to those supervisors who indicated that they had never been involved in grievance actions.

**Findings of the Sub-Questions**

In addition to the four main objectives for this study there were sixteen sub-questions that were investigated. Those questions and their findings are as follows:

Sub-question 1: Do supervisors believe that they have an adequate background in labor-management relations knowledge to work with unions?

Findings: There were 200 among the 413 supervisors who were surveyed who indicated that they were not satisfied with their level of knowledge and another 55 supervisors indicated that they really did not know.
Sub-Question 2: What efforts, if any, have supervisors made to acquire labor-management relations knowledge?

Findings: There were 294 or 71 percent of the supervisors who indicated that they had made no effort on their own to acquire increased skill in labor relations.

Sub-question 3: Have supervisors been provided with opportunities for education or training in the area of labor-management relations?

Findings: There were 248 of the supervisors or 60 percent of them who indicated that they had never been offered an opportunity to enroll in a labor-management relations course of instruction.

Sub-question 4: If the supervisors had been exposed to labor-management relations training or education, how effective did they believe such programs had been in increasing their knowledge?

Findings: Of the 248 supervisors who indicated they had received prior instruction in labor-management relations, 178 stated that in their opinion the course of instruction that they received was of some benefit to them.

Sub-question 5: Of what value have the education programs been in the opinion of the supervisors?

Findings: Most of the 248 supervisors who indicated that they had taken a course in labor relations
gave a good or excellent rating to the value or quality of the course.

Sub-question 6: Is there a relationship between the level of management at which a supervisor works and his knowledge of labor-management relations?

Findings: The higher level a supervisor was assigned within the management hierarchy the more likely he was to be more knowledgeable in the subject of labor-management relations.

Sub-question 7: Is there a relationship between involvement in grievances and the level of knowledge of labor-management relations?

Findings: The more that supervisors had been involved in grievance actions the more likely they were to score high in cognitive knowledge.

Sub-question 8: What are the attitudes of supervisors toward unions?

Findings: The supervisors' attitude tended to be positive with two-thirds of them scoring above the selected standard for affective attitude.

Sub-question 9: In the opinion of the supervisors, what impact does a union organization have upon management's role to accomplish its mission?

Findings: There were 353 of the 413 respondents who indicated that they thought that their effectiveness
as a manager had been adversely affected because of a union contract.

Sub-question 10: Do supervisors believe that the union's role is such that it can benefit both labor and management?

Findings: Supervisors were generally undecided or inclined to disagree that unions could perform a useful function. There were 177 supervisors who agreed that the unions forced them to do a better job of managing.

Sub-question 11: Do supervisors believe that it is appropriate to take employees into their confidence and permit them to share in decision-making?

Findings: There were 379 of the supervisors who acknowledge that they thought that supervisors should cooperate with unions.

Sub-question 12: What in general is the attitude of most supervisors toward the presidential labor-management relations policies?

Findings: More than 75 percent of the supervisors or 331 of them indicated that they were uncertain what was expected of them and were uncertain about the policies.

Sub-question 13: From the survey taken of supervisors in the federal government can any conclusions be drawn concerning how they will tend to act or react when dealing with unions or union members?
Findings: Answers to statements in the Part II portion of the survey instrument generally indicated that of the 413 supervisors surveyed, many of them did not manifest a highly negative attitude toward union members and their activities.

Sub-question 14: Do supervisors who have been union members have a less biased attitude toward unions than do those who have never belonged to unions?

Findings: Those supervisors who indicated that they had previously belonged to unions tended to score higher in both attitude and cognitive knowledge.

Sub-question 15: If supervisors have close relatives who belong to unions, do those supervisors appear to be less negative in their attitude towards unions and their membership?

Findings: Supervisors whose close relatives were members of a union were more inclined to score above the selected standard than were those supervisors who did not have close relatives who were union members.

Sub-question 16: Do supervisors respond toward unions in the same manner that their parents did when the supervisors were children growing-up in their family environment?

Findings: Supervisors who grew-up in a family environment in which the parents were favorable to unions,
scored higher in attitude than did those supervisors whose parents had strong feelings against unions.

Conclusions

Following are some of the conclusions that were arrived at from a review of the data collected in this study:

1. Supervisors in the federal government, in this study, lacked a knowledge of the fundamentals of labor-management relations as outlined in the presidential executive orders when measured against the standard selected for this study.

2. The attitude scores of federal government supervisors surveyed in this study were only marginally consistent with the government's labor-management relations policy when measured against the standard selected for this study.

3. Those supervisors in this study who were assigned to high level management positions scored higher on test items than did those supervisors assigned to lower levels and this would seem to indicate that the top management supervisors in this survey could be expected to respond to labor relations problems in ways more appropriate and more consistent with federal government labor relations policies than first line supervisors.
4. There was little difference in the attitude toward unions between supervisors with more years of supervisory experience and those with less years of supervisory experience.

5. The higher the management level to which a supervisor was assigned the more likely he was to be more knowledgeable in the area of labor-management relations.

6. The supervisors who had been more involved in grievance actions were more likely to score higher in cognitive knowledge.

7. Supervisors who had (1) been former union members, or (2) who had grown-up in a family environment in which their parents agreed with unions and union activities, or (3) had close relatives who were union members, were more inclined to indicate a positive attitude toward unions when responding to the survey questionnaire.

8. There was a need identified for additional educational courses and programs in labor-management relations for supervisors in the federal government.

9. Providing traditional adult education programs for the supervisors—which provides an increase in knowledge or understanding of labor relations—will not improve the supervisor's effectiveness in working with unions. An adult education program which is experiential in nature and seeks to modify behavior of the participants is more likely to be effective.
Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study the following recommendations are suggested which conceivably could contribute toward an improvement in the labor relations skills and attitudes of supervisors in the federal sector:

1. A continuing education program in the field of labor relations should be designed for supervisors in those agencies of the federal government which have characteristics that are not significantly different from those agencies surveyed in this study. Such a program should provide opportunity for first line supervisors to have an introductory course in the field with more advanced courses for higher level managers.

2. The introductory course should provide the cognitive background for labor relations but should also provide a substantive component of experiential learning. The advanced courses should be primarily experiential in nature.

3. Senior administrators in the federal government should make certain all managers and supervisors in their areas are aware of the policies pertaining to labor-management relations in the federal sector. This information should be updated with a semi-annual reminder to managers and supervisors.

4. Current in-service programs offered by the federal government in the area of labor relations should
be surveyed so that the course content can be analyzed and modified where appropriate.

5. All management development programs for managers in the federal sector should include a component on labor relations.

Recommendations for Further Research

Following are some recommended areas for further research that would contribute to a better understanding of the role of supervisors in the federal sector and their relationship with federal employees who are members of federal labor union organizations:

1. Additional research should be conducted to validate the findings in this study and that research should be expanded to include a much larger sampling of supervisors.

2. Additional research should be conducted to compare those who have received education in labor relations with those who have not received such education to determine whether educational programs in labor relations improve the effectiveness of supervisors.

3. A study should be conducted to determine the impact upon the union organization when a supervisor joins the union and the reaction toward such a supervisor by union members who are not supervisors.
4. A survey of the impact that unions are having upon the civil service commission policies and procedures would be helpful for gaining some insight into future trends in that area of government personnel management.

5. There is a need for a survey to measure what supervisors consider their labor-management relations responsibilities are in relation to the various organizational levels to which they are assigned.
APPENDIX A

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT
APPENDIX A

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A SURVEY OF THOSE WHO SUPERVISE FEDERAL
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

1. The attached questionnaire is designed to survey your knowledge of the field of labor-management relations in the Federal Sector. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY. Your answers will be kept in strict confidence because there is no means provided for matching the survey questionnaire to individual participants. Please comply with the following instructions:

   a. Complete the questionnaire ONLY if you are a supervisor or manager.

   b. When the word "union" appears in a question, it pertains ONLY to the Federal Government Employee's labor organizations. When you answer the questions, DO NOT BASE your answers on your knowledge of industrial unions, but only upon your knowledge of the Federal Government's Employee's labor unions.

   c. If you do not know the answer to the questions in Section I and III of the questionnaire, please DO NOT GUESS. If you do not know the answer or are in doubt of the answer, circle the words "I don't know."

   d. Select only one answer for each question unless you are requested to do otherwise.

2. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this survey. Those who are conducting it express their appreciation for the time that you have taken to share in an exercise that we anticipate will lead to improved communication and understanding in the important area of labor-management relations. Your efforts are sincerely appreciated.
PART 1

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THOSE WHO SUPERVISE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

1. If an attempt is made to organize the employees I am supervising, am I required by policy to remain neutral?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

2. Are Union Stewards entitled to some time to perform those duties that are associated with their union position?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

3. As soon as there is an exclusively-recognized union, decisions regarding personnel policies, practices and working conditions may no longer be made unilaterally by top management.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

4. In a Federal Government agency, every supervisor and manager as defined in Executive Order 11491, as amended, has the authority to commit the activity in the administration of the labor agreement.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

5. The Executive Order requires that management confer and consult with the Federal union concerning numbers, types and grade of positions or employees assigned to an organizational unit, work project or tour of duty.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know
6. A grievance that pertains to Equal Employment Opportunity may not be processed under the negotiated grievance procedures outlined in a labor contract agreement in the Federal Government.

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know  

7. May supervisors within the Federal Government join a recognized Federal labor union if they so desire?

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know  

8. If a union has been formed and given exclusive recognition, is management required to enter into collective bargaining if requested to do so by the union?

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know  

9. Do Federal Employees have the right to participate in the formulation of policies that affect their working conditions by working through their union representatives?

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know  

10. As a supervisor or a manager I have the right to know who among my employees are members of the union.

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know  

11. If a supervisor is convinced that the person filing a grievance is wrong, may that supervisor refuse to process the grievance?

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. I don't know
12. Can union literature be distributed by union organizers during non-work time in non-duty areas?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

13. Who is primarily responsible for the administration of the labor contract? (Select only one answer.)
   a. The Labor Relations Office
   b. The Unit Commander
   c. The Civilian Personnel Office
   d. The First Line Supervisor
   e. None of the above

14. Union members may use official duty time to do one of the following:
   a. hold membership meetings
   b. solicit for new members
   c. act as a union's designated representative
   d. collect dues
   e. none of the above

15. Exclusive recognition is granted to a union when:
   a. 10% or more of the employees belong to the union
   b. 50% or more of the employees belong to the union
   c. it is selected in a secret ballot by a majority of those voting
   d. it is approved by management
   e. none of the above

16. Under current DoD policy, which one of the following is subject to negotiations between management and a recognized union?
   a. the numbers, types and grades of positions and/or employees assigned to the unit
   b. the technology used in performing the unit's work
   c. personnel policies
   d. all the above
17. When formally bringing a grievance under the negotiated grievance procedure to the attention of the appropriate management official, an employee:

a. must be accompanied by a union representative, if the employee is a union member
b. must be accompanied by a union representative, regardless of his union membership
c. may choose to represent himself
d. must have outside counsel
e. none of the above

18. Please place a check mark opposite each of the following publications that you have read:

- DSA Regulation 1426.1, Labor Management Relations
- DSA Manual 1426.1, Negotiating the Labor Agreement
- Executive Order 11491, as amended
- The Labor-Management Negotiated Agreement that pertains to my work unit (if your unit has a recognized union)

19. Check one of the following:

- I have read one or more of the publications outlined in the previous question but I am not certain that I understand what is expected of me as a manager.
- I have read some of the above publications but I do not agree with the policy that they outline.
- I have read the executive orders and I think that I fully understand their intent and policy as it pertains to unions in the Federal Sector and I am in full agreement with that policy.

20. A policy concerning unions in the Federal Sector has been outlined in the various Executive Orders and that policy:

a. Encourages management to recognize, accept and work closely with unions.
b. Places constraints on management in collective bargaining with unions.
c. Does not deny those in the Federal Service the right to strike.
d. All of the above.
e. None of the above.
f. I don't know.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

22. Does the Executive Order 11491, as amended, contain standards of conduct for Federal Employee Unions?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know
PART II

NOTE: PLEASE CIRCLE THE ANSWER THAT MOST NEARLY REFLECTS YOUR ATTITUDE OR OPINION ABOUT THE STATEMENT.

1. It would not disturb me if the personnel that I supervise should decide to join a union.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree

2. If managers within the Department of Defense are forced to work with union employees, it will destroy the effectiveness of management.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree

3. Supervisors should not cooperate or work with a union unless they have to.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree

4. I do not believe that my effectiveness as a supervisor and/or manager has been greatly reduced because of a union contract.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree

5. There is little that a manager can gain from reading the labor contract or labor agreement.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree

6. I know that many employees are lacking in knowledge and education. If there is an attempt to organize them, it is my responsibility to explain both the advantages and the disadvantages of being a union member.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree
7. Problems that involve a union representative should not be permitted to take place during normal working hours.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

8. In my opinion, a union representative can be a valuable aid in facilitating management changes such as reassignments and reorganizing.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

9. A new policy that affects my subordinates has been received from a higher authority. I would first discuss the new policy with the Union Steward before I inform the rest of the employees.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

10. If I were eligible, I would join a union.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

11. Supervisors have a difficult time communicating with union representatives because the union representatives have less education and status than the supervisor.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

12. I am inclined to welcome a union organization in my unit because a strong union makes a manager's job easier.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

13. In my daily work as a supervisor, I believe I should forge ahead with my management decisions, issue the instructions I consider appropriate and then work out later whatever adjustments with the union are necessary.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree
14. The Union is frequently responsible for low or inadequate production levels and mediocre performance.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

15. In my opinion, any Federal Employee who joins a union is proving that he is a disloyal employee and he should not be trusted.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

16. If a supervisor must work with union members and they file a grievance against the supervisor, I think it only appropriate that the supervisor "tighten up" the work environment to prove to the union members that such a grievance activity may not be in their best interest.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

17. In my opinion, those who represent management at the bargaining table are entirely too lenient with unions.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

18. In my opinion, a good supervisor should encourage his people to join a union.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

19. In preparing an evaluation report on someone I knew was an official in the union, my rating would probably not be as high as it might be if he were not involved in union activities.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

20. I believe that most union officials are dedicated individuals who are making a sincere effort to improve the working environment.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree
21. In my opinion, we managers are becoming mere administrators and are losing our management control over the work environment.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

22. I believe that a good union can perform a useful function and improve the management in a military organization.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

23. An effective supervisor should not show favoritism to those who choose not to join the union.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

24. If anyone even looks as if he/she might attempt to form a union in my unit, I would oppose him/her in every way that I could.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

25. As far as I am concerned, Federal Employee unions should not be permitted to affiliate with national labor organizations.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

26. As a supervisor, anytime I make a significant decision that affects those I supervise, I should first talk it over with the union representative.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

27. Good supervisors will do everything they can to solve people problems without getting the union involved.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree
28. I think that the goal of the unions is to eventually take over the entire role of management.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

29. In my opinion, there are major advantages in a civilian employee belonging to a union.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

30. In my opinion, it is difficult to communicate with union members because they refuse to identify with management's problems.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

31. I think that unions are needed in industry but there is no place for them in the Federal Government.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

32. I do not believe that it will ever be possible to get a full day's work from people who belong to unions.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

33. In my opinion, a good supervisor will make it as difficult as possible for the union by never freely revealing anything to them.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

34. The presence of a union makes for a more effective and more pleasant working atmosphere within the Government environment.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

35. Labor leaders are greedy and involved in graft and in the long run, may prove to be affiliated with some sort of unamerican activity.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
36. In my opinion, organized labor unions are a requirement in today's Federal sector work environment.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

37. Once they are fully organized, the unions will be able to assure fair and equitable treatment of employees in the areas of selection, assignments, promotions and career objectives.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

38. I don't really believe that the unions are concerned with the best interests of employees.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

39. Unions contribute to improved management because they force managers to stop mismanaging and force them to do a better job of planning and managing.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

40. Once the Federal Sector becomes fully organized by unions, the unions will be able to improve pay and working conditions for the employees.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

41. It has been my experience that union members generally attempt to get along with military managers.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree

42. I don't believe that it is possible to have good discipline in any organization that is represented by a union.

   Strongly Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Agree
43. Managers should neither solicit nor accept the advice of any union representative concerning management decisions.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

44. An effective supervisor should make certain that union representatives get their work completed before they are permitted to do any union work.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

45. In my opinion, an effective supervisor will encourage union members to participate in management decision-making.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

46. The union should be kept at arms length at all times if a supervisor wants to remain out of trouble.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

47. In my opinion, the higher authorities have appeased unions too much and they should become harder on them in the future and stop being so lenient.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

48. As a manager, I am shirking my duty if I do not do everything I can to oppose any union representatives' attempt to organize my unit.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

49. If I were on a negotiating team, I would distrust the statements or actions of the union's negotiating team.

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree
50. A supervisor cannot communicate with union members because such persons lack education in the principles of management, production and economics.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
PART III

A SURVEY OF THOSE WHO SUPERVISE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your present status:
   ____ Military
   ____ Civilian

2. At what level of management are you assigned?
   ____ 1st line supervisor or manager
   ____ middle management
   ____ top management
   ____ staff position
   ____ other

3. How many years have you supervised or managed civilian employees? ____ years.

4. About how many of your subordinates are presently civilian employees? ____ (number)

5. Have you ever assisted in negotiating a labor agreement?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. Have you ever participated in a grievance hearing?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. Indicate with a check mark the highest educational level you have attained.
   ____ High school
   ____ Some college
   ____ College graduate
   ____ Some post-graduate work after college
   ____ Advanced degree such as a Masters or a PhD
8. Have you ever managed or supervised an organization or group of employees that were represented by an organized labor union?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

9. Have you ever received any education in labor relations management while performing as a supervisor or manager in the Federal Service?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

10. If you answered the previous question "yes," what type of labor relations management education did you receive? (Circle the appropriate letter.)
    a. Accredited course at a university or college
    b. Self-study program
    c. On-the-job labor relations seminar
    d. Service sponsored formal training (check one of the following:)
       _____DSA  _____Civil Service Commission
       _____Army  _____AF
       _____Navy  _____Marines
       _____Other

11. If you were exposed to an educational program other than a self-study program outlined above, how would you rate the course?
    _____An excellent course
    _____A good course
    _____A poor course
    _____The instruction was not practical
    _____I don't remember
    _____A good course but badly conducted

12. Despite your reaction to the course as indicated in the above question, have you ever used any of the material you learned in the course?
    _____Did not take a course  _____Never  _____Some
    _____Seldom  _____I have not had the opportunity to use the material
13. Have you personally made any effort on your own to acquire education in the area of labor relations management as it applies to the Federal sector?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

14. Have any of your supervisors ever encouraged you to enroll in courses that pertain to labor management relations in the Federal sector?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

15. If you have attended professional military schools such as Command and Staff or War College, was any instruction provided that pertained to labor-management relations in the Federal sector?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

16. Has anyone ever offered you the opportunity to enroll in a labor-management relations course?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

17. If you were offered the opportunity to enroll in a labor management course would you accept the opportunity?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

18. Do you think that you need some education in labor relations management in the public sector?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Frankly I'm not really interested
   d. I don't know
19. Do you think that most supervisors you know would be interested in participating in a course in labor management relations?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

20. I have discussed the subject of union activities in the Federal Sector with other supervisors and in my opinion most of them are making every effort to cooperate with the unions.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. The majority of them are
   d. I don't know
   e. I have not discussed the subject of unions with other supervisors

21. Just how important do you think the subject of labor management relations in the public sector really is?
   a. Very important
   b. Some importance
   c. Not all that important
   d. I haven't given it much thought

22. I have talked with other supervisors and they appear to be opposed to unions in the Federal Sector.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Somewhat
   d. I haven't discussed the subject of unions with other supervisors

23. Have you ever been involved in resolving grievances that were originated by union members in your organization?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

24. Over the past five years, about how many grievances would you say you have been involved in with the union?

   ____ None       ____ 11-15
   ____ 1-5       ____ 16-20
   ____ 6-10      ____ more than 20
25. Do you think that increased knowledge in the field of labor relations might have benefited you when you were involved with the grievances?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Somewhat
   d. I don't know

26. If you have been involved in grievances, did they arise because:
   a. Management was accused of violating a part of the labor agreement contract.
   b. Management did not consult with the union on a policy decision that affected the employees.
   c. One of your subordinate supervisors was responsible for the grievance.
   d. A union steward involved you because you were a representative of management.
   e. None of the above.

27. I feel comfortable with my present level of knowledge about unions and union activities within the Federal Sector.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

28. I have never been required to work in an organization in which there were employees who belonged to a union.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't know

29. My immediate supervisor seems to have a good background in labor relations and functions well with union members.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Most of the time
   d. I don't know
   e. My organization does not have a union
30. Have you ever belonged to any kind of a union organization?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don't remember

31. What were your feelings about unions if you were a union member? (Select only one answer.)
   a. I was not a member
   b. I did not like the experience
   c. I liked the experience
   d. I had no strong feelings either way
   e. I don't remember
   f. I felt like I was being exploited

32. Indicate which of the following belong to or are presently members of any kind of an organized labor union:
   _____father
   _____mother
   _____wife
   _____brothers
   _____sisters
   _____none do belong
   _____husband
   _____close relatives
   _____children

33. How do you feel about the above individuals belonging to a union?
   _____none of them do belong
   _____I have no strong feelings either way
   _____I do not approve of their union membership
   _____I fully approve of their union activities

34. As a youth growing up in your family environment, how would you say your parents reacted to unions in general?
   a. They were on the side of unions.
   b. They detested all union activities.
   c. They had no strong feelings as I recall.
   d. I don't remember their reactions.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY AND FOR THE COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
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COGNITIVE SECTION ANSWER KEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Not Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Not Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Weights for Scoring the Affective Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON EMPLOYEE MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

A. The Federal Employee's Right to Organize.

Federal employees have the right to join bona fide employee organizations. This right encompasses the right to refrain from joining. Wherever any considerable number of employees have organized for the purpose of collective dealing, the attitude of the Government should be that of an affirmative willingness to enter such relations.

B. Forms of Recognition

Bona fide organizations of Federal employees, which are free of restrictions or practices denying membership because of race, color, creed or national origin, which are free of all corrupt influences, and do not assert the right to strike or advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States should be recognized by Government agencies.

Organizations of Federal employees should be granted recognition essentially according to the extent to which they represent employees in a particular unit or activity of a Government agency. This recognition may be informal, formal, or exclusive.

1. Informal Recognition

Informal recognition gives an organization the right to be heard on matters of interest to its members, but places an agency under no obligation to seek its views. Informal recognition will be granted to any organization, regardless of what status may have been extended to any other organization.

2. Formal Recognition

Formal recognition will be granted to any organization with 10% of the employees in a unit or activity of a
government agency, where no organization has been granted exclusive recognition. Formal recognition gives an organization the right to be consulted on matters of interest to its members.

3. Exclusive Recognition

Exclusive recognition will be granted to any organization chosen by a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit. Exclusive recognition gives an organization the right to enter collective negotiations with management officials with the object of reaching an agreement applicable to all employees of the unit. Such agreements must not conflict with existing Federal laws or regulations, or with agency regulations, or with government-wide personnel policies, or with the authority of the Congress over various personnel matters.

C. Veterans Organizations.

The recognition of employee organizations should not affect the special relationship of veterans organizations with Government agencies.

D. Religious and Social Organizations.

The recognition of employee organizations should not preclude limited dealings with employee groups formed for religious or social purposes.

E. The Scope of Consultations and Negotiations with Employee Organizations.

Consultations or negotiations, according to the form of recognition granted, may concern matters in the area of working conditions and personnel policies, within the limits of applicable Federal laws and regulations, and consistent with merit system principles.

Accordingly, as an employee organization has been granted formal or exclusive recognition, it may consult with or negotiate with management officials on matters of concern to employees.

F. Procedure to be Adopted in the Event of Impasse in Negotiations.

Impasses in negotiations between Government officials and employee organizations granted exclusive recognition should be solved by other means than arbitration. Methods for helping to bring about settlements should be devised and agreed to on an agency by agency basis.
G. Form of Agreements.

Agreements between management officials and employee organizations granted exclusive recognition should be reduced to writing in an appropriate form. Decisions reached by management officials as a result of consultation with employee organizations granted formal recognition may also be communicated in writing to the organization concerned. Negotiations should be kept within reasonable time limits.

H. Services That May be Provided for Employee Organizations.

Bulletin boards should be made available to employee organizations. Officially approved or requested consultations with employee organizations should take place on official time. An agency may require that negotiations with an employee organization granted exclusive recognition take place on employees' time. All internal employee organization business should be conducted on official time. If authorized by Congress, voluntary dues withholding may be granted to an employee organization, provided the cost is paid for by the organization.

I. Grievances.

Employee organizations should have a recognized role in grievance systems. Advisory arbitration may be provided by agreement between an agency and an employee organization granted exclusive recognition.

J. Appeals.

A more uniform system of appeals of adverse actions should be established by Government agencies. Veterans and non-veterans should have identical rights to appeal adverse actions to the Civil Service Commission.

K. Union Membership.

The union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the Federal service.

L. Technical Services for the Federal Employee-Management Relations Program.

Technical services required to implement the proposals contained in this report should be provided by the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Labor. Upon request, the Secretary of Labor shall choose a person or
persons to make advisory determinations on appropriate units for exclusive recognition and to perform similar services. The Department of Labor and the Civil Service Commission jointly should prepare recommendations for standards of conduct for employee organizations and a code of fair labor practices for the Federal service.
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THE WHITE HOUSE

EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION IN
THE FEDERAL SERVICE

WHEREAS participation of employees in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies affecting them contributes to effective conduct of public business; and

WHEREAS the efficient administration of the Government and the well-being of employees require that orderly and constructive relationships be maintained between employee organizations and management officials; and

WHEREAS subject to law and the paramount requirements of the public service, employee-management relations within the Federal service should be improved by providing employees an opportunity for greater participation in the formulation and implementation of policies and procedures affecting the conditions of their employment; and

WHEREAS effective employee-management cooperation in the public service requires a clear statement of the respective rights and obligations of employee organizations and agency management:

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States, by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 631), and as President of the United States, I hereby direct that the following policies shall govern officers and agencies of the executive branch of the Government in all dealings with Federal employees and organizations representing such employees.

Section 1. (a) Employees of the Federal Government shall have, and shall be protected in the exercise of, the
right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist any employee organization or to refrain from any such activity. Except as hereinafter expressly provided, the freedom of such employees to assist any employee organization shall be recognized as extending to participation in the management of the organization and acting for the organization in the capacity of an organization representative, including presentation of its views to officials of the executive branch, the Congress or other appropriate authority. The head of each executive department and agency (hereinafter referred to as "agency") shall take such action, consistent with law, as may be required in order to assure that employees in the agency are apprised of the rights described in this section, and that no interference, restraint, coercion or discrimination is practiced within such agency to encourage or discourage membership in any employee organization.

(b) The rights described in this section do not extend to participation in the management of an employee organization, or acting as a representative of any such organization, where such participation or activity would result in a conflict of interest or otherwise be incompatible with law or with the official duties of an employee.

Section 2. When used in this order, the term "employee organization" means any lawful association, labor organization, federation, council, or brotherhood having as a primary purpose the improvement of working conditions among Federal employees, or any craft, trade or industrial union whose membership includes both Federal employees and employees of private organizations; but such term shall not include any organization (1) which asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, or to assist or participate in any such strike, or which imposes a duty or obligation to conduct, assist or participate in any such strike, or (2) which advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of Government in the United States, or (3) which discriminates with regard to the terms or conditions of membership because of race, color, creed or national origin.

Section 3. (a) Agencies shall accord informal, formal or exclusive recognition to employee organizations which requests such recognition in conformance with the requirements specified in sections 4, 5 and 6 of this order, except that no recognition shall be accorded to any employee organization which the head of the agency considers to be so subject to corrupt influences or influences opposed to basic democratic principles that recognition would be inconsistent with the objectives of this order.
(b) Recognition of an employee organization shall continue so long as such organization satisfies the criteria of this order applicable to such recognition; but nothing in this section shall require any agency to determine whether an organization should become or continue to be recognized as exclusive representative of the employees in any unit within 12 months after a prior determination of exclusive status with respect to such unit has been made pursuant to the provisions of this order.

(c) Recognition, in whatever form accorded, shall not --

(1) preclude any employee, regardless of employee organization membership, from bringing matters of personal concern to the attention of appropriate officials in accordance with applicable law, rule, regulation, or established agency policy, or from choosing his own representative in a grievance or appellate action; or

(2) preclude or restrict consultations and dealings between an agency and any veterans organization with respect to matters of particular interest to employees with veterans preference; or

(3) preclude an agency from consulting or dealing with any religious, social, fraternal or other lawful association, not qualified as an employee organization, with respect to matters or policies which involve individual members of the association or are of particular applicability to it or its members, when such consultations or dealings are duly limited so as not to assume the character of formal consultation on matters of general employee-management policy or to extend to areas where recognition of the interests of one employee group may result in discrimination against or injury to the interests of other employees.

Section 4. (a) An agency shall accord an employee organization, which does not qualify for exclusive or formal recognition, informal recognition as representative of its member employees without regard to whether any other employee organization has been accorded formal or exclusive recognition as representative of some or all employees in any unit.

(b) When an employee organization has been informally recognized, it shall, to the extent consistent with the efficient and orderly conduct of the public business, be permitted to present to appropriate officials its views on matters of concern to its members. The agency need not,
however, consult with an employee organization so recognized in the formulation of personnel or other policies with respect to such matters.

Section 5. (a) An agency shall accord an employee organization formal recognition as the representative of its members in a unit as defined by the agency when (1) no other employee organization is qualified for exclusive recognition as representative of employees in the unit, (2) it is determined by the agency that the employee organization has a substantial and stable membership of no less than 10 per centum of the employees in the unit, and (3) the employee organization has submitted to the agency a roster of its officers and representatives, a copy of its constitution and by-laws, and a statement of objectives. When, in the opinion of the head of an agency, an employee organization has a sufficient number of local organizations or a sufficient total membership within such agency, such organization may be accorded formal recognition at the national level, but such recognition shall not preclude the agency from dealing at the national level with any other employee organization on matters affecting its members.

(b) When an employee organization has been formally recognized, the agency, through appropriate officials, shall consult with such organization from time to time in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices, and matters affecting working conditions that are of concern to its members. Any such organization shall be entitled from time to time to raise such matters for discussion with appropriate officials and at all times to present its views thereon in writing. In no case, however, shall an agency be required to consult with an employee organization which has been formally recognized with respect to any matter which, if the employee organization were one entitled to exclusive recognition, would not be included within the obligation to meet and confer, as described in section 6(b) of this order.

Section 6. (a) An agency shall recognize an employee organization as the exclusive representative of the employees in an appropriate unit when such organization is eligible for formal recognition pursuant to section 5 of this order, and has been designated or selected by a majority of the employees of such unit as the representative of such employees in such unit. Units may be established on any plant or installation, craft, functional or other basis which will ensure a clear and identifiable community of interest among the employees concerned, but
no unit shall be established solely on the basis of the extent to which employees in the proposed unit have organized. Except where otherwise required by established practice, prior agreement, or special circumstances, no unit shall be established for purposes of exclusive recognition which includes (1) any managerial executive, (2) any employee engaged in Federal personnel work in other than a purely clerical capacity, (3) both supervisors who officially evaluate the performance of employees and the employees whom they supervise, or (4) both professional employees and nonprofessional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such unit.

(b) When an employee organization has been recognized as the exclusive representative of employees of an appropriate unit it shall be entitled to act for and to negotiate agreements covering all employees in the unit and shall be responsible for representing the interests of all such employees without discrimination and without regard to employee organization membership. Such employee organization shall be given the opportunity to be represented at discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel policies and practices, or other matters affecting general working conditions of employees in the unit. The agency and such employee organization, through appropriate officials and representatives, shall meet at reasonable times and confer with respect to personnel policy and practices and matters affecting working conditions, so far as may be appropriate subject to law and policy requirements. This extends to the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, the determination of appropriate techniques, consistent with the terms and purposes of this order, to assist in such negotiation, and the execution of a written memorandum of agreement or understanding incorporating any agreement reached by the parties. In exercising authority to make rules and regulations relating to personnel policies and practices and working conditions, agencies shall have due regard for the obligation imposed by this section, but such obligation shall not be construed to extend to such areas of discretion and policy as the mission of an agency, its budget, or organization and the assignment of its personnel, or the technology of performing its work.

Section 7. Any basic or initial agreement entered into with an employee organization as the exclusive representative of employees in a unit must be approved by the head of the agency or any official designated by him. All agreements with such employee organizations shall also be subject to the following requirements, which shall be
expressly stated in the initial or basic agreement and shall be applicable to all supplemental, implementing, subsidiary or informal agreements between the agency and the organization:

(1) In the administration of all matters covered by the agreement officials and employees are governed by the provisions of any existing or future laws and regulations, including policies set forth in the Federal Personnel Manual and agency regulations, which may be applicable, and the agreement shall at all times be applied subject to such laws, regulations and policies;

(2) Management officials of the agency retain the right, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, (a) to direct employees of the agency, (b) to hire, promote, transfer, assign, and retain employees in positions within the agency, and to suspend, demote, discharge, or take other disciplinary action against employees, (c) to relieve employees from duties because of lack of work or for other legitimate reasons, (d) to maintain the efficiency of the Government operations entrusted to them, (e) to determine the methods, means and personnel by which such operations are to be conducted; and (f) to take whatever actions may be necessary to carry out the mission of the agency in situations of emergency.

Section 8. (a) Agreements entered into or negotiated in accordance with this order with an employee organization which is the exclusive representative of employees in an appropriate unit may contain provisions, applicable only to employees in the unit, concerning procedures for consideration of grievances. Such procedures (1) shall conform to standards issued by the Civil Service Commission, and (2) may not in any manner diminish or impair any rights which would otherwise be available to any employee in the absence of an agreement providing for such procedures.

(b) Procedures established by an agreement which are otherwise in conformity with this section may include provisions for the arbitration of grievances. Such arbitration (1) shall be advisory in nature with any decisions or recommendations subject to the approval of the agency head; (2) shall extend only to the interpretation or application of agreements or agency policy and not to changes in or proposed changes in agreements or agency policy; and (3) shall be invoked only with the approval of the individual employee or employees concerned.

Section 9. Solicitation of memberships, dues, or other internal employee organization business shall be
conducted during the non-duty hours of the employees concerned. Officially requested or approved consultations and meetings between management officials and representatives of recognized employee organizations shall, whenever practicable, be conducted on official time, but any agency may require that negotiations with an employee organization which has been accorded exclusive recognition be conducted during the non-duty hours of the employee organization representatives involved in such negotiations.

Section 10. No later than July 1, 1962, the head of each agency shall issue appropriate policies, rules and regulations for the implementation of this order, including: A clear statement of the rights of its employees under the order; policies and procedures with respect to recognition of employee organizations; procedures for determining appropriate employee units; policies and practices regarding consultation with representatives of employee organizations, other organizations and individual employees; and policies with respect to the use of agency facilities by employee organizations. Insofar as may be practicable and appropriate, agencies shall consult with representatives of employee organizations in the formulation of these policies, rules and regulations.

Section 11. Each agency shall be responsible for determining in accordance with this order whether a unit is appropriate for purposes of exclusive recognition and, by an election or other appropriate means, whether an employee organization represents a majority of the employees in such a unit so as to be entitled to such recognition. Upon the request of any agency, or of any employee organization which is seeking exclusive recognition and which qualifies for or has been accorded formal recognition, the Secretary of Labor, subject to such necessary rules as he may prescribe, shall nominate from the National Panel of Arbitrators maintained by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service one or more qualified arbitrators who will be available for employment by the agency concerned for either or both of the following purposes, as may be required: (1) to investigate the facts and issue an advisory decision as to the appropriateness of a unit for purposes of exclusive recognition and as to related issues submitted for consideration; (2) to conduct or supervise an election or otherwise determine by such means as may be appropriate, and on an advisory basis, whether an employee organization represents the majority of the employees in a unit. Consonant with law, the Secretary of Labor shall render such assistance as may be appropriate in connection with advisory decisions or determinations under this section, but the necessary costs of such assistance shall be
Section 12. The Civil Service Commission shall establish and maintain a program to assist in carrying out the objectives of this order. The Commission shall develop a program for the guidance of agencies in employee-management relations in the Federal service; provide technical advice to the agencies on employee-management programs; assist in the development of programs for training agency personnel in the principles and procedures of consultation, negotiation and the settlement of disputes in the Federal service, and for the training of management officials in the discharge of their employee-management relations responsibilities in the public interest; provide for continuous study and review of the Federal employee-management relations program and, from time to time, make recommendations to the President for its improvement.

Section 13. (a) The Civil Service Commission and the Department of Labor shall jointly prepare (1) proposed standards of conduct for employee organizations and (2) a proposed code of fair labor practices in employee-management relations in the Federal service appropriate to assist in securing the uniform and effective implementation of the policies, rights and responsibilities described in this order.

(b) There is hereby established the President's Temporary Committee on the implementation of the Federal Employee-Management Relations Program. The Committee shall consist of the Secretary of Labor, who shall be chairman of the Committee, the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. In addition to such other matters relating to the implementation of this order as may be referred to it by the President, the Committee shall advise the President with respect to any problems arising out of completion of agreements pursuant to sections 6 and 7, and shall receive the proposed standards of conduct for employee organizations and proposed code of fair labor practices in the Federal service, as described in this section, and report thereon to the President with such recommendations or amendments as it may deem appropriate. Consonant with law, the departments and agencies represented on the Committee shall, as may be necessary for the effectuation of this section,
furnish assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691). Unless otherwise directed by the President, the Committee shall cease to exist 30 days after the date on which it submits its report to the President pursuant to this section.

Section 14. The head of each agency, in accordance with the provisions of this order and regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, shall extend to all employees in the competitive civil service rights identical in adverse action cases to those provided preference eligibles under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended. Each employee in the competitive service shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of the administrative officer so acting, such appeal to be processed in an identical manner to that provided for appeals under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act. Any recommendation by the Civil Service Commission submitted to the head of an agency on the basis of an appeal by an employee in the competitive service shall be complied with by the head of the agency. This section shall become effective as to all adverse actions commenced by issuance of a notification of proposed action on or after July 1, 1962.

Section 15. Nothing in this order shall be construed to annul or modify, or to preclude the renewal or continuation of, any lawful agreement heretofore entered into between any agency and any representative of its employees. Nor shall this order preclude any agency from continuing to consult or deal with any representative of its employees or other organization prior to the time that the status and representation rights of such representative or organization are determined in conformity with this order.

Section 16. This order (except section 14) shall not apply to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, or any other agency, or to any office, bureau or entity within an agency, primarily performing intelligence, investigative, or security functions if the head of the agency determines that the provisions of this order cannot be applied in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations. When he deems it necessary in the national interest, and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, the head of
any agency may suspend any provision of this order (except section 14) with respect to any agency, installation or activity which is located outside of the United States.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

THE WHITE HOUSE,

January 17, 1962.
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THE WHITE HOUSE

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

WHEREAS the public interest requires high standards of employee performance and the continual development and implementation of modern and progressive work practices to facilitate improved employee performance and efficiency; and

WHEREAS the well-being of employees and efficient administration of the Government are benefited by providing employees an opportunity to participate in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices affecting the conditions of their employment; and

WHEREAS the participation of employees should be improved through the maintenance of constructive and cooperative relationships between labor organizations and management officials; and

WHEREAS subject to law and the paramount requirements of public service, effective labor-management relations within the Federal service require a clear statement of the respective rights and obligations and agency management;

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including sections 3301 and 7301 of title 5 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, I hereby direct that the following policies shall govern officers and agencies of the executive branch of the Government in all dealings with Federal employees and organizations representing such employees.
GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1. Policy. (a) Each employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join, and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Order, the right to assist a labor organization extends to participation in the management of the organization and acting for the organization in the capacity of an organization representative, including presentation of its views to officials of the executive branch, the Congress, or other appropriate authority. The head of each agency shall take the action required to assure that employees in the agency are apprised of their rights under this section, and that no interference, restraint, coercion, or discrimination is practiced within his agency to encourage or discourage membership in a labor organization.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this section does not authorize participation in the management of a labor organization or acting as a representative of such an organization by a supervisor, except as provided in section 24 of this Order, or by an employee when the participation or activity would result in a conflict or apparent conflict of interest or otherwise be incompatible with law or with the official duties of the employee.

Sec. 2. Definitions. When used in this Order, the term --

(a) "Agency" means an executive department, a Government corporation, and an independent establishment as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code, except the General Accounting Office;

(b) "Employee" means an employee of an agency and an employee of a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States but does not include, for the purpose of formal or exclusive recognition or national consultation rights, a supervisor, except as provided in section 24 of this Order;

(c) "Supervisor" means an employee having authority, in the interest of an agency, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to evaluate their performance, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in
connection with the foregoing the exercise of authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment;

(d) "Guard" means an employee assigned to enforce against employees and other persons rules to protect agency property or the safety of persons on agency premises, or to maintain law and order in areas or facilities under Government control;

(e) "Labor organization" means a lawful organization of any kind in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with agencies concerning grievances, personnel policies and practices, or other matters affecting the working conditions of their employees; but does not include an organization which --

(1) consists of management officials or supervisors, except as provided in section 24 of this Order;

(2) asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, or to assist or participate in such a strike, or imposes a duty or obligation to conduct, assist or participate in such a strike;

(3) advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States; or

(4) discriminates with regard to the terms or conditions of membership because of race, color, creed, sex, age, or national origin;

(f) "Agency management" means the agency head and all management officials, supervisors, and other representatives of management having authority to act for the agency on any matters relating to the implementation of the agency labor-management relations program established under this Order;

(g) "Council" means the Federal Labor Relations Council established by this Order;

(h) "Panel" means the Federal Service Impasses Panel established by this Order; and

(i) "Assistant Secretary" means the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor-Management Relations.
Sec. 3. Application. (a) This order applies to all employees and agencies in the executive branch, except as provided in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section.

(b) This Order (except section 22) does not apply to --

(1) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the Central Intelligence Agency;

(3) any other agency, or office, bureau or entity within an agency, which has as a primary function intelligence, investigative, or security work, when the head of the agency determines, in his sole judgment, that the Order cannot be applied in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations; or

(4) any office, bureau of entity within an agency which has as a primary function investigation or audit of the conduct or work of officials or employees of the agency for the purpose of ensuring honesty and integrity in the discharge of their official duties, when the head of the agency determines, in his sole judgment, that the Order cannot be applied in a manner consistent with the internal security of the agency.

(c) The head of an agency may, in his sole judgment, suspend any provision of this Order (except section 22) with respect to any agency installation or activity located outside the United States, when he determines that this is necessary in the national interest, subject to the conditions he prescribes.

(d) Employees engaged in administering a labor-management relations law or this Order shall not be represented by a labor organization which also represents other groups of employees under the law or this Order, or which is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which represents such a group of employees.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 4. Federal Labor Relations Council.
(a) There is hereby established the Federal Labor Relations Council, which consists of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who shall be chairman of the Council, the Secretary of Labor, an official of the Executive Office of the President, and such other officials of the executive branch as the President may designate from time to time.
The Civil Service Commission shall provide services and staff assistance to the Council to the extent authorized by law.

(b) The Council shall administer and interpret this Order, decide major policy issues, prescribe regulations, and from time to time, report and make recommendations to the President.

(c) The Council may consider, subject to its regulations --

1. appeals from decisions of the Assistant Secretary issued pursuant to section 6 of this Order;
2. appeals on negotiability issues as provided in section 11(c) of this Order;
3. exceptions to arbitration awards; and
4. other matters it deems appropriate to assure the effectuation of the purposes of this Order.

Sec. 5. Federal Service Impasses Panel. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Service Impasses Panel as an agency within the Council. The Panel consists of at least three members appointed by the President, one of whom he designates as chairman. The Council shall provide the services and staff assistance needed by the Panel.

(b) The Panel may consider negotiation impasses as provided in section 17 of this Order and may take any action it considers necessary to settle an impasse.

(c) The Panel shall prescribe regulations needed to administer its function under this Order.

Sec. 6. Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor-Management Relations. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall --

1. decide questions as to the appropriate unit for the purpose of exclusive recognition and related issues submitted for his consideration;
2. supervise elections to determine whether a labor organization is the choice of a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit as their exclusive representative, and certify the results;
(3) decide questions as to the eligibility of labor organizations for national consultation rights under criteria prescribed by the Council; and

(4) except as provided in section 19(d) of this Order, decide complaints of alleged unfair labor practices and alleged violations of the standards of conduct for labor organizations.

(b) In any matters arising under paragraph (a) of this section, the Assistant Secretary may require an agency or a labor organization to cease and desist from violations of this Order and require it to take such affirmative action as he considers appropriate to effectuate the policies of this Order.

(c) In performing the duties imposed on him by this section, the Assistant Secretary may request and use the services and assistance of employees of other agencies in accordance with section 1 of the Act of March 4, 1915, (38 Stat. 1084, as amended; 31 U.S.C. §686).

(d) The Assistant Secretary shall prescribe regulations needed to administer his functions under this Order.

(e) If any matters arising under paragraph (a) of this section involve the Department of Labor, the duties of the Assistant Secretary described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section shall be performed by a member of the Civil Service Commission designated by the Chairman of the Commission.

RECOGNITION

Sec. 7. Recognition in general. (a) An agency shall accord exclusive recognition or national consultation rights at the request of a labor organization which meets the requirements for the recognition or consultation rights under this Order.

(b) A labor organization seeking recognition shall submit to the agency a roster of its officers and representatives, a copy of its constitution and by-laws, and a statement of its objectives.

(c) When recognition of a labor organization has been accorded, the recognition continues as long as the organization continues to meet the requirements of this Order applicable to that recognition, except that this section does not require an election to determine whether
an organization should become, or continue to be recognized as, exclusive representative of the employees in any unit or subdivision thereof within 12 months after a prior valid election with respect to such unit.

(d) Recognition, in whatever form accorded, does not --

(1) preclude an employee, regardless of whether he is a member of a labor organization, from bringing matters of personal concern to the attention of appropriate officials under applicable law, rule, regulations, or established agency policy; or from choosing his own representative in a grievance or appellate action;

(2) preclude or restrict consultations and dealings between an agency and a veterans organization with respect to matters of particular interest to employees with veterans preference; or

(3) preclude an agency from consulting or dealing with a religious, social, fraternal, or other lawful association, not qualified as a labor organization, with respect to matters or policies which involve individual members of the association or are of particular applicability to it or its members.

Consultations and dealings under subparagraph (3) of this paragraph shall be so limited that they do not assume the character of formal consultation on matters of general employee-management policy, except as provided in paragraph (e) of this section, or extend to areas where recognition of the interests of one employee group may result in discrimination against or injury to the interests of other employees.

(e) An agency shall establish a system for intra-management communication and consultation with its supervisors or associations of supervisors. The communications and consultations shall have as their purposes the improvement of agency operations, the improvement of working conditions of supervisors, the exchange of information, the improvement of managerial effectiveness, and the establishment of policies that best serve the public interest in accomplishing the mission of the agency.

(f) Informal recognition shall not be accorded after the date of this Order.
Sec. 8. **Formal recognition.** (a) Formal recognition, including formal recognition at the national level, shall not be accorded after the date of this Order.

(b) An agency shall continue any formal recognition, including formal recognition at the national level, accorded a labor organization before the date of this Order until --

(1) the labor organization ceases to be eligible under this Order for formal recognition so accorded;

(2) a labor organization is accorded exclusive recognition as representative of employees in the unit to which the formal recognition applies; or

(3) the formal recognition is terminated under regulations prescribed by the Federal Labor Relations Council.

(c) When a labor organization holds formal recognition, it is the representative of its members in a unit as defined by the agency when recognition was accorded. The agency, through appropriate officials, shall consult with representatives of the organization from time to time in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices, and matters affecting working conditions that affect members of the organization in the unit to which the formal recognition applies. The organization is entitled from time to time to raise such matters for discussion with appropriate officials and at all times to present its views thereon in writing. The agency is not required to consult with the labor organization on any matter on which it would not be required to meet and confer if the labor organization were entitled to exclusive recognition.

Sec. 9. **National consultation rights.** (a) An agency shall accord national consultation rights to a labor organization which qualifies under criteria established by the Federal Labor Relations Council as the representative of a substantial number of employees of the agency. National consultation rights shall not be accorded for any unit where a labor organization already holds exclusive recognition at the national level for that unit. The granting of national consultation rights does not preclude an agency from appropriate dealings at the national level with other organizations on matters affecting their members. An agency shall terminate national consultation rights when the labor organization ceases to qualify under the established criteria.
(b) When a labor organization has been accorded national consultation rights, the agency, through appropriate officials, shall notify representatives of the organization of proposed substantive changes in personnel policies that affect employees it represents and provide an opportunity for the organization to comment on the proposed changes. The labor organization may suggest changes in the agency's personnel policies and have its views carefully considered. It may confer in person at reasonable times, on request, with appropriate officials on personnel policy matters, and at all times present its views thereon in writing. An agency is not required to consult with a labor organization on any matter on which it would not be required to meet and confer if the organization were entitled to exclusive recognition.

(c) Questions as to the eligibility of labor organizations for national consultation rights may be referred to the Assistant Secretary for decision.

Sec. 10. Exclusive recognition. (a) An agency shall accord exclusive recognition to a labor organization when the organization has been selected, in a secret ballot election, by a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit as their representative.

(b) A unit may be established on a plant or installation, craft, functional, or other basis which will ensure a clear and identifiable community of interest among the employees concerned and will promote effective dealings and efficiency of agency operations. A unit shall not be established solely on the basis of the extent to which employees in the proposed unit have organized, nor shall a unit be established if it includes --

(1) any management official or supervisor, except as provided in section 24;

(2) an employee engaged in Federal personnel work in other than a purely clerical capacity;

(3) any guard together with other employees; or

(4) both professional and nonprofessional employees, unless a majority of the professional employees vote for inclusion in the unit.

Questions as to the appropriate unit and related issues may be referred to the Assistant Secretary for decision.
(c) An agency shall not accord exclusive recognition to a labor organization as the representative of employees in a unit of guards if the organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

(d) All elections shall be conducted under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary, or persons designated by him, and shall be by secret ballot. Each employee eligible to vote shall be provided the opportunity to choose the labor organization he wishes to represent him, from among those on the ballot, or "no union." Elections may be held to determine whether --

(1) a labor organization should be recognized as the exclusive representative of employees in a unit;

(2) a labor organization should replace another labor organization as the exclusive representative; or

(3) a labor organization should cease to be the exclusive representative.

(e) When a labor organization has been accorded exclusive recognition, it is the exclusive representative of employees in the unit and is entitled to act for and to negotiate agreements covering all employees in the unit. It is responsible for representing the interests of all employees in the unit without discrimination and without regard to labor organization membership. The labor organization shall be given the opportunity to be represented at formal discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel policies and practices, or other matters affecting general working conditions of employees in the unit.

AGREEMENTS

Sec. 11. Negotiation of agreements. (a) An agency and a labor organization that has been accorded exclusive recognition, through appropriate representatives, shall meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to personnel policies and practices and matters affecting working conditions, so far as may be appropriate under applicable laws and regulations, including policies set forth in the Federal Personnel Manual, published agency policies and regulations, a national or other controlling agreement at a higher level in the agency, and this Order. They may negotiate an agreement, or any question arising
thereunder; determine appropriate techniques, consistent with section 17 of this Order, to assist in such negotiation; and execute a written agreement or memorandum of understanding.

(b) In prescribing regulations relating to personnel policies and practices and working conditions, an agency shall have due regard for the obligation imposed by paragraph (a) of this section. However, the obligation to meet and confer does not include matters with respect to the mission of an agency; its budget; its organization; the number of employees; and the numbers, types, and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organizational unit, work project or tour of duty; the technology of performing its work; or its internal security practices. This does not preclude the parties from negotiating agreements providing appropriate arrangements for employees adversely affected by the impact of realignment of work forces or technological change.

(c) If, in connection with negotiations, an issue develops as to whether a proposal is contrary to law, regulation, controlling agreement, or this Order and therefore not negotiable, it shall be resolved as follows:

1. An issue which involves interpretation of a controlling agreement at a higher agency level is resolved under the procedures of the controlling agreement, or, if none, under agency regulations;

2. An issue other than as described in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph which arises at a local level may be referred by either party to the head of the agency for determination;

3. An agency head's determination as to the interpretation of the agency's regulations with respect to a proposal is final;

4. A labor organization may appeal to the Council for a decision when --

   i. it disagrees with an agency head's determination that a proposal would violate applicable law, regulation of appropriate authority outside the agency, or this Order, or

   ii. it believes that an agency's regulations, as interpreted by the agency head, violate applicable law, regulation of appropriate authority outside the agency, or this Order.
Sec. 12. Basic provisions of agreements. Each agreement between an agency and a labor organization is subject to the following requirements --

(a) in the administration of all matters covered by the agreement, officials and employees are governed by existing or future laws and the regulations of appropriate authorities, including policies set forth in the Federal Personnel Manual; by published agency policies and regulations in existence at the time the agreement was approved; and by subsequently published agency policies and regulations required by law or by the regulations of appropriate authorities, or authorized by the terms of a controlling agreement at a higher agency level;

(b) management officials of the agency retain the right, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations --

(1) to direct employees of the agency;

(2) to hire, promote, transfer, assign, and retain employees in positions within the agency; and to suspend, demote, discharge, or take other disciplinary action against employees;

(3) to relieve employees from duties because of lack of work or for other legitimate reasons;

(4) to maintain the efficiency of the Government operations entrusted to them;

(5) to determine the methods, means, and personnel by which such operations are to be conducted; and

(6) to take whatever actions may be necessary to carry out the mission of the agency in situations of emergency; and

(c) nothing in the agreement shall require an employee to become or to remain a member of a labor organization, or to pay money to the organization except pursuant to a voluntary, written authorization by a member for the payment of dues through payroll deductions.

The requirements of this section shall be expressly stated in the initial or basic agreement and apply to all supplemental, implementing, subsidiary, or informal agreements between the agency and the organization.

Sec. 13. Grievance procedures. An agreement with a labor organization which is the exclusive representative
of employees in an appropriate unit may provide procedures, applicable only to employees in the unit, for the considera-
tion of employee grievances and of disputes over the inter-
pretation and application of agreements. The procedure for
consideration of employee grievances shall meet the require-
ments for negotiated grievance procedures established by
the Civil Service Commission. A negotiated employee
grievance procedure which conforms to this section, to
applicable laws, and to regulations of the Civil Service
Commission and the agency is the exclusive procedure avail-
able to employees in the unit when the agreement so pro-
vides.

Sec. 14. Arbitration of grievances. (a) Negotiated
procedures may provide for the arbitration of employee
grievances and of disputes over the interpretation or appli-
cation of existing agreements. Negotiated procedures may
not extend arbitration to changes or proposed changes in
agreements or agency policy. Such procedures shall provide
for the invoking of arbitration only with the approval of
the labor organization that has exclusive recognition and,
in the case of an employee grievance, only with the approval
of the employee. The costs of the arbitrator shall be
shared equally by the parties.

(b) Either party may file exceptions to an arbi-
trator's award with the Council, under regulations pre-
scribed by the Council.

Sec. 15. Approval of agreements. An agreement
with a labor organization as the exclusive representative
of employees in a unit is subject to the approval of the
head of the agency or an official designated by him. An
agreement shall be approved if it conforms to applicable
laws, existing published agency policies and regulations
(unless the agency has granted an exception to a policy or
regulation) and regulations of other appropriate authori-
ties. A local agreement subject to a national or other
controlling agreement at a higher level shall be approved
under the procedures of the controlling agreement, or, if
none, under agency regulations.

NEGOTIATION DISPUTES AND IMPASSES

Sec. 16. Negotiation disputes. The Federal Medi-
ation and Conciliation Service shall provide services and
assistance to Federal agencies and labor organizations in
the resolution of negotiation disputes. The Service shall
determine under what circumstances and in what manner it
shall proffer its services.
Sec. 17. Negotiation impasses. When voluntary arrangements, including the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or other third-party mediation, fail to resolve a negotiation impasse, either party may request the Federal Service Impasses Panel to consider the matter. The Panel, in its discretion and under the regulations it prescribes, may consider the matter and may recommend procedures to the parties for the resolution of the impasse or may settle the impasse by appropriate action. Arbitration or third-party fact finding with recommendations to assist in the resolution of an impasse may be used by the parties only when authorized or directed by the Panel.

CONDUCT OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND MANAGEMENT

Sec. 18. Standards of conduct for labor organizations. (a) An agency shall accord recognition only to a labor organization that is free from corrupt influences and influences opposed to basic democratic principles. Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, an organization is not required to prove that it has the required freedom when it is subject to governing requirements adopted by the organization or by a national or international labor organization or federation of labor organizations with which it is affiliated or in which it participates, containing explicit and detailed provisions to which it subscribes calling for --

(1) the maintenance of democratic procedures and practices, including provisions for periodic elections to be conducted subject to recognized safeguards and provisions defining and securing the right of individual members to participation in the affairs of the organization, to fair and equal treatment under the governing rules of the organization, and to fair process in disciplinary proceedings;

(2) the exclusion from office in the organization of persons affiliated with Communist or other totalitarian movements and persons identified with corrupt influences;

(3) the prohibition of business or financial interests on the part of organization officers and agents which conflict with their duty to the organization and its members; and

(4) the maintenance of fiscal integrity in the conduct of the affairs of the organization, including
provision for accounting and financial controls and regular financial reports or summaries to be made available to members.

(b) Notwithstanding the fact that a labor organization has adopted or subscribed to standards of conduct as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, the organization is required to furnish evidence of its freedom from corrupt influences or influences opposed to basic democratic principles when there is reasonable cause to believe that --

(1) the organization has been suspended or expelled from or is subject to other sanction by a parent labor organization or federation of organizations with which it had been affiliated because it has demonstrated an unwillingness or inability to comply with governing requirements comparable in purpose to those required by paragraph (a) of this section; or

(2) the organization is in fact subject to influences that would preclude recognition under this Order.

(c) A labor organization which has or seeks recognition as a representative of employees under this Order shall file financial and other reports, provide for bonding of officials and employees of the organization, and comply with trusteeship and election standards.

(d) The Assistant Secretary shall prescribe the regulations needed to effectuate this section. These regulations shall conform generally to the principles applied to unions in the private sector. Complaints of violations of this section shall be filed with the Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 19. Unfair labor practices. (a) Agency management shall not --

(1) interfere with, restrain, or coerce an employee in the exercise of the rights assured by this Order;

(2) encourage or discourage membership in a labor organization by discrimination in regard to hiring, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment;

(3) sponsor, control, or otherwise assist a labor organization, except that an agency may furnish customary and routine services and facilities under section 23 of this Order when consistent with the best interests of the agency, its employees, and the organization,
and when the services and facilities are furnished, if requested, on an impartial basis to organizations having equivalent status;

(4) discipline or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed a complaint or given testimony under this Order;

(5) refuse to accord appropriate recognition to a labor organization qualified for such recognition; or

(6) refuse to consult, confer, or negotiate with a labor organization as required by this Order.

(b) A labor organization shall not --

(1) interfere with, restrain, or coerce an employee in the exercise of his rights assured by this Order;

(2) attempt to induce agency management to coerce an employee in the exercise of his rights under this Order;

(3) coerce, attempt to coerce, or discipline, fine, or take other economic sanction against a member of the organization as punishment or reprisal for, or for the purpose of hindering or impeding his work performance, his productivity, or the discharge of his duties owed as an officer or employee of the United States;

(4) call or engage in a strike, work stoppage, or slowdown; picket an agency in a labor-management dispute; or condone any such activity by failing to take affirmative action to prevent or stop it;

(5) discriminate against an employee with regard to the terms or conditions of membership because of race, color, creed, sex, age, or national origin; or

(6) refuse to consult, confer, or negotiate with an agency as required by this Order.

(c) A labor organization which is accorded exclusive recognition shall not deny membership to any employee in the appropriate unit except for failure to meet reasonable occupational standards uniformly required for admissions, or for failure to tender initiation fees and dues uniformly required as a condition of acquiring and retaining membership. This paragraph does not preclude a labor organization
from enforcing discipline in accordance with procedures under its constitution or by-laws which conform to the requirements of this Order.

(d) When the issue in a complaint of an alleged violation of paragraph (a)(1), (2), or (4) of this section is subject to an established grievance or appeals procedure, that procedure is the exclusive procedure for resolving the complaint. All other complaints of alleged violations of this section initiated by an employee, an agency, or a labor organization, that cannot be resolved by the parties, shall be filed with the Assistant Secretary.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 20. Use of official time. Solicitation of membership or dues, and other internal business of a labor organization, shall be conducted during the non-duty hours of the employees concerned. Employees who represent a recognized labor organization shall not be on official time when negotiating an agreement with agency management.

Sec. 21. Allotment of dues. (a) When a labor organization holds formal or exclusive recognition, and the organization agree in writing to this course of action, an agency may deduct the regular and periodic dues of the organization from the pay of members of the organization in the unit of recognition who make a voluntary allotment for that purpose, and shall recover the costs of making the deductions. Such an allotment is subject to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission, which shall include provision for the employee to revoke his authorization at stated six-month intervals. Such an allotment terminates when --

(1) the dues withholding agreement between the agency and the labor organization is terminated or ceases to be applicable to the employee; or

(2) the employee has been suspended or expelled from the labor organization.

(b) An agency may deduct the regular and periodic dues of an association of management officials or supervisors from the pay of members of the association who make a voluntary allotment for that purpose, and shall recover the costs of making the deductions, when the agency and the association agree in writing to this course of action. Such an allotment is subject to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.
Sec. 22. Adverse action appeals. The head of each agency, in accordance with the provisions of this Order and regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, shall extend to all employees in the competitive civil service rights identical in adverse action cases to those provided preference eligibles under sections 7511-7512 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each employee in the competitive service shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of the administrative officer so acting, such appeal to be processed in an identical manner to that provided for appeals under section 7701 of title 5 of the United States Code. Any recommendation by the Civil Service Commission submitted to the head of an agency on the basis of an appeal by an employee in the competitive service shall be complied with by the head of the agency.

Sec. 23. Agency implementation. No later than April 1, 1970, each agency shall issue appropriate policies and regulations consistent with this Order for its implementation. This includes but is not limited to a clear statement of the rights of its employees under this Order; procedures with respect to recognition of labor organizations, determination of appropriate units, consultation and negotiation with labor organizations, approval of agreements, mediation, and impasse resolution; policies with respect to the use of agency facilities by labor organizations; and policies and practices regarding consultation with other organizations and associations and individual employees. Insofar as practicable, agencies shall consult with representatives of labor organizations in the formulation of these policies and regulations, other than those for the implementation of section 7(e) of this Order.

Sec. 24. Savings clauses. (a) This Order does not preclude --

(1) the renewal or continuation of a lawful agreement between an agency and a representative of its employees entered into before the effective date of Executive Order No. 10988 (January 17, 1962); or

(2) the renewal, continuation, or initial according of recognition for units of management officials or supervisors represented by labor organizations which historically or traditionally represent the management officials or supervisors in private industry and which hold exclusive recognition for units of such officials or supervisors in any agency on the data of this Order.
(b) All grants of informal recognition under Executive Order No. 10988 terminate on July 1, 1970.

(c) All grants of formal recognition under Executive Order No. 10988 terminate under regulations which the Federal Labor Relations Council shall issue before October 1, 1970.

(d) By not later than December 31, 1970, all supervisors shall be excluded from units of formal and exclusive recognition and from coverage by negotiated agreements, except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

Sec. 25. Guidance, training, review and information. (a) The Civil Service Commission shall establish and maintain a program for the guidance of agencies on labor-management relations in the Federal service; provide technical advice and information to agencies; assist in the development of programs for training agency personnel and management officials in labor-management relations; continuously review the operation of the Federal labor-management relations program to assist in assuring adherence to its provisions and merit system requirements; and, from time to time, report to the Council on the state of the program with any recommendations for its improvement.

(b) The Department of Labor and the Civil Service Commission shall develop programs for the collection and dissemination of information appropriate to the needs of agencies, organizations and the public.

Sec. 26. Effective date. This Order is effective on January 1, 1970, except sections 7(f) and 8 which are effective immediately. Effective January 1, 1970, Executive Order No. 10988 and the President's Memorandum of May 21, 1963, entitled Standards of Conduct for Employee Organizations and Code of Fair Labor Practices, are revoked.

RICHARD NIXON

THE WHITE HOUSE

October 29, 1969.
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EXECUTIVE ORDER 11616

THE WHITE HOUSE

AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11491, RELATING TO
LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including sections 3301 and 7301 of title 5 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, Executive Order No. 11491 of October 29, 1969, relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service, is amended as follows:

1. Section 2(b) is amended by deleting the words "formal or".

2. Paragraph (2) of section 2(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) assists or participates in a strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, or imposes a duty or obligation to conduct, assist, or participate in such a strike;"

3. Section 4(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is hereby established the Federal Labor Relations Council, which consists of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who shall be chairman of the council, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and such other officials of the executive branch as the President may designate from time to time. The Civil Service Commission shall provide administrative support and services to the Council to the extent authorized by law."

4. Section 6(a) is amended--

(a) by deleting the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3).
(b) by substituting for paragraph (4) the following:
"(4) decide unfair labor practice complaints and alleged violations of the standards of conduct for labor organizations; and"

(c) by adding at the end thereof the following:
"(5) decide questions as to whether a grievance is subject to a negotiated grievance procedure or subject to arbitration under an agreement."

5. Section 7(d) is amended to read as follows:
"(d) Recognition of a labor organization does not --
"(1) preclude an employee, regardless of whether he is in a unit of exclusive recognition, from exercising grievance or appellate rights established by law or regulations; or from choosing his own representative in a grievance or appellate action, except when presenting a grievance under a negotiated procedure as provided in section 13;
"(2) preclude or restrict consultations and dealings between an agency and a veterans organization with respect to matters of particular interest to employees with veterans preference; or
"(3) preclude an agency from consulting or dealing with a religious, social, fraternal, professional or other lawful association, not qualified as a labor organization, with respect to matters or policies which involve individual members of the association or are of particular applicability to it or its members.
Consultations and dealings under subparagraph (3) of this paragraph shall be so limited that they do not assume the character of formal consultation on matters of general employee-management policy, except as provided in paragraph (e) of this section, or extend to areas where recognition of the interests of one employee group may result in discrimination against or injury to the interests of other employees."

6. Section 7(f) is amended to read as follows:
"(f) Informal recognition or formal recognition shall not be accorded."

7. Section 8 is revoked.

8. Section 13 is amended to read as follows:
"Sec. 13. Grievance and arbitration procedures. "a) An agreement between an agency and a labor organization shall provide a procedure, applicable only to the unit, for the consideration of grievances over the
interpretation or application of the agreement. A negotiated grievance procedure may not cover any other matters, including matters for which statutory appeals procedures exist, and shall be the exclusive procedure available to the parties and the employees in the unit for resolving such grievances. However, any employee or group of employees in the unit may present such grievances to the agency and have them adjusted, without the intervention of the exclusive representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of the agreement and the exclusive representative has been given opportunity to be present at the adjustment.

"(b) A negotiated procedure may provide for the arbitration of grievances over the interpretation or application of the agreement, but not over any other matters. Arbitration may be invoked only by the agency or the exclusive representative. Either party may file exceptions to an arbitrator's award with the Council, under regulations prescribed by the Council.

"(c) Grievances initiated by an employee or group of employees in the unit on matters other than the interpretation or application of an existing agreement may be presented under any procedure available for the purpose.

"(d) Questions that cannot be resolved by the parties as to whether or not a grievance is on a matter subject to the grievance procedure in an existing agreement, or is subject to arbitration under that agreement, may be referred to the Assistant Secretary for decision.

"(e) No agreement may be established, extended, or renewed after the effective date of this Order which does not conform to this section. However, this section is not applicable to agreements entered into before the effective date of this Order."

9. Section 14 is revoked.

10. Section 19(d) is amended to read as follows:
"(d) Issues which can properly be raised under an appeals procedure may not be raised under this section. Issues which can be raised under a grievance procedure may, in the discretion of the aggrieved party, be raised under that procedure or the complaint procedure under this section, but not under both procedures. Appeals or grievance decisions shall not be construed as unfair labor practice decisions under this Order nor as precedent for such decisions. All complaints under this section that cannot be resolved by the parties shall be filed with the Assistant Secretary."

11. Section 20 is amended to read as follows:
"Sec. 20. Use of official time. Solicitation
of membership or dues, and other internal business of a labor organization, shall be conducted during the non-duty hours of the employees concerned. Employees who represent a recognized labor organization shall not be on official time when negotiating an agreement with agency management, except to the extent that the negotiating parties agree to other arrangements which may provide that the agency will either authorize official time for up to 40 hours or authorize up to one-half the time spent in negotiations during regular working hours, for a reasonable number of employees, which number normally shall not exceed the number of management representatives."

12. Section 21 is amended to read as follows:
"Sec. 21. Allotment of dues. (a) When a labor organization holds exclusive recognition, and the agency and the organization agree in writing to this course of action, an agency may deduct the regular and periodic dues of the organization from the pay of members of the organization in the unit of recognition who make a voluntary allotment for that purpose. Such an allotment is subject to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission, which shall include provision for the employee to revoke his authorization at stated six-month intervals. Such an allotment terminates when --

"(1) the dues withholding agreement between the agency and the labor organization is terminated or ceases to be applicable to the employee; or

"(2) the employee has been suspended or expelled from the labor organization.

"(b) An agency may deduct the regular and periodic dues of an association of management officials or supervisors from the pay of members of the association who make a voluntary allotment for that purpose, when the agency and the association agree in writing to this course of action. Such an allotment is subject to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission."

13. Section 24 is amended by deleting "(a) after the section heading; and by deleting subsections (b), (c), and (d)."

14. Section 25(a) is amended to read as follows: "(a) The Civil Service Commission, in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish and maintain a program for the policy guidance of agencies on labor-management relations in the Federal service and periodically review the implementation of those
policies. The Civil Service Commission shall continuously review the operation of the Federal labor-management relations program to assist in assuring adherence to its provisions and merit system requirements; implement technical advice and information programs for the agencies; assist in the development of programs for training agency personnel and management officials in labor-management relations; and, from time to time, report to the Council on the state of the program with any recommendations for its improvement."

The amendments made by this Order shall become effective ninety days from this date. Each agency shall issue appropriate policies and regulations consistent with this Order for its implementation.

RICHARD NIXON

THE WHITE HOUSE

August 26, 1971.
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EXECUTIVE ORDER 11838

AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11491, AS AMENDED BY EXECUTIVE ORDERS 11616 AND 11636, RELATING TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

THE WHITE HOUSE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including sections 3301 and 7301 of title 5 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, Executive Order No. 11491 of October 29, 1969, as amended by Executive Orders 11616 and 11636, relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service, is further amended as follows:

1. Section 2(c) is amended by deleting the words "or to evaluate their performance, ".

2. Section 2(d) is revoked.

3. Paragraph (1) of section 4(c) is amended to read as follows:
"(1) appeals from decisions of the Assistant Secretary issued pursuant to section 6 of this Order, except where, in carrying out his authority under section 11(d), he makes a negotiability determination, in which instance the party adversely affected shall have a right to appeal; ".

4. Paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 6(a) are amended to read as follows:
"(4) decide unfair labor practice complaints (including those where an alleged unilateral act by one of the parties requires an initial negotiability determination) and alleged violations of the standards of conduct for labor organizations; and

"(5) decide questions as to whether a grievance is subject to a negotiated grievance procedure or subject to arbitration under an agreement as provided in section 13(d) of the Order."
5. Section 7(d) is amended to read as follows:
"(d) Recognition of a labor organization does not—
(1) preclude an employee, regardless of whether
he is in a unit of exclusive recognition, from exercising
grievance or appellate rights established by law or regu-
lation, or from choosing his own representative in a
grievance or appellate action, except when the grievance
is covered under a negotiated procedure as provided in
section 13;
(2) preclude or restrict consultations and deal-
ings between an agency and a veterans organization with
respect to matters of particular interest to employees
with veterans preference; or
(3) preclude an agency from consulting or deal-
ing with a religious, social, fraternal, professional or
other lawful association, not qualified as a labor organi-
zation, with respect to matters or policies which involve
individual members of the association or are of particular
applicability to it or its members.
Consultations and dealings under subparagraph (3)
of this paragraph shall be so limited that they do not
assume the character of formal consultation on matters of
general employee-management policy covering employees in
that unit or extend to areas where recognition of the
interests of one employee group may result in discrimina-
tion against or injury to the interests of other employees."

6. Section 7(e) is revoked.

7. Section 9(b) is amended by substituting the word
"consult" for the word "confer" in the third sentence
thereof.

8. Section 10(a) is amended to read as follows:
"(a) An agency shall accord exclusive recognition to
a labor organization when the organization has been selected,
in a secret ballot election, by a majority of the employees
in an appropriate unit as their representative; provided
that this section shall not preclude an agency from accord-
ing exclusive recognition to a labor organization, without
an election, where the appropriate unit is established
through the consolidation of existing exclusively recog-
nized units represented by that organization."

9. Paragraph (2) of section 10(b) is amended by
adding at the end thereof the word "or".

10. Paragraph (3) of section 10(b) is revoked.
11. Section 10(c) is revoked.

12. Section 10(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) All elections shall be conducted under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary, or persons delegated by him, and shall be by secret ballot. Each employee eligible to vote shall be provided the opportunity to choose the labor organization he wishes to represent him, from among those on the ballot, or 'no union', except as provided in subparagraph (4) of this paragraph. Elections may be held to determine whether—

(1) a labor organization should be recognized as the exclusive representative of employees in a unit;

(2) a labor organization should replace another labor organization as the exclusive representative;

(3) a labor organization should cease to be the exclusive representative; or

(4) a labor organization should be recognized as the exclusive representative of employees in a unit composed of employees in units currently represented by that labor organization or continue to be recognized in the existing separate units."

13. Section 11 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. Negotiation of agreements. (a) An agency and a labor organization that has been accorded exclusive recognition through appropriate representatives shall meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to personnel policies and practices and matters affecting working conditions, so far as may be appropriate under applicable laws and regulations including policies set forth in the Federal Personnel Manual; published agency policies and regulations for which a compelling need exists under criteria established by the Federal Labor Relations Council and which are issued at the agency headquarters level or at the level of a primary national subdivision; a national or other controlling agreement at a higher level in the agency; and this Order. They may negotiate an agreement, or any question arising thereunder; determine appropriate techniques, consistent with section 17 of this Order, to assist in such negotiation; and execute a written agreement or memorandum of understanding.

(b) In prescribing regulations relating to personnel policies and practices and working conditions, an agency shall have due regard for the obligation imposed by paragraph (a) of this section. However, the obligation to meet and confer does not include matters with respect to the mission of an agency; its budget; its
organization; the number of employees, and the numbers, types, and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organizational unit, work project or tour of duty; the technology of performing its work; or its internal security work project or tour of duty; the technology of performing its work; or its internal security practices. This does not preclude the parties from negotiating agreements providing appropriate arrangements for employees adversely affected by the impact of realignment of work forces or technological change.

"(c) If, in connection with negotiations, an issue develops as to whether a proposal is contrary to law, regulation, controlling agreement, or this Order and therefore not negotiable, it shall be resolved as follows:

(1) An issue which involves interpretation of a controlling agreement at a higher agency level is resolved under the procedures of the controlling agreement, or, if none, under agency regulations;

(2) An issue other than as described in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph which arises at a local level may be referred by either party to the head of the agency for determination;

(3) An agency head's determination as to the interpretation of the agency's regulations with respect to a proposal is final;

(4) A labor organization may appeal to the Council for a decision when--

(i) it disagrees with an agency head's determination that a proposal would violate applicable law, regulation of appropriate authority outside the agency, or this Order, or

(ii) it believes that an agency's regulations, as interpreted by the agency head, violate applicable law regulation of appropriate authority outside the agency, or this Order, or are not otherwise applicable to bar negotiations under paragraph (a) of this section.

"(d) If, as the result of an alleged unilateral change in, or addition to, personnel policies and practices or matters affecting working conditions, the acting party is charged with a refusal to consult, confer or negotiate as required under this Order, the Assistant Secretary may, in the exercise of his authority under Section 6(a)(4) of the Order, make those determinations of negotiability as may be necessary to resolve the merits of the alleged unfair labor practice. In such cases the party subject to an adverse ruling may appeal the Assistant Secretary's negotiability determination to the Council."

14. Section 13 is amended to read as follows:
"Sec. 13. Grievance and arbitration procedures.
(a) An agreement between an agency and a labor organization shall provide a procedure, applicable only to the unit for the consideration of grievances. The coverage and scope of the procedure shall be negotiated by the parties to the agreement with the exception that it may not cover matters for which a statutory appeal procedure exists and so long as it does not otherwise conflict with statute or this Order. It shall be the exclusive procedure available to the parties and the employees in the unit for resolving grievances which fall within its coverage. However, any employee or group of employees in the unit may present such grievances to the agency and have them adjusted, without the intervention of the exclusive representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of the agreement and the exclusive representative has been given opportunity to be present at the adjustment.
(b) A negotiated procedure may provide for arbitration of grievances. Arbitration may be invoked only by the agency or the exclusive representative. Either party may file exceptions to an arbitrator's award with the Council, under regulations prescribed by the Council.
(c) [Revoked.]
(d) Questions that cannot be resolved by the parties as to whether or not a grievance is on a matter for which a statutory appeal procedure exists, shall be referred to the Assistant Secretary for decision. Other questions as to whether or not a grievance is on a matter subject to the grievance procedure in an existing agreement, or is subject to arbitration under that agreement, may by agreement of the parties be submitted to arbitration or may be referred to the Assistant Secretary for decision."
(e) [Revoked.]

15. Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. Approval of agreements. An agreement with a labor organization as the exclusive representative of employees in a unit is subject to the approval of the head of the agency or an official designated by him. An agreement shall be approved within forty-five days from the date of its execution if it conforms to applicable laws, the Order, existing published agency policies and regulations (unless the agency has granted an exception to a policy or regulation) and regulations of other appropriate authorities. An agreement which has not been approved or disapproved within forty-five days from the date of its execution shall go into effect without the required approval of the agency head and shall be binding on the parties subject to the provisions of law, the Order and
the regulations of appropriate authorities outside the agency. A local agreement subject to a national or other controlling agreement at a higher level shall be approved under the procedures of the controlling agreement, or, if none, under agency regulations.

16. Section 21(b) is revoked.

17. Section 23 is amended by deleting at the end thereof the following:

"other than those for the implementation of section 7(e) of this Order".

The amendments made by this Order shall become effective ninety days from this date except that the amendments to sections 11(a) and 11(c) shall not become effective until ninety days after issuance by the Federal Labor Relations Council of the criteria for determining compelling need. Each agency shall issue appropriate policies and regulations consistent with this Order for its implementation.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 6, 1975.
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