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ABSTRACT

The thesis examines small firm workers in terms of three main areas:

(i) the process of becoming a small firm worker;
(ii) meanings and social relations associated with working in the small firm;
(iii) participation in non-work social relations and world-views.

Previous research on small firm workers argued that they developed a distinct set of orientations leading them to choose working in small rather than large firms. Within the firm, shopfloor workers were held to be highly involved in their jobs and to enjoy close personal relations with owner-managers. Outside work, small firm workers were assumed to be more integrated into the community and to have a deferential image of society.

To test these views, 145 male shopfloor and supervisory workers in eight small firms were interviewed and their views compared to those of 88 equivalent workers in two large firms. Forty executives in the small and large firms were also interviewed. The ten firms were drawn equally from the printing and electronics industries which were chosen for the contrast they provided on such aspects as size distribution of establishments, rate of technological change and trade union density.

The results show that not only are several of the above views questionable but that seeing the small firm worker as having a fixed set of orientations is also inadequate. Rather he should be seen as a distinct social type with considerable variation in attitudes and behaviour related to a specific set of experiences, influences and social relationships. The small firm worker cannot, therefore, be simply defined in terms of the presence or absence of characteristics held to be distinctive of large firm workers. Theoretically, it is shown that orientations must be closely linked to situational constraints arising out of relations with significant others, the industrial sub-culture and the local economic and social order.
# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

- Sociology and the Small Firm
  - A Resurgence of Interest
  - Problems of Defining the Small Firm
  - The Economic Importance of the Small Firm
  - Previous Research on the Small Firm and the Small Firm Worker
  - The Aims of the Present Research

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

## CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

### INTRODUCTION

- The Social Action Perspective
- Some Problems of the Social Action Perspective
- Methodological Issues
- Specific Theoretical Constructs

### THE SAMPLES

- The Sample Industries
- The Sample Firms
- The Sample Respondents

### THE SHOPFLOOR AND SUPERVISORY WORKER QUESTIONNAIRES

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

## CHAPTER 3. BECOMING A SMALL FIRM WORKER

### INTRODUCTION

- Sociological Theories of Occupational Placement
- Occupational Placement and the Small Firm Worker

### THE OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF THE SAMPLE

### THE FIRST JOB EVER

- Reasons for Taking the First Job Ever
- Leaving the First Job Ever

### A SECOND MAIN JOB

- Reasons for Taking the Second Main Job
| Reasons for Leaving the Second Main Job | 105 |
| CONSISTENCY AND REASONS FOR JOB CHANGING | 106 |
| Job Change Decisions and Consistency: the Main Sample | 109 |
| Job Change Decisions and Consistency: the Control Sample | 111 |
| THE PENULTIMATE JOB | 114 |
| Reasons for Taking the Penultimate Job | 116 |
| Reasons for Leaving the Penultimate Job | 119 |
| ENTERING THE JOB HELD AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW | 122 |
| Consistency, Orientations and the Job Held at the Time of Interview | 127 |
| AN OVERALL VIEW | 129 |
| Entering the World of Work | 129 |
| Employers and Occupational Placement | 131 |
| Other Influences on Occupational Placement | 133 |
| The Importance of the Industrial Sub-Culture | 134 |
| Orientations and the Adjustment to Work Experience | 139 |
| The Importance of Changing Jobs | 140 |
| REFERENCES AND NOTES | 143 |

**CHAPTER 4. ATTITUDES TO CURRENT JOB AND FIRM**

**INTRODUCTION**

**JOB EXPECTATIONS AND JOB SATISFACTION**

- Physical Fatigue
- Nervous Strain
- Boredom
- Job Expectations
- Extrinsic/Intrinsic Responses
- Job Satisfaction and Present Job
- Thinking About Work at Home

**PATTERNS OF HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL INTERACTION IN THE SMALL FIRM**

- Existing Views of Social Relations in the Small Firm
- Horizontal Interaction in the Small Firm
- Vertical Interaction in the Small Firm
- Worker-Supervisor Relations
- Workers' Relations with Owner-Managers
ATTITUDES TO PROMOTION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Attitudes to Promotion 184
Attitudes Towards Entrepreneurship 187

MATERIAL REWARDS AND THE SMALL FIRM

Objective Aspects of Material Rewards 192
Subjective Aspects of Material Rewards 196

ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNIONISM AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Union Membership in the Sample Firms 201
Effectiveness of Trade Union and Size of Firm 203
Attitudes to Unions in Non-Union Firms 204
Management-Worker Relations: Conflict and Consensus 205
Attitudes to Striking 207

TRADE UNIONS, INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND THE WIDER SOCIETY

Attitudes to Other Workers Striking 210
The Power of Trade Unions in Society 212
Attitudes to the 1971 Industrial Relations Act 214

CONCLUSIONS: AN OVERALL VIEW OF ORIENTATIONS TO THE JOB, THE FIRM AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Expectations and Satisfactions 218
Horizontal and Vertical Social Relations Within the Firm 223
Promotion and Getting Ahead 233
Material Rewards 234
Industrial Relations 237

REFERENCES AND NOTES

CHAPTER 5. COMMUNITY, POLITICS AND SOCIAL CLASS

INTRODUCTION

THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES

Community Integration 251
Political Allegiance 253
Defence and Class Consciousness 253

COMMUNITY

The Social Environment of the Sample 256
Geographical Mobility 260
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership of Clubs and Associations</th>
<th>261</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Associations and Social Class</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Non-Kin and Kin</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Newspaper Readership and Interest in Local Activities</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatisation and Non-Work Social Life</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLITICS**

| Voting Behaviour | 272 |
| Voting and Age | 276 |
| Voting and Trade Union Membership | 278 |
| Consistency and Voting Behaviour | 280 |
| Differences Between the Main Parties | 282 |
| Influencing the Political Process | 284 |
| The Locus of Influence in Society | 286 |
| Significant Political Others | 288 |

**SOCIAL CLASS**

| Self-Rated Social Class | 302 |
| Self-Rated Social Class and Politics | 304 |
| Self-Rated Social Class and Industrial Relations | 306 |
| Number of Classes in Society | 308 |
| Social Class Labelling | 310 |
| Criteria of Social Class Membership | 312 |
| Criteria of Class Membership and Age | 314 |
| The Structure of Social Classes: Two Class Models | 316 |
| The Structure of Three Class Models | 318 |
| More Complex Models of Class | 320 |
| Social Mobility | 322 |
| A Final View of Class Imagery | 324 |

**CONCLUSIONS: AN OVERALL VIEW OF COMMUNITY, POLITICS AND SOCIAL CLASS**

| Community Participation | 334 |
| Participation in Local Associations | 336 |
| Other Non-Kin and Kin Relations | 338 |
| Leisure Activities and Local Newspaper Reading | 340 |
| Political Behaviour and Orientations | 342 |
| Aspects of Political Influence | 344 |
| Social Class Imagery | 346 |

**REFERENCES AND NOTES**

| 348 |
I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Professor Asher Tropp for the sympathetic and very encouraging supervision he gave throughout the research for and writing of this thesis.
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Sociology and the Small Firm

Manual workers generally have received a great deal of attention from industrial sociologists yet the small firm manual worker has been given comparatively little of this attention. This is surprising when it is realised that, even on a conservative definition, 90% of economic establishments in Britain would be described as 'small'.

There are a number of possible reasons for this neglect but two reasons may be suggested as of some importance.

First, the founding fathers of sociology were consistently more interested in the emergence of large-scale organisations in modern society and either explicitly or implicitly, saw the small enterprise as characteristic of an early phase of the development of industrial society, destined soon to disappear. Perhaps this is most apparent in the works of Weber and Marx. Weber saw the large bureaucracy as a defining characteristic of industrial societies and argued that this kind of organisation would increasingly permeate all spheres of social life, squeezing out older, particularistic, smaller organisations.

Marx, even more explicitly, argued that the small enterprise associated with early capitalism would give way to an ever increasing concentration of ownership and the development of large-scale enterprise as a result of the inexorable operation of capitalist market forces. Contemporary Marxist writers continue to emphasise this process and the large-scale enterprise, consigning the small firm to the periphery of the economy and society.

Similarly, the main thrust of Durkheim's most influential ideas emphasises a shift from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity. This involves a transformation from social integration based on essentially similar, undifferentiated social relations, to social integration linked with a widespread division of labour of which the large enterprise is a prime example. Like Marx and Weber, Durkheim emphasised a further theme in discussions of the small enterprise which, as will be seen, is echoed in the recent revival of interest in the small firm, that is, that the large firm has higher levels of anomie and impersonality than the small firm.

A second reason for the neglect of the small firm and its workers
involves practical problems of research. Small firms are difficult to gain entry into for research and the 'pay-off' from each successful entry tends, by definition, to be a small sample. Small firm owner-managers are not, on the whole, well educated or likely to have been exposed to the 'behavioural science' perspective which forms part of the professional training of the modern manager in the large enterprise. The world-view of the small firm owner-manager has been repeatedly found to stress independence, a dislike of large organisations (particularly those associated with government) and a dislike of theory as opposed to practice. He tends, therefore, not to share the vocabulary of social science or be particularly sympathetic to requests for co-operation in academic research from representatives of large, quasi-governmental organisations.

Moreover, the typical small firm executive has less time to give to researchers. His role is generally multi-functional compared to that of the large firm executive and, equally, the small firm worker's role is one where absence from the task may disrupt production in a way which would not normally occur in the large enterprise. The small firm executive may also be nervous about the effects on worker-management relations of allowing 'outsiders' to question employees.

**A Resurgence of Interest**

Nevertheless, there has recently been a resurgence of interest in the small firm and the small firm worker. This results from a combination of several influences. Probably, the most general is a mounting disenchantment with the alleged benefits of growth and economic concentration which were very much the vogue in the 1960's. Several authors have attacked the previously fashionable idea that economies of scale more than outweighed any negative effects of size. A second influence has been the active seeking of alternative social arrangements to those of the large bureaucratic organisation. The increased interest in the small firm as an alternative economic unit, has connections with the increased interest in communes, industrial democracy and the quality of working life in general. In a vague way, the stereotype view of the small firm is seen as closer to these alternatives than the large enterprise.

This rather romantic view of the small enterprise and its associated social relations, was well exemplified, for example, in the work of Schumacher. He argued, on ecological and other grounds, that we should return to an economy based on small-scale, easily applied technology,
which would also allow individuals to satisfy their creative needs:

"Small-scale operations, no matter how numerous, are always less likely to be harmful to the natural environment than large-scale ones, simply because their individual force is small in relation to the recuperative forces of nature. There is wisdom in smallness if only on account of the smallness and patchiness of human knowledge, which relies on the experiment far more than on understanding." (11)

Such a view conveniently overlooks the impact on the environment and quality of life of the population, of the excesses of 19th century industrialism largely based upon a small firm economy. At the human level he argued, with a host of other observers:

"...most of the sociologists and psychologists insistently warn us of its [the trend towards increasingly large organisations] inherent dangers - dangers to the integrity of the individual when he feels as nothing more than a small cog in a vast machine and when the human relationships of his daily working life become increasingly dehumanised..." (12)

He advocated turning large-scale enterprises into 'quasi-firms', that is, collections of semi-autonomous units, whenever it is desirable to retain some of the advantages of size. But the independent, small enterprise is seen as the ideal arrangement:

"In small-scale enterprise, private ownership is natural, fruitful and just." (13)

But we may question whether quasi-firms of the kind advocated, do give individual participants a feeling they work for a small organisation and whether small-scale enterprise really does escape the disadvantages of the large enterprise to the extent that writers like Schumacher appear to think.

It might be argued, for example, that the small firm in the modern economy is, in many ways, more capitalistic than the large-scale enterprise. The basis of internal relations within the firm is the effort-bargain between employer and employee; in a free enterprise economy all other relations must be secondary to this selling and buying of labour. But in the large firm this relationship may be masked in a number of ways. For example, large firms are more likely to emphasise non-monetary aspects of personnel relations through fringe benefits ranging from discount purchasing to extended sick pay and subsidised meals. The small firm, on the other hand, is often by virtue of its smallness, unable to afford such benefits. The large firm through its product mix (usually wider than that of the small firm) and ability to manage the market environment, is able to offer greater employment security and predictable earning levels resulting from a more even flow of work than the small firm.
Earlier the world-view of the small firm owner-manager was mentioned, a world-view which, in many respects, is closer to a 19th century laissez-faire ideology than the world-view of the modern, large firm manager. The small firm owner-manager is more likely to define worker-manager relations in terms of paternalistic, autocratic views which reject trade unions and other modern emphases on worker autonomy. The small firm work environment is strongly influenced by the owner-manager world-view and accordingly:

"The organisation has usually a poorly defined or poorly used control and information system (no sharing of information); there is an absence of standard procedures and rules and a lack of formalisation. Instead, we noticed the use of subjective, personal criteria for the purpose of measurement and control. Job descriptions and job responsibilities are poorly defined or non-existent. This situation contributes to a high incidence of role conflict and role ambiguity leading to low job satisfaction, low self-confidence, a high degree of job-related tension ... and low confidence in the organisation." (14)

While this may be a somewhat over-generalised characterisation, it reflects many of the research findings on the world-view of the small firm owner-manager. For the employee, working in a small firm may be an experience far removed from the stereotype view of the small firm which equates physical proximity of employer and employee with good interpersonal relations and the elimination of problems related to the negotiation of an effort-bargain between seller and buyer.

The revival of interest in the small firm is also evident in other ways. The Department of Industry publishes a Small Firms Register of Research (15), the latest of which, lists over 100 projects. A national daily newspaper has established a weekly small business section. (16) A recent survey of studies of size and organisation structure reports that, while in the period 1965-1969 there were 20 studies, in the period 1970-1974 there were 48. (17) One of the most important influences in increasing interest in the small firm was undoubtedly the setting up of the Bolton Committee in 1969 by the then President of the Board of Trade, to consider the role of small firms in the economy. The report was published in November 1971 (18) and received wide publicity. Directly and indirectly, it has inspired a number of research projects. (19)

Problems of Defining the Small Firm

Defining the small firm for research purposes is no easy task. The existing literature is vague, contradictory or simply evasive. Partly this is due to problems inherent in any discussion of the small firm and partly to the differing aims of writers on the subject. The most influential discussion of the problems of defining the small firm is
that offered by the Bolton Report. The terms of reference of the Committee defined the small firm as "one with not more than 200 employees" but added, "this should not be regarded as a rigid definition". The Committee quickly found that:

"... a small firm could not be adequately defined in terms of employment or assets, turnover, output or any other arbitrary single quantity, nor would the same definition be appropriate throughout the economy." (21)

Nevertheless, at a general level, the Committee concluded that the small firm had three main characteristics:

"Firstly, in economic terms, a small firm is one that has a relatively small share of its market. Secondly, an essential characteristic of the small firm is that it is managed by its owner or part-owners in a personalised way, and not through the medium of a formalised management structure. Thirdly, it is also independent in the sense that it does not form part of a larger enterprise and that the owner-managers should be free from outside control in taking their principal decisions." (22)

This definition is relatively easy to criticise on several points. For example, many small firms have large, even dominant shares of their markets. Small firms often specialise in providing products or services in areas where, for a variety of reasons, other firms, small or large, choose not to compete. Or again, 'independent' is a highly relative term and legal independence of the small firm may still not allow owner-managers to take major decisions 'free from outside control' where, as is sometimes the case, a small firm is highly dependent on a large firm for a market for its products. More seriously, as the Committee admitted, their definition could not be operationalised since insufficient data is available on the management, organisational structure and market shares of British firms. Instead, an arbitrary definition based upon available statistics was selected for each of nine economic sectors. (23) In several instances, such as retailing and motor trades, the definition was based upon the annual sales turnover of the enterprise. (24) In others, such as road transport, it was based on the number of vehicles used. In manufacturing the Committee chose to stay with its terms of reference definition of '200 employees or less'.

Sociologically, a definition based on such a simple criteria as numbers employed is unlikely to be satisfactory for it takes no account of organisational structure which may vary considerably for organisations of a given size. More important, any definition of the small firm based solely upon the numbers employed, excludes the meanings and definitions of those participating. It was argued earlier that, the dominant role in the small firm is often filled by individuals with a
highly distinct world-view which, in turn, is likely to impinge sharply on the meanings and definitions of other participants.\(^{25}\)

Size may be associated with a wide range of other aspects of the firm and the usual assumption is that such associations are clear and unambiguous. However, such assumptions require careful examination. In the present research an initial position was taken that any such associations had to be empirically established and that it was entirely possible that for some actors, aspects associated with size might not occupy a central position in their definition of work.

At the preliminary stage of the present research, the Bolton Committee's definition of the small firm as one employing 200 or less was, despite the above doubts, adopted. It was thought that the Committee must have had at least some reasonable grounds for the figure chosen and that (as proved correct) it was likely to be influential on other research and theorising on the small firm. This would increase the comparability of the present research with other findings.

Other research has not, however, always used this upper size limit to define the small firm. Ingham, for example, in an important study of small firm workers completed before the Bolton Committee reported, adopted an upper limit of 'less than 100 employees'.\(^{26}\) In an Institute of Personnel Management sponsored text on personnel problems in the small firm published at about the same time, the authors stated that they had "in mind the firm with under 500 employees".\(^{27}\) Batstone in his research, also completed before the Bolton Report was published, again employed a definition of 'less than 100 employees'.\(^{28}\)

In the analysis of findings from the present study, the original definition of '200 workers or less' has been retained although not without reservations. By the end of the fieldwork the researcher had become convinced that by the time a firm employs nearly 200 people it has more in common, in some ways at least, with a large firm rather than the small firm employing, say, 50 people. But given the crudity of such simple statistical definitions of size and their neglect of the more sociological aspects of the firm (as well as the connections between the two) over-concentration on this issue seems unnecessary. There is no one magic number of persons involved which sociologically demarcates the 'small' from the 'large' business firm. (This point will be discussed further when a preliminary examination of previous thinking on the social correlates of the small firm is introduced later in this chapter).
The Economic Importance of the Small Firm

The striking point to emerge from the Bolton Committee's research was that, on the definitions selected, in all nine economic sectors small firms comprised 85% or more of all firms and in four sectors it was 90% or more. In manufacturing, 94% of all firms employed 200 employees or less and the average small firm employed only 25 persons. In employment terms, one in five workers in manufacturing industries worked in such firms producing 16% of manufacturing output. Altogether, the Committee estimated that there were 320,000 small firms in the industries covered by their enquiry employing 4.4 million persons. (29)

The most recent available published figures are those from the 1972 Census of Production. As Table 1.1 shows, they suggest that, in manufacturing, there are almost 69,000 small firms employing 200 employees or less with almost 30% of the labour force in this sector working in such firms. Between them they produce almost a quarter of manufacturing gross output (excluding public sector enterprises). These figures understate the numbers working in small establishments because many of the latter are subsidiaries of larger firms and thus do not qualify as small 'enterprises'. According to the Census, there are 80,288 establishments making up the total number of enterprises shown in the Table. (30)

On these figures it is clear that the small firm is of considerable importance in the British economy on both employment and output criteria. The data in Table 1.1, indeed, may be said considerably to underestimate the importance of the small firm in the economy in at least two ways. First, in many areas of economic activity there is little competition between small and large firms because the latter does not operate in a particular market. An obvious example is the small, local jobbing printer. Large printing firms experience disadvantages in operating in such a local market and there are few, if any, economies of scale. Unless a small firm existed, therefore, the local market would probably be very imperfectly served.

Secondly, the simple tabulation of market and employment shares ignores relationships between firms and especially between small and large firms. Many large firms are highly dependent upon small firms for supplies and services that they would find either impossible or administratively very difficult to provide for themselves. For instance, the Bolton Report stated:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Employed</th>
<th>Enterprises (1)</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Gross Output</th>
<th>Operatives (2) as Per Cent of all Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(thousands)</td>
<td>(£ million)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 99</td>
<td>66,119</td>
<td>1,133.7</td>
<td>6,607.0</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>394.4</td>
<td>2,324.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 199</td>
<td>68,971</td>
<td>1,528.1</td>
<td>8,931.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and over</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>3,638.9</td>
<td>41,790.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72,301</td>
<td>5,167.0</td>
<td>50,721.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: (1) An enterprise is defined as "one or more establishments under common ownership or control" p.PA1002 V para.12.
(2) 'Operatives' are manual workers excluding supervisors.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
"One of the "Big Four" motor manufacturers had 1,200 suppliers of which 13% were small firms accounting for 31% of total purchases ... A division of one major aerospace company had 76 suppliers in the United Kingdom manufacturing parts and components under sub-contract and of these 43% were small firms; of its 104 material suppliers 12% were small firms. Most of the large companies praised small firms for their low prices, speed and flexibility and service and one company claimed it could not operate without them." (31)

The CBI put the point more bluntly when it argued that, if small firms ceased to exist in Britain, "most of the large firms would grind quickly and painfully to a halt". (32)

If Marx overestimated the rate of decline of the small firm in the economy, we still cannot be very precise about trends in the importance of the small firm. Official statistics are unhelpful for several reasons. Firstly, the collection of statistics from small establishments is patchy. Normally establishments employing less than 25 persons are not required to provide detailed Census returns but where such establishments account for a "relatively high proportion of total employment and output" the exemption limit is lowered to 11. (33) The data on establishments employing less than 25 persons is, therefore, often estimated. Secondly, it may be suggested that, for several reasons, including taxation reasons, many small firms in their early phases of existence, where perhaps the founder is employing only part-time or casual labour, are unknown to any Government department. Thirdly, the Censuses of Production completed from 1970 onwards use a different classification of firms from that of previous Censuses and there are, therefore, considerable problems of comparison.

However, the long term trend has clearly been in the expected direction for most of this century. The Bolton Report estimated that, in 1924, 44% of all people employed in manufacturing establishments were in establishments employing less than 200 people and that by 1968 this had fallen to 29%. Information on enterprises is scarcer but the Committee estimated that, in 1948, 38% of the manufacturing labour force were employed in small enterprises but by 1963 this had fallen to 20%. (34) Between 1963 and 1968 the total of small manufacturing firms fell by 7% from 61,508 to 58,198. (35) Since 1968, because of the change in the basis of collection of the data and the limited period for which data is available, further estimates of the trend are difficult. The Bolton Committee were optimistic arguing that the decline in the small firm was levelling off. (36) More recent estimates,
however, are less optimistic. Bannock argues that the point at which the decline of the small firm "would threaten the whole basis of the free enterprise economy", which the Bolton Committee thought would not come about in the foreseeable future, "has already been reached". The nature of this threat rests on a belief that the small firm performs an essential 'seedbed' function in the economy. A vigorous small firm sector is required to produce a stream of new enterprises some of which will grow to challenge and displace existing large firms:

"... an economy totally dominated by large firms could not for long avoid ossification and decay, nor can we think of any long-term alternative to the maintenance of a thriving small firm sector as a safeguard against this. This "seedbed" function, therefore, appears to be a vital contribution of the small firm sector to the long-run health of the economy." (38)

Whether this recent pessimism on the present state and future of the small firm is justified is a moot point. The poor quality of the available data makes firm conclusions impossible. Short term economic factors may also be important. The present recession in the economy, for example, probably hits small firms harder than large firms since, as the Bolton Committee argued, small firms are less able to protect their profit margins in a difficult market situation. Further, the fall in real income in a recession leads to a fall in the demand for specialised goods, luxury goods and special services which small firms are particularly suited to meet. Finally, not only does the failure rate among small firms tend to rise in a recession but the economic uncertainty and fall in real income probably slows the rate of formation of new small firms. A return to levels of economic activity similar to those in the 1960's might be expected to be more favourable to the small firm. But, whatever the trend, it is quite clear that the small firm will continue to play a substantial role in the economy far into the foreseeable future and, if only for this reason, small firms and their workers are eminently worthy of research.

Previous Research on the Small Firm and the Small Firm Worker

Writings relevant to research on the small firm worker may be conveniently divided into four categories. The criteria for these categories are whether the writing concerns the small firm worker directly or indirectly and whether it is based upon research conducted according to acceptably rigorous methodology or is mainly unsupported assertion.
The first category, indirect and unsupported propositions on the small firm, is typically found in the speeches of politicians and in the mass media and contributes greatly to what may be termed the 'folk lore' view of the small firm. This view stresses that the small firm and small firm worker are distinct social phenomena displaying characteristics which mark them off socially from large firms and large firm workers. On the whole, this stereotype of the small firm is highly value-laden, stressing the alleged favourable aspects of the small firm as a work environment for both the owner-manager and the small firm worker. For both, the small firm is seen primarily as a source of intrinsic satisfactions which come from the work itself and from social relations among the participants.

Occasionally, however, negative aspects of the stereotype are introduced. For example, the disadvantages of particularism may be stressed with the small firm owner-manager being seen as having too great and close an influence over his workers and the small firm worker as having difficulties in maintaining his autonomy. Small firm owner-managers may be seen as demanding more of their workers than large firm executives would dare to do and small firm workers may be seen as experiencing problems in negotiating wages and conditions. But, on the whole, it is the positive aspects of the small firm and small firm employment which are most emphasised in these indirect and unsupported characterisations.\(^{(42)}\)

The second category here is research reaching an acceptable level of methodological rigour which provides indirect indications. This category covers a very wide variety of material. One important variety concerns research on the properties of small organisations qua organisations as compared to large organisations. Hall has provided a summary of a good deal of this literature.\(^{(43)}\) He argues that there is some general agreement among researchers on relations between size - measured by the number of persons comprising the organisation - and certain aspects of organisational structure. Some of the findings here appear rather obvious at first sight, for example, that size is positively correlated with the number of levels of authority and degree of internal differentiation. However, agreement among researchers even on these relationships is far from total: Hall notes several pieces of research which provide apparent exceptions to such correlations.\(^{(44)}\)

One reason for this lack of consistency is that size and organisational structure appear to be related to other variables such
as technology. For example, organisations whose production technology involves a high degree of repetition and standardisation appear to be somewhat more structured - size held constant - than organisations whose production technology displays the opposite characteristics. Hall seems to give technology prior influence over size in such relations. Another variable isolated in this context is 'professionalisation' that is, the degree and extent of professional socialisation among organisational members. The higher the degree and extent of professionalisation, the lower the level of formalisation in the organisation as measured by rules and procedures.\(^{(45)}\)

On the other hand, certain other aspects of organisational structure appear less related to size. The degree of centralisation and other aspects of social control, which are the result of elite decision-making and wider cultural factors (such as those emanating from the social institutional area in which the organisation exists, which may vary from a charity to a prison) are often found to be poorly related to size.\(^{(46)}\)

One problem with a good deal of this literature is that the importance of the comparative dimension is grossly understated. Lip service is often paid to the limitations of discussing findings on size and other variables where the organisations under study come from very different institutional areas. Yet results are frequently presented as if findings on hospitals, prisons, universities and charity organisations were directly comparable with those on organisations in manufacturing industry. This appears sociologically naïve in that it plays down, by implication, the importance of just those sets of meanings, attitudes and values of participants and others in contact with the organisation, which are the core of the organisation as a sociological entity. From a sociological viewpoint, the number of hierarchy levels or departments in an organisation are of less importance than the social processes by which the structure comes into existence and is sustained. The variation in cultural patterns, elite and member characteristics between organisations in different sectors of society may be expected to be sufficient to lead to a good deal of structural variation, regardless of size and might be seen as a more logical starting point for analysis.

Even in a single institutional area - the industrial organisation - the approach to the analysis of differences between small and large organisations may be just as confused and inadequate as the attempts
to generalise about organisations of different size in differing social contexts. This point is well illustrated by the long debate on the importance of technology and size on the structure of industrial organisations between Woodward and the group of researchers collectively known as the Aston School. Woodward originally argued, on the basis of a survey of 100 manufacturing firms varying in size from 100 people to over 8,000, that production technology was the major determinant of organisational structure. The Aston School researchers, through a series of replication studies and conceptual refinements, developed a counter argument which demoted technology and, instead, emphasised the importance of other variables, especially size. Both sides of the debate virtually exclusively confine themselves to the organisation as a whole giving relatively little attention to the impact of technology or size on the individual work role or worker.

Briefly, the Aston School researchers isolated a number of 'primary dimensions' such as, size (number of employees), span of supervision, vertical span (number of levels in the organisational hierarchy) and attempted to operationalise these to investigate several samples of organisations in manufacturing and other areas such as local government. They argued that the primary dimensions grouped themselves into two clusters negatively correlated with each other. But the relationship of each cluster with other variables such as size of organisation is consistent in the succession of studies. For instance, a consistent relationship was reported between increases in size and greater delegation of routine decision-making and between increases in size and the adoption of formalised control procedures, documentation and role specialisation.

The disagreement between the two sides was not as sharp as the above summary suggests in that technology was seen by the Aston School researchers as closely related to those aspects of the organisational structure most connected with the actual work flow whereas other aspects of the organisational structure - those most related to administration - were more related to size than technology. In other words, there was some agreement with Woodward's thesis.

Both sides in this debate are, it will be seen, subject to the criticism presented earlier in relation to Hall's overview, that the emphasis on so-called structural variables might be seen as unsociological. If the structure of the organisation is seen as strongly
related to - or even the outcome of - the decisions, values, beliefs and goals of participants then clearly it has only indirect application to the study of small firms as social groupings. It appears that some of the original Aston School researchers have also had doubts on this point. It is also noticeable that the Aston School studies were not longitudinal so that the implied dynamic relationships between size and structural aspects of the organisation were strictly the result of inferential reasoning rather than empirically established. But perhaps the most serious criticism of this kind of research as an aid to small firm research, is the size range of the samples of organisations studied.

Woodward, as already noted, restricted her sample to firms employing over 100 people. She states that 46% of the firms in the area from which the sample was drawn employed 100 or less and goes on to argue:

"Preliminary contact suggested that few firms employing less than 100 people had an elaborate formal organisation. Visits were paid to a one in four sample of these firms. In the majority there was no clearly defined level of management between the Board and operators. There were few organisational problems and it appeared that little would be lost if the smaller firms were omitted." (52)

On the experience of the present researcher and other research, small firms are as problem-prone as any other organisation, if not more so, and to see their organisations as without organisational levels seems simply the result of too perfunctory an inspection. To say that little would be lost by excluding nearly half of the possible sample of firms might also be thought questionable.

The Acton School studies are even more vulnerable to criticisms of the size range of their sample both because of the high number of people in the smallest organisations in their samples and because of their emphasis on the importance of size in relation to organisational structure. In the 1969 sample reported by Hickson et al, for example, the size range of the organisations in which research was carried out was from 250 to over 2,000. (54) In the small sample of Hinings and Lee, intended to replicate the first study, the size range was 11 to 2,454. (55) A 'national' sample reported in Child and Mansfield had a size range of 108 to 9,778. (56) In other words, all these samples exclude a large proportion of the size range of manufacturing enterprises in the British economy. To select only establishments employing 100 or more is, as the 1972 Census of Production shows, to exclude over 85% of manufacturing establishments from consideration. (57) The claim, therefore, that the findings have isolated size as a key variable in
relation to organisational structure must be seriously qualified to state that this is applicable only to those establishments in the 15\% of the size range covering the very largest manufacturing establishments in the British economy. Overall, therefore, despite the volume of research literature on the relationship between size and the structure of organisations, most of it is of little real help to research on the small firm generally and the small firm shopfloor worker in particular.

Another area of research findings which falls into this second category concerns the impact of organisational size on the individual. Again there is a large body of such material derived from studies of a wide variety of organisations. One strong theme in the literature is that a knowledge of the impact of large organisations on individuals provides a knowledge of the impact of the small organisation on the individual. If, for example, people find big organisations impersonal and dissatisfying it is often assumed that the small organisation participant will be exempt from such feelings simply because the organisation is small.

In discussing findings on individual attitudes and behaviour in relation to size of organisation two initial points need to be made. First, few studies distinguish clearly between size of organisation and size of sub-unit in which the individual participates. Secondly, few if any studies try to determine the individual's perceptions of size in relation to the organisation. Thus, the researcher defines the organisation as 'large' or 'small' on some relatively arbitrary basis such as those discussed earlier but fails to ensure that (a) his decision is shared by the members of the organisation under study and (b) that, even if members do share the definitions of 'small' and 'large' adopted, they also share the evaluations of size held by the researcher.

Notions of 'small' and 'large' are relative to the institutional context involved; a school with 400 pupils in a big city conurbation may be seen by educational researchers as 'small' while a manufacturing firm employing 400 workers would be seen as 'medium' sized by industrial sociologists or the Bolton Committee. Whether the children in the school or the shopfloor workers in the firm share these conceptions is another issue. Equally at issue is whether the size of the organisation as a whole has any salience in their overall definitions of participation.
in the organisation. Hall, for example, suggests that size might have an immediate impact on the individual's definition of organisational experience but this "diminishes the longer a person is in the organisation." Unfortunately, only limited and indirect evidence is offered in support of this point but it does raise the issue of time in the discussion of the salience of organisational size for the individual member. Finally, to the extent that size does enter the individual's definition of organisational experience, there is the question of evaluation. Some aspects of the organisation linked to size may be positively evaluated and others negatively evaluated. Different groups in the organisation, moreover, may have very different evaluations of aspects of the organisation related to size.

The distinction between size of sub-unit and size of the organisation as a whole is related to the above point. Does the shopfloor worker in a factory react more strongly to differences in size of work group or department or to differences in size of the firm as a whole? To the extent that researchers have not drawn such a distinction they cannot be sure that estimations of job satisfaction, morale, absenteeism and the like are related to one or the other.

This latter point is well brought out in a survey of some of the literature on the impact of organisational size on individual attitudes and behaviour offered by Porter and Lawler. They note that while many studies fail to distinguish between size of organisation and size of sub-unit, those that have almost consistently report that small sub-units are superior to larger units on most of the dimensions examined. The latter include job satisfaction, labour turnover, absenteeism and accident rates. The studies covered a wide variety of work situations - from package delivery departments to warehouses to car sales - but relatively few concerned workers in manufacturing.

Overall, the material on department or work unit size and attitudes and behaviour appears to offer more clear-cut findings than that on relations between attitudes and behaviour and total size of organisation. Lawler and Porter are inclined to argue that sub-unit size effects are probably more important than size effects related to the organisation as a whole. They suggest that the individual worker relates more to his work group or department than the firm as a whole and that, if there are negative effects associated with large size of the organisation as a whole, these might well be offset by small work units.
The high degree of agreement among the studies discussed by Porter and Lawler may be questioned on several grounds. Some of the topics discussed such as job satisfaction and morale have subsequently emerged as far more problematic than was imagined in the period during which the studies were carried out. (Most of the studies discussed were carried out in the 1950's in the United States.) As will be shown in Chapter 3, job satisfaction in particular is difficult both to conceptualise and to study. That findings in earlier studies often rest on relatively crude theorising is nowhere more clear than in discussions of worker-management conflict. Generally, the absence of trade unions and strikes in small firms are taken to indicate that small firms are relatively conflict-free. It is now realised, however, that worker-management conflict may take many forms of which the strike is only one. The absence of trade unions in small firms may have more to do with the problems trade unions encounter in organising small firms than the quality of worker-management relations. Similarly, low absenteeism levels are also sometimes taken as an indication of good relations between workers and management but, as will be argued in Chapter 4, an alternative and more plausible explanation may be offered for these findings.

Another helpful compilation of research materials on social aspects of the small organisation is offered by Ingham. Like Porter and Lawler, he finds much of the previous findings and theorising to be questionable. He also goes beyond the usual strict concern with workplace attitudes and behaviour to which most commentators have restricted themselves and discusses studies of differences in political attitudes and behaviour among small firm workers as compared to large firm workers. In other words, this discussion is among the first to attempt to go 'beyond the factory gates' and link work attitudes and behaviour with those in non-work life. Many of the studies Ingham examines are those discussed by Porter and Lawler but he does not make the clear distinction between findings and theorising on the sub-unit within the organisation and the organisation as a whole regarded as so important by Porter and Lawler. He concludes that the available research shows that absenteeism rates and size of firm are clearly and positively correlated but that the findings on labour turnover and size of firm are inconclusive because of the methodological inadequacies of much of the research.

A large part of Ingham's discussion is devoted to the impact of
different levels of bureaucratisation on the individual worker's orientations and behaviour. He makes a distinction between bureaucratic organisation (defined as the formal structure of management, the degree of managerial specialisation, levels of hierarchy, chains of command and other organisational manifestations of bureaucracy) and bureaucracy as a method of administering the labour force and work process. It is, he contends, bureaucracy in the second sense which has the greater consequences for worker involvement in the firm.

This is an important distinction because it leads us away from the rather unsociological concern with organisational structure characteristic of those who, like the Aston School researchers discussed above, tend to be over-concerned with the structure of the organisation and towards a greater concern with social interaction within the firm. Unfortunately, Ingham does not fully exploit this distinction. It might, for example, have been closely linked with a study of the differences in managerial ideologies and behaviour in small firms as compared to large firms and with a study of the way industrial subcultures are related to size of firms in particular industries. Instead, managerial ideologies among small firm owner-managers are largely assumed and industrial sub-cultures, which, as the present study will show, are of considerable importance in interpreting worker attitudes and behaviour, remain unexamined.

Thus, it is argued that, in the absence of bureaucratic rules in the small firm, that is, bureaucracy in the second of the above senses:

"... effective co-ordination and control within an industrial organisation requires a body of norms which are shared by both management and men." (65)

This clearly ignores other alternative management strategies which are expressions of the particular world-view of the owner-manager discussed earlier. Autocratic, particularistic, arbitrary methods of co-ordination and control are perhaps more common than this consensual alternative to bureaucracy. Another example of this kind of reasoning is that the "less 'rationally' organised production methods" of the small firm will allow more frequent interaction between workers in the firm. (66) Besides possibly equating opportunity with desire, this appears to be an example of the kind of thinking which assumes that the known character of the large firm needs only to be 'reversed' to provide an interpretation of the small firm. The analysis presented in Chapter 4 of the present study shows that small firm social interaction patterns cannot be simply inferred in this way.
Finally, in this second category, it is necessary to examine two much cited, early British studies of the 'size-effect' in industry. The first of these was carried out by the Acton Society Trust and published in two parts. The first reports findings from studies of coal pits employing between 200 and 2,000; of a large firm in the chemical industry, 91 of whose establishments — mainly factories — employing between 8 and nearly 11,000 were studied; and, of a large retail store group with 230 stores employing between 13 and 336 girls.

An earlier study reported that miners in smaller pits took much more interest in the affairs of their pit than miners in larger pits, knew more about the workings of consultative committees, voted more regularly at committee elections and showed more interest generally in the industry. However, in the studies being discussed, the findings were almost entirely based upon the examination of statistical records of the enterprises. They reported, for example, that in the pits, absenteeism and accident rates were positively correlated with size.

The author(s) saw these statistical measures as indicators of 'morale', although they were aware of some of the pitfalls involved in such an analysis. They recognised, for instance, that 'morale' was difficult to define:

"It is not enough to describe it by another word or phrase, such as esprit de corps, community spirit, social health ... the very solidity among coal miners that would bring them out on strike might be regarded as evidence of high morale by other miners but of low morale by Government ... watching output figures." (69)

Nevertheless, they went on to argue that a high accident rate or high absenteeism was evidence, other things being equal, of a downward trend in 'morale'. In other words, after recognising that the definition of 'morale' depended on which 'side' of industry it was being used, it was still felt that a one-to-one relationship between certain behaviour and 'morale' was possible.

In the second study of 91 establishments of a large chemical firm, the data analysed came from the company's lost time records. Again absenteeism was found to be positively related to size of unit. But a breakdown of the evidence suggested that, although absenteeism through certified sickness was higher in large than in small units, absenteeism without leave did not vary with size of unit. As the report admits:

"If morale (willing participation in the work) can to some extent be measured by the amount of time men take off for one reason or another, one would have supposed that absence without leave would have reflected this more clearly than any other form of absence." (71)
The report argued that this type of absence did not depend on what goes on inside the factory but on factors in the workers' out-of-work life. In other words, the so-called 'size effect' was being largely explained in terms of factors which had little to do with size of firm.

Workers with staff status, who were paid when sick, were over twice as likely to be absent through certified sickness as other, non-staff workers doing the same job. Absenteeism increased with size of establishment for both staff and non-staff grades but staff grades showed the sharper rise. Again, the report, although unable to offer an interpretation, was unwilling to accept the implication of linking absenteeism with 'morale' - that staff grade workers (generally given this status as a reward for length of service or other merit) appeared to show lower 'morale' or willingness to participate. As will be seen in Chapter 4 of the present study, the findings may be more plausibly interpreted without the aid of 'morale' as defined here.

Finally, no correlation between labour turnover and size of factory was found although it was admitted that the way labour turnover was measured was possibly too crude to reveal such differences. For instance, high labour turnover in a single department can greatly influence the overall labour turnover rate for a factory and a labour stability measure (which measures the proportions of workers who stay from year to year) would have perhaps been more helpful.

The third study of a large retail group again relied entirely upon statistical data from the company's records. The results, however, were rather different to those of the two previous studies. Absenteeism and size of unit were much less closely related than in the two previous studies and absenteeism was found to be more strongly related to labour turnover. The report notes that the girls worked in small teams so that, if one girl was sick or absent for some time, the others would have to work harder. This was seen as helping to explain the higher labour turnover rates.

One particularly interesting finding in this study was that labour turnover rates were lower in smaller than larger towns and that absenteeism was more closely related to size of town than size of store. This again brings in the neglected dimension of out-of-work influences on attitudes to work and the firm although the analysis is taken no further. Again, as will be seen later - especially in Chapter 5 - this may be of considerable importance in understanding differences between small and large firm workers' attitudes and behaviour.
The report as a whole is typical of research on industry and manual workers of its period. There is an over-reliance on statistical data, a vagueness in conceptualising central constructs such as 'morale' and, above all, a failure to actually ask workers what they felt about the job, the establishment and the firm. Finally, the establishments studied were all subsidiaries of larger organisations and hence the problems of distinguishing size effects associated with sub-units from those associated with the organisation as a whole existed.

The second Acton Society Trust Report attempted to isolate some of the social factors behind the statistical data reported in the first report. Further statistical data on size effects was collected from samples in different industries and, with one exception, the results supported those in the first report. The main study, however, was of 12 manufacturing establishments employing from "about a score of people to a little under 4,000." Statistical analysis of overall absenteeism rates showed a 'size effect' with larger units having higher levels of absenteeism.

From the 12 units, five were selected for more intensive study. These ranged in size from 58 people to 3,500 but only the smallest employed less than 200. One finding was that absenteeism rates could fluctuate sharply from one year to the next so that for some years the smallest plant had a higher level than the average level among the larger units. Bad health of one or two workers in a small establishment, it was pointed out, could have a very large influence on overall absenteeism so that a detailed knowledge of a particular plant could well change the interpretation of absenteeism levels.

The remainder of the report was a careful study of the five establishments to identify the particular factors associated with absenteeism levels in each. It found that:

"... quite a substantial part of the size effect ... arises from causes having nothing to do with ... satisfaction ... and psychological identification with ... work." (75)

For example, in the smallest factory, workers were likely to meet the foreman outside work and this made them disinclined to be absent without good reason; in the larger factories workers lived over a wide area and discovery of an 'unjustified' absence was less likely.

The report then made a number of further points on size and absenteeism which further showed that 'morale', as defined, was far from the
most important factor involved. For instance, 'morale' related to poor timekeeping, absenteeism or labour instability was often related to other factors resulting from small establishment management decisions or decisions of what were then called Labour Exchange personnel:

"The very small unit simply cannot do with a load of bad timekeepers; it gets rid of them by hook or by crook... They cause too much dislocation to be tolerated. A man goes to work with a concern either because he is recommended by friends, or because he is sent by the Labour Exchange, or, in the case of a group of concerns, because he has been transferred... All these channels... have a sifting effect which tends to send the bad timekeeper to a larger rather than smaller unit... Labour Exchanges generally try to avoid sending a man with a bad attendance record, or a tendency to change jobs more frequently, to a small concern where his habits would be a disproportionate nuisance." (76)

In other words, in attempting to move away from a simple statistical analysis of recorded data linked to assumptions about worker attitudes, the study began to draw out some of the social and organisational complexities connected to varying levels of absenteeism and labour turnover and to discard simple assumptions about the attitudes of the small firm worker.

Again, however, the study has serious limitations by the standards of modern industrial sociological research. The main research strategies, beside the examination of company records, were the simple observation of each firm plus discussions with management personnel. Shopfloor workers were not interviewed, other than on a very informal basis and most of the analysis takes a strongly management and problem-centred viewpoint. Finally, there was again a failure to determine whether shopfloor workers perceptions of size were related to the individual establishment or to the company as a whole.

The second frequently cited early British study of the 'size-effect' is that of Revans. (77) This largely reiterates the views on the relationships between size and absenteeism, accident rates and industrial disputes, presented in the Acton Society Trust studies. The industries from which the data was drawn were coal mining with some more limited data from a chemical products group and an electrolytic producer. Again, positive correlations were derived from various statistical records and these were again held to be indicators of 'morale' among shopfloor workers. However, the definition of 'morale' differs from that of the Acton Society Trust study. Revans sees it rather more clearly as:

"... the willingness of men and management to work together; withdrawal for any reason from the working situation may be considered as evidence that morale is not as good as it might be." (78)
This is offered after the author has recognised (in the same paragraph) that any definition of 'good' morale will be relative, depending on whether management or workers are offering the definition. Like the Acton Society Trust's conceptualisation, therefore, that of Revans would, by more recent standards of theorising, be seen as questionable.

In Revans' view the 'ideal' industrial establishment, against which actual establishments were to be compared, was completely conflict free; such a view is now recognised as failing to understand the basic social character of any human organisation and especially one based on the ideology of free enterprise, as inherently conflict prone. It will also be seen that such an approach is highly prescriptive. Finally, methodologically, there is the same weakness as in the Acton Society studies: statistical correlations based upon limited data are generalised to construct an elaborate set of ideas about worker attitudes and behaviour without interviewing a single shopfloor worker.

Revans reported, as did the Acton Society Trust studies, that absenteeism, disputes and accident rates were positively correlated with supervisory span of control; the narrower the span of control the lower the levels of absenteeism, accidents and disputes. This finding again shows the importance of the distinction between size of sub-unit and size of organisation in discussing the 'size-effect'. Indeed, there are often three levels to distinguish - size of sub-unit within the establishment; size of establishment and size of organisation as a whole. Disentangling the relations here is clearly not easy and these studies do not explicitly attempt this.

The studies discussed above illustrate the range of material which, although they say little directly about the shopfloor worker in manufacturing, claim to be based on research and to offer generalisations about the relations between size of organisation, organisational structure and the attitudes and behaviour of participants. It is important to stress the selective character of this discussion not only in terms of the above kind of material but also in terms of the wide range of more general sociological theorising and research which also has relevance. For instance, as Chapter 3 of the present study demonstrates, the view that small firm workers are self-selecting through the gradual build-up of orientations in their employment life, can be articulated to the much wider, general theorising and research on occupational placement. Or again, the analysis in Chapter 5 of small firm workers' political
and social class imagery shows this can be directly integrated with
the extensive literature on politics and class among manual workers
in Britain.

The third category of literature of interest in research into
the small firm is material which directly discusses the small manu-
facturing firm but where the empirical support is slight or non-
existent. Probably the best known and most influential example here
is the Bolton Report itself. It might seem that putting the Report
into this third category is somewhat over-strict in that the Committee
sponsored several research projects whose findings were published
separately and which might reasonably be expected to empirically
support the bulk of the Report itself. However, a closer examination
shows this is not the case. The research was of a limited kind, mainly
consisting of either essentially descriptive material on particular
industries such as the road haulage industry (Research Report 1) or
research on management aspects of the small firm such as problems of
raising external finance (Research Reports 4 and 5) or the role of the
small firm in innovation (Research Report 6).

A small proportion of this research was concerned with the social
relations of the small firm but again the viewpoint was strongly
managerialist. Moreover, the quality of the research was not high.
Most projects were small scale, the methodology limited and the
response rates often poor. For example, Research Reports 16 and 17, on
financial and non-financial data, collected by postal questionnaires,
achieved only 13.4% and 22.1% response rates respectively. But most
indicative of the managerialist bias was that there was no direct re-
search on small firm workers. (This did not, however, prevent the
Report and Research Reports from making generalisations about the small
firm worker and small firm worker-management relations).

The great majority of the Report is, in fact, unsupported asses-
tion and prescription. There is a strong assumption of the virtues
of the free enterprise economy and the small firm. Thus, the first of
the eight functions of the small firm offered by the Committee is that:

"The small firm provides a productive outlet for the energies of
that large group of enterprising and independent people who set
great store by economic independence and many of whom are anti-
pathetic or less suited to employment in a large organisation but
who have much to contribute to the vitality of the economy." (83)

The remaining functions are in similar vein stressing the efficiency
of the small firm in certain activities; its contribution to consumer
choice; its role as supplier to large firms; its contribution to the
overall competitiveness of the economy; its importance in innovation and as a 'seedbed' for new, large firms. No mention is made of the small firm as an employer or of any benefits it might confer on employees.

For these reasons, therefore, the Bolton Report is included in this third category of literature relevant to research on the small firm worker. This is not, however, to underestimate its importance. On the contrary, the Report's ideological perspective is an excellent example of the prevailing view of the small firm and, indirectly, of the small firm worker. Throughout the analysis in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the present study, reference will be made to the Report's views and findings; the analysis will, however, show the clear shortcomings of the Report.

A more modest example of the literature in this category is an article on labour relations in the small firm which was helpful in the preliminary thinking for the study. The authors, noting the Bolton Report's conventionally over-optimistic view of labour relations in the small firm, make the point that a conflict free view of the small firm is mainly wishful thinking.

"... while working alongside a considerate boss can no doubt make for high morale and job satisfaction, this does not make irrelevant the questions which arise in larger firms as to how terms and conditions of employment in all their various aspects are to be regulated." (85)

The authors go on to argue that, not only are many small firm employers hostile to trade unions but also that:

"Many small firm employees do not regard union membership as appropriate for them and no doubt many are unaware of the advantages it would bring." (86)

The present study tested these views in both trade union and non-trade union small firms and compared small firm worker attitudes with those of workers in large firms.

The authors also critically examine the assumption that small firms have few problems of communication. They argue that the assumed advantages of small firms in vertical communications - the close contact between owner-managers and shopfloor workers, the informal atmosphere where 'everybody knows everybody else' and so on - can be spurious:

"... these very conditions can themselves prove a hazard in that they encourage complacency about communications and consultation. They can lead to the belief that no particular effort is required to ensure that employees have all the information they need about their jobs and about the firm, or to find out the opinions of employees on working arrangements." (87)
This prompted the present research to focus carefully on vertical relations in the small firm and the authors' doubts are fully supported by the data discussed in Chapter 4.

Again, further examples of this kind of material could be listed but for the present study its value was limited. It was mainly a source of possible propositions to be tested and aspects of worker attitudes and behaviour which might be examined. Much of it suffers from over-generalisation and prescriptive tendencies or relies on inadequate supporting material such as the Bolton Report itself.

The fourth and final area of published material relevant to the study of the small firm worker is by far the most important. It concerns material directly on the small firm worker in manufacturing based on research reaching an acceptable level of rigorousness. There are few studies meeting this criteria and, of these, only two may be said to be of special importance. The first and most influential study of the small firm worker in manufacturing is by Ingham.

Ingham's central argument is an extension of the argument of Goldthorpe et al in their study of large firm workers. Briefly, the contention is that manual workers, over their work career, develop a distinct set of orientations which lead them, other things being equal, to self-select themselves into work environments congruent with their orientations. He distinguishes four kinds of basic orientations which may be held by manual workers. First, workers who have a combination of high economic and high non-economic requirements from their work. Ingham feels that those with these orientations may have difficulties in finding a congruent work environment and will usually give priority to economic requirements. They will, therefore, tend to work for large firms since these normally pay better than small firms. Second, some workers will have orientations combining wants for high economic rewards with low requirements for non-economic rewards. This orientation Ingham labels economistic-instrumental and corresponds to the orientation claimed by Goldthorpe et al to be strongly represented among their Luton sample.

Third, are manual workers whose orientations combine low levels of wants for both economic and non-economic rewards. No example is provided for this orientation but these workers would:

"... view work solely as a means to an end insofar as they do not pursue non-economic rewards in work; but neither do they seek high wages." (93)

Finally, some manual workers develop an orientation which combines low
wants for economic rewards with high wants for non-economic rewards. These will find small, low wage firms with a low level of bureau-
cratization, most congruent with their orientations. Ingham terms 
this orientation non-economicist-expressive and this is seen as the 
typical small firm worker orientation.

Ingham's arguments and evidence are examined at length in subsequent 
chapters where they are related to the theorising and findings of the 
present study. However, some initial remarks may be made about both 
his theorising and the study itself. Commentators have made the point 
that the fourfold classification of orientations to work, despite the 
reference to development over time, is essentially static. Further, 
despite Ingham's qualifications concerning the simplicity of his four-
fold classification, it has nevertheless been argued that this is over-
simplification to an extent which may render analysis unproductive.

More generally, it will be argued in the present study that, worker 
orientations should be seen as contingent not only on previous work 
experience but also on current work experience, life cycle position, 
industrial sub-culture, trade union membership and community. While 
this clearly introduces additional complexities, it is felt that these 
are the minimum which need to be taken into account to provide an adequate 
characterisation of the small firm worker.

Methodologically, Ingham's study suffers from several deficiencies. 
First, is his size of sample. He interviewed only 47 small firm res-
pondents and these were compared with a control sample of 69 large firm 
workers. Respondents were all semi-skilled or skilled; apprentices, 
unskilled workers and supervisors were excluded. These exclusions may 
well have led to bias in the small firm sample. As will be seen in the 
present study, small firm employer personnel selection practices are 
likely to be less universalistic than those of large firms. Small firm 
employers are more likely to recruit workers who, conventionally, would 
not be regarded as 'skilled' even though they can (perhaps after a 
short period of on-the-job training) do the job almost as well as a 
formally skilled worker. Further, because small firms are likely to 
employ higher proportions of younger workers than large firms, excluding 
apprentices and trainees may have also led to bias.

It has been pointed out, that the contrast in the sizes of firms 
chosen for the study may not have been as helpful in studying the 'size-
effect' as might first be thought. The largest of the small firms 
employed 63 people while the smallest of the large firms employed 3,000.
In other words, the samples lacked firms in a wide intermediate size range. Finally, in controlling for technology by selecting firms solely in light engineering, the study could not assess the impact of industrial sub-cultures in firms of differing size. As the present study indicates, the influences of such sub-cultures may have a greater influence on workers' definitions of work than influences related to size of firm.

The second study directly concerned with small firm workers in manufacturing is that of Batstone. This study, carried out as part of a larger study of Banbury, focused mainly on relationships between plant size and class imagery among manual workers. But the study also covered a number of other areas including social relations within the firm, and the findings proved very helpful for the present study. In particular, Batstone found that although small firm workers were less class conscious than large firm workers, they showed no pronounced deferential orientations. This finding was unexpected in the light of previous research but, as will be seen in Chapter 5, was fully in accord with the present findings. Equally, the stereotype of the small firm worker which sees him as a major source of support for the Conservative Party among manual workers, was not supported by Batstone's study or by the present study.

There were, however, a number of important differences in the findings between Batstone's research and the present study. These are fully discussed at appropriate points in the analysis of data in subsequent chapters. Some of the differences are undoubtedly due to important differences in the type of small firm and community in which the workers lived and Batstone's work is very helpful in highlighting the importance of non-work life and experience on small firm workers' definitions of work and firm. Some of the differences are, however, less explicable and may be due to differences in theoretical approach and research design. Like Ingham's research, that of Batstone suffers from the problems of a small sample. He interviewed 38 small firm manual workers and 41 manual workers in larger firms mainly employing over 250 workers. Some of the latter were employed in nationalised undertakings. He was unable to control for technology so that again the importance of industrial sub-cultures could not be examined.

There are further sources of research on small firm workers in manufacturing but these are mainly studies of other issues connected with manual worker attitudes and behaviour which touch upon size of firm.
indirectly. For the present study one of the most influential examples of this research was that of Cannon. This was a study of printing compositors, their political and class imagery and their participation in an occupational community, in the late 1950's. Since one of the two industries in the present study was printing, Cannon's findings were directly relevant. He interviewed just over 100 compositors in 28 firms and, although the exact size range of the firms is not given, clearly they were all small. As a former compositor himself, Cannon's findings provide valuable material on the occupational identity and world-view of the small firm printing worker of a quarter of a century ago which was used as a base for comparison with findings from the present study.

Printers have also been studied by Sykes whose findings have been published in a number of articles. These provided considerable detail on internal social relations in the printing firm and again, although the size range of firms is not given, they were obviously small. The data was again mainly collected in the 1950's and the analysis is often historical, concentrating on the development of trade union organisation in the printing industry. This material, therefore, also provides comparative data on the attitudes and behaviour of printing workers but is perhaps of less value than Cannon's research because it was carried out in Scotland. As stressed above in the discussion of Batstone's research, differences in the regional location of firms and workers may lead to differences in attitudes and behaviour.

A final example of research of this kind is a study of non-skilled manual workers' ideology where the sample included a proportion of small firm workers. Of 926 workers interviewed, 129 (13.9%) worked in four firms employing less than 200. The firms were in several industries and the workers had a wide variety of jobs but the findings on ideology indicated that size of firm was not associated with any particular patterns of ideology.

The above discussion has covered a wide range of previous writing and research more or less relevant to the study of the small firm worker. It is not meant to be exhaustive but merely to indicate the diversity of sources and to introduce the more important themes and findings. Much of the material is discussed further in subsequent chapters in relation to specific findings. Together, this material provided the background for the preliminary thinking for the present study and the formulation of the initial aims.
The Aims of the Present Research

Two points are clear from the above material. First, in terms of rigorous research, the small firm worker has received less attention than he deserves proportionate to his representation in the labour force. Second, that the monolithic quality of the stereotype of the small firm worker, to which so many appear to subscribe, is highly suspect. It embraces workers from such a wide variety of industries and communities that it is simply inherently implausible.

Accordingly, the main aims of the present study were to examine in detail the life of the small firm worker in terms of a set of hypotheses which incorporated the main elements of the stereotype of the small firm worker and the findings of previous research, particularly that of Ingham. Formally stated, the central hypothesis, to which a set of secondary hypotheses were related, was:

That workers in small manufacturing firms, that is, those employing less than 200 people, display important differences in attitudes and behaviour as compared to workers doing similar work in large firms in the same industries.

Existing views of the small firm worker covered three main areas: his work career, his attitudes and behaviour in relation to working in the small firm and participation in the wider society. The first area, work career, was mainly concerned with the view discussed above that small firm workers gradually build up, throughout their work career, a distinct small firm worker orientation. It was felt that this idea had been very inadequately tested in previous research and that a substantial proportion of available resources should be devoted to this topic. The collection of data here was centred around three secondary hypotheses on the development of small firm worker orientations in previous work experiences, that is, experiences in employment prior to joining the firm at the time of interview. The hypotheses and the reasoning behind them are introduced in Chapter 3.

The second area, workers' involvement in the firm, has been the subject of most previous attention and much of the apparent consensus was summarised under five secondary hypotheses. These hypotheses are introduced with their associated reasoning in Chapter 4. This area received by far the bulk of attention in the research because of the sheer range of propositions to be tested.

The third area, participation in the wider society has, like the development of the work career of the small firm worker, been very much under-researched. Partly this is connected to the tendency in most earlier research on manual workers to 'stop at the factory gates'. Life
outside work, of course, covers a great deal of activity so it was decided to restrict research to a number of specific issues. These were, first, participation in the community; were small firm workers more likely to be fully integrated into their local community than large firm workers? Secondly, was political attitudes and behaviour. This was particularly interesting in that, at the start of the research, Britain's political order was probably more turbulent than it had been since the end of World War Two. Finally, data was collected on class imagery. This followed on easily from the interest in political attitudes and behaviour and focused especially on the theme of the 'deferential' worker. Three secondary hypotheses covered this investigation of non-work life and again they are introduced in detail later in Chapter 5.

Data was also collected on a fourth topic, leisure activities, and this is introduced where it is relevant to the testing of a number of hypotheses. Unfortunately, the research strategy used to collect this data had certain shortcomings (methodological considerations are discussed in Chapter 2) and, therefore, this data is only used to provide additional support or disconfirmation of a point. However, it retains considerable value because of the element of between-method triangulation it provides.

Clearly, the three areas are all connected with each other but no single previous study has attempted to draw out these interconnections. In other words, the breadth of interest in the present study was a good deal wider than in previous research. It was tempting to reduce this wide coverage after the data was collected and concentrate attention on perhaps just two areas. But an initial analysis of the data showed that the interconnections between areas were such that, the exclusions of findings from any one area would undermine the overall analysis and the value of the study as a contribution to the sociology of the small firm worker.
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CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Theoretical perspectives in industrial sociology have undergone considerable changes in emphasis over the last two decades. In the early 1960's, although text books defined industrial sociology as applying general sociological theory to social life in industry, the dominant perspectives were not really very sociological. The claim of close links with mainstream sociological theory usually took the form of a vague functionalism stressing the links between industry and the wider society. The contributions of Durkheim, Weber and especially of Marx to the sociological analysis of economic activities were only briefly, if at all, recognised.

At the more specific level of the enterprise and the worker, three theoretical approaches predominated for much of this period but none could claim direct descent from general sociological theorising. At the beginning of the period, Scientific Management, although already largely superseded in influence by later perspectives, was still extensively discussed in industrial sociology. It retained its interest for industrial sociologists not so much as an aid in interpreting life in industry as for other reasons. For instance, its simplistic assumptions about worker motivations and prescriptive view of managerial roles made it a convenient peg upon which to hang a discussion of how later research and theorising had developed more complex views.

The second and more influential approach in industrial sociology in the 1960's was Human Relations. This perspective focused especially on the worker and its various 'schools' were, and are, the outcome of a long tradition of research dating back to the Hawthorne studies conducted in the early 1930's in the United States. The influence of the Human Relations perspective was also partly the result of its proponents being very conscious of developing an alternative view of the worker and the enterprise to that offered by Scientific Management. Again, its theoretical foundations have little explicit connection with general sociological theorising and in recent years its main theoretical base has been in social psychology.

The third perspective which has had a considerable influence in industrial sociology is sometimes labelled the 'technological implications' approach. Since 1960 this perspective has, for many
industrial sociologists, completely superseded Scientific Management and the Human Relations approach. It takes technology as a starting point in analysing the firm and workers' attitudes and behaviour. Usually, its proponents stress that it is not a variety of technological determinism but rather that technology and workers' attitudes and behaviour are closely and reciprocally related. For example, it is argued that technology in the form of assembly line production, clearly sets limits on worker autonomy and the formation of informal social groups and workers are likely to react to such limitations in particular ways. In other words, there is a high degree of association between technology and attitudes and behaviour but such associations are neither necessary nor inevitable.

The Social Action Perspective

However, in the late 1960's the technological implications and the Human Relations perspectives came under powerful challenge from what has come to be known as the social action perspective. As with the preceding perspectives, social action developed partly as a counter perspective to those previously dominating industrial sociology. It took as its starting point the actor's definition of the work situation, his goals and his wider world-view. It was explicitly assumed that these three would be interrelated so that a full understanding of any one required knowledge of the others.

Proponents of a social action approach made two initial critical points in relation to previous theoretical perspectives. First, unlike previous perspectives, the social action approach was explicitly sociological, deriving its inspiration from mainstream sociological theorising and especially from the ideas of Weber. The claim that industrial sociology was a specialism within sociology could, for the first time, be accepted. Secondly, again unlike earlier perspectives, the social action approach by taking the worker as actor and social being as a starting point, made the fundamental link between work and non-work life. Previous perspectives 'stopped at the factory gates' in that the worker was not seen as an individual with meanings, goals and values, derived from his whole range of life experiences. Instead, he was an 'input' into the work system to which certain needs were attributed, and who had to be integrated into the needs of the enterprise.

It may be argued that the social action approach has come to
dominate the study of manual workers in industrial sociology since 1970. Even those who take other perspectives as a basic framework of analysis have sometimes recently adopted the primary emphasis in the social action perspective on the actor's definitions and goals. In the face of the epistemological and theoretical confusion which has emerged elsewhere in sociology in recent years, this consensus is a help to the researcher where, as in the present case, he shares the conviction that a social action approach provides the most fruitful means of understanding the position of the manual worker in industry. But there are several further reasons which can be advanced to suggest that this perspective is particularly useful for the present study.

Firstly, the social action perspective provides an especially suitable theoretical approach in relation to the small firm work environment. The small firm is, compared to the more commonly studied large firm relatively unstructured so that interaction is rather more on a face-to-face basis, unmediated by impersonal bureaucratic procedures. Moreover, as a social and economic entity, the small firm is more problematic; its existence is much more the direct, recognisable result of particular decisions and actions of those involved in its everyday operation. The large firm, on the other hand, is often controlled at a distance by people whose connections with day-to-day managers and ordinary workers are remote. In short, the definitions, values and goals of individuals - including shopfloor workers - have great importance for the small firm as a social entity and a knowledge of them is critical to understanding the small firm. No alternative perspective in industrial sociology focuses so strongly on these aspects of the small firm. Further, this approach might be regarded as especially helpful in the present state of research on the small firm. As the review of the literature in Chapter 1 showed, with very few exceptions (see the next paragraph) research on the small firm has almost totally neglected the shopfloor workers' own view of working in the firm.

A second reason for the adoption of the social action approach concerns previous sociological research on the small firm worker. In Chapter 1 it was noted that there were relatively few sociological studies of small firm manual workers reaching a satisfactory level of rigorousness and of these, two, those of Ingham and Batstone, were argued to be the most important. Both studies adopted a social action
approach and Ingham in particular explicitly attempted to develop the social action approach further than previous researchers. In addition, the study of printing workers by Cannon also seen in the last chapter as important in relation to the present study, employed a very similar perspective.

Thirdly, a social action approach requires the adoption of relatively few a priori assumptions concerning the individual worker and the social networks in which he participates. Research strategies do not, therefore, have to be highly specific to the perspective. This means that in testing hypotheses an element of theoretical triangulation can be introduced, that is, that alternative interpretations derived from other theoretical perspectives may also be tested. Thus, in Chapter 5 of the present study, the assessment of the extent of deferential imagery among small firm workers is discussed alongside a Marxist interpretation of workers' attitudes centred on the notion of class consciousness. In this way competing interpretations rather than a single interpretation based upon a single perspective, can be tested. The result of this advantage is likely to be a stronger overall interpretation of the available data in the sense that it informs more than one view of the phenomena being studied.

Adopting a social action perspective in the present study, therefore, ensures that its findings are more easily compared and contrasted with those of other studies. This consideration is also relevant more generally in that, an aim of any research on manual workers should be to incorporate it into the whole corpus of findings on this category of workers, regardless of the size of firm in which they work. The adoption of the social action approach also serves this wider aim given its present wide usage in industrial sociology generally.

Some Problems of the Social Action Perspective

The adoption of a social action perspective, however, cannot be undertaken uncritically. A number of criticisms and limitations of the perspective have emerged and these require consideration in relation to the aims of the present study. In making the workers' definitions of work the starting point of any analysis two basic questions have been raised: what are the sources of these definitions and how stable are they over time?

Sources of workers' definitions of - or orientations to - work
have been the subject of a good deal of discussion and, as Brown has argued, there is broad agreement on a number of such sources. Goldthorpe et al. are representative of the majority view in emphasising sources prior to the current work experience and non-work sources. A main assumption by these theorists is that orientations develop over time and become, under full employment conditions, a major influence on occupational choice. Ingham has particularly emphasised this point in relation to the small firm worker.

The development of these orientations has also been linked to social and geographical mobility and life cycle position as well as the community, social class and education, but it has become apparent that there has been too great an emphasis on sources of definitions of work prior to current work experience and too little emphasis on the ongoing experience of work in the current firm. A more serious problem, however, is the weight that should be attached to the various sources of definitions of work. Goldthorpe et al. and Ingham, for example, placed great emphasis on the gradual build up of prior orientations as work experience increases while Daniel, on the other hand, has argued that a sudden change in the current work environment may have correspondingly powerful effects on overall orientations.

This last point leads on to the second question - how stable are workers' definitions of work over time? The most plausible answer to this question is that it depends on the orientation and the rate of change in environmental influences linked to workers' definitions. For example, at one extreme are those manual workers who appear to retain a remarkably constant core definition of work even over several generations with the most obvious example being the coal miner. The degree of continuity perceived in the core definition of work will, of course, depend on the level of generality adopted for the purposes of analysis. But it also depends on the aims of a specifically sociological analysis itself. As Weber stressed, at the sociological level we are attempting to isolate 'typical' patterns of action, that is, an abstraction of common features of the definitions of work held by some occupational category and not the definitions of particular individuals.

Yet, the self-imposed limitation of a specifically sociological level of analysis does not entirely meet the point of defining the
core elements in any occupational category's definition of work. We might, for example, internally divide the category into those at different points in the life cycle or stage of occupational experience and isolate the typical definitions held by such sub-groups. But even such refinements cannot counter the impossibility of saying a priori which elements or meanings in the workers' definition of work are more or less permanent and which more ephemeral.

At the opposite extreme, change in the whole range of sources linked to workers' definitions of work may be expected to be associated with instability in such definitions. For instance, the emergence of a significant level of unemployment and high levels of inflation in the 1970's might have just such an effect. Other, documented examples are the break-up of traditional urban working class communities or, as will be argued in the present study, the impact of widespread technological change in the workers' industry.

A further point is whether instabilities in workers' definitions are seen as short term or long term. Daniel has emphasised the impact of particular wage settlements on workers' definitions but also implies that the influence of such events may be relatively short term. The famous strike which occurred at Vauxhall soon after Goldthorpe et al had completed their study might also be seen, in the light of the subsequent history of labour relations at the plant, as a short term effect.

The general point to be made here is that research on workers' orientations has been inclined to be over-static, neglecting the possibility that there will be dynamic interrelations between experiences, definitions and wants. Put another way, the action perspective has, despite its concern with the actor's viewpoint, under-emphasised the purposable reinterpretation of experience by the worker which arises out of both changes in available meanings from such sources as the mass media and non-work social interaction and current experiences of work in a particular firm.

This issue of the stability-instability of workers' definitions is incapable of logical resolution. What is required is an accumulation of research findings on work meanings so that typically slower and faster changing meanings can be identified and, above all, more longitudinal research on particular categories of workers. Until this stage is reached the only alternative assumption to be adopted is that we should expect that meanings and definitions linked to
relatively unchanging sources of influence to be the core elements for a particular group of workers orientations to work and conversely that, substantial change in known sources of influence - in and out of the work situation - may be expected to be associated with instabilities in workers' meanings.

A further issue connected with the above is the complexity of the definitions of work held by workers. Critics of research adopting a social action perspective have, for example, argued that Goldthorpe et al's instrumental orientation is over-simple, representing a misleading compression of the actual variability in orientations among their respondents. In the present study a similar criticism will be developed by contrasting the present findings with those of Ingham who, as outlined in Chapter 1, adopts a similar mode of conceptualising worker orientations in relation to the small firm worker. One effect of such an approach is to present an over-rational, over-consistent view of the meanings attached to work. In practice, the definitions of work and world-views of manual workers may be highly inconsistent and even vague. It is surprising that researchers should think otherwise since few people, manual workers included, are ever in situations where a high degree of overall rationality and consistency is required and where such situations do occur, it is unlikely that more than a few elements require reinterpretation to meet an immediate desire for consistency.

As Bulmer pointed out, one reason for this understatement of the complexity and inconsistency of worker definitions is the popular use of the ideal type in analysing findings. Once the ideal types have been generated - usually limited to a maximum of three or four with one often carrying the bulk of the data and analysis - there is an inevitable tendency to fit the data to the type. Too often the heuristic purpose of typologising is forgotten so that, rather than representing a convenient, suggestive but open framework for analysing data, the set of types are treated as a closed set of analytical categories capable of 'explaining' all the available findings. (This heavy emphasis on the ideal type also greatly contributes to the implied static character of worker orientations). However, the use of ideal type analysis in this way is not a necessary aspect of the social action approach; as the present study attempts to show, an alternative analysis which captures more of the complexity, inconsistencies included, of the definitions of work and world-views of manual
A less discussed problem in relation to the social action approach concerns the relations between definitions and behaviour. Advocates of a social action approach have stressed the logical separation between what goes on in people's minds and their behaviour, while arguing that behaviour is only explicable in terms of a knowledge of the meanings attached to it by actors. However, the reverse of this position, the specific behaviour likely to follow from the holding of a particular definition of work or world-view, is another issue. Few social action theorists would wish to claim any one-to-one relationship between the holding of a particular orientation and subsequent behaviour but they nevertheless frequently imply broader behavioural outcomes. For instance, Goldthorpe et al argued that the instrumental orientation of their workers made them prototypical of manual workers in general and that this had considerable implications for British society in terms of the behavioural outcomes of such an orientation.

Yet, the whole issue of the relationship between orientation and behaviour is highly problematic as much, mainly social psychological, theorising and research has made clear. Dissonance theory, for example, had provided numerous examples of definitions of situations adjusting or changing in relation to particular experiences. Workers, in other words, may fundamentally adjust their definitions subsequent to particular experiences. But probably the most important findings of this kind of research have been the repeatedly low correspondence between expressed views and subsequent behaviour. This is particularly the case where people are expressing a general definition or view as opposed to an intention to behave in a particular way on some future occasion. Definitions of work, especially where these are generalised into typical forms held to be characteristic of specific occupational categories, contain a high proportion of general attitudes with few references to intentional behaviour so that great caution should be exercised in discussing any behavioural implications.

Although few would claim that one-to-one relationships between definitions and behaviour usually occur, it is still likely that the range of possible behaviour in relation to a particular definition or world-view is easily underestimated. Two reasons may be suggested for this. First, behaviour is contingent on particular situations.
which will tend to contain specific aspects likely to lead to refinements to previously held definitions and views. Secondly, the knowledge of workers' definitions is generally incomplete, having been usually gained through an interview of some kind which, inevitably, provides information - accurate or otherwise - only in relation to the particular questions asked.

For the present study, in the light of both the above considerations and the nature of some of the findings themselves, claims concerning the likely behavioural outcomes of small and large firm workers' definitions of work and images of society will be limited. However, this does not mean that no behavioural outcomes are thought likely. On some issues such as where the objective situation of the worker is known and unlikely to change, some correspondence between workers' orientations and future behaviour is probable while other findings, such as those on attitudes to joining a trade union, concern intentional behaviour where previous research has indicated that a close relationship between orientations and future action may be less expected.

Social action research has also been criticised for over concentration on a focal group in a particular social setting. Thus, in the study of shopfloor worker orientations, little or no attention is given to other groups in the firm, particularly management, whose views may be expected to differ from those of shopfloor workers and whose decisions are very much part of the objective situation of the worker. This criticism will be developed, for example, in Chapters 3 and 4 of the present study in relation to Ingham's analysis which, it will be argued, neglects the definitions and behaviour of the small firm executive in relation to the shopfloor worker. Unlike other forms of management, the small firm owner-manager has now been extensively documented and the findings are of great importance in discussing the situation of the shopfloor worker. Again, therefore, this criticism is not fundamental to the social action perspective but simply a shortcoming of particular studies adopting the perspective.

The above criticism has, however, been made more recently in a rather different form. Rose has argued that the social action perspective has developed to provide an essentially middle range analysis which fails to make proper links with the wider socio-economic context. This criticism resembles the Marxist critique of Goldthorpe...
et al's study which stressed their failure to integrate their view of the manual worker with a full analysis of the workers' general position in society. In other words, even where the focal groups are 'affluent workers' or 'small firm workers', the analysis does not locate them in a clearly defined, theoretically adequate view of the society which constitutes the workers' objective social, economic and political situation.

To be fair to Goldthorpe et al, they do not entirely neglect this point. They do discuss the position of the affluent worker in the wider society in their third volume but other proponents of a social action perspective, such as Ingham and Silverman, have no such defence. Indeed, in the case of Ingham, there is a failure to discuss the wider community in which his respondents live let alone a consideration of the small firm worker in society in general. Yet this neglect will be shown in the present study to be a considerable shortcoming in understanding the social situation of the small firm worker.

Even in Goldthorpe et al's analysis, the macro-level of the social order is only sketchily outlined and mainly consists of an extrapolation of the social, economic and political trends of the affluent sixties the inadequacy of which is only too clear in this decade. Again, such an inadequacy is not inherent in a social action perspective but simply the practice of most studies to date. The point made earlier concerning the adoption of an implicit social action perspective by Marxist researchers on manual workers supports this. In the present study the position is adopted that the most adequate view of the macro-level of society - the wider, objective situation of the worker - is provided by a neo-Marxist interpretation. Moreover, it is further assumed that an adequate interpretation of the workers' overall life situation involves the consideration of the possible interrelations between the macro-level and worker definitions and interpretations.

The main reasons for adopting a social action perspective have now been presented together with a discussion of what has been seen as its main limitations. It will be noted that the phrase 'social action theory' has been avoided throughout this discussion for, as Cohen has argued, the social action approach is best taken as a method which brings a particular kind of focus to bear on the object of inquiry: interpretations and theory are logically separate from
the approach itself. Most of the limitations discussed were argued to be more the result of the way particular researchers have used the approach than inherent in the approach itself. This is not, however, to deny that shortcomings remain. The inherent character of the phenomena at the centre of attention - definitions, beliefs, world-views and goals - present permanent problems for any research based on this approach. Equally, the relationship between such phenomena and action itself remains a difficulty for this approach. But the shortcomings must, it is argued, be set against the special advantages of the perspective for the study of the small firm worker.

Methodological Issues

The above discussion of the social action perspective touched only lightly on the methodological issues connected with the perspective in conducting research. The issues here may be divided into two broad categories: those connected with strategies of research and those relating to the specific theoretical and conceptual constructs employed for the study of the small firm worker.

Undoubtedly, the central issue in relation to research strategies has been the use of the survey as the main means of gathering data where the theoretical perspective is that of social action. This strategy has been employed by most researchers adopting this approach but is often seen as a fundamental weakness. Basically, critics have argued that the survey interview is too insensitive a way of investigating workers' definitions of work. Where the researcher is gathering information on a wide range of topics, the coverage of questions will be very limited so that, at best, only a very partial 'map' of the complex of meanings held by respondents in relation to aspects of social reality can be derived. The connections between elicited meanings and the way they are brought to bear together with other, undiscovered, meanings in particular situations, can only be guessed by the researcher. If the respondents are manual workers, lack of verbal skills may add to these problems.

The survey strategy is usually cross-sectional and the actual behaviour of respondents to situations to which their stated opinions relate, usually remains unchecked. This may be linked with a further point. The survey interview is a distinct social interaction setting whose characteristics may well influence respondents to offer opinions and views they would not offer or hold in other interaction contexts.

A further methodological point parallels a point discussed in
the previous section on the tendency of researchers adopting the social action perspective to over-concentrate on a focal group in a social setting and fail to give sufficient attention to those with whom the focal group interacts. If the small firm is a complex social reality made up of the differing definitions, attitudes and world-views of those involved then a single research strategy which seeks data from the focal group alone cannot adequately explore this complexity or adequately test hypotheses concerning social relations with others.

All research strategies are imperfect and answers to the above criticisms requires a discussion of both alternatives to the survey strategy and how the alleged limitations of the survey strategy may be countered. The main advantage of the survey strategy is that it enables the researcher to cover a relatively larger sample of respondents than would normally be possible using other research strategies. This advantage was important for the present study because the researcher was very conscious of the fact that previous research on the small firm worker had been limited, even by the usual standards of sociological research, and that this had resulted in attempts to discuss 'the small firm worker' as an undifferentiated social type. Given the proportion of workers in small firms and their distribution throughout the economy and society, this lack of differentiation was inherently unlikely. A main aim in the present research, therefore, was to increase, insofar as available resources permitted, the range of small firm workers contacted so as to be able to suggest some of the main differences within this occupational category.

A second important advantage of the survey is its ability to tap information on attitudes and meanings in relation to a wide range of issues as well as to gather full information on the descriptive characteristics of respondents. The main alternative research strategies advocated for use with the social action perspective - usually varieties of participant observation - cannot do either as well. For instance, one important aim in the present study was to investigate the alleged deferential orientation of the small firm worker. The deferential orientation is widely recognised as extremely complex and subtle and forms part of the general body of meanings related to social stratification. Most manual workers do not normally discuss social stratification in everyday interaction so investigating deferential meanings in natural social settings is very difficult.
To arrive at any conclusion, therefore, indirect research strategies such as participant observation require an unacceptably high level of inferential analysis which cannot be a substitute for the respondents' own stated views.

Qualitative research strategies which have sometimes been seen as the most suitable for research aiming to reveal the meanings attached by actors' to their participation in a social setting, are often unsuitable for research in the small firm. While participant observation has been used with some success in research in large firm settings, its main disadvantage in the small firm is that, even where the researcher has the resources available to spend an extended period of time in full-time employment in a firm, the result will be a case study which, while it may provide very detailed data on the particular firm studied, will not be easily generalisable. At the present stage of development of research-based knowledge of the small firm this strategy would, therefore, not take us much beyond the present level of understanding.

Team participant observation such as that used by Gouldner (41) or semi-participant observation, where the researcher enters the firm as a researcher, known as such by participants in the firm, are also unsuitable for research in the small firm. The latter is usually a busy, confined, sometimes noisy social setting (as in printing one of the industries in the present study) where participants have little time to talk to an outsider. In a large firm a worker may take time off to talk to a researcher with little impact on overall production but in a small firm this is much more difficult. In a large firm an unused office may be available for private conversation but again this is less likely in the small firm. Management in the small firm is probably less predictable in its movements through the shopfloor area and administrative departments are usually physically closer to the shopfloor. For both reasons, shopfloor workers are likely to be much more guarded in their statements where these relate to management activities than in the large firm.

It may be argued that, the criticisms of the survey strategy when used with the social action perspective have been over-stated or may be rendered less serious by refinements to the strategy as conventionally employed. In addition, a number of further research strategies may be employed to provide data and methodological
that is, that the data collected by the main research instrument may be checked against data gathered from other sources and by other methods.

The charge of insensitivity against the survey research strategy is easily exaggerated. In the present study the main shopfloor worker and supervisor interviews were normally carried out in respondents' homes, where the atmosphere was one in which the researcher was a guest and the respondent very much on his 'home ground'. The interview was a second meeting following an informal interview on the shopfloor at which the aims of the research were introduced and the respondents' co-operation sought. By the beginning of the interview proper, therefore, some rapport with respondents had been built up and they were aware of the main interests of the research.

In constructing the questionnaire (discussed more fully below) great emphasis was placed on including a very large proportion of 'open' questions, that is, questions where the respondent was not required to choose an answer from a limited range of possible answers. Many questions were backed up by 'probes', that is, requests for the respondent to enlarge on his previous answer usually of the form: 'why do you feel that way?' or even just a silence which often prompted the respondent to add to a previous answer. Respondents were encouraged to enlarge on issues that particularly interested them and to discuss points with the researcher (although the latter was careful not to 'lead' respondents in these exchanges). In these ways the interview came to resemble more closely a conversation rather than a stereotyped interview composed of 'yes', 'no' questions which is so often, correctly, criticised by opponents of the survey strategy.

One criticism of survey interviews rests on a misunderstanding of the way questions are usually asked. Critics often refer to the unlikelihood of eliciting much detail of respondents' views with a single question on a topic but few serious researchers would do this anyway. Most respondents would, in any case, probably refuse to be limited in this way, demanding the opportunity to expand on their first replies. But, as in the present study, the researcher normally asks respondents a sequence or batch of questions surrounding a particular topic. Some of these questions will be very open and many will be backed by probes so that on a single topic, such as class imagery in the present study, for example, the respondent might answer perhaps
as many as 20 questions and 'probes' over a period of several minutes.

One reason why survey strategies often involve highly struc-
tured, 'closed' questions concerns problems of coding. The researcher
wishes to ensure standardised replies to enable coding to be as pre-
cise as possible and if a high proportion of open or non-scheduled
questions are used, this is difficult. In the present study this
problem was solved by tape recording the interviews. This allowed
coding to be carried out after the interview and allowed qualitative
analysis of replies to questions which could only be conventionally
coded at the expense of a considerable loss of detail. It also reduced
the effects of selective perception on the part of the interviewer in
categorising responses and allowed the revision of coding categories
where the data-theory interaction process suggested this was desirable
since all interviews could be heard again. (Of course there is the
possibility that the presence of a tape recorder itself introduced
bias but the experience of both the present researcher and others,
is that this occurs only very infrequently.)

A further criticism of the survey strategy where individual
respondents are interviewed is that it is atomistic in the sense that
the sociologist should be not so much interested in the individual
per se as in his social relations with others. The survey interview,
it is argued, often treats the individual as if he did not have rela-
tions with others. At the behavioural level this criticism has some
force because of the problems of relating expressed opinions to actual
behaviour in natural social settings. But again the criticism can be
over-stated. For example, much of the interviewing in the present
study, as will be seen below, was of interactive samples, that is, of
respondents who interact with each other in settings about which data
was collected and thus a high proportion of questions concerned rela-
tions with others where the replies of 'others' could also be analysed.
In this way a good deal of data on social relations as well as work
orientations was collected.

A considerable element of data and methodological triangulation
was introduced into the research design by the use of a range of
further strategies. Besides the main interview, shopfloor and super-
visor respondents were also asked to complete a self-administered leisure
questionnaire covering the period from the Friday evening to Sunday
evening immediately following the main interview. As the title implies,
this questionnaire sought information on respondents' activities and with whom they interacted in their leisure time. This data was helpful in the examination of hypotheses relating to the extent to which workers continued social relations with fellow workers in their leisure time and especially in relation to their integration into the wider society.

As noted earlier, a criticism of much previous research on manual workers has been the over-concentration on the workers themselves to the exclusion of others with whom they interact. To counteract this weakness and to provide further data, a programme of interviews with executives in the small and large firms was made an integral part of the research design. In the small firms, owner-managers and other senior executives were interviewed while in the larger firms interviews were mainly with production and personnel managers plus certain more senior managers. These interviews were semi-structured and in almost every instance took place over several occasions. On some occasions the interviews took the form of a panel discussion with a group of executives being interviewed together.

These executive interviews concentrated on two areas of data. First, information was sought on worker-management relations and especially on personnel selection practices. Executives were asked about their definitions of 'good' and 'bad' workers, what they saw as their main labour 'problems' and their overall view of social relations in the firm. Secondly, data was also gathered on the history of the firm, recent changes in organisation, the product mix and plans for the future. Shopfloor respondents often raised issues relating to this second area in their main interview and in the second and subsequent executive interviews these were introduced - in a way which would fully preserve worker respondents' anonymity - to elicit management views. The data from the executive interviews provided key material for testing hypotheses relating to occupational placement and internal social relations in the firm.

Two non-interview research strategies were also incorporated into the research design. The first of these was an organisational biography constructed for each firm in the study. This was built up from data gathered from a number of sources. First, was the researcher's direct observation of the firm over the fieldwork period. In every firm, the researcher spent some time, spread over a number of visits, talking to workers and supervisors and generally observing production
and social relations. The prime purpose of these visits was to arrange the main interviews with shopfloor and supervisory workers. On average this involved a 15-20 minute conversation with each potential respondent which included a discussion of his job and the product being made.

In each firm certain workers or supervisors became key informants. These were often people who had been with the firm some time or people who showed a particular interest in the research or people with whom the researcher developed a relationship over and above that developed with the typical respondent. These key informants were interviewed on several occasions in and out of work and provided a great deal of extra data on the firm and its workers.

Further data for the organisational biographies was derived from the main shopfloor worker and supervisor interviews and the executive interviews. Shopfloor and supervisory workers provided a good deal of data on the firm as part of their replies to the questions and probes in the main interview and, as noted earlier, executives were questioned directly on the history and organisation of the firm.

The final product was a set of written notes which provided an overall view of each firm. Since various informants often supplied information without perhaps intending to, which could be put alongside information from other sources, this organisational biography became rather more than the sum of its parts and provided a good deal of data for the hypotheses concerning the firm itself discussed in Chapter 4.

The second non-interview research strategy consisted of notes compiled immediately after each interview with shopfloor and supervisory respondents on the social context of the interview. The aim here was to compile data on patterns of social interaction between the respondent and other members of his household, especially husband-wife relations in the case of married respondents and on life-styles generally. Many respondents became interested enough in the subject matter of the interview to wish to continue discussing their views after the interview would normally have been completed. In some instances the wives of married respondents who had sat in on the interview took this opportunity to offer their views. This data was used to test hypotheses on non-work life discussed in Chapter 5. For example, respondents lived and worked in an area with a high middle class representation in the population and this data was helpful in
assessing the extent of any middle class influences on home life.

It is therefore argued that, the particular ways in which the survey strategy combined with other research strategies was used in the present study countered the main shortcomings attributed to this approach while retaining its main advantages. There can be no claim that all limitations were dealt with since all strategies have permanent, eradicable imperfections. But it is claimed that the strategies selected and the ways in which they were used, represent an acceptable compromise in relation to the aims and resources available for the research.

Specific Theoretical Constructs

The second major methodological issue to be discussed concerns the particular theoretical constructs selected for the study. A general case for the social action perspective was made earlier but in any particular piece of research decisions have to be made on how it is to be applied. It was also noted earlier that much of the previous research on manual workers employing a social action perspective, used static ideal type constructs which suggest an unchanging orientation may be attributed to a particular group of workers. This use of ideal type constructs has a number of serious disadvantages in the present context. For instance, as Ingham's analysis exemplifies, there is a temptation to accept that there is a single type of small firm worker with a fixed orientation. The highly questionable assumptions involved in this have been alluded to earlier and the substantial variation in worker definitions revealed by the data to be discussed in subsequent chapters, fully supports this point. It was considered, given these early doubts about previous work, that part of the weakness of existing interpretations rested on this usage of the ideal type and that, therefore, an alternative conceptual approach was required.

A second weakness of ideal type approaches is that they generally operate at a single level or confuse various levels of analysis. For example, Lockwood in his seminal article on working class images of society, which used the ideal type approach, tries to collapse two levels of analysis - orientations to work and firm and views of society in class and political terms - into one. This involves the further assumption that there is a one-to-one relationship between these two levels. An example of a view that operates at a single level is the implicit ideal type of the small firm worker offered by
the Bolton Report which refers only to workplace definitions and says nothing about the small firm worker as non-worker and the connections between these.

The alternative approach selected for the present study involved adopting three anchor constructs, each appropriate to a particular level of social reality. They were chosen because each has been found to be helpful in previous sociological research and each provided a very considerable measure of theoretical flexibility. By the latter is meant that each allows considerable room for the interpretation of data in a variety of ways without the necessary adoption of restrictive assumptions concerning work orientations which might be the case if other perspectives were adopted.

The first construct adopted was occupational identity defined as: the ideas, beliefs, knowledge and values which go with membership of a particular occupational role.

This construct has a long and distinguished previous usage in industrial sociology dating back to the 'Chicago School' of the 1930's and is particularly associated with Everett Hughes. The basic idea developed by Hughes and his followers was to explore, with the minimum of prior assumptions, the ways in which workers in particular roles define their work and work experiences. Through the notion of 'career', defined as the way in which the actor sees his occupational life as a whole, the worker's overall view of work is looked at rather than simply his prior orientations or his views of his present job and firm.

The advantages of the occupational identity construct for this study is that it enables us to start with a clean slate, without preconceptions of the small firm worker as a special social type. Nor does it beg the question of the salience of size of firm in the workers' definition of work: this question is left entirely open. But, equally, it does not preclude the testing of previous views for, the same data gathered to build up a picture of the common characteristics of workers' occupational identities also provides a clear test of previous findings.

Obviously, any individual worker's occupational identity will be complex and variable and is likely to contain a large number of meanings which the respondent may find difficult to verbalise. Fortunately, however, there is no intention of trying to delineate the workers' entire occupational identity but instead merely to
explore those aspects which are critical to the examination of the hypotheses formulated about attitudes to work, involvement in the firm and previous work experiences.

It has been stressed that work roles are only one - albeit crucially important - part of the individual's life and that to understand the individual's occupational identity we must also know about his non-work life. A development in theorising in relation to occupational identity is of considerable help here. This is the notion of 'latent social roles', that is, those social roles which the individual occupies in other social contexts than the one which is the main object of enquiry. The individual's definitions of work will be influenced by his definitions in other, non-work roles and vice versa. Moreover, changes in one will have some influence on the other although the impact may sometimes be difficult to determine or may take time to manifest itself fully.

The concept of occupational identity, aided by the notion of latent social roles, provide the main theoretical construct in the analysis of data at the level of the worker, his work role and non-work roles. But there is a further level of analysis which is also important and which provides a way of dealing with one of the major previous criticisms against the social action perspective - the over-concentration on the particular group of workers being studied to the neglect of other participants in the firm. It has been noted that among the research strategies used to counter this in the present study were the executive interviews and the development of organisational biographies for each firm. But at the theoretical level this over-concentration was countered by adopting the notion of industrial sub-culture. This may be defined as:

the distinctive set of meanings and behaviour patterns shared by those who work in a particular industry.

The review of previous material on one of the industries in the present study, printing, showed that the industry had a strongly developed sub-culture which would be of considerable importance in understanding the work organisation and relations between managers and workers. As the discussion in subsequent chapters shows, the other industry in the study, electronics, has an equally distinct sub-culture.

The third anchor construct used in analysing the data in the present study is image of society. This has been widely used in
previous studies, particularly by those employing a social action perspective, and needs little further discussion here. Again the point must be emphasised that although an individual's image of society defined as the ideas, beliefs and values which go to make up his overall view of the society in which he lives, will be complex, the present study will seek to examine only certain aspects of this image. These aspects, as in previous studies, mainly concern politics and social class.

Occupational identity, industrial sub-culture and image of society will not, of course, be treated as separate from each other. Each is related to the others and a central aim of the present study is to ascertain some of the main links involved. All emphasise the actors' viewpoint, although the actors involved are not only those who are the main foci of research but include others with whom they interact. Yet, at the same time, structural aspects cannot be ignored, particularly those which provide the objective situation of the worker and the firm - the local market situation for particular kinds of labour, the general level of economic activity, the trade union situation of the industry and so on. Workers' definitions will have some relation to these but, naturally, these definitions may not agree with the analysis of the researcher based upon data not normally available to the worker. The latter analysis, however, is assumed to provide the limitations within which the actors' freedom, regardless of his definitions, is constrained.

THE SAMPLES

The Sample Industries

In setting up the research design for the study, it was felt that previous research had not paid sufficient attention to the type of industry and products involved. Many studies, as noted in Chapter 1, have simply mixed together samples of small firms drawn from a wide range of industries apparently assuming that differences between industries had little or no effect on their findings. This implicit assumption may be found even among the most acceptable previous research. Batstone, for example, not only mixed firms from different industries but included nationalised undertakings in his control sample. Ingham controlled for such differences by selecting his entire sample of small firms from one industrial sector, light engineering, but this did not, of course, allow any investigation of differences between sectors.
Since selecting a sample of firms to allow a wide representation of different industries was totally beyond the resources available, it was decided to draw the samples from two industries chosen for their sharp contrast with each other on several relevant dimensions. The two industries chosen were printing and electronics. They were selected in the first instance because, a priori, they seemed to represent the two extremes of contemporary British industry. Printing, is an old established, craft-based industry dating back over 500 years while electronics is a modern science-based industry whose beginnings date back, at most, to the late 19th century but which did not really provide significant employment until after the First World War.

Within printing it was decided to interview workers in general printing and publishing since small firms in the industry are unlikely to be involved in newspaper printing. However, in discussing the industry as a whole, reference must be made to newspaper printing because virtually all workers in the latter are recruited from general printing. The prosperity and technology of newspaper printing, therefore, has a strong influence on employment prospects for all workers in the industry. This is particularly the case in the geographical area from which the present sample of printers were drawn because, under favourable conditions, many might expect to obtain work - either on a full-time or casual basis - on the national newspapers printed in London. The latter pay much higher rates than in general printing and competition for such jobs is high.

The electronics industry is, unfortunately, difficult to define precisely. It covers a very diverse range of products from computer controlled machine tool equipment to cheap transistor radios. It was decided, however, to confine the sample to firms involved in small batch production of technologically sophisticated products. Firms involved in manufacturing in two Minimum List Headings in the Standard Industrial Classification (MLH 354 and 367) met these requirements. The actual sample mainly contained firms in MLH 367. The main reasons for this selection were that small firms are more common in these areas than in, say, computer or mass production electronic consumer products and because of the sexual composition of the labour force. The electronics industry generally employs a high proportion of female labour (in 1973 43% of all employees) but in the area selected for study this proportion is about 30%, that is, similar to
the level in manufacturing industry as a whole. The reason for this is that female workers tend to be employed in mainly unskilled or semi-skilled work and in the areas from which the sample was drawn, there is much less work of this kind. Instead, the work approaches the character of a craft, with workers exercising a high degree of job discretion. This makes it, therefore, much more comparable with printing also an industry with relatively few female workers.

As Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show, the two industries present a contrast in several other ways than simply length of time in existence. While both industries have increased their gross output in the period 1970-75 by broadly similar proportions, printing shows a considerable decline in employment opportunities (-7.8%) but in electronics the fall was less than 1% and, in one of the areas studied, actually increased. Moreover, the greater reduction in jobs in printing was in the higher paid sector of newspaper printing.

The two industries also display differing size distributions. General printing is a small firm sector par excellence. As Table 2.2 shows, over 98% of establishments employ less than 200 people and, in fact, only 20 firms (less than 1% of all firms in general printing) had establishments employing over 750 people in 1973. Newspaper and periodical printing has more large firms but even here less than 25 firms had establishments employing more than 750 people in 1973. In the selected areas of the electronics industry although a high proportion of firms are small there are more large firms. In the radio, radar and electronic capital goods sector, for example, 11 firms had establishments employing over 1,500 in 1973. The scientific and industrial instruments sector of the electronics industry clearly contains a rather large proportion of small firms than the radio, radar and electronic capital goods sector but the proportion remains smaller than in general printing and publishing.

This difference in the size distributions of the two industries is reflected in the proportions employed in small and large establishments. In general printing, almost half (49.4%) of the workers are in establishments employing less than 100 people while in the two sectors of the electronics industries in the present study, less than 15% of workers are employed in establishments of this size. Over 80% of workers in electronics work in large establishments, as defined in the present study, compared to less than 40% in general printing.
### Table 2.1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>810.3</td>
<td>149,400</td>
<td>687.5</td>
<td>75,900</td>
<td>363.4</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>440.0</td>
<td>72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>924.8</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>768.2</td>
<td>72,400</td>
<td>398.3</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>472.7</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>975.0</td>
<td>132,100</td>
<td>898.8</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>398.5</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>475.9</td>
<td>64,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,160.5</td>
<td>137,600</td>
<td>1,037.3</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>512.6</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>612.6</td>
<td>70,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,456.6</td>
<td>137,100</td>
<td>1,253.2</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>708.8</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>748.9</td>
<td>65,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,741.6</td>
<td>138,900</td>
<td>1,352.3</td>
<td>68,800</td>
<td>857.5</td>
<td>46,100</td>
<td>863.6</td>
<td>65,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Report on the Census of Production, Provisional Results, 1975, HMSO, London, 1977, Table 1, PA1000 26-51

**Notes:**

2. Employment data covers shopfloor workers only and therefore does not agree with the totals in Table 2.2.
Another area of contrast between the two industries is trade union membership. General printing is one of the most highly unionised areas of British industry. Research by Price and Bain showed that, while just over half the labour force were trade union members in 1974, in paper, printing and publishing 71.6% of workers were in trade unions. Indeed, several commentators have argued that trade unions in printing have an exceptionally high degree of influence in the industry as compared to unions in other industries.

It has proved impossible to obtain reliable estimates of trade union membership in the electronics industry because of the problems in defining the exact boundaries of the industry, because no trade union exclusively recruits members in the industry and because no official data exists on the distribution of union membership by industry. Trade union participation is, however, unlikely to be high, or even to reach the average level in manufacturing industry. Price and Bain provided data on trade union participation for 35 industrial sectors but, unfortunately, electronics was not among them. In a footnote they state that in the areas not mentioned union density was low compared to the average in the labour force as a whole.

An important final contrast in the two industries is their rate of technological change. The electronics industry, from its inception, has had a very high rate of innovation. As Allen has pointed out:

"... industries at the beginning of their careers, are likely to expand rapidly because most of the demand at that time is 'new', in the sense that... customers are in the market for the first time. After all potential areas have been satisfied, however, demand is likely to become stagnant or even decline because it is now mainly a demand for replacements... the electronics industry has avoided this condition because whenever the 'new' demand... has approached saturation, it has been revived by some outstanding innovation." (66)

Since 1950, for example, television (black and white and now colour) computers, audio equipment and industrial electronics have each produced innovations leading to massive demand. More recently, microelectronics, most obviously represented by the pocket calculator, has emerged as the next level of innovation. This innovation is also expected to produce a high level of demand.

Printing, on the other hand, has manifested a very slow rate of technological change until recently. Until this decade the rate of change was so slow that it was suggested that if Caxton returned he would have few difficulties in understanding the ordinary workshop.
### TABLE 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishments %</td>
<td>Employment %</td>
<td>Establishments</td>
<td>Employment %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-99</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>96,283</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>26,081</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and over</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72,479</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES:

### NOTES:
2. The data refers to establishments not enterprises because in the Census of Production the statistical unit is the individual establishment. A single enterprise may control more than one establishment and these may vary in size. However, the excess of establishments over enterprises is usually not large and since the enterprises controlling more than one establishment will tend to be those employing over 200, the above distributions may be taken as broadly accurate indicators of the size distribution of enterprises at the small firm end of the distribution.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
But in the present decade a number of important changes have begun to have far-reaching effects on the whole industry. These changes range from a switch from traditional letter-press printing to lithography in general printing to the introduction of computer typesetting in newspaper printing. The latter eliminates the traditional composing stages in newspaper production and the compositor - the key craft worker in the industry (66) The rate of introduction of these new methods is relatively slow for a number of reasons ranging from the cost of the investment in new technology, to confusion over which new technology to adopt, to trade union resistance. But observers are agreed that not only is this the most important technological revolution since the introduction of printing itself but that from now on change will be continuous. (68)

For the above reasons, therefore, these two industries were selected to provide a contrast sufficient to assess the importance of the industrial context on firms of varying size. The industrial culture, it was hypothesised, would have varying impact on the definitions of work held by shopfloor workers and that these might compete with or even be stronger than influences associated with size of firm. In choosing printing as one of the industries, there was the additional advantage of a pre-existing literature to guide preliminary theorising and the opportunity for the present research to update this literature, especially in the light of the technological changes discussed above.

The Sample Firms

The selection of firms from which workers were to be interviewed was influenced by several considerations. First, the decision on the number of firms to be included was largely dictated by the size of the total shopfloor worker sample envisaged. The latter, as noted earlier, was to be the largest available resources would allow in order to produce reasonably sized sub-samples. The target total of small firm respondents adopted was 150 and it was estimated that, if small firms broadly representing the size spectrum of 1-200 employees were to be sampled, then about eight firms would produce the desired sample. The target size adopted for the control sample was 75 - again largely dictated by available resources - and two firms were thought sufficient to provide this sample.

The second reason influencing the selection of firms was geographical. Initial investigations showed that the Surrey area
contained sufficient numbers of small and large firms in the two industries but limitations of resources dictated that no firm more than 15 miles from Kingston upon Thames should be considered. Respondents may live some distance from their place of work and even adopting a 15 mile limit meant that some interviews involved a round trip of 60 miles. Adopting a larger geographical area from which to recruit firms might have meant that some interviews would have been unable to arrange or could only take place under unsuitable conditions thus leading to bias.

A third factor influencing selection here was available information on local firms. In the case of the printing industry obtaining information on the whereabouts and type of product of firms was relatively easy. Trade directories, the local Industrial Liaison Officer, personal contacts with local trade union representatives and the British Federation of Master Printers (now the British Printing Industries Federation) produced ample information from which to compile a list of local firms. However, this may not have been complete; it is quite possible that small firms existed who were not known to any of the above.

Selecting firms in the electronics industry in the two sectors chosen was altogether much more difficult. Trade directories were unhelpful because of the problems of defining the boundaries of the industry and, more important, did not provide sufficient information on type of product made or numbers employed. Company names were often misleading since companies with the word 'electronics' in their names sometimes had only a slight connection with the industry. Trade associations were also vague on members' product mix and many firms, especially small firms, were not members. The low level of unionisation also made local trade union officials a poor source of information. The list of possible firms compiled for this industry, therefore, was largely based upon information from personal contacts, senior executives of local firms in the industry, a local productivity association and local Industrial Liaison Officers. But, clearly, the list was incomplete and in no way could be seen as a proper sampling frame.

But by far the most important influence on the selection of firms was willingness on the part of management to participate. In Chapter 1, the well established reluctance of small firm owner-managers to co-operate in research was discussed and easily the most difficult
fieldwork problem in the present study was gaining access to the small firms. Letters to managing directors, requesting an interview to discuss the research, usually received an outright refusal or no answer at all. The decision to recruit firms evenly spread across the size spectrum of up to 200 employees added to this problem because, as Table 2.2 shows, there are relatively few establishments in the size category 100 to 200. Finding suitable firms in this size category was a difficult task and negotiating entry especially stressful because refusals meant further problems in locating suitable firms. Personal introduction was the only reliable way of obtaining an interview and it was on this basis that the eight small firms were finally selected from a possible 12 whose management agreed to discuss the research. (The four firms not selected were either unsuitable because of the type of product made or because a firm of their specific size had already agreed to participate).

Access to the two large firms from which the control sample was recruited was much easier. The area contained only a handful of firms suitable for this purpose in terms of their product character and their existence was easily established. Two, one in each industry, were selected and their senior management approached through personal contacts. Both agreed to participate and, after separate approaches and negotiation, trade union representatives in the firms also offered their full co-operation.

It must be accepted, therefore, that the sample firms in the present study are not statistically representative. It could be that the willingness of senior management to co-operate in the research made them unrepresentative of other firms in their industry in this area and especially of small firms. On the other hand, the point may be made that the non-representativeness of senior management does not necessarily extend to their shopfloor workers. As will be seen in Chapter 4, social relations between senior management and shopfloor workers were not close and, therefore, any bias arising from the selection of firms may not have affected the representativeness of the worker samples.

Table 2.3 lists the firms and gives details of size. (Names of firms are pseudonyms since all were guaranteed confidentiality in any publication of results but they have been chosen to reflect the product and character of the firm.) The smallest printing firm,
Silver, Brown and Stone, had a somewhat unusual structure which affects the use of the data from its respondents. About two years prior to the research, one of the two owners of the firm had retired through ill health and the remaining partner was nearing retirement. The latter had a son who had just entered the business but would not be able to take over if his father was forced to retire. It was therefore decided to offer 50% of the shares in the firm to four long-serving shopfloor workers and the remaining partner's son. Therefore, of the 11 male members of the firm, six were directors. However, day to day administration was in the hands of the senior partner and two of the newer directors. All partners did some shopfloor work and three did exactly the same job as before they became partners. Major policy decisions were taken at monthly meetings which took place after normal working hours. For the analysis in the present study all male members of the firm were asked to agree to be interviewed and the directors' replies, as former shopfloor workers, are included in the examination of hypotheses relating to previous work experience examined in Chapter 3. However, in the two subsequent chapters on experience in the current firm and non-work life, the interviews with the directors form part of the data gathered in the executive interviews.

The remaining small printing firms were conventionally organised and illustrate the variation to be expected among such firms at the present time. For example, Baker Lithographic, as the pseudonym implies, does no traditional letter-press work and is representative of recent trends in printing away from the latter. It is also a non-trade union firm which is again more common among firms not using traditional technology. The remaining two small firms are both unionised and use more traditional technology (although one, Leadprint, has begun to switch to newer technology).

All the small electronics firms were conventionally organised and as the pseudonyms in Table 2.3 hint, their main products range from sophisticated measuring equipment used in the electronics industry itself, to aircraft equipment, to equipment used in intensive care units in hospitals. It will be noted that total employment in Electronic Instruments Limited was higher than 25, the upper limit of the size range it was selected to represent. The reason for this was that the interviewing programme was spread over several weeks and in between negotiating access to the firm and the end of the inter-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Total F.T Employment</th>
<th>Total Supervisors and Shopfloor Workers</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
<th>Response Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Silver, Brown &amp; Stone</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker Lithographic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadprint</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Periodicals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45(1 in 2 sample)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total and Average Response Rate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>Electronic Instruments</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memaid Electronics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Electronics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aero Electronics</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>35(1 in 2 sample)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total and Average Response Rate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Printing Co. Ltd</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Radi Co Ltd</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Totals</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
viewing programme, total employment in the firm rose above the 25 limit.

The large printing firm, the Surrey Printing Company, is by printing industry standards very large. It contained a general printing department specialising in high quality work (it has a royal warrant) and a local newspaper printing department. The large electronics firm which provided the remainder of the control sample, the National Radar Company, is a subsidiary of one of Britain’s major electronics groups. It is an international supplier of radar equipment used mainly for military purposes. It employs 1,600 at the establishment in the present study but a very high proportion of these are in research and development and administration.

Thus, the firms in each industry in the main and control samples were similar in most respects in terms of type of product, skill mix of workers and geographical location. Of course, the matching of firms is not exact, since this is virtually impossible given the limitations and problems of selecting the firms discussed above. But it is argued that a closer match has been achieved than has usually been the case in previous research.

The Sample Respondents

Table 2.3 also gives details of the shopfloor and supervisory respondents interviewed in each firm. It was decided to exclude women workers for two main reasons. First, printing has relatively few women workers and they are usually confined to peripheral tasks. As noted earlier, to allow for this, the electronics firms were chosen from two areas in the industry likely to employ few women workers. Second, since the size of the main sample was to be about 150, it was felt that to include women workers would have reduced sub-samples to a size where interpretations would be virtually impossible. (As will be seen in later chapters, even with an all male sample, sub-samples are often smaller than desirable.)

The decision to include supervisors in the sample did, unfortunately, lead to problems in the fieldwork and analysis. It had not been appreciated just how big was the difference in the span of control of supervisors between small and large firms. In the small firms this was so much narrower than in the large firms that supervisors are over-represented in the small firm sample. Therefore, in several areas of analysis supervisor sub-samples are excluded because their views would mask the differences between small firm and large firm
shopfloor workers.

In the two largest of the small firms (Richmond Periodicals and Aero Electronics) Table 2.3 reports that the shopfloor and supervisory workers interviewed were drawn from one in two samples of all potential respondents. Two reasons underlay the decision to adopt this sampling fraction. First, to have interviewed all male shopfloor workers and supervisors would have resulted in the sample from these two firms having an overwhelming influence on the overall results from the small firm samples. Second, to have interviewed all possible manual and supervisory respondents in these firms would have raised the overall sample in the study well beyond the resources available.

In the two control sample firms respondents were selected from departments chosen because their tasks and technology were close counterparts to those of the small firm respondents in the main sample. As Table 2.3 shows, this produced a potential sample of 111 which was well above the target sample of 75 originally chosen but the size and composition of departments made adopting other strategies impracticable.

Overall, the total sample interviewed at 233 had rather fewer small firm respondents than originally planned (145 instead of 150) and rather more large firm respondents (88 instead of 75).

The response rates shown in Table 2.3 compare favourably with those achieved in research on similar samples of manual workers using similar methodologies. Although the rate varied from firm to firm nowhere did it fall below 70%. Attempts to obtain as much information on non-respondents as possible were, of course, made. Several non-respondents, while being unwilling to be formally interviewed, were nevertheless prepared to talk to the researcher on the shopfloor on a casual basis. Besides providing information on non-respondents, these interviews also sometimes provided further data for the organisational biographies. Information on non-respondents was also sought from key informants in their respective firms.

Table 2.4 reports the age distribution of the manual and supervisory worker samples. It is immediately apparent that there is a substantial difference in the age distributions of the two samples with small firm respondents being, on average, 9.2 years younger than the large firm respondents. Within the main and control samples, however, there is very little difference between the two industries. At
first this difference suggested the possibility that the small firm sample contained an over-representation of younger respondents. However as the analysis proceeded it became clear that the difference between the samples was a genuine one due to differences between the work situations of the small and large firm workers. These differences are thoroughly explored in Chapters 3 and 6 but, briefly, they result from differences in the employee selection methods of small and large firm employers and workers' occupational choices. Other research on small firm workers has reported similar differences. As might be expected from the above there were also differences in the marital state of respondents in the main and control samples. Among the small firm sample, 54.7% were married but among the large firm control sample this rose to 72.7%. In much of the analysis, therefore, it has been necessary to control for this difference and to be aware of the difference in non-work life situations which arise from differences in marital state and which, in turn, are likely to be closely related to orientations to work and firm.

THE SHOPFLOOR AND SUPERVISORY WORKER QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaires employed in the interviews with shopfloor workers and supervisors are presented in the Appendix. The main interview questionnaire was developed following the piloting of an earlier version on workers in two small firms (one in each of the industries in the main study). As discussed earlier, it incorporated features designed to counter the weaknesses of the survey interview research strategy which have emerged in previous research. The main feature of this kind was the extensive use of open questions and probes designed to encourage the respondent to give as full an answer as possible.

A further feature of the questionnaire is the inclusion of a number of questions used in previous research on manual workers. The aims here were to cut down the risk of unsuitable questions surviving the pilot survey testing and, above all, to increase the comparability of the present findings with those of other research. Of course, the extent to which this aim could be met was restricted by the need to ask questions specific to the hypotheses being tested in the present research but it was found possible to include a number of such questions. Reference is made to the findings and comparisons which followed from this strategy at the appropriate points in subsequent chapters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 21</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 but less than 30</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 but less than 40</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 but less than 50</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50 but less than 60</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60 and over</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N               | 73                          | 66                             | 46                         | 45 (1)                        | 159                  | 87                     |

| Average Age:    | 27.4                       | 28.8                           | 27.6                       | 27.1                          | 28.1                 | 37.5                   |

**Notes:**

1. One respondent's age is not known.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Although the exact sequence and number of questions asked of the respondent depended partly on his personal characteristics, such as marital state, type of job held and whether the firm was unionised or not, interviews typically lasted between 50 minutes and two hours. Younger workers, with limited previous experience and usually fewer opinions on many issues, provided the shortest interviews but older workers frequently gave 1½ hours or more of their time. (The latter included the respondents noted earlier who extended the interview beyond the time required to complete the questionnaire to discuss issues in which they were particularly interested.) Straightforward questions on previous work experience and similar areas were introduced at the beginning of the interview and questions on more sensitive areas such as politics and social class towards the end. In other words, questions of this kind were only asked after the researcher had had the opportunity to establish a firm rapport with the respondent. These questions, it may be argued, are intrinsically more interesting for most respondents and coming at the end of the interview helped to counter any possibility of respondent fatigue. The use of card statement questions at several points in the interview also introduced an element of novelty.

As previously noted, respondents were also asked at the end of the main interview if they would complete a leisure questionnaire over the weekend following the interview and return this to the researcher in a pre-paid envelope. (This questionnaire is also reproduced in the Appendix). It asked respondents to indicate by ticking the appropriate items on a 30 item check-list, what they were doing in each of seven time periods from Friday to Sunday evening. The aim here was to collect further data on non-work life and activities. Just over 75% of those interviewed returned the questionnaire and the information is used in the examination of hypotheses in Chapter 5.

Further points of theoretical and methodological concern are discussed in relation to particular issues in later chapters but the above provides an overall outline of the strategies employed and the reasons for their adoption. The data gathered from the various strategies have been analysed in several ways. Data that could be treated in a standardised fashion was analysed and tabulated with the aid of a computer. Qualitative data, derived from the interviews and other research strategies, was analysed by inspection. In some instances the same data could be treated in both ways. The availability of all
the interviews on tape meant that not only could a variety of ways of categorising and analysing data be attempted to test out aspects of hypotheses but also that such analysis could be supported by a knowledge of respondents' overall views which were impossible to categorise in any convenient fashion. One result of the latter is that it has been found impossible to reduce the findings to any overall simple array of types and certainly there is no support for any simple notion of 'the small firm worker'. On the other hand, the findings are sufficiently clear in many instances to provide a convincing test of the hypothesis relating to each of the three areas of the worker's life studied and may be argued to justify overall the theoretical and methodological strategies adopted.
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CHAPTER 3. BECOMING A SMALL FIRM WORKER

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the data collected in relation to the first of the three main areas of the study, the work career of the small firm worker. As noted in Chapter 1 in the review of previous research, an influential view has been that small firm workers develop a distinct set of orientations which leads them increasingly to seek employment in the small rather than the large firm. It was argued that this notion had been very inadequately tested and that the present study would explore this view more thoroughly. It should also be noted that the discussion of the development of worker orientations has rarely been grounded in the wider theorising and research on occupational placement.

Despite the existence of a considerable literature in sociology and psychology, just how manual workers come to occupy particular work roles is by no means clear. Much of the psychological literature consists of attempts to devise methods of selecting individuals for specific jobs - selection tests, personality and interest inventories and the like - which has little relevance for the present research. They are only infrequently used in the selection of manual workers, are virtually never used in small firms and make relatively little reference to the worker's own aspirations and self-definition.

However, some of the psychological literature does look at occupational placement much more from the actors' point of view and in terms of a process occurring over time. Lancashire has usefully divided this material into two groups:

1. The Differentialists who attempt to distinguish differences between people in contrasting occupations in various areas of the economy. Roe provides one well known, if much criticised, example of this kind of approach while Holland has produced a more sophisticated version. These approaches resemble those in the personnel selection literature above and similarly lack relevance for the present study since size of firm is not among the factors considered.

2. The Developmentalists who attempt to explore the ways in which people develop their ideas about occupation and work throughout the life cycle. Probably the best known example of this type is that of Ginzberg closely followed by the critical reformulation of Super. These theories suggest that individuals proceed through several stages of mental preparation or adjustment in relation to occupational
placement. These stages begin well before the individual enters adult employment and continue during the individual's early work career. The first stage typically consists of fantasising about possible work roles and occurs before and during the early teenage period. The next stage is one of tentative choice and occurs around the period of entry into work and is followed by stages in which trial jobs may be taken, followed finally by acceptance of a job perceived as a life-time work role.

Leaving aside the criticisms of these theories made by other psychologists concerning methodological shortcomings such as the narrow social class basis of sample selection and the cross-sectional rather than longitudinal interviewing of subjects, they appear to the sociologist as unsatisfactory on several other counts. In particular, there is the treatment of the actor's wider social context as passive and unchanging. There is, for instance, little reference to the differing selection practices of employers and the ways in which these may vary in different sectors of the economy or in relation to factors such as the level of employment in the local labour market. In a rapidly changing economy the assumption that the individual will not be forced to revise his ideas concerning the desirability of an occupational role, perhaps several times in his work life, seems highly questionable.

Sociological Theories of Occupational Placement

Sociological theories of occupational placement are somewhat closer to the developmental than the differential approach but they rarely assume a long time span of development. Rather it is recognised that, compared to the several year time span typically assumed by psychological writers, in real life occupational placement processes are often highly situational and time-specific. Equally important, is the recognition that structural factors are of great importance in explaining occupational placement. This is supported by numerous studies showing the varying but significant influence of social class and family origin, education, relatives, locality, the structure of the local employment market and vocational guidance services.

Sociological theories of occupational placement, therefore, appear more relevant to the present study although they are not without their own limitations. For example, few writers could seriously claim to offer anything more than a partial framework for the analysis of occupational placement even for a single group of work roles such as the skilled manual worker. The major problem for the present study is
that there is little previous work on the small firm worker and what little there is seems to have been generated largely without reference to the central themes and findings of the wider literature on occupational placement.

Without examining each of the important sociological contributions on how workers come to occupy particular work roles in detail, it is nevertheless helpful to examine some of the issues and findings discussed. One of the earlier influential pieces of theorising which raises several of the concerns central to occupational placement studies, was that of Blau et al. Although the authors claim that their work incorporates ideas from three disciplines (psychology, economics and sociology) in practice it is clearly mainly sociological. They adopt an essentially developmental approach but also place a good deal of emphasis on structural factors.

One important theme introduced is that of occupational choice being distinguished from both occupational selection and occupational placement. Occupational choice concerns those elements over which the actor has actual or potential control. Occupational selection concerns those elements over which the actor has little control since they are the province of the employing organisation. Together these two sets of elements comprise the basic components of the total process of occupational placement although it will also be influenced by more general structural factors such as the class origin of the actor or the general level of employment in the economy.

A further theme in Blau et al’s paper, much echoed in the later literature, is that occupational choice has two aspects. On one side there is a hierarchy of job preferences based on the actor’s perceptions of their rewards and, on the other side, there is his estimate of the probability of entry into various occupations. Choice of occupation is seen as a compromise between these two sets of perceptions. Thus, it is unlikely that the actor will seek his most preferred occupation if he feels his chances of entry are slim. Instead he will seek a job lower in his hierarchy of preferred occupations which he feels he has a better chance of obtaining.

An illustration of the way this theme has been reiterated in more recent British theorising on occupational placement is provided by the widely cited paper by Ford and Box. In their theory they restate the above idea in terms of the following two propositions:
1. In choosing between alternative occupations, a person will rank the occupations in terms of the relation between his values and the perceived characteristics of the occupation; the higher the coincidence between the characteristics and his values, the higher the rank.

2. The higher a person perceives the probability that he will obtain employment in the higher-ranked occupation, the more likely he is to choose that occupation." (11)

Another important issue originally raised in the Blau et al paper which has been the subject of more recent theorising, is what may be called the 'drift thesis'. Empirical studies, especially of manual workers, have repeatedly indicated that many workers appear to obtain jobs in an aimless, haphazard fashion. They seem to have a very incomplete knowledge of the labour market; they rarely investigate more than a limited range of available jobs and accept jobs almost as if they were indifferent to what they do. Blau et al reject the idea that workers simply drift into jobs and claim that the worker always decides to take one job rather than another. However, their definition of 'decision' is rather a loose one since they argue that a 'decision' must always be made explicitly or implicitly, consciously or unconsciously.

Ford and Box also discuss the apparently fortuitous nature of many job choices by workers and like Blau et al, reject the idea although for a different reason. They argue that any suggestion that workers simply drift into jobs can have no place in a sociological theory of occupational choice. It is the task of a theory to establish the factors which influence choice whether the actor is conscious of them or not. They then go on to claim that:

"There is now general agreement that this phenomenon [occupational choice] is to be viewed as a rational process by which certain desired ends are weighed against the perceived probability of their attainment." (15)

However, this seems an attempt to circumvent the well established findings on occupational choice behaviour. Rather than the rational process that Ford and Box wish to suggest, available findings indicate that, given certain minimal criteria concerned with such factors as locality, wage rates, opportunities for working overtime, chances of extending technical experience and the like, it might be more accurate to describe the way in which manual workers choose their jobs in terms of Simon's notion of 'satisficing'. (16) In other words, the worker does not attempt to find the job that would most satisfy all he desires in a job but takes the first available job that appears to meet this set of minimal criteria.
Roberts, in a more recent article, has pointed out that there is a widespread ideology of free occupational choice in our society which is not matched by reality. He argues that in practice the most important determinant of occupational placement is the social proximity to different types of occupation which results from the individual's educational attainment, class of origin and so on. He feels that the individual's ambitions have very little to do with occupational placement. Indeed, he argues that, in practice, ambitions adapt to the experience of work rather than shape the direction in which the worker attempts to make a work career.

A final issue worth discussing at this point is the relevance of the notion of 'career' itself to manual workers' work experiences. Conventionally, 'career' is used to refer to a more or less consciously planned sequence of work experiences through which the worker attempts to realise a long term occupational aim. This process is usually thought to be best exemplified by the professional worker where a career may be seen as covering the whole employment period from completing full-time education to retirement. However, the degree to which the actual sequence of work experiences is planned, as opposed to being constructed as a 'career' ex post facto by the actor, is debatable even for such occupations as the law where there are recognised levels of employment which can only be attained after a long period of experience and practice.

For the manual worker the notion of career is even more questionable. Apart from doing an apprenticeship, which only a minority of manual workers do anyway, the rest of the workers' work life typically has few recognised stages. There are limited opportunities for promotion, usually to supervisor only, but given the normal span of control at supervisory level in British industry, the average manual worker cannot statistically expect to be promoted. Moreover, as the present research shows, replicating the findings of earlier research, a large proportion of manual workers claim not to want promotion.

Thus, as soon as the manual worker has achieved the requisite skill level for his type of work (often a period much shorter than the craft apprenticeship) and gained some experience, he faces a long period of work, allowing for technological change, which is similar to his present work in firms rather similar to the one he presently works for, until retirement. It is, therefore, unlikely that he will see work experience in terms of a career as defined above. This may also go
some way to explaining frequent findings of apparent indifference in relation to choosing jobs among manual workers. Some firms may pay rather better than others (although such knowledge may not be available in industries with little wage standardisation) or have better equipment but, on the whole, one job may appear very much like another.

**Occupational Placement and the Small Firm Worker**

In the literature on manual worker occupational placement there is little relating size of firm to occupational choice decisions. But it is widely believed that some workers choose to work for small firms rather than large firms while others choose to work for large rather than small firms. Ingham argues strongly for this view and supports it with findings from his research. The idea that size is an important factor in job choice decision-making underlies his whole thesis of self-selection among small firm workers. Essentially, he argues that, over time, workers build up a stable set of orientations central to occupational choice. Those who develop 'economistic-instrumental' orientations, stressing earnings but placing a low valuation on non-economic rewards, will tend to seek work in large firms while workers who develop 'non-economistic-expressive' orientations which focus on non-economic rewards, will tend to work for small firms. Some workers do end up in firms whose characteristics are incongruent with their orientations but if this occurs they will quit after a short time:

"... such incongruent relationships may be viewed as errors in self-selection due to faulty information or complete ignorance of the situation." (18)

Ingham claims substantial support in his data for these ideas but the data from the present research conflicts with his views and leads to an alternative, more complex interpretation of occupational choice in relation to working for firms of different size. However, even before this alternative interpretation is developed there are several observations to make about Ingham's arguments which might in any case foster doubts.

First, there is his surprising lack of reference to previous thinking on occupational placement of the kind discussed earlier in this chapter. This is all the more surprising as Ingham's argument goes very much against the main thrust of argument in the literature and especially the repeated stress on the fortuitous character of job selection decisions among manual workers. Indications of a strong element of self-selection in relation to job choices are unusual.
The study by Goldthorpe et al of large firm manual workers (19), a study which appears to have crucially influenced Ingham's own thinking, is an exception to the above. But, as others have pointed out (20), the sample interviewed by Goldthorpe et al cannot be seen as typical of manual workers in several important respects. For instance, as the researchers themselves state:

"In the light of the comparative material available, our sample of affluent workers must be regarded as being geographically highly mobile." (21)

Manual workers in general and especially those who live in areas of relatively high employment, tend to be highly immobile. Data presented in a subsequent chapter shows that workers in the present study follow the more typical pattern of immobility. Or again, Goldthorpe et al report that their sample showed much more downward intergenerational social mobility than would be expected for a more normal sample of manual workers and 63% of the Luton sample had siblings of white collar status. (22)

Although further differences which make the Goldthorpe et al sample atypical could be cited, three are specifically mentioned as relevant to occupational choice decision-making. Geographical mobility, in particular, may be taken as indicative of an exceptionally positive consideration of job opportunities followed by equally exceptional action. Such positive action is perhaps not surprising given that many of the sample had come from areas with high levels of persistent unemployment but for most of the period since the end of the Second World War this has not been the experience of most workers in Britain. Having white collar siblings is likely, as the authors admit, to make a manual worker more conscious of the range of occupational possibilities and rewards than would be the case for workers from all manual families. Again, this might be expected to promote a higher level of positive thinking about job changing.

In other words, it is misleading to take the pattern of occupational decision-making reported for the Luton sample as typical of manual workers in general. The more ill-defined process reported in the bulk of the literature seems to be the normal pattern yet Ingham's thesis implies that we should expect to find a strong element of self-selection in manual workers' occupational decision-making related to orientations having to do with size and its associated rewards and disadvantages.
Despite the emphasis in Ingham's analysis on the development of a specific orientation throughout the workers' employment experience there were relatively few questions on his interview schedule on previous work experience. There was also little attempt to trace any possible development of orientations over time. Only three questions concern motivations on taking or leaving previous jobs. There are a number of questions concerning motivations connected with staying or leaving the respondent's current job but these are concerned with present orientations rather than the development and persistence of orientations in previous jobs. This is a very serious omission given the need to establish the stability of a definition of work which will override situational factors relevant to the acceptance or leaving of jobs such as limited knowledge of alternative jobs or the special demands associated with the family life cycle.

However, despite these doubts, these ideas on self-selection among small firm workers led to the setting up of the first of the hypotheses to be tested in this chapter:

1. That small firm workers gradually build up, throughout their work experience, a set of persistent orientations which lead them to choose working for a small firm rather than a large firm. The development of these orientations will be evident in the decisions associated with successive job changes and will, compared to large firm workers, emphasise intrinsic considerations.

The second hypothesis to be considered was suggested by the existing literature on the world-view of the small firm owner-manager, discussed in Chapter 1, and the pilot study findings:

2. That the occupational selection practices of small firm employers will differ from those of large firm employers and that this will affect the occupational placement of manual workers in both kinds of firms.

Ingham, like most other writers on occupational placement (although with the exception of Blau et al, as pointed out above) neglects the importance of employers' occupational selection practices. This is important in the present context since it implies that the selection practices of small and large firms are identical which, as will be seen, is far from the case. The differences are, in fact, substantial and help, for example, to account for the big difference in the average age of respondents in the small and large firm samples in the present study (discussed in Chapter 2) as well as the comparative absence of workers aged over 45 among the small firm sample.

The third hypothesis was also partly suggested by the pilot study findings but, in addition, reflects the findings of several pieces
of previous research on manual workers:

3. That job change decisions among small firm workers are related to a wide range of influences which may be seen as external to immediate orientations to work. Important among such influences are marital state and position in the life cycle but other influences such as the economic situation of the industry will also be relevant.

The importance of influences of this kind on orientations to work has been well established in previous research but has not been directly linked to the small firm manual workers' orientations. Batstone makes no reference to such influences and Ingham argues that life cycle position has little or no influence on small firm workers' definitions of work. Nor did Ingham examine the importance of the economic situation of the industry in which his respondents worked as a source of such influences. The findings from the present study, it will be argued, indicate the importance of this neglect and how the small firm worker resembles other manual workers in reacting to external influences of this kind. This neglect, it will be noted, is an example of the weakness (discussed in Chapter 2) of much research employing a social action approach in neglecting the objective situation of the worker.

These three hypotheses on occupational placement provide the basic propositions which the data examined in this chapter tests. However, as will be seen in the following analysis, the data, in offering an alternative view of the differences between small and large firm workers in this aspect of work life, allows us to go beyond the immediate concerns of the hypotheses to suggest other factors of importance.

THE OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF THE SAMPLES

It was decided that to adequately test the three hypotheses it would be necessary to investigate the previous work experiences of the sample in some detail. As can be seen in the main interview schedule (see Appendix) the initial 21 questions cover respondents' previous work history and these are followed by questions concerning reasons for taking the job held at the time of interview. In addition, the interviews with small and large firm executives provided data to test the second hypothesis.

Younger respondents, of course, had often had only one or two main jobs but older respondents had sometimes had a large number of
It was, therefore, necessary to compromise between collecting as much detail on previous work experience as possible and not using too much of the available interview time on this one topic. Hence, it was decided to restrict the questions to details of the first job on completing full-time education (regardless of the period this job was held) the next main job (that is, a job held for more than one year), the last main job prior to the current job and, finally, the current job. One problem in collecting data of this kind is that respondents may have failures of memory but by confining the questions to the first job ever and subsequent 'main' jobs the seriousness of this problem was reduced.

If the partners in Silver, Brown and Stone are included in the total, then information was gathered on 499 jobs held by respondents prior to those held at the time of interview. Thus, although the data does not cover all jobs held prior to the job at the time of interview, it can with fairness be said to deal with respondents' work experience in some depth. An overall picture of respondents' work experience is provided in Table 3.1.

However, the Table is misleading in that it suggests that workers in the large firms have had more main jobs than the small firm workers. It will be remembered from the discussion of the basic characteristics of the samples in Chapter 2 that, on average, workers in the large firm control sample were 9.2 years older than workers in the main small firm sample. It is, therefore, necessary to control for age in making comparisons of respondents' work histories. When such an allowance for age is made, the relationship between number of main jobs held since completing full-time education and the type of firm in which the respondent works becomes the reverse of that implied in Table 3.1. The difference is very marked in both industries although more so in the printing than in the electronics industry.

In printing, for example, excluding respondents whose job at the time of interview was their first job after completing full-time education, 62.7% of the small firm respondents aged under 30 had had two or more main jobs. The comparable figure for workers in the large printing firm was only 24.3%. Over a third of small firm printing workers aged under 30 had had three or more main jobs whereas this was true of less than 20% of the large firm workers. Extending the comparison to workers under 45 years of age, 90.2% of the workers in the small printing firms had had two or more main jobs; the comparable figure
for the large firm control sample was 62.2%.

The sample of workers drawn from the electronics industry show a similar, if less marked, contrast. Thus, again excluding respondents who had had only the job at the time of interview, 47.1% of the respondents in the small electronics firms, aged under 30, had had two or more main jobs. Among the large firm control sample the comparable percentage was 34.9. However, for respondents aged under 45 the percentages having had two or more main jobs were similar (76.3% among small firm workers and 72.1% among the large firm sample.)

It may be argued that the most informative comparison here is between respondents aged under 30 years. In the period from completion of full-time education to about the age of 30, the main pattern and character of the manual workers' occupational experience is established. Most of the major changes of job and industry will be made in this period since by this age the respondent will usually be married and seeking a secure and regular income. Family responsibilities may also be expected to inhibit further experiment in variety of work.

But also, as later years are approached and especially after the age of 45, barriers posed by employers' employment practices will also tend to lead to fewer job changes. This point is highly relevant to the second hypothesis on employers' worker selection practices. Small firm employers find it easier to implement a preference for workers below the age of 45. However, such preferences are more difficult for the larger employer to practice particularly in the unionised printing firm where the union has a strong influence on who is employed but also in any large firm where employment practices are more 'visible' to the outsider.

It is, therefore, not surprising that there is a convergence in the number of main jobs held throughout the working life where the comparison is of workers aged over 45. The large firm worker, who has had fewer main jobs anyway, will tend to stay on in the job he holds at the age of 40 or thereabouts while the rate of change from one main job to another by the small firm worker will slow down considerably.

Of course, it could be argued in relation to the data presented above that, although workers in the large firm control sample have had, on average, fewer main jobs than the small firm workers, this might not necessarily indicate greater stability of employment experience. Large
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job at Interview only job since completing F.T Education</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Main Jobs</td>
<td>18 22.8</td>
<td>13 20.3</td>
<td>10 22.7</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>31 21.7</td>
<td>13 14.8</td>
<td>44 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>19 24.1</td>
<td>12 18.7</td>
<td>8 18.2</td>
<td>9 20.5</td>
<td>31 21.7</td>
<td>17 19.3</td>
<td>48 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>9 11.4</td>
<td>9 14.1</td>
<td>8 18.2</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>18 12.6</td>
<td>22 25.0</td>
<td>40 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More Main Jobs</td>
<td>10 12.6</td>
<td>18 28.1</td>
<td>11 25.0</td>
<td>17 38.6</td>
<td>28 19.6</td>
<td>28 31.8</td>
<td>56 24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=79 100.0  N=64 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=143 100.0  N=88 100.0  N=231 100.0

**NOTES**

(1) For the definition of 'main' job see text.

(2) Includes the six partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Two respondents in the small electronics firms had had several jobs but none for longer than a year. They are therefore excluded.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
firm workers might have had fewer main jobs but held them for about the same or a shorter time as small firm workers had held their main jobs so that they might also have had more short period or temporary jobs.

While complete data on all the main jobs held by respondents in the main and control samples is not available, data is available on the length of employment in the second main job and the penultimate main job for 148 and 112 respondents respectively. In addition, data on the length of time in the first job ever and in the firm at which the respondent was working at the time of interview are also available.

Some of the relevant data is summarised in Table 3.2 where it is shown that, in each of these four jobs, small firm workers stayed, on average, for a shorter period of time than their large firm counterparts. This relationship holds for both industries although there are some differences between the two industries. Further, the data also indicates that, once age is controlled for, small firm workers have also had more jobs in their work experience. In other words, small firm workers show greater employment instability. This finding is fully consistent with the qualitative data gathered by probes to replies to the main questions on previous employment which also suggested that respondents in small firms were likely to have had more short term and temporary jobs than workers in the control sample.

This greater employment instability, as measured by these indicators, appears to be especially marked in the earlier years of employment. There is some difference between the two industries in that the workers in the small electronics firms show a rather higher degree of instability. Further discussion of this topic will be postponed until later in this chapter when the diversity of industrial experience of the main and control samples is discussed.

THE FIRST JOB EVER

In the transition from full-time education to work, the information given by the samples on how they found their first job ever replicated the findings of previous research. Young people find their first job in a variety of ways but in the present research and in earlier studies, two points stand out: the relative unimportance of formal occupational placement agencies such as the school or Youth Employment Service, and the high degree of chance in what is, on the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Job Ever (1)</th>
<th>PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED JOBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Printing Firm Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than six months</td>
<td>10 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; one year</td>
<td>14 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; two years</td>
<td>21 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; five years</td>
<td>33 (38.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=56(2)\] \[N=54\] \[N=37\] \[N=43\] \[N=110\] \[N=80\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Main Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year but less than 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 4 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 5 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=38(3)\] \[N=41\] \[N=30\] \[N=39\] \[N=79\] \[N=69\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penultimate Main Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year but less than 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less &quot; 3 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 4 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 5 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=23(4)\] \[N=35\] \[N=22\] \[N=32\] \[N=58\] \[N=54\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job at Time of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; five years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=62(5)\] \[N=63\] \[N=37\] \[N=40\] \[N=125\] \[N=77\]

NOTES: 1. Excludes all respondents whose job at the time of interview was the only job since completing f.t. education.
2. Includes all partners in Silver, Brown & Stone.
3. Includes 3 partners in Silver, Brown & Stone who have had several main jobs.
4. The period of time in the penultimate main jobs of 2 respondents is not known.
5. Excludes partners in Silver, Brown & Stone and any respondents who have worked more than one period in the firm.
face of it, a key role transition in the individual's life.

Table 3.3 indicates the ways in which respondents stated they found their initial job after completing full-time education. On first inspection there are few major differences between the samples from the two industries or the small and large firm samples. School or college and the Youth Employment Service, the institutional agencies mainly available to respondents, account for, on average, between 25% and 30% of first job placements. Although comparisons with other sources on the importance of such agencies are not easy (official figures, for example, are believed to exaggerate the 'success' of the Youth Employment Service in placing young people in employment) (30) the data from the present study seems broadly in line with previous findings.

By far the most important way in which respondents found their first job was through informal contacts and especially through their father or other relative. Except for the large firm printing workers, there is little difference between the sub-samples with 40-50% of respondents reporting that they found their first job through such informal contacts.

The difference in the case of the large firm printing workers, where a lower proportion report the use of informal contacts, is possibly due to their use of a semi-formal agency not available to workers entering the electronics industry. The printing industry has set up Local Apprenticeship Committees in many parts of the country (including London) consisting of employees' and employers' representatives plus, occasionally, representatives from the Youth Employment Service and Local Educational Authority. These supervise a scheme to which interested youngsters (who have been fortunate enough to find out about its existence) can apply for a job in a firm participating in the scheme. In the present study about 10-12% of the printing workers (mostly in the Surrey Printing Company) had found this way into the industry.

A popular view concerning workers in the printing industry is that a high proportion of workers have fathers who are themselves in the industry. The data from the present sample supports this idea. Among the printing workers, 17.1% had fathers who were or had been in the industry while in the electronics industry sample, only 8.2% reported that their father had been or was in the same industry. However, there was a marked difference between the small and large firm printing workers. While one in four of the large firm printing workers had
### Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>来源</th>
<th>小型印刷业</th>
<th>小型电子业</th>
<th>大型印刷业</th>
<th>大型电子业</th>
<th>所有小型业</th>
<th>所有大型业</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>学校/大学</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>青年就业服务</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>父母或其他亲属</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>邻居或朋友</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>私人就业机构</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>广告</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>其他/未提及</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=79 100.0 N=66 100.0 N=44 100.0 N=44 100.0 N=145 100.0 N=88 100.0**

**Notes:**
1. 包括Silver、Brown和Stone的六种合作伙伴。

百分比可能不加到100，因为四舍五入。
fathers who were or had been in the same industry among the small firm printing workers this figure was about one in eight. Respondents sometimes had other relatives working in the industry but this did not alter the general conclusion that small firm workers in the printing industry had fewer connections with the occupational community which is one of the most distinctive (if perhaps declining) characteristics of this industry. The level of occupational inheritance found among the electronics industry sample (which varied only 1.5 percentage points between the small and large firm samples) was very similar to that reported by Willmott in his 1966 study of young people entering work in East London. 

The next most important source for first ever jobs after informal contacts of the kind just discussed, was newspaper advertisements. In the small firms in both industries between 10.1% and 16.7% said this was how they obtained their first job. Among the large electronics firm sample, 11.4% found their initial job in this way. The large firm printing workers reported the lowest level (6.8%) of any sub-sample, and this was thought to be due to the availability of the special entry scheme into the industry noted above, the greater use of kin connections and, at least until recently, the popularity of printing as an occupation.

Between them the above methods of finding a job accounted for about 80% of all first jobs. Besides those who were a little unsure of just how they obtained their first job (mainly older respondents some of whom, it will be remembered, started work over 40 years ago) the remaining respondents mentioned a number of relatively uncommon ways of finding jobs: "I just walked in and asked if they had anything" and, "... the managing director's wife knew the woman in the corner shop who said I should go down and see them".

Private job agencies, despite the comment they have attracted concerning their part in the occupational placement process in recent years, played only a small part in helping respondents find their first job (they were mentioned by only 3% of respondents overall). This is probably because they concentrate their efforts on older, more profitable, workers. As will be seen below, they become more important in relation to subsequent jobs for workers in the electronics industry.

**Reasons for Taking the First Job Ever**

Turning to the reasons respondents gave for taking their first job ever, as opposed to how the job was found (although as becomes clear
below, this distinction may often be slight since the way a job was found was often closely bound up with the decision to take it) respondents again offered a wide range of answers. In some cases the respondent offered several reasons and in Table 3,4 all classifiable reasons are recorded plus an indication of those who were unable to give any clear reason due to memory lapses or other factors. It is also clear, given the importance of parental influences in the initial job placement process, that in discussing reasons for taking the first job ever, we are not always so much discussing the respondent's orientations to the job, as those of his parents.

One factor which stands out immediately in the Table is the lack of importance given to money by respondents in taking their first job, regardless of size of firm. (The workers in the large printing firm did give this reason rather more frequently than respondents in the other three main sub-samples but even here it is less than 10% of the reasons mentioned.) This is perhaps not surprising when the situational factors involved are noted; the emphasis on satisfaction, interest and future prospects given by all three principal sources of occupational values (home, school and formal vocational guidance agencies) and the corresponding disvaluing of monetary rewards as an immediate main gratification. Since respondents themselves are, in most cases, unsure of what they want to do, even if they have wants for monetary rewards (perhaps supported by the values of their peers) they are still very much open to influence towards jobs seen as 'worthwhile' by adult significant others.

Previous research has noted the way in which parents generally attempt to guide their sons toward jobs seen as having 'good prospects' or as being superior to the father's job. What is sometimes not stressed in this context is that these parental aspirations are often rather vague. Working class parents have a limited knowledge of available job opportunities and prospects, especially of white collar jobs and appear to make no systematic attempt to gather such information. In the present study it was not, of course, possible to investigate directly the attitudes of respondents' parents but the sub-sample of parents within the sample amply demonstrated in their replies to questions concerning the occupational futures of their own children, just how limited their thinking in this area could be. One of the most frequent replies to questions concerning the kind of job respondents preferred for their children, was the evasive one of allowing the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance of Learning a Skill</td>
<td>15 16.7</td>
<td>9 11.2</td>
<td>10 16.4</td>
<td>6 11.1</td>
<td>24 14.1</td>
<td>16 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Appeared Interesting</td>
<td>22 24.4</td>
<td>25 31.2</td>
<td>5 8.2</td>
<td>13 24.4</td>
<td>47 27.6</td>
<td>18 15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw No Alternative</td>
<td>4 4.4</td>
<td>11 13.7</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>11 20.4</td>
<td>15 8.8</td>
<td>17 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>7 7.8</td>
<td>6 7.5</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>13 7.6</td>
<td>8 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Relative Worked in Firm</td>
<td>4 4.5</td>
<td>3 3.7</td>
<td>8 13.1</td>
<td>5 9.2</td>
<td>7 4.1</td>
<td>13 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Worked in Firm</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>1 1.6</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>3 1.8</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Advice/Pressure</td>
<td>11 12.2</td>
<td>6 7.5</td>
<td>9 14.7</td>
<td>6 11.1</td>
<td>17 10.0</td>
<td>15 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Convenience</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>3 3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Give No Reason</td>
<td>23 25.5</td>
<td>16 20.0</td>
<td>16 26.2</td>
<td>10 18.5</td>
<td>39 22.9</td>
<td>26 22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.
- Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
children 'to make up his or her own mind'. (It should be stressed that these observations are in no way a criticism of respondents. Availability of information on job opportunities in our society is very limited and respondents' own education did not usually equip them to seek out even the information that is available).

If money is the least mentioned reason for taking the first job ever, the most frequently mentioned reason, with the notable exception of the large firm printing workers, is that the job appeared 'interesting'. There is also a difference overall between small and large firm respondents in that small firm workers mention this reason more often. At first sight this appears to provide early support for the first hypothesis on the development of orientations. But an alternative suggestion concerning this difference may be derived from a closer look at the sample from the Surrey Printing Company.

It will be seen in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 that workers in this firm were the most likely to mention parental intervention in initial job placement, put most emphasis on monetary rewards and were (as will be discussed later) more likely to have completed an apprenticeship than respondents in any other of the main sub-samples. This combination of factors could be seen as suggesting that the large firm printing workers were the most constrained by external influences in their first job ever placement and the least free or able to select a job on intrinsic (to them) criteria.

This suggestion is less well supported by the data from the National Radar Company but it is still consistent. For example, respondents in this firm reported that, in two out of three cases, their first job was found through sources espousing values likely to influence them towards a job with a 'future', namely school or college (15.9%), the Youth Employment Service (9.1%) or parents or relatives (38.6%). One in ten also had their first job in a firm in which a parent or relative worked, a percentage second only to that reported by the large firm printing workers. They were, at 3.7% of reasons given, the least likely of respondents to mention money as a reason for taking their first job.

The residual category of 'Other or Could Give No Reason' may seem unduly large at first glance but accurately reflects the high proportion of respondents who were uncertain as to why they had taken
their first job ever. The 'Other' part of this category is a small percentage of respondents who gave reasons difficult to categorise in other ways. For instance, a few printing workers mentioned that their first contact with printing had been at school which offered printing as a craft subject. This influenced their choice of job on leaving school not so much because they had developed an intrinsic interest in printing but because at least they had some idea of what the job entailed. Another example of these less usual reasons was offered by an electronics worker who said he chose his first job because it was near the home of the girl he was going out with at the time.

The category 'Could Find No Alternative' might also be added to the group since this included the just over one in ten respondents who gave a negative reason for taking their first job ever. Usually this was because they could find no particular job that attracted them. In these cases the first job was taken with a feeling of resignation; a feeling that 'anything was better than nothing'. A minority among this category did have a more preferred job in mind but were unable to find what they wanted. Thus, a small electronics firm worker said that he took his first job on leaving school because it was the only local firm offering training as a draughtsman but he would have really preferred to be a commercial illustrator and the job he had taken seemed to be the nearest to it he could find.

A further minority in this category were those who took their first job as a 'stop-gap' while trying to obtain another job they actually preferred. An application to the London Apprenticeship Committee by a boy wishing to enter printing, for example, might take some months to process and the applicant would take another job while waiting. Of course, sometimes the 'stop-gap' job turned out, for one reason or another, to be a first job proper.

Enough has been said on how the first job ever was obtained and the reasons given for taking it, to support the thesis that the link between full-time education and entry into employment was typically a haphazard and varied one. The overall picture is of a limited knowledge of available job opportunities, a high degree of uncertainty about the kind of job preferred and the importance of parental influence. Formal occupational placement agencies were not, on the whole, very important in finding a first job. In this initial stage in the formation of the workers' occupational identity, it is clear that it is
likely to be highly unstable and very much open to further influence.

As noted earlier, the small firm worker sample stayed, on average, for a shorter time in their first job ever than workers in the large firms. Thus 27.5% of the small firm workers had left their first job within one year of starting as compared to 18.7% among the control sample. Within five years, 70.9% of the small firm workers had left their first job; among the control sample the percentage was 53.7% (see Table 3.2 above). This difference is probably due to several factors but an obvious one is the greater likelihood of the large printing firm workers having completed an apprenticeship. In the electronics industry where workers are less likely to have done an apprenticeship, this has less explanatory power and other factors may be more important. Suggestions on the latter will emerge in the discussion of the reasons given for leaving the first job below.

It is also worth noting at this point that not only did the small firm workers stay in their first job for a shorter time on average but they were also more likely to have started in a different industry to the one in which they were working at the time of interview. While 61.3% of the large firm workers had their first job in the same industry as the one in which they were working at the time of interview, this percentage was only 48.6% for the small firm workers.

The above figures in fact understate the difference between the main and control samples because among the large firm electronics workers there was a higher proportion of respondents whose skills were not industry-specific. This refers to the workers engaged in the fabrication of housings for electronic equipment whose metal-working skills could be used in several industries. Since the electronics industry rarely offers formal training for this kind of work, these workers almost certainly began their work experiences in another industry. (Small electronics firms employ workers to do similar work but are more likely to buy housings for equipment from specialist outside suppliers.)

A further difference here was that small firm workers were also more likely to have had a white collar job as their first job ever. Usually the job involved low level general office work or some kind of selling. Of the one in five small firm workers reporting a white collar start to their work life (as compared to only four respondents from the 88 in the control sample, or 4.5%) a high proportion stated that they had entered white collar work at the insistence of parents.
to whom such work was socially superior to manual work.

**Leaving the First Job Ever**

Table 3.5 provides a breakdown of the reasons offered by the main and control samples for leaving their first job ever. Again there is a wide range of reasons which are not always easy to categorise. There are, however, interesting differences between the small and large firm samples. Excluding factors outside the respondent's control such as the firm going bankrupt or moving to another site beyond reasonable travelling distance or being conscripted into the armed forces, the reasons may be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic varieties plus a residual category.

Among extrinsic reasons were all those which explicitly mentioned material rewards or prospects (although, of course, extrinsic meanings may have been connected with other, less easily categorisable reasons). Reasons of this kind were most frequently given by small printing firm workers (35.2% of the reasons offered). Workers in the small electronics firms, the large printing firm and the large electronics firm gave very similar proportions of extrinsic reasons within a range of 17.5% to 19.7%.

Conversely, small printing firm workers were among the least likely to give intrinsic reasons for leaving their first job. The category 'Intrinsic Reasons' in the Table includes a wide variety of reasons which seemed easy to categorise as such: "I could not get on with my boss, he was always picking on me"; "...the work was just dead boring"; or, "I was the only young bloke there - all the others were over 40". In addition, reasons mentioning finding a more interesting job were also categorised as intrinsic. As the Table indicates, such reasons accounted for only 11% of those offered by the small printing firm workers and the only group who mentioned them less often were their large firm counterparts. On the other hand, the group most likely to offer intrinsic reasons were the small electronics firm workers where one in four mentioned this type of reason.

Thus, although overall the small firm workers were more likely to mention intrinsic reasons, there is no simple size relationship apparent in the data. A size relationship holds only if type of industry is held constant. This provides an early indication of the possible importance of industrial subculture. But perhaps not too much should be made of the importance of intrinsic reasons for leaving
TABLE 3.5  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm went broke or moved</td>
<td>1/51 1.4%</td>
<td>1/56 1.5%</td>
<td>7/57 15.2%</td>
<td>1/43 2.0%</td>
<td>2/105 1.9%</td>
<td>8/80 10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made redundant/sacked</td>
<td>8/51 11.3%</td>
<td>8/56 12.1%</td>
<td>7/57 15.2%</td>
<td>1/43 15.7%</td>
<td>16/105 15.7%</td>
<td>15/80 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic reasons</td>
<td>8/51 11.3%</td>
<td>17/56 25.7%</td>
<td>3/57 6.5%</td>
<td>8/43 15.7%</td>
<td>25/105 24.1%</td>
<td>11/80 13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money reasons</td>
<td>17/51 23.9%</td>
<td>13/56 19.7%</td>
<td>4/57 8.7%</td>
<td>8/43 11.8%</td>
<td>30/105 28.6%</td>
<td>10/80 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training/apprenticeship</td>
<td>10/51 14.1%</td>
<td>8/56 12.1%</td>
<td>6/57 13.0%</td>
<td>3/43 5.9%</td>
<td>18/105 17.1%</td>
<td>9/80 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prospects</td>
<td>8/51 11.3%</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>3/57 6.5%</td>
<td>4/43 7.8%</td>
<td>8/105 7.5%</td>
<td>7/80 8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents moved</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>2/56 3.0%</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>4/43 7.8%</td>
<td>8/105 7.5%</td>
<td>7/80 8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered armed forces</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>5/56 7.6%</td>
<td>5/57 10.9%</td>
<td>4/43 7.8%</td>
<td>5/105 4.7%</td>
<td>9/80 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain more experience</td>
<td>5/51 7.0%</td>
<td>1/56 1.5%</td>
<td>5/57 10.9%</td>
<td>2/43 3.9%</td>
<td>6/105 5.7%</td>
<td>7/80 8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11/51 15.5%</td>
<td>11/56 16.7%</td>
<td>6/57 15.0%</td>
<td>13/43 25.5%</td>
<td>22/105 20.9%</td>
<td>19/80 23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot remember</td>
<td>3/51 4.2%</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>2/43 3.9%</td>
<td>3/105 2.8%</td>
<td>2/80 2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 71/100.0% 66/100.0% 46/100.0% 51/100.0% 237/100.0% 97/100.0%

NOTES: Information is given for all respondents who have had more than one job since completing full-time education including 5 partners in Silver, Brown & Stone (one partner has had only one job since leaving school).

The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
the first job since such reasons appear to account for under 20% of all reasons given.

The reasons placed in the residual category were those under the headings of 'No Training or Apprenticeship' and 'To Gain More Experience'. The former is, it could be argued, more likely to be extrinsic while the latter is more likely to be intrinsic but the meanings here may be complex and it seemed safer to treat them separately. The lack of any proper training or apprenticeship was mentioned most by small firm workers although with an almost similar frequency by the large printing firm workers. The large electronics firm workers seem to have been the least worried by this lack in their first firm.

The wish to extend experience was mentioned rather less often with only the large printing firm workers mentioning it with any frequency at one in ten of the reasons offered. This latter emphasis is probably related to the tradition in the printing industry where an apprentice, on completing his 'time', nearly always moves to another firm. A long standing employer-union agreement stipulates that a firm must take on a minimum number of apprentices for a given number of journeymen. When an apprentice becomes a journeyman his employer may not need another journeyman or be able to afford him, so he is encouraged to move to another firm. This also permits a new apprenticeship in the original firm ensuring another generation of trained craftsmen. Thus, overall on these residual reasons for leaving the first job ever, few differences related to size emerged and there is little indication of the assumed orientations special to the small firm worker.

Not all the small firm workers started their work experience in a small firm but an analysis of the reasons given for leaving the first job related to size of first job firm, adds little to the above. As expected, for the printing workers any analysis is difficult because it is a small firm industry and only a few of the small firm sample (12 respondents in all) had started work in a large firm. Allowing for the smallness of this sub-sample, for those who worked for a first firm employing less than 200, 36.6% of the reasons mentioned were extrinsic while for those who worked in a large firm in their first job ever, 23.5% of the reasons were classed as extrinsic. Those who worked for a small firm in their first job ever, mentioned intrinsic reasons as 9.1% of all reasons for leaving. Intrinsic reasons were, in contrast, 17.6% of the reasons offered by respondents who had started at a large firm.
The analysis of reasons given for leaving the first job ever related to size of firm is easier for the small electronics firm workers because the sample splits almost equally into groups starting their work experiences in small and large firms. For those who started in a small firm, 22.6% of the reasons offered were categorised as extrinsic as compared to 17.1% of the reasons given by those who began in large firms. The proportion of reasons firmly classed as intrinsic was, at 25.7%, the same for those who started at small firms as for those who started in large firms. An interesting difference was that 20% of those who started in large firms lost their first job by being made redundant, something which no respondent who started at a small firm reported.

What seems to emerge from this analysis is that extrinsic reasons were mentioned more frequently by those who had begun their industrial experiences in small firms than by those who had started in large firms. But this did not mean that there was a corresponding difference in terms of reasons which could be firmly categorised as intrinsic. In fact, there was little difference here between those who started in small firms and those who started in large firms except for a slight tendency for the latter to mention intrinsic reasons more often.

It may be argued that, in the formation of the worker's occupational identity, an examination of the reasons given for leaving the first job ever provides the first indications of the development of the meanings attached to work. The reasons offered for taking the initial job in the worker's experiences were, as noted earlier, very much influenced by significant others and told us more about these others' notions of suitable work for a young person entering employment than about respondents' orientations.

However, by the time the decision is made to leave the first job ever, the respondent has begun to generate meanings derived from actual experience rather than from the second-hand meanings of others (who, in some instances, such as teachers at school, may have very little experience of industry themselves). But it would be premature to draw any conclusions from the data at this point for we can assume that meanings formed this early in the worker's experience will be relatively unstable and still very much open to influences from subsequent experiences both in and out of work. The importance of the data analysed in this section cannot, therefore, be assessed until
further data is presented on work experiences in later jobs.

A SECOND MAIN JOB

The second job for which data was gathered was not necessarily the second job held by the respondent since any job held for less than a year was not the subject of direct questions (although most respondents gave some information on jobs held for short periods). For 53 respondents, the second job held was their job at the time of interview and it is convenient to add this data to the data from respondents who have had a second main job, that is, one that lasted for longer than one year, prior to the job at the time of interview. This produces a larger sample for analysis and also has the advantage of biasing the data toward more recent work experiences on such matters as how the job was found and the reason or reasons for taking the job. Naturally, the data on reasons for leaving the second main job refers only to those respondents who have had a second main job prior to the job at the time of interview.

Although family influences were important in finding a second job, as Table 3.6 shows, they were, as might be expected, less important than in obtaining a first job. Indeed, the distribution of the ways in which a second job was found begins to resemble the pattern reported for adult workers in previous research. But, if parents and relatives are less important, personal contacts remain a popular way of finding a job with peers largely replacing kin contacts, especially among workers in the main sample.

However, the source which emerges as the most important way of finding a second job for all samples except the large printing firm workers (and even for these it was still important) was the newspaper advertisement, usually in a local newspaper. Almost one in three small firm workers found their second job in this way. Among the large electronics firm workers the figure fell to just under one in four and for the large printing firm workers, who have their trade union as their main job finding aid, the newspaper was the way just under one in seven found their second job. However, for workers in the printing industry the newspaper is more likely to be a national newspaper, especially the Daily Mail which is a recognised medium for finding jobs in this industry.

One indication of the formation of a more positive occupational identity by the time the worker seeks a second job is the proportion,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Through School, College or YES</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Approached Firm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Contacted Respondent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Not Remember</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Information is given for all respondents who have had a second main job plus all respondents whose second job was the one held at the time of interview.
2. Includes the partners in Silver, Brown & Stone who have had a second main job or whose jobs at the time of interview was their second job.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
on average 13.7% of the whole sample, who contacted the firm themselves asking if there was a job available. This way of finding a job was mentioned so rarely by respondents when discussing how they obtained their first job that it did not even warrant a separate category in Table 3.3 above. It is also notable that the proportions finding second jobs in this way is very similar for both the small and large firm samples.

The Table also reveals a difference in the selection practices of small and large firms which is important in relation to the second hypothesis being tested in this chapter. It is clear that small firm managements are much more likely to seek out suitable workers through outside contacts and by approaching the worker directly to offer him a job. Only two large firm respondents reported that they had obtained their second job in this way, as compared to the 8.2% of the small firm respondents.

In the interviews with small firm executives, the latter reported that Surrey was a difficult area in which to find suitable workers as it had had no real unemployment since before the Second World War. They also stressed that a small firm could not afford to carry 'dead wood' whereas this might be possible in a larger firm. The poor performance of a worker in a large firm would have less effect on overall labour productivity than in a firm whose entire labour force might not be as big as a single department in a larger firm. Owner-managers therefore were always on the lookout for high quality workers and regarded personal recommendation as an excellent source of such workers.

This concern with the quality of labour is also connected with the higher than expected labour turnover in the small firms, as indicated by the stability rates of the sample discussed below. Small firm executives were usually consciously attempting to weed out unsuitable workers. Given that their labour forces were smaller, they were in a better position to assess labour quality than a larger firm might be and, in the absence of an effective trade union, found it easier to discard unsuitable labour. These points are, of course, strongly consistent with the second hypothesis.

It was briefly noted that, for the large printing firm workers, the trade union was the most important way of finding a job. As Table 3.6 shows, almost one in three of these workers found their second job this way. Most of the large printing firm workers who
found a second job in this way were journeymen changing jobs after completing an apprenticeship but some were apprentices whose second main job was their apprenticeship. Management have little control over who they employ when workers use this method of obtaining a job. The Father of the Chapel is informed that, for example, another compositor is required and he contacts the union who add the job to their list. The job is offered to the person at the top of the waiting list and, if he feels that the job would suit him, he attends the firm for an interview. It would be difficult for management to reject a worker without an explanation acceptable to the union.

For the workers in the large electronics firm it will be seen that the private agency is an important source of second jobs (13.9% of respondents found their second job in this way.) Some of these respondents were contract workers, that is, they worked for the agency rather than the firm itself, the latter paying the agency a weekly fee for the worker's services. However, contract working is largely a way of increasing earnings by reducing the amount of income tax paid and foregoing such benefits as paid holidays and contract workers may, in all other respects, be regarded as employees of the firm.

The small electronics firms used private agencies less often and this was one of the minor ways used to find a second job, another example of the effects of differing employment practices on occupational placement. Small firm executives in the electronics industry resented contract agencies, believing not only that they were an expensive source of labour but that they encouraged labour turnover. They also believed that contract workers were resented by other employees because they appeared to receive higher earnings. Contract workers, therefore, were used only as a last resort to obtain a worker unobtainable through other channels, or workers required only temporarily. This is not to say that large firm personnel recruiters were in favour of contract agencies - far from it - but they were more resigned to the use of contract labour and, indeed, in the present study it was found that some contract workers had been with the firm for a considerable period, even as long as a year.

This data on how the second main job was obtained not only supports the second hypothesis on differences in personnel selection practices between large and small firms but also shows the importance
of differences in industrial sub-cultures. The importance of the trade union as an institutionalised means of finding jobs in the printing industry contrasts sharply with the way in which private, profit-making employment agencies have emerged as an alternative institution in the much less unionised electronics industry.

What is perhaps conspicuous by its absence in Table 3.6 is the lack of mention of formal occupational placement agencies and especially the Employment Exchange or, as it is now called, the Job Centre. It was mentioned so rarely that it was not given a separate category and the few instances of its occurrence are contained in the 'Other or Could Not Remember' category.

There are a number of factors connected to this lack of use of government job finding agencies. Partly, it is a local phenomenon in that, in an area where jobs are plentiful, a worker normally has little difficulty in finding a job and does not need to use a source which for many has a stigma attached to it. Partly, also, this is due to the existence of alternative agencies such as the trade union or the contract agency which workers believe have access to more attractive jobs than the official agencies.

But perhaps equally important was the belief of employers that the Employment Exchange or Job Centre was not likely to be a source of high quality workers. A worker who sought a job in this way was seen as one who had failed to find a job by any other means. (On the other hand, one source of trained workers in the electronics industry, an industry which offers little formal training to workers itself, is government retraining courses for workers. These were highly regarded by small and large firm executives, as a source of competent workers).

Finally, the lack of resort to the Youth Employment Service by the sample was due to some extent to the fact that many respondents were too old to use this source by the time they came to seek a second job. In other cases this was apparently due to similar reasons to those noted above to explain why respondents did not use the Employment Exchange or Job Centre.

Reasons for Taking the Second Main Job

The reasons given by respondents for taking their second main job (or second job where the respondent's second job was his job at
the time of interview) are reported in Table 3.7 and show a pattern emerging which is repeated in the data for subsequent jobs discussed later. There are very clear differences between the industrial sub-samples in the main small firm sample. The small printing firm workers were the most likely of all respondents to mention money in the reasons offered for accepting a job. While reasons involving money were 24.2% of all reasons offered for accepting a second job by the small printing firm workers, in no other group did money reasons represent more than 15% of the reasons mentioned.

The small electronics firm workers, on the other hand, were the most likely to state that they had taken their second job because it appeared interesting. This represented nearly a third of all the reasons mentioned by these workers and was, for example, over twice as high as for the small printing firm workers. In no other sub-sample did it form more than 20% of the reasons offered.

Differences between the two industries are also apparent among the large firm control sample. The opportunity to do an apprenticeship or to extend industrial experience, was the single most frequent reason given by the large printing firm workers (28.6% of all reasons mentioned). This was about double the frequency found among the large electronics workers. This difference is not so much related to size as to the fact that, of the two industries in the study, only one, printing, has a properly developed apprenticeship scheme plus a tradition, discussed above, of changing jobs immediately on completing an apprenticeship in order to gain further experience.

The workers in the large printing firm were also the most likely to mention the geographical location of the job as a reason for acceptance. The main fact connected with this was also industry-specific. Several respondents in this firm had previously worked for printing firms in the centre of London. These firms were mainly concerned with printing for the City and especially with periodical and magazine printing. But, by the middle of the 1960's, many of these firms had closed down or merged with other firms causing widespread redundancies. This decline was due to the general fall in demand for magazines and the redevelopment of much of central London making it increasingly uneconomic to locate a firm in the area. Most of these firms were 'union houses' and members, in obtaining a new job through the union, used this opportunity to obtain a job nearer home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to Learn a Skill or Extend Experience</td>
<td>N=56 %</td>
<td>N=54 %</td>
<td>N=38 %</td>
<td>N=44 %</td>
<td>N=110 %</td>
<td>N=81 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Appeared Interesting</td>
<td>15 22.7</td>
<td>9 12.8</td>
<td>14 28.6</td>
<td>10 18.2</td>
<td>24 17.6</td>
<td>18 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Find a More Preferred Job</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>8 11.4</td>
<td>5 10.2</td>
<td>7 12.7</td>
<td>9 6.6</td>
<td>12 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Reasons</td>
<td>16 24.2</td>
<td>10 14.3</td>
<td>6 12.2</td>
<td>7 12.7</td>
<td>26 19.1</td>
<td>13 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Pressure or Advice or Other Family Reasons</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
<td>2 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent, Relative, Neighbour or Friend Worked at Firm</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
<td>3 6.1</td>
<td>5 9.1</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
<td>8 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Approached Respondent</td>
<td>4 6.1</td>
<td>5 7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because Job Was Local</td>
<td>6 9.1</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>7 14.3</td>
<td>6 10.9</td>
<td>7 5.1</td>
<td>13 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
<td>11 15.7</td>
<td>5 10.2</td>
<td>11 20.0</td>
<td>22 16.2</td>
<td>16 15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1. Information is given for all respondents who have had a second main job or whose job at the time of interview was their second job including the relevant partners in Silver, Brown & Stone.
2. Due to differences in the coding of sub-samples' responses the totals for 'Could Not Find a More Preferred Job' understates slightly, but the differences are small.

The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Increased costs of commuting to and from central London have also influenced other printing workers to accept jobs nearer their homes. Travel costs were mentioned with increasing frequency as a reason connected with leaving and accepting jobs as the interviewing programme proceeded due to successive increases in the cost of both public transport and petrol in 1975. Again, several of these differences between respondents in the two industries point towards the importance of the industrial sub-culture in understanding patterns of occupational placement.

Among the reasons mentioned with rather less frequency, it is noticeable that, although as Table 3.6 showed earlier, parents, relatives and peers are sources of job information, they are mentioned less often as reasons for actually accepting the second job. Only eight of the 110 small firm respondents mentioned relatives or friends as a reason for accepting a job. Among the large firm control sample the proportion is not a great deal higher at 10 out of 81 respondents.

The category 'Could Not Find a More Preferred Job' in Table 3.7 refers to respondents saying that they accepted a second job either because they could not get the job they really wanted or, more often, because after a period of looking they felt forced to take a job rather than remain unemployed. That this reason is offered by almost 10% of respondents again shows that the idea of occupational choice is easy to over-emphasise.

The category 'Other/Don’t Know' in Table 3.7 may again seem unduly large but, as with the first job ever, a number of respondents gave reasons for taking their second job which were difficult to categorise in other ways. For instance, a printing worker stated that he took his second main job because it would help him qualify for a council flat. Another worker said that, out of two jobs he had found near to his home, the one he accepted was on the bus route which passed his parent's house. A small electronics firm worker said that, although one reason he accepted the job was that it appeared interesting, another reason was that he preferred to work on his own and this seemed possible in that particular firm. Finally, a respondent who was typical of those who were classified as 'Don’t Know' said: "No particular reason at all - I was dead bored at the previous job and that was the reason I left but I don’t think I had any special reason for taking the job at ____".

As with the first job ever, it was found that small firm workers
were less likely to have had their second main job in the same industry in which they were working at the time of interview. There were, however, differences between the two industries on this point with electronics workers being more likely to have worked in another industry. Thus, while 87.7% of the large printing firm workers had their second main job in the same industry as the one at the time of interview (as compared to 71.1% of the small printing firm workers) this figure was only 46.2% for the large electronics firm workers (as compared to 30.0% for the small electronics firm workers).

In other words, although there were differences between the two industries, there remained a marked difference between the main small firms sample and the large firm control sample. The overall data, covering all jobs on which information was collected, is summarised in Table 3.8. It will be seen that, for all jobs, small firm workers were more likely to have worked in a different industry than workers in the control sample.

Earlier, in Table 3.2, the data on length of time spent by respondents in each of the jobs for which information was collected was summarised and it will be noted that small firm workers in both industries were reported as, on average, having spent a shorter time in their second main job. Among the small printing firm workers, 71% had left their second main job within three years. For their large firm counterparts this figure was 43.3%. The small electronics firm workers stayed, on average, a little longer with 65.8% having left this job by the end of their third year but again this was much higher than among the large firm workers where 46.1% had left their second main job within three years.

Thus, overall, the reasons offered by respondents in the main and control samples for accepting their second job appear mainly unrelated to size of firm. Rather, other factors connected to the worker's life situation, his knowledge of available job opportunities, his personal goals at the time of taking the job, the advice of significant others and especially factors connected with the special characteristics of the industry in which he was working, appear important. In fact, size was mentioned very rarely by respondents and then usually only as a secondary reason.

Equally, the pattern of reasons offered by respondents for accepting a second main job does not fit at all well with the alleged
### Table 3.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Job Ever</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in Same Industry as Job at Time of Interview</td>
<td>36 64.3</td>
<td>17 32.1</td>
<td>30 81.1</td>
<td>16 42.1</td>
<td>53 48.6</td>
<td>46 61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=56 (2)</td>
<td>N=53</td>
<td>N=37</td>
<td>N=38</td>
<td>N=109</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Main Job</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in Same Industry as Job at Time of Interview</td>
<td>27 71.1</td>
<td>12 30.0</td>
<td>26 87.7</td>
<td>18 46.2</td>
<td>39 50.0</td>
<td>44 63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=38 (3)</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>N=69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penultimate Main Job</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in Same Industry as Job at Time of Interview</td>
<td>20 80.0</td>
<td>22 62.8</td>
<td>20 95.2</td>
<td>20 64.5</td>
<td>44 71.7</td>
<td>40 76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=25 (4)</td>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>N=21</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>N=60</td>
<td>N=52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Data is given only on respondents who have had a job before the job held at the time of interview.
2. Includes five partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
3. Includes three partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
4. Does not include any partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
orientations held by workers in different sized firms suggested by previous research. Thus, the most instrumentally minded workers in the sample, as measured by the frequency that money reasons were mentioned, were the small printing firm workers who offered such reasons almost twice as often as respondents in the large firm control sample. Yet the most intrinsically minded workers in the research were the small electronics firm workers, if such orientations are accepted as being indicated by the frequency that reasons emphasising the interest the worker thought the job might have.

The large firm control sample do not mention money as a reason for taking this second job with the frequency that could be interpreted as indicating an overwhelmingly instrumental orientation with only, on average, 12.5% of the reasons given for accepting the job referring to money. But what has to be kept in mind is that, in fact, it is difficult to distribute a high proportion of the reasons given into instrumental or intrinsic categories with any degree of certainty and a lot of reasons do not have very much to do with such considerations. This was especially the case where the worker could give no clear reason for accepting the job but felt that he had simply drifted into the job.

It seems likely, therefore, that the generalisation to be developed on job change decision-making will have to take into account much more than simply the orientations of workers. Overall, the data does not so far support the first hypothesis very well but continues to provide strong support for the second hypothesis and increasing support for the third hypothesis on the importance of influences external to immediate orientations to work. The presentation of the data on the penultimate main job held by respondents will provide further clarification and a more detailed discussion will be more appropriate at that time.

Reasons for Leaving the Second Main Job

The reasons given for leaving the second main job are summarised in Table 3.9. The most frequently mentioned reason is money. The small and large firm samples are very similar here with about one in five of the reasons mentioned referring to monetary rewards. To these reasons might be added those mentioning lack of prospects since the meaning associated with this, as was clear from respondents' replies, was usually extrinsic. Again, the frequency that this kind of reason is mentioned varies little between the main and control samples.
TABLE 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm Went Broke or Moved</td>
<td>4 (8.9%)</td>
<td>3 (6.0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.0%)</td>
<td>7 (7.4%)</td>
<td>5 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Redundant or Sacked</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>6 (12.0%)</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>4 (9.3%)</td>
<td>8 (8.4%)</td>
<td>12 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Reasons</td>
<td>8 (17.8%)</td>
<td>6 (12.0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.5%)</td>
<td>12 (27.9%)</td>
<td>14 (14.7%)</td>
<td>14 (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Reasons</td>
<td>11 (24.4%)</td>
<td>13 (26.0%)</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>8 (18.6%)</td>
<td>24 (25.3%)</td>
<td>16 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training/Apprenticeship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Prospects</td>
<td>5 (11.1%)</td>
<td>4 (8.0%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>4 (9.3%)</td>
<td>9 (9.5%)</td>
<td>8 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found More Interesting Job</td>
<td>3 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.2%)</td>
<td>6 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Moved</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered Armed Forces</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>4 (8.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>6 (6.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Problems</td>
<td>4 (8.9%)</td>
<td>3 (6.0%)</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (7.4%)</td>
<td>3 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Cannot Remember</td>
<td>5 (11.1%)</td>
<td>9 (18.0%)</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>8 (18.6%)</td>
<td>14 (14.7%)</td>
<td>11 (13.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 45 (100.0%) | 50 (100.0%) | 36 (100.0%) | 45 (100.0%) | 95 (100.0%) | 79 (100.0%) |

NOTES: (1) Includes three partners in Silver, Brown and Stone

The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Extrinsic reasons are the single most frequently offered reason in all sub-samples except the large electronics firm workers who, again going against the expectations generated by previous thinking on relations between size of firm and worker orientations, mention intrinsic factors more frequently than any other sub-sample in small or large firms. The small firm workers offer intrinsic reasons as 18.9% of the reasons reported (combining intrinsic reasons in general with finding a more interesting job). This proportion is rather higher than that for the large printing firm workers, at 16.6%, but well below that of the large electronics firm workers at 32.5%.

It is noticeable that, by the time respondents had reached the end of their second main job, there was rather less concern with obtaining a training or apprenticeship and also with extending industrial experience than was the case when leaving the first job ever (see Table 3.5). Perhaps this is not very surprising given that, by the time the sample reached this point in their work experience they were, in many cases, in their early twenties. But it is noticeable that this reduction in ambition was not matched by a corresponding increase in the frequency that a lack of prospects was mentioned. This might be interpreted as a recognition by respondents that they had reached the limits of their occupational development and could expect to do much the same kind of work for the rest of their work lives.

Again, as with reasons connected with decisions to take or leave the first job ever, it is worth emphasising that a high proportion of the reasons mentioned are best classified as 'involuntary'. If the reasons mentioning that the firm went bankrupt or moved or the respondent was made redundant or sacked or travelling problems are combined, they may form up to 30% of the reasons given by respondents in a sub-sample for leaving their second main job. Such experiences may affect work attitudes and definitions but they cannot properly be said to be part of the workers' stable orientations at the time at which the experience occurs.

CONSISTENCY AND REASONS FOR JOB CHANGING

At this point in the analysis it is worth raising the issue of the consistency in the values and reasons which respondents report as connected with successive job change decisions. There are two
important aspects of this issue, one methodological and one substantive. The methodological aspect concerns the danger of assuming that, for example, the almost 20% of small firm workers who reported that they left their first job ever for money reasons (see Table 3.5) were the same people who comprise the very similar percentage shown in Table 3.7 as accepting their second job for similar reasons.

The second, and more substantive aspect of this issue, follows from this methodological point since questioning this assumption may provide important indications on whether, as work experience lengthens, workers develop more or less stable orientations which guide job change decisions. For the present research, the examination of this assumption provides a test of the first hypothesis that manual workers develop a strong tendency toward self-selection into firms of a certain size or whether, on the contrary, the lack of consistency in values and reasons offered suggests, as the third hypothesis argues, that job change decision-making is much more influenced by factors which are highly specific to the particular job change being considered.

In discussing the results of this test of the consistency in the values and reasons underlying respondents' job change decisions, two points should be kept in mind. First, the ordering of questions put to respondents (see Appendix pp.2-5) was so arranged that respondents were not asked questions concerning reasons for taking a particular job immediately after answering questions on the reasons for leaving their previous main job. These questions were separated by questions on other characteristics of the jobs being discussed such as the size of the firm in which the job was held or its geographical location. This was to minimise the possibility of respondents injecting a spurious consistency into the reasons given for making job changing decisions which might result if questions concerning the leaving of one particular job were immediately followed by questions concerning accepting a later job.

The second point to be kept in mind here is that the next job for which information was sought, after the questions on a given job were completed, was not necessarily the next job held by the respondent. Since questions on jobs between the first job ever and the job held at the time of interview concerned only jobs held for at least a year, there could be a gap of several months or longer between the first job ever and a second main job. Equally, the gap between the
second main job and the next job on which information was sought, the 'penultimate job' (that is, the last main job held before coming to work for the firm at which the interview was arranged) might be several years.

In other words, the data being discussed here is not an attempt to trace the pattern of job change decision-making for every job held but rather to obtain data on such decision-making at a number of points in the worker's work experience. This was not an ideal arrangement but was necessitated, as pointed out earlier, by the limited time available for an interview covering a range of aspects of the respondent's occupational identity, world-view and non-work experiences. Nevertheless, it is argued that sufficient data has been collected to make a serious assessment of the consistency of values and reasons offered by respondents in relation to job changing decision-making.

It will have been noted from the previous discussion that, for the jobs on which data was collected, respondents offered a wide range of reasons for leaving or taking jobs so that the analysis of the degree of consistency of values and reasons is not always easy even if the reasons given are grouped into larger categories than those used for the discussion of a single job. A further complication which again tends to produce rather small sub-samples, is that the proportion of reasons for leaving a job which may be classed as 'involuntary' is sometimes quite large. It was pointed out above that for the second main job held by respondents such reasons were as high as 30% of all reasons offered.

If there are strongly developed persistent orientations held by workers connected with leaving and taking jobs, then the operation of factors beyond the worker's control will tend to mask the existence of such orientations if respondents tend to report involuntary factors as the sole reason for leaving or accepting particular jobs. On the other hand, it might be argued that, to the extent that such occurrences are a frequent fact of life for manual workers, they will inhibit the development of long term permanent orientations because the latter cannot be easily exercised in making decisions to remain in or change a job. Keeping these points in mind, as the data now to be discussed indicates, there does not appear to be a high degree of consistency in the reasons and values offered by respondents for job change decisions connected with leaving the first job ever, taking a
second job and leaving this second job. The data, in short, goes against the first hypothesis.

Job Change Decisions and Consistency: the Main Sample

Among the small printing firm workers, the largest group offering the same reasons for leaving their first job ever, among the total of 51 respondents for whom data is available, were 17 respondents who gave money reasons for their decision. Following through this sub-sample to their second job (either the job held at the time of interview or the first main job after the job held immediately after completing full-time education) indicates that the second job was accepted for a wide range of reasons. Twenty-five reasons were mentioned and among these two reasons are mentioned most frequently, money reasons (seven of the reasons reported) and the desire to learn a skill or extend work experience (mentioned in a further seven reasons).

Other reasons mentioned were that the second job appeared interesting (mentioned three times) that the job was conveniently local (mentioned twice) that a relative worked at the second job firm, that the worker could find no alternative job he preferred more and that the second job firm contacted the respondent offering him a job. (These last three reasons were mentioned once each). Finally, three respondents offered reasons which were too vaguely stated to be coded with any confidence. No other sub-sample among the small printing firm workers was large enough to be worth following through in this way since a similar fragmentation of the reasons offered for accepting a second job, occurs in relation to any given reason for leaving the first job ever.

Looking at these small printing firm workers in terms of the reasons reported for accepting the second job as compared to the reasons given for leaving the same job, the largest sub-sample is again those respondents who offer money reasons. Of the 38 respondents for whom data is available, 13 reported that monetary considerations influenced their decision to accept the job. The same 13 workers, however, reported that they left their second main job for a mixture of at least eight distinct reasons. Of the reasons mentioned four concerned money and a further respondent mentioned that the second firm he worked for appeared to lack prospects (which probably referred to monetary rewards). A further four of the 13 mentioned that they left this job for intrinsic reasons of one kind or another. One stated that he
left because of travelling problems and one could not remember why he left. The remaining three respondents left their second main job involuntarily. No other sub-sample among the small printing firm workers was large enough to merit analysis of the reasons for taking and leaving the second main job.

The small electronics firm workers were, it will be remembered, almost the opposite of the small printing firm workers in the orientations displayed in relation to accepting and leaving jobs since they placed a much greater emphasis on intrinsic factors. It is, therefore, not surprising that, of the 55 respondents for whom information is available on the reasons for leaving their first job ever and for accepting their second job, the largest sub-sample were 14 respondents who mentioned intrinsic reasons for leaving their first job ever. In reporting the reasons for accepting their second job, these 14 mentioned intrinsic factors in half of the total reasons reported. Three further reasons were unambiguously connected with money and two stressed that the respondent had been unable to find a more attractive alternative job. The remaining reasons were impossible to classify with any confidence.

The emphasis on intrinsic factors among small electronics firm workers was maintained in the reasons offered for accepting and leaving their second main job. Again the largest sub-sample having similar reasons for accepting a second main job were 14 respondents (out of 38 for whom information was available) who mentioned intrinsic reasons. However, there is some difficulty in following this group through to the reasons offered for leaving their second main job in relation to any persisting orientations, because five were made redundant.

The remaining nine respondents offer a mixture of 14 reasons for leaving their second main job. Half of these reasons mention money and two further reasons refer to a perceived lack of prospects. The other reasons referred to travelling problems and one respondent was unsure why he left; only one of the reasons offered was unambiguously intrinsic. Again there were no other sub-samples among the small electronics firm workers big enough to warrant analysis on the relationship between reasons for accepting the second main job and the reasons for leaving the same job.

Some caution must be exercised in uniting the two industrial sub-samples in the small firm worker sample because of the rather
differing patterns of reasons reported by respondents for the three job changing situations discussed. However, it does reveal the fragmentation of reported reasons for a later decision for any given prior decision on a job change. For example, of the 21 respondents who reported that they accepted their second main job for intrinsic reasons, seven reported that they left this second job because of monetary considerations. A further eight stated that they left for reasons beyond their control. This supports the point made earlier about how large involuntary factors may loom in the work experiences of manual workers.

Of the 18 respondents who stated that money was a factor in accepting their second main job, six stated that they left this job for intrinsic reasons, seven mentioned money reasons, and a further respondent mentioned the lack of prospects in the firm. The remaining four respondents gave involuntary reasons. A further sub-sample of 16 respondents stated that a reason for their taking this second main job was to acquire a skill or training. Six of these, however, said that their reason for leaving their second job had to do with money, a further four offered intrinsic reasons, two were disappointed with the training facilities the firm actually provided and the remaining five reported that they left for involuntary reasons. (This total exceeds 14 because some respondents gave more than one reason.)

Job Change Decisions and Consistency: the Control Sample

A comparison of the data from the main sample with that from the large firm control sample is again rendered difficult by problems of grouping the varied reasons offered for taking or leaving jobs into larger and reasonably homogeneous categories. Thus, of the 38 respondents in the large printing firm sample for whom data is available on changing from first to second job, only eight could be firmly classified as clearly offering either intrinsic or extrinsic reasons for leaving their first job ever. In fact, for this sample the single largest category is those who left their first job ever for involuntary reasons (17 of the 38 or 44.7%).

Data is available for 30 respondents who have had a second main job but again only a minority can firmly be classified in terms of the intrinsic-extrinsic distinction. Five respondents offered extrinsic reasons for taking a second main job and of those, three were made redundant, one left because of money reasons and one because
the prospects in this second job seemed poor. A further five respondents gave intrinsic reasons for accepting their second main job and, of these, one left because neither the money nor the prospects were satisfactory, two others left for money reasons alone, one because of travel problems and only one because of an intrinsic reason. Thirteen of the 30 were classified as leaving this second main job for involuntary reasons (43.3%). It would be hazardous to draw any firm conclusions from such problematic data but it is possible to suggest in relation to the first hypothesis that there is no strong apparent trend toward consistency of orientations, especially because such a high proportion of the job changes analysed were not initiated by respondents themselves.

A somewhat clearer pattern emerges for the large electronics firm workers than for the large printing firm workers just considered. To begin with, in leaving their first job ever, fewer of the large electronics firm workers left for involuntary reasons (10 of the 42 respondents for whom data is available, or 23.8%). Of the seven respondents who were clearly categorised as leaving their first job ever for intrinsic reasons, three took their second main job because it appeared interesting, two because they thought it would enable them to acquire a skill or extend their experience, one because he had a friend working for the firm and because it was local and one because he could not find a job he preferred.

A further six large electronics firm respondents left their first job ever for money reasons and of these, two took their second job for money reasons, two because the job appeared interesting, one took it to acquire a skill and one because he could not obtain a more preferred job. The remaining 19 respondents do not produce large enough sub-samples to make it worthwhile to analyse the reasons why the second job was taken in relation to a specific reason for leaving the first job ever.

Information on 39 respondents in the large electronics firm sample who had had a second main job and who gave reasons for leaving that job, is also available. The biggest sub-sample among these giving a similar reason for accepting their second main job, stated that they did so for intrinsic reasons. This group of 10 respondents, one in four of those for whom information is known, offered a broad range of reasons for leaving their second job. Four respondents said
that their reason for leaving was connected with money, another three gave intrinsic reasons, one could see no prospects for him in the firm, one was rather unsure and the remaining respondent's firm went bankrupt. (In all, seven of the 39, 17.9%, respondents being discussed here left their second job for such involuntary reasons.) Seven of the 39 accepted their second main job for money reasons and of these, two left the job for the same reason, two for intrinsic reasons, one because of the lack of prospects, one was unable to say why he left and one was made redundant. The remaining possible sub-samples from these respondents for the analysis of the reasons for taking a second main job in relation to the reasons for leaving that job, are again too small to make analysis worth pursuing.

It will be seen from this detailed analysis of the relations between the reasons offered for accepting and leaving these two jobs, that there is only a moderate degree of consistency in the values and reasons given for decisions made by respondents concerning job changing at a given and a subsequent time in their work experience. Partly, this was seen to result from the fact that respondents are by no means always exercising a real choice when they change jobs, particularly in relation to leaving a job. For most manual workers the involuntary leaving of a specific job cannot be followed by any prolonged search for another job for they do not usually have the resources to permit this. It is also likely that they face moral pressures from family and peers against any extended search for a job.

But aside from this important lack of choice, there remained a tendency for a wide range of reasons to be given by a group who shared a similar declared reason for making a decision on a change of job, when they reported the reasons for subsequent behaviour to do with job changing. Not all the data on job changes has been presented yet since the penultimate job and the job held at the time of interview have still to be discussed and it might be argued that, if any persistent orientations develop in relation to job changing they may become more apparent later in the worker's employment experience. A further consideration of consistency of values and reasons in relation to job changing will be made, therefore, after the data on subsequent jobs has been analysed.

However, at this point it may be argued that the data offers little support for the first hypothesis on the build up of persistent
orientations related to self-selection in occupational placement. Rather, the data is more consistent with the view, suggested in the occupational literature discussed earlier, that situational and time-specific influences play a key part in job changing among manual workers. To this extent, the data provides more support for the third hypothesis than the first.

THE PENULTIMATE JOB

The penultimate job refers to the last job which the respondent held for at least a year, before coming to work for the firm at the time of interview. Therefore, this job need not have followed immediately after the second main job examined above and need not have been the job held immediately before joining the firm cooperating in the present study. Again, in selecting this job for detailed study, the aim was to obtain data on a job which could be assumed to have been an important part of the worker's previous work experience rather than spend valuable interviewing time seeking data on short-term jobs which the respondent might well only recall with difficulty. This job would normally have been held when the respondent's occupational identity was firmly established and might be expected to clearly reveal any persistent orientations connected with accepting and leaving a job.

The number of respondents for which information was obtained was naturally smaller than for the second main job because, given the age range of the sample, fewer respondents had had the opportunity to extend their work experience this far. The total for the small firm sample was 60 and for the large firm control sample, 54.

The pattern of job finding in relation to the second job is repeated in the data on the ways in which the penultimate job was found. As for the second job, the most important single way in which the penultimate job was obtained was through a newspaper advertisement. For the small firm worker sample as a whole, the percentage is almost exactly the same at 28.3% (compared to 28.2% for small firm workers in the data on the second main job). But there was a difference between the two small firm samples here. While 44% of the small printing firm workers stated that they found their penultimate job through a newspaper advertisement, only 17.1% of the small electronics firm workers mentioned this source. For the latter sample, friends were the single most important way in which the job was found being mentioned by 28.6% of respondents.
Among the large firm control sample the newspaper advertisement was more frequently mentioned than it was in relation to the second job and it remained the single most important way with 37% stating that this was their source of a penultimate job. (The comparable figure for the second job, reported in Table 3.6, is 23.4%.)

Again, the importance of a father or other relative declined as a way of finding a job. For the second job, 11.8% of the small firm workers and 14.8% of the large firm workers stated that they had found their job through kin connections but for the penultimate job these figures fell to 8.6% and 5.5% respectively. Conversely, and again following the trend suggested by the data on the first job ever and the second job, friends or other personal contacts become a more important source of jobs. Among the small electronics firm workers this was, as noted above, the most important way of finding a job (the only group for which this way was more important than the newspaper advertisement) and even among the small printing firm workers 20% found their penultimate job in this way. The latter percentage was matched almost exactly by that reported by workers in the large firm control sample where there was little difference between the two industries. For the large firm sample, as for the small firm sample, there was an increase in the importance of friends as a source of jobs. When the second main job sub-sample and the penultimate job sub-samples are compared, the percentage more than doubles from 8.6% to 20.4%.

For the printing workers the trade union was again an industry-specific way of locating a job. But, again, this was more the case for the large firm workers than for those in the main sample. There was, however, no increase in the importance of the trade union when second and penultimate jobs are compared; in fact, the figure for the penultimate job is rather lower at 22.7%.

The industry-specific method of obtaining a job among the electronics workers, the private employment agency, turned out to be no more important for the penultimate job than for the second job. In both cases the percentage of workers who say they found their job in this way is less than 10%. This is disproportionate to the importance attached to this source of labour in the executive interviews. This suggests that the vocal attention executives gave to the private employment agency was more related to a dislike of the agencies than their actual importance as a source of labour. A further test of
this point will be provided by the data on how the job held at the time of interview was found, discussed later in the chapter.

In the analysis of how the second job was obtained it was shown that differences in the recruitment practices of small and large firms affected the ways in which workers obtained jobs. These differences are even more marked for the penultimate job where 15% of the main sample respondents (12% of the small printing firm workers and 17.1% of the small electronics firm workers) say they obtained the job because the firm contacted them. Again, only a single member of the large firm control sample claimed he found his penultimate job in this way. This data, therefore, again provides strong support for the second hypothesis being tested in this chapter.

Finally, there was, as with all the previous jobs discussed, a range of somewhat unusual ways of finding a job reported by respondents in both small and large firms. One respondent heard two people talking about a job in a pub and contacted the firm the following morning; another respondent's car broke down in front of the entrance to the firm and he went to ask for help and a further respondent wired a house while filling in time between jobs and heard about the job from the house owner. As for the second job, very few respondents stated that they had obtained their job through an Employment Exchange. Naturally, given the average age of the sample in this penultimate job, there were no respondents who found their penultimate job through a school or college or through an apprenticeship scheme.

**Reasons for Taking the Penultimate Job**

When the reasons for taking the penultimate job are examined (see Table 3.10) several of the findings reported for the second job are again echoed although there are also differences. One of the findings which is repeated is the greater propensity for the small electronics firm workers to mention that the job appeared to be interesting as a reason for accepting the job. The latter sub-sample alluded to the apparent interest of the job in just over 30% of reasons offered while the comparable figure for the small printing firm workers was 21.4%. However, the frequency with which money reasons were mentioned by the small firm workers as a reason for taking the penultimate main job was at a very similar level among the printing and electronics workers at a little over 17%.

In other words, the greater emphasis by the small printing firm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Taking the Penultimate Main Job</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance of Learning a Skill</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>N=60</td>
<td>N=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Appeared Interesting</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Reasons</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Find no Alternative</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Relative Worked in the Firm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Worked in the Firm</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Get Preferred Job</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.
- Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
workers on money as a reason for taking a job, shown for the second job, was not repeated for the penultimate job. Both sub-samples among the small firm workers mentioned money as a reason less often than respondents in the large firm control sample where the lowest frequency of mentioning this reason, at 25%, was among the large printing firm workers. But again there is no simple intrinsic-extrinsic distinction between the small and large firm samples of respondents. Thus, the large electronics firm workers were just as likely to mention intrinsic reasons as the small printing firm workers. In relation to the first hypothesis, therefore, although there is some support for the idea that small and large firm workers display differing sets of orientations in relation to occupational placement, differences between the two industries, which it will be argued reflect differences in industrial sub-cultures, are at least as important.

A further important finding in relation to the first hypothesis on self-selection is the high proportion of respondents who are shown in Table 3.10 as indicating that their penultimate job was not a first choice but was accepted either as a substitute for a job they wanted but could not get, or because they could not find a job they would have liked more. For the small firm respondents as a whole such reasons comprise 23% of all reasons mentioned and for the large firm control sample the percentage, although lower, is still 17.3%. (Indeed, among the large printing firm workers, not being able to find an alternative job accounted for a quarter of all reasons given. This is an unexpected finding for a group of workers often thought to have a high degree of control over their work life). This data again points to the misleading connotations which may go with any simple acceptance of the notion of occupational 'choice' among manual workers.

It will also be noted that the division of the reasons offered by respondents into intrinsic-extrinsic categories in fact covers a majority of the reasons offered only in the case of one sub-sample (the large electronics firm workers). Now it may be that some of the other reasons given by respondents should be categorised in terms of the intrinsic-extrinsic categorisations. For example, the two respondents among the small electronics firm workers sub-sample who stated that they took their penultimate job in order to learn a skill may have done so for either intrinsic or extrinsic reasons (if the respondent made this clear at the time of interview it would have been coded as such and added to the totals mentioning such reasons). But even
allowing for a degree of understatement in this way, it is difficult to conclude that such reasons could have covered the majority of all reasons offered and hence we may suspect that an explanation of occupational placement in terms of such orientations can, at best, only be partial.

In fact, as in the discussion of previous jobs, there was a tendency for respondents to give a very wide range of reasons for particular actions or decisions in relation to job changes, many of which could not be categorised very easily because they were rather novel in character. It will also be seen, when successive Tables are compared, that the same categorisation is not used in all Tables. This is because the most suitable categorisations varied for the different jobs upon which respondents supplied information. Thus, no category for reasons mentioning geographical convenience of the job appears in Table 3.10 because only two respondents mentioned this in relation to their penultimate job.

In looking at whether the industry in which the penultimate job was located was the same as the industry in which the job at interview was held, as might be expected a higher proportion of jobs were in the same industry, overall, than for any previous job discussed. (See Table 3.8 above). For the printing industry workers the same small-large relationship observed with regard to the second job was repeated. Thus, although 80% of workers in the small printing firms, who had had a penultimate job, had worked in a printing firm the percentage of printers in the control sample whose penultimate job was in the printing industry, was nevertheless still higher at 95.8%. But in the case of the electronics industry samples, although the percentage whose penultimate job was in the same industry as their job at the time of interview was higher than was the case for the second job held, the small-large relationship was not maintained.

Among the small electronics firm workers, 62.8% of those who had had a penultimate job, held this job in the same industry as the one in which they were working at the time of interview but the percentage among the large firm control sample for this industry was 53.1%. The difference in this case is accounted for by the higher proportion of workers in the National Radar Company with skills not specific to the industry. If these are ignored then the large firm workers have a higher proportion whose penultimate job was also in the electronics
industry than the small firm workers.

Overall, however, the workers in the printing industry are again seen to be more likely to have worked in the same industry in previous jobs as the industry they were working in at the time of interview than the workers in the electronics industry. A final similarity between the second and penultimate job findings is that small firm workers are more likely to have had a white collar job in their penultimate job than workers in the control sample, a further pointer to their more varied occupational experiences. In other words, if manual workers do build up distinct, permanent orientations linked to occupational self-selection, then the small firm workers in the present study appear to show this much less clearly than the large firm workers. In terms of both industry and kind of job held in earlier work experience, they exhibit greater uncertainty.

Reasons for Leaving the Penultimate Job

The final set of data on the penultimate job concerns reasons given by respondents for leaving. This data, summarised in Table 3.11, shows again three main groups of reasons, monetary, intrinsic and involuntary reasons, which between them account for nearly two-thirds of all reasons given (62.7%). This is a very similar percentage to that reported for the second job held by respondents.

For the penultimate job no clear distinction between the small and large firms can be drawn in the comparison of intrinsic and extrinsic reasons. There are, on the other hand, slight differences between industries. The small printing firm workers were more likely than the small electronics firm workers to mention money and, as in the case of the reasons offered for leaving the second job, the small printing firm workers are more money-minded than their large firm counterparts. But rather less expected in the light of the data presented on previous jobs, is that the small printing firm workers are also the most likely of any group to mention intrinsic reasons for leaving - particularly that the job was boring and repetitive. The small electronics firm workers were the least likely to mention intrinsic reasons but the frequency with which this reason is offered by this group is very similar to that of the large electronics firm control sample. The small electronics firm workers were again, as in the data on the previous jobs, the least money-minded of all subsamples regardless of size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Respondents for which Information is Provided</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers N=25</th>
<th>Small Electronic Firm Workers N=55</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers N=22</th>
<th>Large Electronic Firm Workers N=32</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers N=60</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers N=54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm Went Broke or Moved</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (11.6%)</td>
<td>1 (4.0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.1%)</td>
<td>7 (9.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Redundant or Sacked</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 (32.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.0%)</td>
<td>5 (12.8%)</td>
<td>14 (19.4%)</td>
<td>9 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Reasons</td>
<td>8 (27.6%)</td>
<td>8 (17.8%)</td>
<td>5 (20.0%)</td>
<td>7 (17.9%)</td>
<td>16 (22.2%)</td>
<td>12 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Reasons</td>
<td>7 (24.1%)</td>
<td>6 (13.9%)</td>
<td>5 (20.0%)</td>
<td>7 (17.9%)</td>
<td>13 (18.0%)</td>
<td>12 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job had no Prospects</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>3 (7.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.0%)</td>
<td>4 (10.2%)</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
<td>5 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Reasons</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>2 (8.0%)</td>
<td>3 (7.7%)</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
<td>5 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>9 (31.0%)</td>
<td>5 (11.6%)</td>
<td>7 (28.0%)</td>
<td>11 (28.2%)</td>
<td>14 (19.4%)</td>
<td>18 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 (100.0%)</td>
<td>43 (100.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
<td>39 (100.0%)</td>
<td>72 (100.0%)</td>
<td>64 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

The total number of reasons exceeds the total of respondents in all sub-samples because some respondents gave more than one reason.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Involuntary reasons are the third main group of reasons for leaving the penultimate job accounting for one in five of all reasons offered overall, but they were particularly frequently given by respondents in the small electronics firms. Other reasons offered by respondents, which were worth placing in separate categories, were mentioned rather less frequently. A lack of prospects in the penultimate job comprised between 5% and 8% of the reasons given throughout the sample; family reasons (which refer to such reasons as problems in finding accommodation or a wish to move nearer to ageing parents) comprised 4% to 8% of the reasons offered.

The 'Other/Don't Know' category contains the usual range of more esoteric reasons plus those respondents who were unsure or could not remember why they had left this job. Examples of the less frequently mentioned reasons were a suspicion on the part of the respondent that the company was not doing very well and might be cutting its labour force over the coming months or a belief that the firm would close down the department in which the respondent worked. Most of the respondents in this set of data were working at a time when there was no conscription into the armed forces so the few respondents who gave this reason for leaving their penultimate job are also included in this category.

The data on penultimate jobs represents a picture of job change decision-making at what, for most respondents, would be seen as a period in which their position in the economic order was firmly established with regard to training and the type of job they would be able to take. The respondent was usually at least in his twenties and was in some cases much older (especially among the large firm workers). Nevertheless, it is clear that many respondents showed a lack of control over their choice of work either through involuntary reasons for changing jobs or because they found it difficult for one reason or another - perhaps a lack of knowledge of employment opportunities or misleading beliefs about the nature of the job when accepting employment in a firm - to find a job they particularly wanted.

The intrinsic-extrinsic distinction was found to be inadequate as a way of classifying a large proportion of the reasons offered by respondents for job changing. It might be argued that this distinction should be applied only to those respondents who indicate that their change of job was made reasonably free of external pressures and that
this might reveal that orientations are related to size in a clearer manner. But this would be to hide the lack of freedom of choice among respondents in relation to job changing which will affect any tendencies to self-selection and offer a highly misleading picture of the experience of changing jobs among the sample. Nor would this mode of analysis deal adequately with the high proportion of reasons, offered by respondents in connection with all the jobs discussed so far, which cannot be easily categorized in terms of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. Focusing on the reasons classified as intrinsic or extrinsic and excluding other reasons from consideration, still reveals no clear size relationship and the differences which are revealed may be explained more convincingly, as will be argued later in this chapter, in terms of alternative influences. At best, therefore, the first hypothesis is shown to offer only a very limited indication of the influences on occupational placement.

Besides the lack of certainty or failures of memory concerning reasons for taking or accepting jobs, a further interesting point, revealed both by the data on the respondents' penultimate job decision-making and the decisions related to previous jobs, is the proportion of reasons which might be seen by an observer as 'trivial' given the supposed critical importance in the life of most people, attached to changing a job. Perhaps for the manual worker such a change is not so momentous as is sometimes believed even where the decision is a moderately free one. For the manual worker who has had several year's experience and who has accepted that he is unlikely to have a job that is much superior either in material rewards or status and in a situation of relatively full employment, a change of job does not constitute the dramatic disjunction in experience that it is sometimes assumed to be. Often one job is not too dissimilar from another in terms of the perceived choice available to the actor and decisions, where the actor feels relatively unconstrained by family pressures or a limited knowledge of available jobs, turn on relatively slight differences between job possibilities.

A final point to note on the data on the penultimate job, summarised in Table 3.2 above, is that again the small firm workers stayed, on average, for a shorter period of time in the job than those in the large firm control sample. The difference is very clear-cut for both industries. Among the small firm workers 62.1% stayed in the penultimate job for less than three years compared with only
46.3% of the workers in the control sample. The most likely to change jobs among the small firm sample were the electronics workers, where 55.7% had left this job within three years and the least likely to leave the job within this period were the large printing firm workers where 40.9% had left and, in fact, over a quarter had stayed in their penultimate job for over ten years.

ENTERING THE JOB HELD AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW

The final set of data to be examined in relation to the hypotheses being tested concerns the ways in which respondents found the jobs held at the time of interview and their reasons for taking them. This data covers all respondents in the study and is, of course, the most recent job change in the respondent's work experience and therefore the least likely to be affected by lapses of memory. But, as will be seen, the pattern of replies repeats many of the findings established in relation to previous jobs.

Table 3.12 summarises the data on how the job held at the time of the interview was obtained and shows that, as with the second and penultimate main jobs, the most important medium for finding a job was newspaper advertisements with about one in three respondents finding their job in this way. It was less used, however, by the large firm control sample probably because, again as the Table indicates, these respondents are more likely to use job finding methods specific to their industry. Relatives, friends and to a much lesser extent, neighbours, are the next most frequent sources of jobs. (For the small printing firm workers, kin and peer sources are together actually more important than newspaper advertisements). Among the main sample, as a whole, these sources were responsible for about one in five of all jobs but were rather less important for the control sample respondents where 15.9% reported that they found their current job in these ways.

The industry-specific methods of job finding which were in evidence in relation to the second and penultimate jobs, were rather more strongly represented in the data on the current job. Among printing workers the trade union and the apprenticeship scheme were important ways of finding jobs but this was again very much more so for large firm workers. For the small printing firm workers this way of finding a job was not as available because fewer were trade union members but also because the unions have less control over entry into small firms, presumably because it is difficult to closely supervise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Through School or College</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Father or Relative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Neighbour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a Friend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert. in the Paper</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment Agency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a Trade Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Somebody Who Worked in the Firm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Contacted Respondent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Industrial Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Approached Firm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Known</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=73 100.0  N=66 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=139 100.0  N=88 100.0

NOTES: (1) Does not include the partners in Silver, Brown & Stone. Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
entry into the very large number of small firms especially where Fathers of the Chapel are not very union-minded. The private employment agency, the industry-specific way of job finding for the electronics workers, was used by a little over one in five of respondents. As for previous jobs discussed, the large firm obtained more of its work force from this source than the smaller firms.

Since the data being considered here covers all respondents for whom information is available (except the six partners in Silver, Brown and Stone) it covers the complete age range of respondents. It is, therefore, possible to compare the extent to which younger respondents, especially those whose current job was their first job ever, used formal occupational placement agencies with the extent to which respondents considered previously used this method of finding their first job ever where this was not the job held at the time of interview. The comparison shows that formal agencies are apparently now being used to a greater extent. This would be expected given that some of the respondents considered earlier did not have access to such agencies because they started working before they existed or when they were available to only a small proportion of school leavers. Of the 43 respondents whose job at the time of interview was their first job ever, 17 or just under 40% had obtained the job in this way. Non-formal methods of finding a first job, therefore, appear to remain more important than formal agencies, at least for the present sample of manual workers.

A further parallel between the findings on the way the current job was found and the findings on earlier jobs was the differences in labour recruitment methods between small and large firms. About 5% of the small firm workers stated that their current job resulted from the firm contacting them whereas no large firm respondent claimed that he originally found the job in this way. These findings provide further support, therefore, for the second hypothesis concerning differences in personnel selection between small and large firms. About 10% of the remaining respondents approached the firm asking if there was a job available although it was large firm respondents who were the most likely to have done this.

The reasons offered by respondents for taking the job at the time of interview cover an even wider range than for previous jobs discussed possibly because this is the first instance in which the
whole sample (apart from the partners in Silver, Brown and Stone) has been analysed. As Table 3.13 shows, the largest single groups of reasons are those associated with intrinsic and money considerations but they are, as with the previous jobs analysed, by no means all of the reasons offered and, indeed, are a minority of reasons given in all sub-samples. Although small firm workers were more likely, overall, to offer intrinsic reasons and the large firm workers were more likely to give money reasons, the findings do not provide a clear-cut difference between the main and control samples. As in the case of the second job, small printing firm workers were more inclined to mention money than their large firm counterparts.

These findings reinforce the doubts expressed earlier about the limitations inherent in discussing job changing among manual workers solely in terms of meanings narrowly connected with the character of the job itself. In both the main and control samples, a substantial proportion of reasons were unrelated to such meanings. Moreover, even where the comparison is made entirely in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic meanings associated with work, the size relationship is not completely consistent. Both points indicate a lack of support for the first hypothesis.

Table 3.13 should not be seen as providing a complete picture of respondents' job change decisions. Respondents entered the job held at the time of interview at widely varying points in their work experience but because of differences between the main and control samples, large firm workers tended to enter this job rather later in their work experience. The important difference in the average age of the main and control samples has already been mentioned with workers in the control sample being, on average, just over nine years older than the workers in the main sample. A further important difference, related to this age difference, was the difference in the proportions of married respondents. Among small firm workers, it will be remembered, about half (51.5%) were or had been married at the time of interview while among the control sample the corresponding proportion was 75%. These differences, as the third hypothesis being tested in this chapter suggests, may be closely connected with the considerations workers have in mind when changing from one job to another.

In discussing the meanings surrounding entry into employment on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=75 (1) %</td>
<td>N=66 %</td>
<td>N=44 %</td>
<td>N=44 %</td>
<td>N=139 %</td>
<td>N=88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Learn a Skill or Extend Experience</td>
<td>10 11.5</td>
<td>11 12.2</td>
<td>6 10.5</td>
<td>2 3.5</td>
<td>21 11.9</td>
<td>8 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Appeared Interesting</td>
<td>16 18.4</td>
<td>20 22.2</td>
<td>8 14.0</td>
<td>7 12.3</td>
<td>36 20.3</td>
<td>15 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Reasons</td>
<td>24 27.6</td>
<td>15 16.7</td>
<td>12 21.0</td>
<td>17 29.8</td>
<td>39 22.0</td>
<td>29 25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Reasons</td>
<td>3 3.4</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>5 2.8</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Worked in Firm</td>
<td>2 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Find No Alternative Job/First Job That Turned Up</td>
<td>3 3.4</td>
<td>10 11.1</td>
<td>4 7.0</td>
<td>9 15.8</td>
<td>13 7.3</td>
<td>13 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Worked in the Firm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Contacted Respondent</td>
<td>4 4.6</td>
<td>8 8.9</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>12 6.8</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Advice or Pressure</td>
<td>2 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Convenience</td>
<td>6 6.9</td>
<td>9 10.0</td>
<td>10 17.5</td>
<td>10 17.5</td>
<td>15 8.5</td>
<td>20 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Give No Reason</td>
<td>16 18.4</td>
<td>14 15.5</td>
<td>14 24.6</td>
<td>9 15.8</td>
<td>30 16.9</td>
<td>23 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87 (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>90 100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>177 100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** (1) Does not include partners in Silver, Brown & Stone. (2) Some Respondents gave more than one reason. Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
completing full-time education, the data indicated that among all respondents there was rather less concern with material factors than was the case for subsequent job decision-making. This, it was argued, was due to the influence of significant others, especially parents and teachers, on what kind of job to take at the start of adult employment. These others would, it was felt, strongly favour jobs assumed to have long term prospects rather than jobs offering immediate material rewards. The data on the reasons for leaving the first job ever, accepting and leaving the second job, suggested an increased concern with material rewards among respondents. This was interpreted as indicating a decline in the influence of the significant others mentioned above and the increasing influence on the workers' occupational identity of the direct experience of work and its potential rewards.

But it may be further argued, that as the respondent enters the stage of his life cycle in which he marries, sets up home and becomes a parent, his job changing decisions will reflect these changes in his non-work life. He will acquire new significant others, his wife and her family, who will assess him to a great extent on how well he provides for his family. His own parents and his peers might also be expected to adopt similar criteria stressing material factors.

To test this argument and to allow for the differences in the average ages of the main and control samples and the differing proportions who were married, the samples' responses to the questions on why they took their current job were analysed by examining the replies of all respondents who were aged 21 or over and married or about to be married, at the time of starting this job. The data broadly supports the argument in two ways and hence also provides some support for the third hypothesis on the importance of influences external to the immediate meaning of work on job change decisions.

There is a higher proportion among all sub-samples mentioning money as a reason for accepting the job held at the time of interview among those aged 21 and over, married or about to be married at the time of starting this job than among the sample as a whole, although the difference is not large for any grouping. In all sub-samples there is also a decline in the extent to which intrinsic reasons for accepting the job held at the time of interview are mentioned as compared to the sample as a whole.
Further, the fact that older workers and those who are married, are more concerned with material factors and less concerned with intrinsic factors when taking a job, has the effect of reducing the apparent differences between the main and control samples displayed in Table 3.13 in their relative concern with intrinsic and extrinsic factors. This undermines the notion that small firm workers are more concerned with intrinsic factors than their large firm counterparts. Part of the difference between the two samples, in other words, may be explained by the differences in average age and marital state.

None of the sub-samples here are very large so no great emphasis can be put on this analysis but it is consistent with the view developed in relation to the previous jobs discussed, that situational factors are at least as important as any more long term influences on the decisions made by workers on leaving or taking a job. The fact that the differences, which might be expected to follow from the argument presented above, are not any bigger may well be connected with the involuntary character of much of the job changing which again shows its importance in the taking of the job held at the time of interview.

The importance of involuntary influences on job changing may be gauged from the following. Among the small printing firm workers, for example, 12.5% of the sample left the last main job prior to the job held at the time of interview for involuntary reasons, the lowest percentage for any sub-sample. Among small electronics firm workers the percentage rises to 48.1% of all those who have had at least one job prior to coming to work for the firm at the time of interview.

There is no apparent size relationship here, however, since the large printing firm workers have, at 45.9%, a level over double that of the small printing firm workers but the large electronics firm workers, at 25.6%, are very much less likely than the small electronics firm workers to have left the last job prior to the job held at interview for involuntary reasons. Thus, on average, a third of the sample in the present study left the last main job prior to the job held at the time of interview for involuntary reasons, the most frequent reason being that they were made redundant because of the economic difficulties of the firm in question.

It can be argued from an analysis of the reasons given by
respondents for leaving the second and penultimate main jobs and for taking the job at the time of interview, that the effect of involuntary reasons for leaving would be to inhibit the occurrence of large changes in the display of freely operating orientations. But, further, involuntary job changing would also inhibit their development or persistence over time through a lack of opportunity for reinforcement. This argument would also go against the first hypothesis.

If it is accepted that the reasons categorised as 'Family Reasons', 'Could Not Find a Job Preferred More', 'Parental Pressure or Advice' and 'Because the Job Was Local' refer to influences which do not reflect attractions of the job or firm itself, then these reasons have similarities with the involuntary reasons discussed above. Like involuntary reasons, they show influences operating which work against the surfacing of orientations, where these might exist, which would allow the analysis of self-selection tendencies simply in intrinsic-extrinsic terms.

It can be seen in Table 3.13 that these reasons, when aggregated, form a sizable proportion of all the reasons offered by respondents. For the small printing firm workers they are 16% of all reasons, the smallest proportion among all sub-samples, which may be compared to the highest proportion, 35% of all reasons, given by the large printing firm respondents. On average, a quarter of all reasons reported by the sample as a whole refer to such reasons. (The above percentages are almost certainly an understatement because the 'Other/Could Not Remember' category in Table 3.13 also probably contains reasons which are unrelated to the work situation or firm itself.)

In terms of the ideas on occupational placement in the existing literature and the focus on self-selection in relation to specific work situation characteristics, there has, it would seem, been a considerable underemphasis on involuntary reasons for taking and leaving jobs. But if involuntary influences on job changes are given greater importance then the overall effect is to undermine the self-selection thesis asserted in the first hypothesis and give further support to the third hypothesis.

Consistency, Orientations and the Job Held at the Time of Interview

With the above in mind it is possible to return to a further test of the consistency in the values and reasons reported by respon-
dents in job change decision-making over time. Unfortunately, the size of the samples in relation to leaving the second main job, taking the penultimate job and leaving this job for the current job are, after they are broken down into sub-samples associated with the various reasons offered, too small for any adequate analysis. Instead, an analysis of the reasons given by respondents for leaving the second main job is compared with the reasons offered by the same respondents for taking either the penultimate job or the current job, depending on which came first, although even here the sub-samples are sometimes not large.

As might be expected, the degree of consistency is somewhat higher than when the transition between leaving the first job ever and a second main job was analysed since respondents had reached a later stage in their work experience. By this stage, most had reached a 'plateau' in their occupational development and were increasingly less likely to change to a different kind of job. Yet, nevertheless, the level of consistency was only relatively higher. Thus, among the ten small printing firm workers who stated that they had left their second main job mainly for money reasons, seven mentioned similar reasons for accepting the next job upon which data was collected. But of the eight respondents in the same group who mentioned intrinsic reasons for leaving the second main job, only two mentioned similar reasons for accepting the next job. A further two mentioned money reasons and three mentioned reasons which could not be classed in terms of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. Among the large printing firm control sample, of the seven respondents who mentioned money as a reason for leaving the second main job, three mentioned similar reasons for accepting their next job upon which data was gathered, two mentioned intrinsic reasons and two mentioned reasons which could not be classified as either.

Similar levels of consistency were found among the small electronics firm workers. Nine respondents mentioned monetary considerations as part of their reasons for leaving their second main job. Of these, four mentioned similar reasons for taking their next job for which data was collected, three cited intrinsic considerations and the remaining two respondents offered reasons not possible to classify as either. Although of the six respondents from this sub-sample who offered intrinsic reasons, not one mentioned money reasons as being part of their reasons for taking their next job, equally, not all the
reasons offered were clearly intrinsic.

Among the large electronics firm control sample, twelve respondents mentioned intrinsic reasons for leaving their second main job and, of these, five offered a similar reason for taking the next job upon which they were questioned, four mentioned monetary considerations and the remainder reasons not classifiable as either. Of the eight who mentioned money reasons for leaving their second main job, five offered similar reasons for taking their next job, one mentioned intrinsic considerations and the other two offered reasons fitting neither category.

It may be argued that, despite the rather higher degree of consistency indicated by this data, when the levels of involuntary and non-work connected reasons are borne in mind, there is little evidence that job changing is strongly influenced by persistent orientations of an intrinsic or extrinsic kind. Again, therefore, there is little support for the first hypothesis that workers self-select themselves into firms whose characteristics are assumed to be most congruent with such persistent orientations. The data, however, provides at least indirect support for the third hypothesis stressing the importance of situational influences on job changing which would, as noted earlier, more fully accord with the findings of the bulk of the literature on occupational placement.

AN OVERALL VIEW

The data on respondents' work experiences has now been examined in detail and it is possible to draw some conclusions in relation to the three hypotheses being considered. It is immediately clear that a rather different interpretation of the occupational placement process than that which emphasises self-selection based upon the extrinsic-intrinsic orientations dichotomy, is required.

Entering the World of Work

We might begin at the point of entry into employment. Data from the present study fully supports the general picture, drawn in the previous literature, of the rather confused young male making the transition from full-time education to adult employment with few formal institutional aids and a sincere, if vague, determination on the part of parents and kin to help in the transition. The lack of support from the educational system was obvious both in the general sense that the relevance of the educational curriculum to future
employment was rarely mentioned and also in the sense that careers
guidance, as a help in the transition process, was, in fact, used
only by a minority. Similarly, the Youth Employment Service was
indicated, once again, to be of relatively minor importance.

In looking at respondents' orientations at the point of entry
into the world of work, the data often pointed to the orientations
of significant others rather than those of respondents themselves.
The most important significant others were parents and other close
kin. In the most positive case the main concern of parents was for
a job with 'prospects' rather than immediate material rewards. In
a number of instances, most commonly among respondents in the small
electronics firms, parents were also concerned with social mobility,
having ambitions for their son to 'do well' as measured by having a
white collar rather than a manual job. There were also a substantial
number of respondents who reported that they had received little or
no guidance from any source at all.

Parental concern for their sons' occupational success, however,
was not matched by serious attempts to gather up-to-date information
on available jobs. Parental views were often based on the fathers'
own experiences of entering full-time employment a generation previously
and were often more relevant to the period between the two World Wars
than to recent decades. Although the influence of non-kin related
sources, including the school and Youth Employment Service, was of
much less importance, their effect was to reinforce the emphasis of
parents and kin on intrinsic rewards and future prospects in selecting
a first job. Respondents themselves usually had no firm views on the
subject, with most admitting they had very little idea about what
they wanted to do and hence were quite happy to follow the advice of
parents and other significant adults.

Yet, nevertheless, it is in this seemingly haphazard transition
from full-time education to employment, that the differences between
the small and large firm worker samples begin. These differences,
which, as will become clear, are interrelated, begin with the findings
that, on average, small firm workers stayed in their first job for
less time than the large firm worker and were much less likely to
have served an apprenticeship or equivalent formal training or, if
such a training was begun, to have successfully completed it. The
small firm worker was also more likely to have started his industrial
experiences in an industry other than the one he was working in at
the time of interview and was more likely to have started his work life in a white collar job than his large firm counterpart.

If these initial differences are put alongside those reported for subsequent jobs, which also show a tendency among small firm workers to change jobs more frequently and to have worked in a wider variety of industries than the large firm workers, then small firm workers are indicated as having considerably lower levels of job and industry stability. The overall picture adds up to a less favourable market situation for the small firm worker as compared to the control sample workers. In other words, the small firm workers had got off on 'the wrong foot' on entry into full-time employment and in their subsequent work experience had, in the main, retained this market disadvantage. This finding provides strong support for the third hypothesis since the worker's market situation, in this sense, must be considered as external to immediate orientations to work. Of course, respondents in both the main and control samples entered jobs at the completion of full-time education which offered little chance of enhancing their later market situation but small firm workers were less likely to remedy this situation in subsequent job changes, despite the fact that they changed jobs more frequently.

Employers and Occupational Placement

A market situation is made up of two main elements - in this case a seller of labour and a buyer of labour - and the market situation characteristics of the main and control samples must be articulated with the employing practices of different firms, the subject of the second hypothesis being considered here. The small firm workers on average less well trained and less experienced than the large firm workers, are less likely to satisfy the universalistic personnel selection criteria of the large firm which stresses an apprentice training or its equivalent, relevant industrial experience and a history of employment stability.

In addition, large firms may, for reasons of labour relations, recruit only members of a relevant trade union for all or certain jobs. Indeed, in the completely unionised large printing firm in the present study, the selection of journeymen was effectively controlled by the union. Even apprentices were selected by a local joint employer-union committee upon which the management of individual firms taking apprentices were not necessarily directly represented. Small firm workers were much less likely to have union cards and were, there-
fore, excluded from firms where union membership was a precondition of entry. In effect, this means that they were excluded from working for many large firms.

Small firm employers have rather different labour selection practices. Few have a personnel department (only one of the small firms in the present study had one - the largest of the small electronics firms - and this had been only recently established). Normally, labour recruitment and discharging is carried out by the owner-manager himself or under his close supervision. Less universalistic criteria are used in selecting workers; owner-managers focus much more on the man himself rather than simply on his job qualifications on paper.

Small firm employers, therefore, are more willing to hire people whose previous job history is unconventional or people who, despite a lack of obvious qualifications, appear capable of being trained into useful additions to the firm's labour force. Such workers may even be preferred since they will be trained for the job in that particular firm and will have no 'bad' habits to unlearn. The small firm executive interviews also revealed preferences for younger workers (which was supported by the age data for the main and control samples) and for non-union members who, it was believed, might be a less 'disturbing' influence on the existing work force. As the income data discussed in Chapter 4 indicates, workers meeting these criteria are likely to be cheaper to hire, a not unimportant factor for the small firm employer.

Small firm owner-managers were usually more or less consciously trying to build up an ideal labour force. The character of this ideal labour force came from a combination of the definition of a 'good' worker in the small firm owner-manager's world-view and appropriate objective skill criteria. For instance, the relative absence of contract workers in the small electronics firms was partly due to owner-managers believing that such workers would not display the level of loyalty their 'ideal' worker would have to the firm. The labour stability rates for the small firms in the present study, which showed a higher rate of labour turnover than in the large firms, indicated that small firm owner-managers do not find the task they set themselves here an easy one.
Other Influences on Occupational Placement

In demonstrating the importance of the worker's market situation and the differing personnel selection practices of small and large firm employers, strong support is provided for the second and third hypotheses examined in this chapter. This is not to assert that workers' orientations are unimportant, as will be seen below in this and subsequent chapters. But it is meant to stress that a range of other influences, mostly ignored by previous research, must be considered in arriving at an adequate interpretation of the ways in which manual workers come to work for small and large firms.

A social action interpretation concentrating on the definitions of workers must, in other words, be augmented by reference to the definitions of others involved in occupational placement, especially those who can offer or refuse employment, and the objective character of the worker's life situation. Important aspects of the latter range from the kind of occupational training experiences he acquires to his position in the life cycle.

The importance of orientations in occupational placement, so strongly emphasised in the first hypothesis, particularly in relation to size of firm is, on the basis of the present data, also bound up with several further considerations. Thus, the notion that it is possible to differentiate between small and large firm workers simply in terms of orientations dichotomised into intrinsic and extrinsic categories, is questionable on at least two further grounds. First, a large proportion of the reasons offered for leaving or accepting jobs were impossible to classify in terms of the intrinsic-extrinsic categorisation or to see as clearly reflecting the actor's choice.

Of great importance among the involuntary reasons discussed, was the incidence of redundancy through no fault of the worker precipitating him into a job change not of his own choosing. This factor has been given little attention in previous studies. Partly this may have been due to the relatively high employment levels and economic stability of the 1950's and 1960's. This may have led researchers to ignore this aspect of workers' experiences and give too much emphasis to freedom of occupational choice. In the present decade, higher levels of economic inactivity may, however, have made involuntary redundancy an even more common experience among manual workers. (39)

In any event, it is difficult to justify ignoring such a frequent experience associated with occupational placement in any adequate
theory. In the present study involuntary reasons were never less than 13% of the reasons given for leaving any job for which data was collected. What is more, among small firm workers, the level of involuntary redundancy increased as successive jobs were examined, reaching almost 30% of the reasons offered for leaving the penultimate job. Among large firm workers the level remained broadly constant but was still about one in five of all reasons given for all jobs for which data was collected.

A second set of reasons, which were also difficult to classify in terms of any intrinsic-extrinsic categorisation, referred to issues with little direct relevance to either the job or firm at which the respondent was working. Among these were reasons such as changes in the availability of public transport and especially increases in the cost of travelling. Accommodation problems were another example of this type of reason. Reasons of this kind, when combined with the involuntary redundancy reasons discussed above, often accounted for more job change activity than reasons linked to the intrinsic or extrinsic orientations of respondents.

In other words, to attempt to discuss the reasons why people come to be in or leave particular jobs in terms of intrinsic-extrinsic orientations is to account, at best, for only a proportion of the reasons attached to job changing and occupational placement. This suggests that the first hypothesis is inherently incapable of providing the basis for a full interpretation of the differences in occupational placement between small and large firm workers.

The Importance of the Industrial Sub-culture

But even within the boundaries of the intrinsic-extrinsic categorisation, the hypothesis that, over time, the actor acquires a set of persistent orientations which guide freely made job change decisions was rendered doubtful by the data from the present research. Attempts to trace the build up and persistence of intrinsic or extrinsic orientations through successive job changes indicated rather a low level of consistency in the values and reasons offered by respondents. Disregarding the earliest job change decisions in the respondent's work experience, which might be regarded as prior to any stable set of orientations, even the job change decisions associated with subsequent jobs appeared to display a relatively low level of consistency. Thus, even among respondents in job change situations relatively
free from influences beyond their control or where external factors unconnected with the work situation itself were not important, there were few clear indications of self-selection in terms of persistent intrinsic or extrinsic considerations extending over more than one job change.

There were, however, clear differences between the samples on the relative importance attached to intrinsic and extrinsic considerations in leaving or accepting a job and these are large enough to require comment and interpretation. The major differences, it will have been noted, were usually not so much between the small firm and control samples but between the printing and electronic small firm samples. In other words, the explanation for these differences must primarily be sought in terms of factors other than size. Here it will be argued that, these differences are related more to the sub-cultures of the two industries from which the samples were drawn, than to the sizes of the firms.

The small printing firm workers, for example, were frequently the most money-minded of all samples, regardless of industry or size of firm, while the small electronics firm workers were usually the most intrinsically-minded sample of all. Often the large firm control sample was sandwiched between the two small firm sub-samples, albeit displaying a propensity to favour extrinsic factors over intrinsic ones, in the reasons which could be classified in these ways.

Printing, as described in Chapter 2, has a well developed industrial culture stemming from its long existence and relatively slow rate of technological and organisational change, at least until comparatively recently. The occupational community of the printing worker, an important aspect of the industrial sub-culture, has been well documented previously and suggests that workers in this industry have a considerable awareness of the fortunes of their fellow workers and the industry itself.\(^{40}\)

Until about the late 1950's the level of earnings, job security and job autonomy of the printer were unmatched by almost any other manual worker. (Many of the printing firm respondents made this point, often using phrases suggesting that the printer had been 'an aristocrat among manual workers'). But the changing fortunes of the industry (also documented in Chapter 2) have led to a fall in relative earnings and lower levels of economic security. Workers in the industry
In the present study were well aware of these changes.

Within the printing industry there has long been a small proportion of workers, those who work on the national and provincial newspapers, who earn high wages by the standards of the industry as a whole. These workers form a reference group for printers in relation to earnings, and many workers below middle age aspire to join this earnings elite. Their chances however have become increasingly remote. The national newspapers have been in financial trouble for some years and have been partly successful in reducing the number of printers employed by introducing capital intensive technology. This trend shows every indication of accelerating in the future.

Although provincial newspapers are profitable, competition for jobs on them is stiff and very much in the control of the main unions in the industry. Given these aspects of the industrial sub-culture and the recent history of the industry, it is not surprising that printing workers are very conscious of earnings. Nor is it surprising that the small printing firm workers, who tend to have fewer chances of high earnings, are the most money conscious.

It is also worth mentioning, in the light of what will be said below about the electronics industry sub-culture, that one element in the somewhat over-romanticised picture of the printing industry offered in previous research, has been the stress on intrinsic rewards. It is usually suggested that the printer is a craftsman who has escaped the boredom and routine of much modern factory work. The data from the present study does not support this view. On the contrary, many printing workers emphasised how boring and routine they found their work.

A technical manual for the building industry, a daily listing of commodity exchange prices, a monthly magazine for intending house purchasers (examples of products printed by the firms for which the present sample worked) are, as respondents pointed out, hardly exciting, particularly where the order is for a large number of copies or, as in the case of a magazine, repeats itself month to month, year in and year out. It is, therefore, not surprising that in discussing the reasons surrounding job changing, intrinsic factors were not often mentioned by printers in either small or large firms.

In the electronics industry sub-culture a strong contrast to that of the printing industry was found. The industry, as again
pointed out in Chapter 2, is highly conscious of its scientific base. It has had an exceptional rate of technological change since the end of the Second World War and each innovation has been a further reminder of its links with the expansion of scientific knowledge. The workers in the present study were perhaps more conscious of this than workers in other parts of the industry might be because they were among the more skilled workers, making small batch, high quality, products rather than the more mundane products such as transistor radios. Respondents' views on their jobs and the industry, repeatedly mentioned these considerations, indicating the importance of intrinsic factors such as the satisfaction derived from constructing a sophisticated instrument from a drawing, trying it out on the bench and solving the inevitable teething problems associated with high quality, small batch production.

An aspect of the social organisation of the electronics firm, and one perhaps connected to the ethos of science, is the way the usual distinction between shopfloor and white collar workers is blurred. Most workers, regardless of whether they are the equivalent of a shopfloor worker or not, wear white coats or casual clothing and the clear social demarcations found in the ordinary manufacturing factory are much less evident. Thus, common work roles such as 'test engineer' are sometimes difficult to grade as 'manual' or 'white collar' and in the present study, respondents with this job designation were often found to have very varying educational backgrounds and responsibilities.

Paradoxically, therefore, in the present study it was the electronics worker, working in the more recently established, rapidly changing, science-based industry and not the worker in the traditional printing industry, who most clearly manifested the orientations of the craftsman, strongly emphasising intrinsic aspects of his job. However, again there is a sub-group of workers in the industry, who earn much more than the typical worker and who again form a reference group for workers as a whole. These are the contract workers described earlier, who are able to earn more by foregoing such benefits as sick pay and holiday pay and by being prepared to work wherever their agency sends them. There is also the possibility of paying, legally or otherwise, lower levels of income tax than the ordinary worker.

But contract workers do not appear to be such a positive reference group as the newspaper workers in the printing industry for two reasons.
In the first place, they are a comparatively recent phenomenon in the industry, emerging as a result of labour shortages. Secondly, where contract workers work alongside non-contract workers, a certain friction tends to develop. Contract workers are observed to be earning more than other workers doing the same job, sometimes staying for long periods rather than simply being employed to fill a temporary labour shortage and hence, are often strongly resented by the permanent work force. Contract workers also frequently make it clear to permanent workers that they regard the latter as either not skilled or confident enough to become contract workers or simply as not very enterprising.

In the printing industry the presence of a number of unions, who to some extent compete with each other in demonstrating their bargaining skills, means that the general wage levels in the industry are better known than in the electronics industry. A printing worker can make a more realistic estimate of the earnings being offered by a particular firm (and conversely employers, even non-union employers, are aware of this) than is possible in the electronics industry. This provides a further reason why consciousness of earnings is likely to be higher in the printing industry.

The electronics industry, on the other hand, is not highly unionised and the unions that do recruit workers in the industry are not usually industry specific. Unlike the printing unions, whose 'Chapel' or branch is based on the firm, unions with members in the electronics industry generally organise their branches on a geographical basis. In short, unions in the electronics industry do not provide information on pay and conditions with anything like the efficiency of the printing unions. If these considerations are added to the ones mentioned earlier on the relative differences in the position of money reference groups among workers in the two industries, then it can be suggested that they help to explain the rather lower frequency of references to money among the electronics workers while the remarks on the craft orientations of electronics workers, help to explain the greater concern with intrinsic aspects of the job.

It is, therefore, argued that differences in orientations of an intrinsic or extrinsic kind (remembering once again that such orientations do not by any means predominate in the reasons mentioned by respondents in relation to job changing) are very much more connected
with the sub-cultures of the two industries from which the samples are drawn than to the size of firms. It is not that worker orientations are completely unconnected with characteristics associated with size but rather that the industrial sub-culture influences the form orientations associated with size of firm will take in the particular industry.

Orientations and Adjustment to Work Experience

There remains, however, a slightly higher concern overall with extrinsic matters among workers in the control sample than among the small firm workers but, as the data already presented has shown, this is not a clear-cut difference. Such a difference might also be interpreted in terms of the differing market and non-work life situations of the two samples and this interpretation might be preferred to one narrowly based on intrinsic-extrinsic orientations on two grounds.

First of all, there was a marked absence in the reasons offered by respondents for taking or leaving a job, of any reference to size or its correlates. This was in spite of respondents being told, at the time the main interview was arranged, that the research was concerned with differences between small and large firms as places in which to work. Even when size aspects were mentioned, they were rarely a major reason for a job change decision.

In the case of the printing industry the lack of reference to size is not surprising since, as was pointed out in Chapter 2, this is a small firm industry with over 75% of the firms in the industry employing less than 50 workers. Thus, for most workers, the choice of working in a large firm is not one that frequently arises; most job changing simply involves moving from one small firm to another. In the electronics industry it is more possible to work for a large firm, particularly in the area from which the present sample was drawn, but even so there are very many small firms in which to work given (as also pointed out in Chapter 2) that even in this industry over 80% of establishments employ less than 100 workers.

Secondly, while a worker's orientations are relatively flexible, on the data from the present study, it might be suggested that his market situation is much less so. Not only does this refer to the skills and experiences he acquires but, as argued earlier, it refers also to employer responses to worker characteristics which were again
seen to be related to size of firm. In other words, it may be more plausible to suggest that for some small firm workers, particularly those with market situation disadvantages, the lack of manifestation of extrinsic orientations might be an adjustment to a personal market situation. (41)

The Importance of Changing Jobs

A final point, which might perhaps be made on occupational placement among manual workers generally, is that researchers may tend to over-emphasise the transition from one job to another in relation to the actor’s own feelings about this disjunction in his work life. As argued previously, after about age 21 the manual worker reaches a ‘plateau’ in his work experiences. He finds it increasingly difficult to enter any new job which requires a long period of training. He is, therefore, increasingly confined to jobs similar to his present job, if he wishes to retain whatever benefits, financial or otherwise, he has derived from his previous work history.

Similarly, his chances of promotion, even to foreman, are not high, given the typical span of control of the foreman in British industry. Equally significant, as several studies show, that most shopfloor workers do not want promotion. Therefore, changing jobs, even where this is entirely voluntary may not be attended by perceptions of a momentous event occurring. A new job might promise to be rather more interesting or slightly better paid (although the latter may depend on fluctuating levels of overtime) but most jobs will be broadly similar. In many instances, changing jobs is surrounded by constraints and involuntary influences to such an extent that occupational choice is very limited.

These considerations may also help to explain the lower than expected employment stability rates among both the small firm and large firm control samples. As Table 3.2 showed, just over half of the respondents (50.6%) had been in the job at the time of interview for less than two years with small firm respondents having, on average, been in the job for less time than the large firm respondents. Only a quarter of the respondents had held their current job for longer than five years. These employment stability rates for the current job were similar to those reported for previous jobs. In other words, job changing was a fairly frequent experience among the workers in the present study.
If the first hypothesis, stressing the gradual build up of orientations leading to self-selection into firms of different size, offered a strong basis for interpreting occupational placement among small and large firm workers, it might be expected that employment stability would increase with the length of employment experience. But the data does not support this for either the main or control samples but especially not for the small firm workers whose employment stability is much lower than that among the large firm workers. Employment stability only appears to increase with age and other factors indicating the operation of involuntary influences on job changing.

The impression given by respondents was that leaving a job was often not the result of a careful reasoning process, aiming at a new job with certain desired characteristics, even where the leaving was voluntary. Nor was taking a new job clearly the result of the operation of a persistent set of orientations built up over the period of work experience which related to the supposed characteristics of future possible jobs.

Instead, the notion introduced earlier of 'satisficing' seems to describe more accurately than previous theorising what actors were doing when changing jobs. At the 'plateau' point in work experience (which would cover the majority of the period of adult employment) it would be irrational to entertain high expectations about a future job, given the considerations outlined above. Workers do not have such expectations and are not seeking some ideal job defined in terms of intrinsic or extrinsic orientations but, within the constraints imposed by external factors such as market situation, knowledge of available job opportunities, geographical and especially family and life cycle reasons, they accept a job that appears to meet their minimum expectations. These external influences plus employer personnel selection practices, mentioned as important in the second and third hypotheses, seem, therefore, to provide a more adequate basis for interpreting how manual workers come to work for firms of different size. But, in addition, the data has also indicated the importance of the industrial sub-culture as a source of meanings which go to make up the occupational identity of workers in particular industries and which greatly affect the emphasis given to extrinsic and intrinsic factors in defining work.

Overall, therefore, it is argued that the intrinsic-extrinsic
orientations approach to occupational placement provides a very inadequate interpretation of occupational placement patterns among the present sample. It has been shown that a number of other factors need to be taken into account to provide a more adequate interpretation. These include the respondent's age and position in the family life cycle; his market situation; reference groups inside and outside of work; the sub-culture of the industry in which the majority of his work experience has occurred and employers' employment practices. In particular, it has been shown that the chances of working for a small or large firm are related to age, market situation and employers' employment practices.

Self-selection based upon persistent orientations narrowly linked to the character of the job and the firm has, it may be argued, been shown to be of relatively minor importance. Indeed, such orientations, it might be suggested, may well represent an adjustment to work experiences arising out of occupational placement patterns largely beyond the worker's control. Further support for this interpretation emerges in Chapter 4 when attitudes to the job and firm at the time of interview are analysed.
REFERENCES AND NOTES


(3) Lancashire, _op. cit._


(8) See the papers in W.M. Williams, _op. cit._ and Carter _op. cit._


(11) Ibid. p.289.


(13) Ford and Box, _op. cit._ p.288. Emphasis in original.


pp. 68-89. Even where workers would like promotion they usually do not think their chances of promotion are very high as the above studies show.


(18) Ibid. p.52.

(19) Goldthorpe et al, *op. cit.*


(24) Ingham *op. cit.* pp.153-163 reproduces the Interview Schedule. See espec. Questions 4(a) to 4(f).


(27) Ingham, *op. cit.* p.130.


(30) M. Carter, ibid. pp.144-45, discusses this point and concludes that the genuine 'success' rate of the Youth Employment Service is at a level broadly similar to that reported in the present study. Willmott ibid. p.105, Table 105, reports that 39% of his 177 boys were placed in their first job ever by the Y.E.S. Undoubtedly, much depends on local factors such as availability of employment and the efficiency of the Y.E.S. officers involved.


(33) Willmott op. cit. p.107. Eight per cent of his young workers were in the same occupation as their father.

(34) For a summary of some of this research see Carter op. cit. Ch.2.


(36) A recent survey which, although it looks at the way employers recruit labour, also supports the general pattern of findings in this study, is: 'Employers, Recruitment and the Employment Service' Dept. of Employment Gazette, Dec. 1975, pp.1251-1257.

(37) These views echo the findings reported over 20 years ago in the second of the Acton Society Trust Studies discussed in Ch.1. pp.20-21.


(39) However, recent legislation such as the Employment Protection Act 1975, has made discarding labour more expensive for employers and this may have helped to prevent redundancy levels rising to some extent.

(40) Although, as will be seen in Chapters 4 and 5, the findings from the present study suggest that the occupational community should be given less significance in interpreting the occupational identity and world-view of the printing worker than it has in previous research.

(41) The way in which definitions may change or adjust to the situation in which the worker finds himself was discussed in Chapter 2 where some of the relevant literature was cited. (See Ch.2, pp.62-65). An example from industry is reported in: D. Levinson, 'Role, Personality and Social Structure in the Organisational Setting', Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol.58, 1959, pp.170-81, reprinted in G. Salaman and K. Thompson (eds) People and Organisations, Longmans for Open University Press, London, 1973, pp.223-57.

(42) This research is discussed further in Chapter 4, p.186. This finding may also indicate an adjustment of orientations to the recognition that promotion is unlikely anyway.
CHAPTER 4. ATTITUDES TO CURRENT JOB AND FIRM

INTRODUCTION

It was argued in the previous chapter that job changes for the manual worker are often less momentous than some researchers have argued. Nevertheless, changing jobs is no simple continuation of the worker's work experience. Entering the social world of a new firm represents a discontinuity in experience and the beginning of a new phase in the process of occupational socialisation. Every firm develops a distinct organisational sub-culture of its own and for the newcomer on the shopfloor, there is, inevitably, a slightly alien quality about this sub-culture. For his occupational identity it is a new source of meanings which, if he stays at the firm for any length of time, will have important implications for this identity.

In previous research employing a social action perspective, there has often been an assumption that knowledge of the worker's prior orientations to employment allows an almost total interpretation of his current work experiences. Acceptance of this assumption precludes consideration of the potential of current work experience for altering the actor's occupational identity. In other words, this view leads to the assumption that knowledge of the worker's reasons for accepting a job provides an adequate explanation for his remaining in that job. This is, at the very least, highly questionable.

The meanings which form the core of the worker's occupational identity may be greatly influenced by factors linked to a specific situation and period of time and this situation may be internal or external to the work-place. Thus, rather than a near-fixed occupational identity, 'the small firm worker' we might suggest a more dynamic and flexible occupational identity for workers in small firms, the outcome of the interplay of a number of influences in the past and present, in and outside the work-place.

The literature on the small firm worker, discussed in detail in Chapter 1 strongly suggested the development of a single, distinctive small firm worker occupational identity which appeared, at least by implication, to be increasingly unaffected by subsequent experiences in or out of the firm. It was from this earlier view that the initial hypotheses on attitudes to the job and firm at the time of interview examined in this chapter were derived. The five main hypotheses, together with a number of sub-hypotheses exploring certain aspects
in more detail were:

(i) That workers in small firms display a greater concern with intrinsic aspects of the job and social relations in the firm than do workers in large firms. This will be expressed in a higher level of intrinsic expectations and a lower concern with extrinsic aspects such as the level of material rewards.

(ii) That the small firm, because of its special organisational and social character, provides an environment highly congruent with the predominantly intrinsic orientations of the small firm worker.

(iii) That small firm workers have more extensive and more intense informal relations with their peers in the work-place. This will show not only in the number of people regarded as close friends at work but also in a willingness to continue relations outside the work-place.

(iv) That small firm workers will display high levels of vertical interaction with superiors in the firm and especially owner-managers. They will also identify closely with management goals and their relations with senior management will be an important source of satisfaction.

(v) That workers in small firms will have more individualistic, as opposed to collectivist orientations, as compared to workers in large firms, and that this will be expressed by:
   (a) greater ambitions for promotion;
   (b) greater ambitions to enter into entrepreneurship;
   (c) less favourable attitudes to collective action such as joining trade unions or going on strike.

The data presented in Chapter 3 on the meanings surrounding job changing and on labour turnover have already suggested doubts on some aspects of these hypotheses. In this chapter a close examination of the data on attitudes to the job and firm at the time of interview questions these views even further.

JOB EXPECTATIONS AND JOB SATISFACTION

The study of work motivation and involvement among manual workers has produced an extensive literature, especially in the field of psychology. Much of this literature also suggests a number of research strategies which can be used in the study of these topics but of the two approaches which have dominated recent thinking neither was seen as suitable for the present study. Probably the most influential approach to work motivation in the last decade has been that based on expectancy theory stemming from the work of Vroom. Expectancy theory posits relationships between the perceived outcomes available in the work situation, ways available to the actor to achieve certain desired outcomes, and behaviour. As with the theoretical perspective of the present study, expectancy theory focuses on perceptions and makes no
a priori assumptions about what workers' want in the work situation, insisting that one object of research is finding out the nature of these wants.

However, the approach has a number of major drawbacks for the purposes of the present study. First, several methodological problems have arisen in the research instruments developed for the theory apparently related to the complexity of the instruments themselves so that doubts have emerged on the interpretation of results. A more mundane but equally important reason for rejecting this approach is its time consuming character. In research attempting to gather information on several aspects of the occupational identities and world-views of manual workers, the use of strategies derived from this theoretical approach seemed to offer no great return for taking up so much interview time. Secondly, and theoretically important, expectancy theory has been mainly concerned with effort in the work situation in relation to extrinsic rewards with relatively much less concern for intrinsic orientations. Given the special interest in the significance of intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic orientations for manual workers, central to the present study, the approach was held to be inadequate.

The other influential approach in the study of worker motivation and involvement in recent years considered for its relevance to the present study, was that of Herzberg and his associates. Usually known as the Two Factor theory, this approach seeks to discover what respondents feel is important about work by the 'critical incident' method in which respondents are asked to name aspects of their work which they feel are exceptionally 'good' or 'bad'. In the analysis of replies from several studies it was claimed that the aspects described most favourably were generally of an intrinsic kind while those mentioned unfavourably were generally of an extrinsic character. These findings seemed especially relevant for the present research but closer examination led to an awareness of certain serious limitations of the theory and its research instrument. The original empirical support was from a study of 200 engineers and accountants and subsequent replication has suggested that manual workers may opt for a different distribution of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

There have also been doubts concerning the critical incident method with critics arguing that the selection of factors is often an artefact of the dichotomous way in which respondents are asked to think.
Studies, using alternative ways of asking respondents' views, have yielded results not supporting the original theory. One reviewer summed up the doubts in this way:

"The vast amount of research on Herzberg's motivator - hygiene or two-factor theory has highlighted its imprecision, its dubious methodology, and its limited reliability, particularly on those few occasions when tested on blue-collar populations in the U.K." (?)

In rejecting existing approaches to worker motivation and organisational involvement an alternative was adopted to avoid some of the pitfalls of the above approaches by making the minimum prior assumptions and using a relatively simple research strategy. In approaching this area there are a number of issues the existing literature connects with worker motivation, job satisfaction and involvement in the firm. Among the more obvious of these issues are workers' feelings of boredom, physical deprivation, expectation of rewards of various types associated with work, and attitudes to management. The researcher is therefore influenced toward focusing on these issues in order to integrate his findings with those of previous researchers. At the same time he must ensure that the result of such influences is not a research instrument preventing respondents from stating their own view on what is important about a job, the extent to which expectations are met by their current firm, and their feelings towards any perceived failures to meet their expectations.

In meeting these somewhat divergent considerations it was felt that, while seeking respondents' views on the conventional aspects of worker motivation and organisational involvement, it would be necessary to use a set of questions, with supporting probes, allowing any special characteristics of the orientations of the main and control samples to emerge. This kind of strategy, it was felt, would provide a greater insight into the worker's relationship with the firm than the kind of research strategies discussed earlier. It is not pretended that the method adopted offers a complete picture of the workers' motivational patterns but it does provide data on a range of aspects relevant to the concerns of the present research.

Physical Fatigue

The first questions on attitudes to the job asked respondents if they found their jobs physically tiring and if so, why. Responses from three of the sub-samples, those drawn from the small electronics firms, and from the two large firm samples indicated that between
25.0% and 36.4% found their job tiring. However, in contrast, 64.3% of the workers in the small printing firms found their jobs physically tiring all or some of the time. The reasons for this difference are, it may be suggested, connected with the differing technologies of the two industries and the types of product produced by individual firms.

The shopfloor worker in the electronics industry normally works sitting down whereas the printer normally works standing up. Further, the printer is often required to move heavy loads of paper or lead type. This difference between the two industries does not, however, explain the differences found between the printing industry samples. Here the explanation may be related to the economic circumstances, job structuring and products produced by the firms in the research. The large firm, from which the control sample was recruited, was divided into three main departments. The first, the main composing room, involved in traditional printing, was suffering from a lack of demand. Since the firm would have encountered considerable resistance to redundancy and since other departments were economically successful, management accepted a degree of overmanning but workers tended to find the job rather less tiring than might otherwise have been the case.

Workers in the second department, the newspaper composing room, worked at a much higher pace since there were deadlines in the production of the four papers produced every week. However, they worked a relatively short working week, around 35 hours, being allowed to leave work as soon as schedules were completed. A somewhat similar position existed in the other department from which workers were interviewed, the linotype department, whose work was geared to that of the newsroom compositors. The job structuring and product aspect of the differences between the main and control samples arises because newspaper printing is less likely to take place in small printing firms and also because work roles are more varied in small firms. This, therefore, seems a size-related factor leading to higher levels of physical tiredness among small firm workers. On the whole, management in the small firms in the study utilized their labour more intensively, ensuring that work roles contained sufficient tasks to fully employ workers. The absence of trade unions gave management greater opportunity to use labour more intensively.

The reasons offered by respondents for physical tiredness provided support for the above analysis. Among printing workers the most
frequently given reasons were lifting, moving heavy objects and extended periods of standing. For the electronics workers, on the other hand, the most frequently offered reasons were the high levels of concentration and attention to detail required. The respondents at the National Radar Company fabricating housings for the electronic equipment were as likely as printing workers to mention lifting and moving as a source of tiredness which would again be expected from the nature of their work.

**Nervous Strain**

Next, respondents were asked if they found their job a nervous strain. Unfortunately, some respondents found the phrase 'nervous strain' difficult to interpret. However, in the event there were only small differences in responses. Among the two small firm sub-samples 37.9% and 39.7% reported that they found their job a nervous strain at least some of the time. For the two large firm sub-samples the corresponding proportions were 34.1% and 45.4% so that the two small firm samples were sandwiched between the two large firm samples. Thus, although there are differences between the large firm sub-samples it is difficult to say whether there are any differences between the main and control samples and given the apparent ambiguity of the question it would be unwise to take this analysis further.

**Boredom**

The subjects of boredom and monotony at work have been widely researched often with considerable variations in findings. This appears to reflect genuine differences between workers in different work roles, the ways researchers conceptualise the notions of boredom or monotony as well as the ways in which information is sought on these topics. For example, Cotgrove et al (10) distinguish between 'boredom', referring to feelings of having too little to do and 'monotony', seen as referring to:

"... the psychological feeling state resulting from repetitive performance of a limited variety of standardised tasks." (11)

In the present study no such distinction was drawn because, although refinements in conceptualisation may in themselves be desirable, it is difficult to know whether they are shared by respondents since even with probing, respondents' views are not easy to interpret. Instead, respondents were asked if they found their job boring and the reasons for their answer. The overall data collected on this question are summarised in Table 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 19.2</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>6 9.1</td>
<td>25 18.0</td>
<td>7 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>23 31.5</td>
<td>26 36.6</td>
<td>21 47.7</td>
<td>21 47.7</td>
<td>47 33.8</td>
<td>42 47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35 47.9</td>
<td>30 45.6</td>
<td>19 43.2</td>
<td>19 43.2</td>
<td>65 46.8</td>
<td>38 45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 1.8</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 75 100.0  N = 66 100.0  N = 44 100.0  N = 44 100.0  N = 159 100.0  N = 88 100.0

NOTES: (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Previous research and thinking on the small firm worker suggests that he experiences lower levels of boredom than workers in large firms. This is allegedly related to greater variation in work role content and a greater capacity to understand how his contribution fits into the final product. If the small firm worker is more orientated to intrinsic rewards and his work environment more able to satisfy this orientation, then relatively lower levels of boredom might be expected.

However, the results in Table 4.1 indicate little difference, overall, in the proportions in the main and control samples who stated that their job was boring at least some of the time. But small firm respondents were twice as likely to find their jobs unequivocally boring as large firm workers (18% as against 7.9%).

The reasons given for jobs being boring appeared similar regardless of industry or size of firm. The repetitive character of the work was the most frequent reason followed by claims that the work was too simple. Such reasons comprised over 80% of all reasons given. A 23 year old printer in the second smallest printing firm said:

"You do the same thing every day. You just set the machine up and away it goes. In fact, I prefer the longer runs which are really boring because then you can do something else. I sometimes read books. All I have to do is put in more paper about every half an hour."

A development engineer (one of the most skilled manual jobs) in the smallest electronics firm in the study indicated even how what might seem an absorbing job to an outsider, could be boring for the person doing the job:

"... electronic work at my level very often involves precision measurements, looking at displays, or actually putting resistors and capacitors together, things like that, and I find the calibration bit of it particularly boring. I don't want to be bothered with it especially when people keep coming down to talk to you. You can be right in the middle of a calculation and somebody comes along and asks you a silly question and you forget what you are doing. It can take half an hour just to get back to where you were."

Although the above reasons were the most frequently given, there were a number of other reasons, mentioned less frequently, linked to other aspects of work—the product, social relations and comparisons with previous jobs. This again throws doubts on the kind of conceptual distinction drawn by Cotgrove et al.

It would be helpful to relate the above findings to those from
earlier research but the considerable variations in previous findings and methodology make such comparisons difficult. Goldthorpe et al. reported that of those workers most comparable to the respondents in the present study, between 13% and 22% found their jobs monotonous. If 'monotonous' is taken as the equivalent of 'unequivocally boring' in the present study, then Goldthorpe et al.'s large firm workers appear to be similar to the present small firm workers but more bored than the control sample.

The most obvious source of comparison for the present study is Ingham's study. However, despite the light that such a question might have thrown on the intrinsic involvement of his respondents and the comparisons which would have been possible with other research, particularly Goldthorpe et al.'s study, Ingham did not ask a direct question on boredom or monotony allowing such a comparison. Batstone, whose main aim was exploring class imagery among small firm workers, also did not directly question his respondents on this topic.

Job Expectations

The most important question asked on expectations and satisfactions surrounding the job held at the time of the interview was:

"People tend to think some things about a job are more important than others. Here is a list of some of the things that are mentioned - which would you pick out as the most important?"

Respondents were given a card listing 14 items (a set of cards, with the items listed randomly over the set, avoided the order of items influencing respondents' choices). The items on the card (a list is provided alongside Question 14 in the interview schedule in the Appendix) were selected after examining previous research on job satisfaction and motivation in order to increase comparability. The form of the question follows a similar question asked by Goldthorpe et al. using a six item choice. However, to achieve a more 'open' question allowing respondents to state preferences for items not listed, the following 'probe' was added:

"It may be that what you think is most important about a job is not listed on the card. If you feel that what you think is most important is not listed, I would like to hear what it is."

Having answered, respondents were asked what they thought was the next most important thing about a job so that, overall, all respondents made two choices in order of importance.

'Good Pay' and 'Interesting Work' were the most frequently mentioned items, accounting for 43.9% of all first choices. These
two items plus three others, 'Plenty of Variety in the Job', 'Security' and 'Pleasant Working Conditions' in fact accounted for three quarters of all first choice items (74.9%). Perhaps more surprising was the infrequency with which some of the items were selected. For example, no respondent selected 'Good Bonus' either as a first or second choice and 'Plenty of Overtime' was selected by only five respondents but only as a second choice. 'A Strong and Active Union' was selected by four respondents as a first choice and by three as a second choice. Only three respondents selected a 'Pension' as either a first or second choice.

The replies to these questions have been analysed in depth because of their importance in indicating several main aspects of respondents' occupational identities and for the insights they provide on differences between the main and control samples. However, caution has to be exercised in this analysis and few findings can be stated in an unqualified form. For instance, it became clear in interviews that respondents often drew a distinction between some ideal job and jobs they expected to obtain or, at least, hoped to obtain. This distinction, it is suggested, partly explains the infrequency of selection of 'Plenty of Overtime' and 'A Strong and Active Union'. In an ideal job respondents believed a man ought to be able to earn a 'decent' income without overtime and good management-worker relations would make a union unnecessary. On the other hand, in real life a worker may seek a job with overtime to maintain what he regards as a moderate standard of living and he frequently joins a trade union as 'insurance' against arbitrary management action or to increase job opportunities.

Further, some of the items on the card were unavoidably ambiguous in meaning. While 'Full Wages if Sick' has the same meaning for most users, 'Good Working Conditions' may have a more variable meaning. The latter may refer to either intrinsic or extrinsic aspects of the job or even to a mixture of both, although respondents' replies indicated that for most who selected this item, it referred to intrinsic aspects. Finally, ambiguity inevitably leads to overlaps in meanings attached to items by respondents. Thus, 'Good Working Conditions' may have meanings which overlap with those held by respondents who selected 'Good Equipment to Work With' and 'Interesting Work' may have meanings which overlap with those attached to 'Plenty of Variety in the Job'. Or again, 'Good Equipment' may, for some respondents, be
related to extrinsic considerations because superior equipment provides a more favourable wage-effort bargain, that is, material rewards are perceived as higher because they are obtained for less physical effort than in a workplace with old fashioned equipment. Similarly, some respondents may select 'Responsibility' because responsibility is often associated with higher pay. Some of these ambiguities may be minimised by grouping responses into larger categories as below, but they are impossible to eliminate and interpretation of the data can only be made with the reservation that subtle differences may be lost in this way.

Extrinsic/Intrinsic Responses

Table 4.2 gives an overall view of respondents' first choices grouped into extrinsic and intrinsic responses. The results appear to fully support previous views of the small firm worker as more intrinsically attached to work than the large firm worker. Overall, two thirds of the small firm workers selected intrinsic items as compared to less than half of the large firm workers. Conversely, under a third of small firm respondents chose extrinsic items while almost half of the large firm respondents did so.

The overall findings here agree closely with the findings in Chapter 3 on the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic meanings in decisions on accepting and leaving jobs. Thus, the small electronics firm workers are again far the most likely to mention intrinsic considerations with nearly three quarters of them saying these were the most important things about a job. Equally, the small printing firm workers are again more extrinsically minded than small firm workers are normally thought to be. However, both industrial subsamples in the main sample display lower levels of extrinsic orientations than the control sample.

Yet, as in Chapter 3, it is necessary to allow for the substantial differences in age and marital status between the main and control samples. It was shown in Chapter 3 that decisions related to the taking and leaving of jobs were linked to position in the life cycle in that workers aged 21 and over who were married showed a greater concern with extrinsic aspects of work. It might be expected, therefore, that a similar relationship exists between life cycle position and respondents' expectations of work.

It is also necessary to introduce a further qualification to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTRANSC ITEMS (2)</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=73</td>
<td>N=66</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>N=139</td>
<td>N=88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Pay</td>
<td>15 20.5</td>
<td>9 13.6</td>
<td>12 27.3</td>
<td>15 34.1</td>
<td>24 17.3</td>
<td>27 30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>4 6.1</td>
<td>6 13.6</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
<td>14 10.1</td>
<td>11 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Strong and Active Union</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 2.1</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Wages if Sick</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>2 3.0</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>3 2.1</td>
<td>3 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 38.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 24.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 47.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 50.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 31.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 48.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRINSIC ITEMS</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=73</td>
<td>N=66</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>N=139</td>
<td>N=88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Work</td>
<td>19 26.0</td>
<td>16 24.2</td>
<td>7 15.9</td>
<td>7 15.9</td>
<td>35 25.2</td>
<td>14 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenty of Variety in the Job</td>
<td>7 9.6</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>4 9.5</td>
<td>20 14.6</td>
<td>7 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Workmates</td>
<td>7 9.6</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>10 7.2</td>
<td>3 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Working Conditions</td>
<td>5 6.8</td>
<td>6 9.5</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>11 7.9</td>
<td>7 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Boss Who Takes a Real Interest in You</td>
<td>5 6.8</td>
<td>7 10.6</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>12 8.6</td>
<td>5 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>1 0.7</td>
<td>3 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
<td>4 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/Could Not State</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 60.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 74.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 52.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 45.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>93 66.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 48.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
(2) There are only five items under the heading 'Extrinsic Items' because no respondent selected 'Good Bonus' or 'Plenty of Overtime' as a first choice.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
analysis to allow a proper comparison between the main and control samples. This concerns the supervisors who, as might be expected, were more likely than other respondents to express intrinsic preferences. It was noted in Chapter 2 that because of the differences in supervisors' span of control between the small and large firms, supervisors are over-represented in the main sample. Thus, supervisors comprised 15.1% of the main sample but only 5.7% of the control sample. This imbalance between the two samples therefore affects comparison on this topic.

The narrowing effect on the differences between the main and control samples is very marked for the printing workers when supervisors are excluded. Thus, while 40.6% of the small printing firm workers chose extrinsic items as most important about a job, the comparable figure for their large firm counterparts was 47.6%. The differences in the selection of intrinsic items were even smaller with only four percentage points separating the two samples. For the small electronics firm workers, although a narrowing of differences does occur when supervisors are excluded from the analysis, there remains a clear contrast with the large electronics firm workers. For example, 70.4% of small electronics firm shopfloor workers chose intrinsic items as compared to only 47.6% of their large firm counterparts.

The above difference is also, however, partly linked to the 12 contract workers among the large electronics firm workers who are, as expected, more likely to opt for extrinsic items than non-contract workers. As there were only three contract workers among the small electronics firm workers, the distribution of contract workers overstates the differences between the main and control samples. Thus, if contract workers are excluded from the control sample, of the remaining 30 shopfloor workers, 11, or 36.7%, selected extrinsic items which is not very different from the 29.0% among small electronics firm workers. The higher proportion of contract workers in the control sample is related to size in that, as discussed in Chapter 3, small firm employers dislike employing contract workers more than large firm employers. Worker orientations are less important here, however, because although contract workers emphasise extrinsic considerations (especially pay) they are paid the same regardless of size of firm.

Taking age, if supervisors are excluded, the data indicates an association between age and the selection of intrinsic or extrinsic
items. As Table 4.3 shows, among workers aged 24 and under, the expected relationship - small firm workers showing a strong preference for intrinsic items and large firm workers opting much more for extrinsic items - is strongly in evidence with the difference between the main and control samples even greater than that shown in Table 4.2. But this difference is almost entirely absent when workers aged 25 years and over are compared. The differences in orientations, therefore, as measured by the responses to this question, are almost entirely confined to workers under 25 years of age.

The considerable differences in the proportions of respondents in the main and control samples who were married is also relevant here. Since marital state is normally positively associated with age it is not surprising that a similar convergence in orientations is found when marital state is held constant. Table 4.4 shows that among married respondents, there is little difference in the selection of extrinsic or intrinsic items, regardless of size of firm. The differences are very much concentrated among unmarried respondents who in the large firm control sample are almost twice as prone to select extrinsic items as the unmarried small firm respondents.

Table 4.5 presents the findings on marital state and orientations in more detail and indicates that, with the exception of one sub-sample (the large electronics firm workers) married respondents are more likely to opt for extrinsic items. The differences found between the industrial sub-samples among the main small firm sample in the earlier analysis remain. Thus, although married respondents among the small electronics firm workers are more likely than single respondents to select extrinsic items, they still display a lower level of preference for extrinsic items than married respondents among the small printing firm workers. In other words, the emphasis on intrinsic aspects of the job which, it was argued in Chapter 3, forms a distinctive characteristic of the electronics industry sub-culture seems strong enough to counter, to some extent, the impact of extrinsic influences on occupational identity formation coming from non-work life sources. (It will be noted, for example, that the difference between the unmarried and married respondents for the small electronics firm workers in the level of preferences for extrinsic items is less than that between the unmarried and married respondents among small printing firm workers.)
### Table 4.3

**ITEMS SELECTED AS MOST IMPORTANT ABOUT A JOB, AGE AND SIZE OF FIRM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Small Firm Shopfloor Workers (1) Aged 24 and Under</th>
<th>All Large Firm Shopfloor Workers Aged 24 and Under</th>
<th>All Small Firm Shopfloor Workers Aged 25 and Over</th>
<th>All Large Firm Shopfloor Workers Aged 25 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Items</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Items</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did Not State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 49 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 13 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 69 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 70 \quad 100.0 \]

**NOTES:**

(1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone

Percentages do not add up to 100 because of rounding.
TABLE 4.4
ITEMS SELECTED AS IMPORTANT ABOUT A JOB, MARITAL
STATE AND SIZE OF FIRM - SHOPFLOOR WORKERS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers (1)</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 27.1</td>
<td>25 45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Items</td>
<td>42 71.2</td>
<td>29 52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did Not State</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 100.0</td>
<td>55 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: (1) Excludes two respondents divorced or separated at the time of interview and the partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

(2) Excludes three respondents divorced or separated at the time of interview.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic Items</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Items</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/Did Not State</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

(1) Excludes two respondents divorced or separated at the time of interview and partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

(2) Excludes three respondents divorced or separated at the time of interview.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Unfortunately, the smallness of the sub-samples of unmarried respondents among the large firm control samples makes an analysis of the findings difficult. The rather odd suggestion that among the large electronics firm workers married respondents are less likely than unmarried to choose extrinsic items, is very probably the result of the smallness of the sub-sample of unmarried respondents. All that can be said here is that, as Table 4.4 indicates, overall, the large firm control sample married respondents appear to be as extrinsically-minded as other married respondents in the study and that this observation is based on the largest of the sub-samples within the large firm control sample.

It will be remembered that respondents, having made a first choice on what they felt was most important about a job were then asked what they felt was next most important. The data from this second choice has not been analysed in as great a depth as that from the first choice because a preliminary analysis showed that the findings paralleled those of the first choice in the aggregate proportions of extrinsic and intrinsic items selected. This is not to say, of course, that individual respondents always chose the same kind of item - either extrinsic or intrinsic - in both selections but that the sub-totals for each category for each sub-sample were substantially the same with the exception of the large electronics firm control sub-sample. In the latter case, there was a sharp drop in the proportion selecting extrinsic items with a corresponding increase in those selecting intrinsic items.

As Table 4.2 showed, half of the large electronics firm sample selected extrinsic items as their first choice but for the second choice this percentage fell to just under 30% and, while 45.4% chose intrinsic items as their first choice, this increased to 65.9% for the second choice item. This difference may again be connected with the contract workers in this sub-sample. If the contract workers are excluded, 36.7% of the remaining respondents selected extrinsic items as their first choice; the corresponding figure for second choice items was 31.3%. For intrinsic items, the first choice proportion was 56.7% of responses and for the second choice 62.8%. These proportions are very similar to those of respondents in the other half of the control sample and hence for the whole control sample. An interpretation of this sharp contrast between the first (mainly extrinsic) choices and second (mainly intrinsic) choices of the contract workers,
is that having opted for a strictly money relationship with the firm, they are nevertheless aware of their relative deprivation in terms of the normal intrinsic rewards of a job in their industry, an awareness, it may be surmised, increased by working alongside non-contract workers.

In view of the importance that intrinsic considerations are thought to have in the occupational identities of small firm workers, it was interesting to note the proportions of small firm respondents who chose intrinsic items for both first and second items. Among the small firm workers as a whole, excluding supervisors, 42.4% of the relevant 118 respondents chose intrinsic items both times. Consistent with the stronger intrinsic orientations they displayed throughout the study, a higher proportion of small electronics firm workers, 54.5%, opted for intrinsic items for both choices than small printing firm workers at 34.2%. The proportion among the control sample, as a whole, opting for intrinsic items for both choices was 32.5%, that is, about 10% less than among the main sample. Little difference between industries was found in the control sample; while 34.1% of the large printing firm workers (excluding supervisors) selected intrinsic items for both choices, the proportion among the large electronics firm workers was 30.9%. In short, while the small electronics firm workers display the expected higher proportion of intrinsic choices in their answers, as compared to the large firm control sample respondents, the same cannot be said for the small printing firm workers. The intrinsic-mindedness of the latter subsample of respondents is of a very similar level to that of the control sample.

Job Satisfaction and Present Job

The above data says a good deal about the aspects of a job which respondents feel are important but it was also important to assess how the job held at the time of interview measured up to these expectations. If, as has been suggested, manual workers do self-select themselves into jobs congruent with their expectations about what a job should offer, then this ought to be revealed in their opinions about their current job. Therefore, after respondents selected what they saw as the two most important things about a job they were then asked how they rated their present job for those items.

In comparing respondents' answers on how they rated the firm
and job at the time of interview on the things thought most important about a job, the proportions rating the firm and job 'Good' and 'Pretty Good' have been combined. This avoids some of the errors resulting from problems of coding this kind of response. Some respondents, for example, were reluctant to offer an 'extreme' reply preferring to understate rather than overstate; combining responses allows for this although it may mask high levels of enthusiasm in particular sub-samples.

Table 4.6 presents the proportions of respondents rating the job at the time of interview as 'Good' and 'Pretty Good' and the proportions rating the job as 'Bad' for their first choice item. The Table covers only respondents who had been with the firm for at least six months. By excluding respondents who had been with the firm for a shorter period, the responses of workers who may be only temporarily working for a particularly sized firm are prevented from over-influencing the results.

Clearly the most satisfied on this indicator are the small electronics firm respondents where just over 70% rated the job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' although they are also, by a small margin, the most likely of all sub-samples to rate the job as 'Bad'. The least satisfied are the large electronics firm workers where only just over half rated their current job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' and just over one in five rated the job as 'Bad'. Thus, the small electronics firm workers appear more satisfied than their large firm counterparts. However, this finding is reversed for the printing industry respondents where the large firm workers appear the more satisfied. A smaller percentage of the small printing firm workers, 54.4%, rate their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' and a larger percentage, 17.5%, rate their job as 'Bad'. Thus, no obvious size relationship is revealed by the data and when the results for the main and control samples are taken as a whole, it can be seen that there is very little difference between them, suggesting that intra-industry factors are more important than size.

In order to take into account all respondents' replies and not simply those who rated the job as 'Good', 'Pretty Good' and 'Bad', a simple index was constructed by weighting responses in their order of favourableness to the job. Thus, five points were given to a response rating the job as 'Good', four points to a response of 'Pretty Good' and so on with the response 'Bad' given one point. The total points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers (%)</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Good' and 'Pretty Good'</td>
<td>31.54.4</td>
<td>2470.6</td>
<td>2466.7</td>
<td>1751.5</td>
<td>5560.4</td>
<td>4159.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Bad'</td>
<td>1017.5</td>
<td>823.5</td>
<td>411.1</td>
<td>721.6</td>
<td>1819.8</td>
<td>1115.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N = 57</th>
<th>N = 34</th>
<th>N = 56</th>
<th>N = 33</th>
<th>N = 91</th>
<th>N = 69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDEX FIGURE (2)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: (1) Excludes the partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
(2) The basis of this index figure is explained in the text.

Percentages do not add up to 100 because the Table does not include respondents who gave other replies.
for each sub-sample were standardised for size by dividing by the number of respondents in each sub-sample. The resulting index figures are also given in Table 4.6.

It should be stressed immediately that the index is not a measure of satisfaction in a mathematical sense but merely a simple way of comparing respondents' views in a convenient quantitative way. The index figures accord closely with the findings discussed above except that the large printing firm workers become the most favourable in their evaluation of their jobs ahead of the small electronics firm workers. The intra-industry relationships with the large printing firm workers being more favourable than their small firm counterparts and the reverse being true for the electronics industry sample remains as before. A similar index figure covering the ratings on second choice items, added to the one for first choice items, reveals the same relative positions for the intra-industry, main and control samples.

For the second choice items, the overall differences between the main and control samples were similar to those for the first choice items. Large firm respondents were, however, slightly more likely to offer 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' ratings than small firm respondents. The intra-industry differences for first choices, on the other hand, were not repeated. For instance, the marked difference in Table 4.6 between the small printing firm workers and the small electronics firm workers, in terms of the proportions of respondents who rated their firm 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', disappeared for the second choice item with about 60% in both sub-samples rating the job highly. Similarly, the proportions rating the job as 'Bad' varied little at between 12.5% and 14.8%. In the control sample, the large printing firm workers recorded a comparable 50.2% rating the job 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' but the large electronics firm workers, rather surprisingly in the light of their rating of their jobs on the first choice item, showed the highest level of approval for the second choice item with 68.2% saying the job was 'Good' or 'Pretty Good'. Finally, there were few indications of differences related to size of firm. The printing industry samples reported almost exactly similar levels and the electronics industry samples showed a small difference with control sample respondents rating their jobs rather more highly.

On rating the second choice item 'Bad', the large firm control sample seemed the least satisfied with 20.5%, overall, rating their
job in this way. Among small firm respondents, 12.5% of the printing workers and 14.8% of the electronics workers, rated the job 'Bad' in relation to this second item. Thus, while the differences between the main and control samples are not big they are broadly consistent. It is felt that less attention should be given to second choice evaluations simply because they are second choices. Respondents rarely indicated that they were giving parity to both items but more often that second choice items had much less salience in their evaluations.

Earlier in this chapter it was shown that important insights on expectations were revealed if the data was related to respondents' age and marital state. It is, therefore, necessary to carry out a similar analysis for the worker's rating of his job at the time of interview in relation to these expectations and this analysis does indeed add to the information on the differences and similarities between the main and control samples.

As previously, age is analysed first, and the overall results for all respondents in the study, show a decline in the proportions rating the job at interview as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' as age rises. Among those aged under 21, 63.6% rated their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' on the first item while among respondents aged 40 and over this proportion fell to 54%. Of course, it is important to note that the sample is cross-sectional and not longitudinal. It is drawn from different generations and from people who have had very differing previous work experiences so it is not possible to say that the data directly indicates a decline in job satisfaction as respondents age. Most previous literature on this topic is similarly cross-sectional but even so there are conflicting views with some writers arguing that the relationship is 'U' shaped, others that the relationship is a linear one with satisfaction increasing with age but few suggesting a decline. While the present sample's age distribution does not permit a confident assertion on this issue, it is notable that the decline noted above holds for all but one of the sub-samples in the study.

In the main sample the lower level of satisfaction among older workers with the way their current job met their work expectations is very clear. Among small printing firm workers, half of those aged under 21 rated their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' and this level holds in the following age group, those aged between 21 and 29 years, but for those aged 30 and over, the proportion falls to about 36%.
Among small electronics firm workers, a similar pattern emerges but with higher magnitudes since the general level of job satisfaction was higher for this sub-sample. For the small firm workers as a whole, of those aged under 21, just under 70% rated their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', while among those aged 40 and over, the percentage was 46.4%. It should be emphasised, however, that some of the age sub-samples here are small and that some of the differences reported for industrial sub-samples may, therefore, be due to small sample size.

The large electronics firm workers displayed a very similar pattern to that among the small firm sub-samples, although again some age group sub-samples are small. The large printing firm workers provide the only example of a sub-sample producing findings contrary to the above. For this sub-sample there is, allowing for the small size of some of the age sub-groups, a clear trend toward greater satisfaction among higher age groups.

Further support for the above findings is provided by the proportions in different age groups who rate the job at the time of interview as 'Bad' in relation to their first choice item. For all respondents in the study there was a slight increase in the proportions who rate the job 'Bad' as older age groups are examined. The differences were again much more marked among the main sample than the control sample. For instance, 13% of those aged under 21 in the main sample rated their current job as 'Bad' in relation to their first choice item but among those aged 40 and over, this proportion was nearly one in three. Unfortunately, the smallness of some of the age groups among the control sample who rated their job as 'Bad' for the first choice means no analysis is worthwhile but the available data indicates little difference between age groups.

Overall, therefore, the relationship between age and job satisfaction suggests that older workers in all but one of the sub-samples, have a lower level of satisfaction in relation to the job at the time of interview than younger workers and especially workers aged under 21. This relationship was most apparent among the main sample. However, the smallness of many of the age sub-groups in the study makes confident assertions here difficult but it is relevant to note that, the overall trend in the whole sample is in line with the findings for the majority of the industry sub-samples in both main and control samples.
When second choice items are examined in relation to age, the results indicate little difference between age groups overall. Just over half of all respondents, regardless of age, rate their job at the time of interview as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good'. Only the small electronics firm workers' results suggest that it is possible that older workers are less satisfied in terms of the second choice item, but again the smallness of the age groupings means that no undue weight should be given to this. The proportions of respondents in different age groups who rate their job as 'Bad' in relation to the second choice item were also very similar, but since the age groups in most of the sub-samples were even smaller than those rating their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', no useful purpose is served by taking the analysis further.

Although age and marital status of respondents are likely to go together, it was, nevertheless, useful to inspect the satisfaction levels of married and unmarried respondents in relation to the items selected as most important about a job. The results, shown in Table 4.7, also provide a check on the findings on the age-job satisfaction relationships. Among the main sample, the relationship between marital status and level of job satisfaction are very marked indeed and more so than for the relationship between age and job satisfaction. Thus, while almost two thirds (65%) of the unmarried respondents in the main sample rated the job at the time of interview as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', only 42.7% of married respondents did so. There was little difference between the two industry sub-samples; both show a similar lower level of satisfaction among married respondents. For second choice items, there was again a lower level of satisfaction among married workers although the difference between married and unmarried respondents was not quite so marked.

The results from the control sample differed in that although the large electronics firm workers showed a similar sharp difference in levels of job satisfaction (70% of the unmarried workers rated their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' as compared to 41.9% of the married respondents) the large printing firm workers were the only industrial sub-sample to show a higher level of satisfaction among married as compared to unmarried workers. While 54.5% of the unmarried large printing firm workers thought the job at the time of interview was 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', for their first choice item, the figure for married respondents was at 72.7%, the highest level for any group, married or unmarried.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Printing Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=28 16</td>
<td>N=43 18</td>
<td>57.1 41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Electronics Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=32 21</td>
<td>N=32 14</td>
<td>65.6 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Printing Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=11 6</td>
<td>N=33 24</td>
<td>54.5 72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Electronics Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=10 7</td>
<td>N=51 13</td>
<td>70.0 41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Small Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=60 39</td>
<td>N=75 32</td>
<td>65.0 42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Large Firm Workers</td>
<td>N=21 13</td>
<td>N=64 37</td>
<td>61.9 57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone
2. Respondents who were divorced or separated at the time of interview are excluded.
The relationship between marital status and job satisfaction for the second choice item was a replica of that found for the first choice item. Again, both main sample industrial sub-samples, show a markedly lower level of job satisfaction among married workers. Again, among the control sample electronics workers, the proportion of married respondents expressing a high level of job satisfaction by rating their job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' paralleled that among the main sample and, again, the large printing firm workers produced an apparently 'odd' finding with married respondents more frequently rating their current job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' than the unmarried.

Although age and marital state are likely to be associated and, as has been shown above, tend to produce for most sub-samples consistent findings on levels of job satisfaction it was also interesting to see whether there was any relationship between job satisfaction and length of time in the job at the time of interview. Because of the size of some sub-samples, due to the rather low labour stability rates in some of the small firms in the study, there are problems in establishing the relations here. However, for the complete sample in the study, there was a decline in the proportion of respondents rating the job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good', in terms of their first choice item, as length of service increased. While 61.7% of those who had been at the firm for up to two years rated the job as 'Good' or 'Pretty Good' for those who had been at the firm for more than five years, the proportion was 51.8%. For most sub-samples there was a slight tendency for those who had been at the firm for between two and four years to report higher levels of job satisfaction than those who had been at the firm for a shorter period, so that the rather lower level reported by those who had been at the firm for longer than five years suggested an inverted 'U' shaped overall relationship between job satisfaction and length of time with the firm.

The above general pattern was also found for the main sample but, because of the small number of workers who had worked over five years in the job, analysis of the industrial sub-samples within the main sample was not worthwhile. Among the control sample, the pattern suggested for the main sample was repeated except that the printing workers showed an increase in level of satisfaction as length of service increased. Again it is not possible to state confidently that the level of job satisfaction is associated with length of service in a particular way because the present samples are cross-sectional
rather than longitudinal. As with age, the findings concern respondents with very different experiences and no generalisations based on the attitudes of older workers can confidently be expected to hold for younger workers as they stay at the firm for a longer period. (On the available labour stability data, not many of the respondents will stay at their present firm for longer than five years anyway.) Finally, given the sample size problems in analysing relationships between job satisfaction and length of time in the firm as well as the lower salience of second choice items, it was not thought worth analysing this relationship for second choice items.

Thinking About Work at Home

To conclude this part of the interview respondents were asked if they thought about work at home. Initially, it was thought that this question might provide indications of levels of positive attachment to the firm. If small firm workers were more intrinsically involved in the firm (which could also be seen as a source of satisfaction) then this might be indicated by a greater tendency to think about work at home. However, it quickly became apparent from the replies that thinking about work at home was not necessarily an indicator of positive involvement in the job and firm. Sometimes thinking about work at home was an indicator of stress because of the demands the worker felt the job made on him. This type of answer was more likely to come from supervisors but shopfloor workers also occasionally replied in this way.

However, the majority of replies indicated that respondents did not think about work at home; indeed, many workers were emphatic that once they left work they firmly put it out of their minds. As a small printing firm worker put it:

"... whenever I leave work that's it. My wife doesn't know anything about my job - that's how I feel about it. She might know a bit but she doesn't know much because I never say anything. I go to work, I work a specific number of hours and that's that. I've got other interests besides my work."

A small electronics firm worker put the same view slightly less forcefully:

"... the only time I ever think about work at home is on Sunday evening: that's when I start feeling down."

There was very little difference between the main and control samples or between the industry sub-samples on this issue. If the proportions who say they think about work at home are added to the proportions who say they sometimes do so, then between 66.7% and 70.3% of
respondents in each of the four sub-samples say that they never think about work at home. Thus, to the extent that this offers indications of positive involvement in job and firm, it provides no grounds for thinking that small firm workers are more involved than large firm workers.

PATTERNS OF HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL INTERACTION IN THE SMALL FIRM

This section focuses on respondents' perceptions of the quality of social relations in the firm. For the purposes of analysis these social relations will be divided into horizontal and vertical varieties. Horizontal relations refer to peer relations among non-supervisory workers, both in and out of work, whilst vertical relations refer to those among people of unequal formal authority.

Existing Views of Social Relations in the Small Firm

Existing views on the quality of social relations in the small firm are to some extent inconsistent despite certain wide areas of agreement. The stereotype view of social relations in the small firm stresses their personal and affective character, especially in the vertical dimension. There is, it is alleged, a strong inverse relationship between quality of social relations and size of firm:

"No special inquiry is, or was, needed to establish one self-evident fact; that is, that face-to-face contact, whether between management and men or between groups doing different jobs, progressively diminishes as the size of the organisation increases. The diminution is inevitable simply as a matter of space, time and the limited capacity of the human memory for carrying a clear picture of other people's faces, character and circumstances; and it is accelerated by the very process of specialisation which is the main raison d'être of the big enterprise's economic success..." (18)

Although the above was written 20 years ago, the same ideas may still be found as a theme in the Bolton Committee Report on the small firm. (19)

Some of the more recent research literature also accepts the above view of the special social character of the small firm. People are said to prefer working in small firms because they feel a higher degree of commitment to the organisation, its management and other participants:

"In the small organisation the low membership allows for the large majority of potential relationships to be realised. Consequently, the development of a system of norms which govern the instrumental activities of the organisation may be reinforced by face-to-face interaction on both the horizontal and vertical levels. Thus, it is possible for workers to identify with the organisation and its goals which, it may be added, are more 'visible' in small firms than in the large plant." (20)
There are a number of logical reservations to be made about this kind of view. For instance, there is no necessary relationship between size of organisation and the number of potential relationships actually realised. As a respondent in the present study pointed out, personal relations, as distinct from functional relations required by work tasks, are a matter of choice and in a large firm one has a large number of people from which to choose personal friends. This assumes, further, that a person does wish to select close friends from the people with whom he works. As will be seen later, a large proportion of workers in the present study prefer not to choose close friends from this source.

It was noted in Chapter 1 that the social unit with which the worker identifies may be his department or section rather than the firm as a whole and that most observers had failed to recognise this possibility. It might be argued that the chances of this distinction arising are less in the small firm but it was clear from respondents' replies in the present study that, in discussing the 'firm', respondents did frequently distinguish between their work group or department and other parts of the firm, especially where the task performed by the respondent and his immediate co-workers was qualitatively distinct from the tasks of others. For example, compositors in the printing firms sharply distinguished themselves from machine operators and test engineers in the electronics firms distinguished themselves clearly from 'mere' wiremen. Thus, replies to questions about social relations in the firm might be grounded in either a narrower or wider view of the 'firm' and it was not always clear which was the case.

Inconsistencies in views concerning the quality of social relations in the small firm are especially apparent in discussions of horizontal relations. Lockwood, for example, discusses what he terms the 'deferential' worker whose typical work role:

"... will be one that brings him into direct association with his employer or other middle class influentials and hinders him from forming strong attachments to workers in a similar market situation to his own. These work conditions are most clearly present in... various kinds of service occupations, in non (or rather pre-)industrial craft jobs, [among] those working in small scale "family enterprises"..." (21)

While Lockwood's argument is presented in ideal typical terms, which always raises problems of deciding what kinds of empirical situations approximate to the ideal type, it may be suggested that the small firms in the present study come reasonably close.
Ingham, however, while agreeing with Lockwood's views on vertical interaction, nevertheless feels differently about horizontal interaction:

"... small organisations will tend to have less 'rationally' organized production methods which allow for more frequent interaction [among shopfloor workers]. I am thinking here not of the technological barriers to interaction but of those barriers which are created by the formal and rigid control which is to be found in the large organisation. For example, large firms often possess rules which prohibit workers leaving their job to talk informally and further constraints are imposed by the careful planning of production which leaves little time between the completion of one job and the start of another." (22)

Lockwood is frank in admitting that he can offer only limited empirical support for his characterisation and it would be easy to argue, in relation to Ingham's view, that workers in large firms often have more autonomy than those in small firms. Research by Lupton, for example, suggests that in the large firm worker control may be substantial, affording ample opportunity for informal interaction and that worker autonomy is at least as much a matter of technology as size of organisation. It has also been argued earlier, that the full use of labour (usually unhindered by the kind of union resistance which might be found in a large firm) was a main goal of small firm management in the present study and a major result of this was restriction on some kinds of worker autonomy. Among these were some opportunities for informal interaction with fellow workers.

**Horizontal Interaction in the Small Firm**

In the present study, the attitudes of respondents to peers were explored by questions on how well they thought people got on with each other in the firm and whether they regarded workmates as close friends. Of especial interest was that the printing industry has been repeatedly seen in earlier research as having a strongly developed 'occupational community' among shopfloor workers. Salaman has defined occupational communities as having the following characteristics:

"First, members of occupational communities see themselves in terms of their occupational role; their self-image is centred on their occupational role in such a way that they see themselves ... as people with specific qualities, interests and abilities. Secondly, members of an occupational group share a reference group composed of members of the occupational community. And thirdly, members of occupational communities associate with, and make friends of members of their occupation in preference to having friends who are outsiders, and they carry work activities and interests into their non-work lives." (25)
Cannon, discussing a sample of compositors in London in the early 1960's, has given a clear account of the printing worker's occupational community, instanced in a developed occupational language and ritual, and on egalitarian ideology reflected in the organisation and activities of the 'Chapel' (or union branch, usually based on the place of work). He also tries to show how the ideology of the printing worker, sustained by this community, manifests itself in a strong commitment to the Labour Party and to the working class.

To the extent that the printers in the present study were members of an occupational community, they might be expected to differ sharply from the electronics workers who form the remainder of the sample. The electronics industry has a comparatively short history, virtually no craft tradition with many of its workers having started their work lives in other industries, and no single union to provide a possible industry-wide social network. In short, the electronics workers could be expected to display lower levels of peer group interaction than the printers, even lower, perhaps, than among manual workers in other, longer established, industries.

The data presented in the previous section already suggests some doubts on the existence of a strong occupational community among the printers in the present study. For example, it was reported that the level of intrinsic-mindedness among printing workers, as measured by questions on what workers thought most important about a job, was no higher, on average, than among electronics workers and, in fact, by far the most intrinsically-minded respondents in the present study were the small electronics firm workers.

Table 4.8 presents respondents' opinions on how well workers in their firm got on with each other. It must be recognised, of course, that respondents almost certainly have varying standards of what constitutes 'getting on well' with each other, depending on previous experiences and expectations about possible levels of interpersonal relations in the work-place. Differences within departments in a firm may also affect respondents' opinions. For instance, in one small printing firm a supervisor in one department had problems in getting people to do what he wanted and this soured personal relations throughout the department. Thus, the opinions of workers in one department may say little about the firm as a whole or interpersonal relations in a firm of a particular size.
### Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>21 (28.8)</td>
<td>25 (37.9)</td>
<td>10 (22.7)</td>
<td>10 (22.7)</td>
<td>46 (35.1)</td>
<td>20 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Well</td>
<td>46 (63.0)</td>
<td>56 (51.5)</td>
<td>29 (65.9)</td>
<td>28 (63.6)</td>
<td>80 (57.3)</td>
<td>57 (64.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Well</td>
<td>3 (4.1)</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>4 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (4.3)</td>
<td>6 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Not Say</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>3 (6.8)</td>
<td>2 (4.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>5 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES:* (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Keeping the above qualifications in mind, the Table suggests that respondents in small firms perceive peer relations in their firms as friendlier than respondents in large firms. The small electronics firm workers are again the most affectively-minded of all sub-samples with almost 38% saying they thought workers in their firm got on 'Very Well' with each other. As with previous questions of this type, coding errors may arise from difficulties in categorising responses referring to qualities of human relations especially as respondents may not wish to give 'extreme' opinions. If, therefore, the replies of those who thought that workers in their firm got on 'Fairly Well' are added to those who thought that people got on 'Very Well', this reduces the differences between both the two industries and the small and large firms. Between 86.3% and 91.8% of respondents, regardless of industry or size of firm, felt that workers in their firm got on 'Fairly Well' or 'Very Well'. At the opposite extreme, few workers felt that worker relations in their firm were 'bad'.

These responses are not easy to compare with those from other studies of workers because of the wide range of industries and backgrounds involved but a recent review of the literature on interpersonal relations at work concludes:

"Studies of interpersonal judgement have drawn attention to the fact that people tend to like others more than they dislike them... Physical proximity and the social interaction which typically follows have regularly been found to create some degree of interpersonal attraction... it appears that in very general terms people in contact with each other will enjoy their company more than they will dislike each other." (27)

This is borne out by the most frequent reason given by the present respondents for their view that people got on 'Fairly Well' or 'Very Well' in the firm - that people were 'friendly with each other' or 'easy going'. Sometimes this reason was linked to a further point stressing that people worked as a team or that relations were good because people knew how to do their job and this did not create problems for others. Size was mentioned by a number of small firm workers as a factor, which, in their view, promoted good relations between people. Large firm respondents were much more likely to talk about relations in their department rather than the firm in general. Several of the latter respondents prefaced their replies by saying that they could give no opinion about other departments or that they thought that relations in other departments were either better or worse than those in the department in which they worked.
The problem remains, however, of assessing the quality of the relations about which favourable opinions were given. Ingham, for example, did not ask his respondents how well they thought people got on with each other but how often they talked to their workmates. In order to distinguish between 'required' and 'optional' interaction he also asked when the interaction occurred and concluded:

"... size of organisation appears to be inversely related to both opportunities for, and the frequency of, shopfloor interaction. We can, therefore, conclude that, ceteris paribus, size is inversely related to the potential level of rewards from social relationships with peers." (28)

However, to say that size is inversely related to the potential level of rewards from social relationships is far from saying that relations in the small firm are more affective than in the large firm. The fact that people talk to each other in their break-times more frequently in one size of firm than another may mean very little.

The inherent ambiguity in work-place peer relations involving people who have come together not through choice, but by the operations of the economic order, is illustrated by the answer to the question, 'How well would you say workers in your firm get on with each other?' given by a small printing firm worker:

"It's very hard to say actually. They appear to argue a fair amount but underneath it all I think they get on quite well. There's a lot of backstabbing, arguing and so on, so that on the surface they don't look like they get on well with each other but a lot of them have worked with each other for a long time and even worked together in other firms. When they are together with each other they seem to get on quite well."

A further check on the quality of peer relations was provided by answers to the question 'Would you call any of your workmates close friends?' Again the meaning attached by respondents to 'close friends' will vary, but the results showed little difference between industries or firms of different size. Between 44.8% and 45.2% of respondents regarded at least one workmate as a close friend in the four main sub-samples with, overall, large firm workers reporting a slightly higher propensity to do so. This finding reinforces the points made above and also appears to indicate little of an occupational community among printing workers if choosing close friends from among workmates is accepted as an important indicator of the existence of such a community.

There was little difference between sub-samples on the number of workmates regarded as close friends by individual respondents. The
proportions of those who claimed to regard three or more workmates as close friends, varied from 13.8% among the small electronics firm workers to 20.4% among the large electronics firm workers. In other words, printing workers in both small and large firms reported levels within this range and again the data does not support the existence of an occupational community. Again also it is the large firm workers who are rather more likely to have several workmates they regard as close friends. However, since the numbers here are small no great weight should be attached to this difference.

A more stringent measure of the quality of shopfloor worker relations is provided by the proportions who choose to associate outside work. Again, this also provides indications on the existence of an occupational community among the printing workers. Table 4.9 shows that small firm workers are more likely than large firm workers to see workmates regarded as close friends outside work (although some doubt must exist because of the size of the sub-samples involved). However, as might be expected, fewer married workers had close friends they saw outside working hours. Thus, among the 75 married small firm workers, 18 (24%) had workmates who they regarded as close friends and who they saw outside work. Among the unmarried workers the comparable percentage was 29 out of 60 (48.3%). For the control sample the percentages were 26.6% and 38.1% respectively.

In other words, it can be argued that, the differences between small and large firms on the extent that workmates who are regarded as close friends are seen outside work, are not so much a matter of stronger interpersonal relations in the small firms as the result of differences in workers' non-work lives. Seeing workmates outside work occurs more frequently among unmarried workers and the small firms have a higher proportion of unmarried workers.

It will also be seen that evidence for the existence of an occupational community among printing workers, as measured by the degree to which workmates, who are regarded as close friends, are seen outside work, is not strong. Forty of the 46 printing workers (86.9%) who regarded at least one workmate as a close friend saw them outside work; the comparable figure for the electronics workers in the study was 36 out of 42 or 85.7%. Marital status also appeared to have a similar effect on the degree to which work relationships are carried on into non-work life. Of the 76 married printing workers, 22 (28.9%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. and percentage of workers who regarded at least one workmate a close friend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.
had close friends at work who they also saw outside of work. For
the electronics workers the comparable figure was 13 out of 63
married workers, or 20.6%. At best, this comparison gives only a
little support for the existence of an occupational community among
the printers, as measured by non-work contacts between members of the
craft, especially when it is remembered that the electronics industry,
because of its short history and lack of craft tradition, might be
expected to display very few indications of an occupational community.

Although Ingham did ask his respondents similar questions to
those above which provide a more exacting test of the degree of
affectivity among workers than simply asking them how often they talked
to each other, he does not report the results, an unfortunate omission
for the purposes of the present study. Batstone found few differences
between his small and large firm workers in the extent of work-place
social relations but large firm workers were more likely to see work­
mates out of work. He also felt that out-of-work relations among
large firm workers were more affective than among small firm workers.

Of other studies, mostly of workers in large enterprises which
have reported on the same issue one in particular should be mentioned
because it raises an interesting additional point. Goldthorpe et al
report that among their manual workers, 55% regarded a workmate as
a close friend. This percentage is higher than in the present
study (38.0%) but an allowance must be made for the fact that Gold­
thorpe et al's sample were drawn from only three plants as compared
to ten in this research. The larger number of plants naturally
reduces the opportunities for contacts between respondents. In addition,
respondents in the present sample almost certainly live over a wider
gеограphiсаl area making out of work contacts more difficult. It also
appears that labour turnover was lower in Goldthorpe et al's three
plants than for the main sample firms in this study. On the other
hand, Goldthorpe et al's sample were all married which, as the present
study shows, would tend to reduce out of work contacts.

Unfortunately, Goldthorpe et al do not present the data on out
of work contacts in a form which allows exact comparison with the
present findings but they do indicate that among workers with similar
skill levels to those in the present study, about 40% had out of work
contacts, of more than a superficial kind, with fellow workers regarded
as close friends. This again is higher than for the present sample
(33.5%) but again the differences in the number of plants involved
and the other factors noted in the previous paragraph, may mean that
the difference is not very great.

What is particularly interesting about the levels of close
friendship and out of work contacts in the two studies, is that Gold­

thorpe et al saw their sample as 'privatised workers' among whose
characteristics were a tendency to sharply separate work life and non­
work life, a low expectation of satisfying social relations with
fellow workers and a wish to have a non-work life centred on people
not connected with work. Small firm workers, on the other hand,
have been seen, as pointed out earlier, as particularly likely to
wish to extend work social relations outside work. In the present
study, however, small firm workers appear to be as privatised as large
firm workers (as measured by close friendships at work and out of work
contacts with these friends) and both seem, overall, as privatised as
Goldthorpe et al's manual respondents.

In fact, it might be argued that, the small firm, because of
its size, has certain characteristics which militate against the for­

mation of affective social relations among workers which are likely
to be continued in non-work social life. One characteristic is the
lower level of labour stability in the small firm (see Chapter 3).
People have less time to get to know each other and a higher level
of labour turnover generates an atmosphere of impermanent social rela­
tions. Also, because the department in a small firm is, on average,
smaller than that in the large firm, there will be fewer people from
which to choose a close friend. Finally, because the firm is small,
it will, on average, contain within each department fewer people of
a similar age range likely to have the same interests and outlook on
life.

Vertical Interaction in the Small Firm

The other dimension of interpersonal interaction to be considered
is the vertical one concerning relations between shopfloor workers and
supervisors and more especially, between shopfloor workers and owner­
managers. Earlier it was argued that previous writing on the small
firm posited vertical interaction as highly affective and particularistic
words, direct and free from the negative, conflict-prone feelings said
to characterise vertical relations in the larger enterprise. Further,
these differences are said to be reflected in the attitudes and be­
aviour of small firm workers as compared to large firm workers.
Table 4.10 presents the views of shopfloor workers on their relations with supervisors (regardless of the actual label used in the specific firm to designate the position of lowest full-time level of authority in the firm). There is no apparent size relationship revealed with the proportion of respondents feeling that they got on 'Very Well' among the control sample being sandwiched between the more extreme levels among the main sample. The small electronics firm workers seem the most satisfied with their relations with supervisors and this goes well with the findings, reported earlier, that they were the most satisfied with horizontal social relations as well as their high level of intrinsic-mindedness displayed in answer to the questions about what they thought most important about a job. Similarly, the relatively low proportion among the small printing firm workers who feel that they got on 'Very Well' with their supervisors also fits well with earlier data.

However, if those who felt that they got on 'Pretty Well' are added to those who replied 'Very Well' then there is a slight convergence between the sub-samples. Yet it remains that, overall, large firm workers apparently felt that they get on better with their supervisors than the small firm workers. This pattern is paralleled by the proportions saying that they get on either 'Not Very Well' or 'Badly' with supervisors; small firm workers felt that they did not get on well more often than did large firm workers.

Ingham, asking a similar question, found that all his small firm workers, without exception, claimed to get on 'very well' or 'quite well' with their supervisors. Among his large firm workers between 87% and 95% said they got on 'very well' or 'quite well'. Although this is contrary to the findings in the present research the difference may not be large since Ingham's results for his small firm respondents look as if they might well result from the smallness of his sample.

Although amalgamating responses helps to eliminate errors arising from coding, it does not show whether different sub-samples had varying expectations about relations with supervisors; small firm workers may have had higher expectations about these relations. Indications on differing expectations about relations with supervisors might be revealed by the reasons given for the quality of worker-supervisor relations. However, on this indicator, little difference
## Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers (1)</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Very Well'</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Pretty Well'</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Fairly Well'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not Very Well'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Badly'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Not State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 64 100.0
N = 56 100.0
N = 41 100.0
N = 42 100.0
N = 118 100.0
N = 83 100.0

**Notes:** (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
is revealed in relation to size. The two most frequently offered reasons for good relations with supervisors were, that the supervisor was friendly and helpful and, offered rather less frequently, that the supervisor left the worker alone to get on with his job. The differences that did appear, although related to size, were of another kind. For instance, large firm workers were more prone to say that good relations with supervisors were due to their job skills, that is, that supervisors respected respondents' work skills and allowed them to supervise themselves. This seems an obvious reflection of the fact that large firm workers were, on average, more qualified and experienced than small firm workers.

Small firm workers, on the other hand, more often ascribed bad relations with supervisors to personality clashes. This may reflect the respondent's rationalisation of criticisms of his work or the smallness of the typical small firm department which may increase opportunities for strains in worker-supervisor relations. The latter may be reinforced by the qualities of small firm supervisors; they are rarely as skilled or experienced as large firm supervisors and the selection of supervisors is very subject to owner-managers' attitudes and values.

The range of opinions found among respondents are illustrated by the following views on worker-supervisor relations. First, a respondent in the second largest printing firm illustrates the view that good relations are due to infrequency of interaction between worker and supervisor:

"...I don't have much to do with him. He is quite a nice chap and you can have a chat with him but he doesn't interfere. I get on well with him I suppose, I think we all do. If there is a problem you go and see him and that's all you do. He doesn't interfere otherwise. He organises things if someone's away, that's all."

Next, another printing worker in a small firm illustrates the view that relations with the supervisor depend on the latter's personality:

"I don't know. I suppose it's because he is a fairly easy going chap. I suppose I'm that way towards him as well. He is easy going - how can you be hard with somebody who is like that?"

Finally, a small electronics firm worker illustrates a personality clash between worker and supervisor:

"Well we've got certain basic disagreements. He thinks he's God's gift to electronics - he thinks he knows everything about the job - he thinks he knows everything about everything! You can't discuss something with him reasonably. If you went to discuss something with him you've had it. He just starts shouting until he shouts louder than anybody else."
Ingham provides further data on this issue which helps to bring out an important point on workers' expectations in relation to supervisory styles. He also reports that by far the most important reason given by large firm workers in his sample for good relations with supervisors was infrequency of interaction while, among small firm workers, the most frequently offered reason was that the foreman was friendly or had been known a long time. The differences between Ingham's two samples in the way these two reasons were offered, was very marked indeed. He argued that this showed the differences in expectations between small and large firm workers. Small firm workers expect and prefer a 'human relations' approach from their supervisors while large firm workers expect and prefer a low frequency of interaction and an affectively neutral style of supervision.

Goldthorpe et al report that 86% of their manual worker sample got on 'very well' or 'pretty well' with their supervisors and like Ingham's large firm workers, they also stressed that infrequency of interaction was the most important reason for good relations. Equally, they mentioned much less frequently the personal attributes and behaviour of supervisors as a reason for good relations.

The differing emphasis on infrequency of interaction and supervisors' personal qualities by respondents in small and large firms in the present study is similar to that reported by Ingham. Whether such differences simply reflect differences in orientations of the two kinds of workers is, as will be argued later, open to question. For instance, an over-emphasis on orientations would ignore the effects of the differences in size of department in small and large firms as a constraint on interaction. It would also ignore the importance of differences in industrial sub-cultures. The independent, self-directing printer has a very different relationship with his supervisor to that of the electronics worker who regards his supervisor as a major source of technological advice.

Workers' Relations with Owner-Managers

Of perhaps even greater interest in the present study than worker-supervisor relations, were relations between shopfloor workers and owner-managers. Previous writing on the small firm has seen these relations as probably the most distinctive social characteristic of the small firm. A number of views examined earlier stressed the open, particularistic relations between owner-managers and shopfloor workers and contrasted these with the impersonal, bureaucratic
relations seen as existing between management and workers in large firms. These ideas provided the basis for the hypothesis tested in the present study: that small firm workers will display high levels of vertical interaction with top management, will identify with management goals and will regard personal relations with top management as an important aspect of their participation in the firm.

Among questions on these issues, respondents in the main sample were asked how well they thought they knew the managing director of the firm. As Table 4.11 indicates, overall, over two out of three shopfloor workers answered 'Not Very Well' or 'Hardly/Not At All'. Naturally, there were variations between firms. In a particular small firm the personal characteristics of a managing director or other director may strongly influence interaction with shopfloor workers. For instance, in the smallest of the small printing firms - Silver, Brown and Stone - the extrovert, ex-shopfloor worker who had become managing director, related more easily to shopfloor workers than the ex-lieutenant colonel of ordnance, the managing director of the next smallest of the printing firms who was unexpectedly reserved for somebody who had been a regular army officer for about 20 years. Nevertheless, even allowing for such variations, the data on this question does not support the notion of close personal relations between managing director and shopfloor workers.

Of course, most of the small firms in the study had other directors besides the managing director, and sometimes these other directors had closer relations with shopfloor workers, either because of their personal social skills or because of the particular managerial function they performed but, overall, their relations with shopfloor workers were as distant as those of the managing directors. An 'A' grade wireman in the smallest of the electronics firms gave a typical reply to the question on how well he knew the managing director:

"To say hello to and that's that."

**Interviewer:** "And how about the other directors - how well do you know them?"

**Respondent:** "Well I know one of them. We've got a new director who was our production manager and I know him fairly well through work. Not socially of course."

The large firm workers in the control sample had little or no contact with top management. The headquarters of the National Radar Company are in Ilford, Essex, on the other side of London from the
TABLE 4.11

SHOPFLOOR WORKERS' ESTIMATE OF HOW WELL THEY KNOW THE MANAGING DIRECTOR (SMALL FIRM WORKERS ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Very Well'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Fairly Well'</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not Very Well'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Hardly/Not At All'</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 64 100.0
N = 54 100.0 (1)
N = 118 100.0

NOTES:
(1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
plant in the present study and visits from the chairman and chief executive were infrequent with something of the character of a tour by a member of the Royal Family. At the Surrey Printing Company, although the company formed part of a larger group, there was a managing director on the premises. He toured the plant on a once a week basis and knew some older workers, who had been with the firm for a long time, well enough to address them by their first names. But, overall, the level of interaction was not very high.

However, what was very noticeable in both large firms was that there were managers, at the level of works manager (that is, either directly above first level supervisor or one level higher) who had relations with shopfloor workers which were at least as personal as those between the workers and directors of the small firms. In both cases, the individuals filling these roles had considerable social skills and were not averse to using more senior management or other departments, as scapegoats for unpleasant decisions thus maintaining their relations with supervisors and shopfloor workers.

A further test of the degree of particularism present in management-shopfloor worker relations was provided by the question:

"If you had a serious problem in your private life - your wife became ill or you suddenly needed money for an emergency - would you go to a manager or director of the firm for help or advice?"

Table 4.12 shows that, on average, less than half the small firm shopfloor workers thought they would do this. Somewhat surprisingly, given that they had previously displayed the highest level of extrinsic-mindedness, the small printing firm workers were the most likely to seek help or advice. The small electronics firm workers, who had previously displayed a high level of intrinsic-mindedness, were, on the other hand, the least likely to go to top management for such aid. (A hint, perhaps, of the danger of assuming that an indicator of intrinsic-mindedness on one issue can be taken as an indicator on other issues). In any event, the difference between the two industries in the main sample is substantial, indicating the lack of a single small firm pattern.

To provide a comparison workers in the large firm control sample were asked a similar question but omitting the word 'director'. Table 4.12 gives a breakdown of the answers and again there is a wide difference between the two sub-samples. But, also, while among the main sample it was the printing workers who were the most likely to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers (1)</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 66</strong> 100.0</td>
<td><strong>N = 56</strong> 100.0</td>
<td><strong>N = 41</strong> 100.0</td>
<td><strong>N = 42</strong> 100.0</td>
<td><strong>N = 118</strong> 100.0</td>
<td><strong>N = 83</strong> 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
resort to management for help on a personal problem, in the control sample it was the electronics workers. It may be suggested that these differences are related to the presence of a union cum occupational community among the printers which, at least traditionally has provided help in solving personal problems, while in the electronics industry, the absence of an integrated, long established union explains why workers are more willing to resort to management for help. The large electronics firm also possessed a more up-to-date personnel department as compared to that in the large printing firm. The greater propensity of the small printing firm workers to say they would go to management for help on a personal problem may also indicate that they are not or do not feel so much a part of, the occupational community as the large printing firm workers.

The proportions of workers who say that they would go to management for help or advice on a personal problem contain a degree of overstatement in that many respondents said they would do so only as a last resort. The kind of particularism involved in a relationship of this kind was rejected by the majority of respondents, regardless of size of firm, because they felt that to ask for help in this way undermined their self respect and independence. As a small electronics firm worker put it:

"I think it's a very bad thing to become too dependent on work. It would become a bit like living in a tied house."

A 40 year old compositor in a small printing firm, who had gone to management for help, clearly felt uncomfortable about it. In answer to the question on whether he would seek help from this source he said:

"I have done, I'll be honest with you. I was forced into buying a house. It was that or nowhere to go. I read about a job in Basingstoke, where they were offering £1,000 to help you buy a house, so I told the foreman I was thinking of moving and going to this place and he told the guv'nor. He came down immediately and offered me a £1,000 loan, and I took the loan."

R: "So does that mean if you had another problem in the future, you would go to management again?"

R: "If I was desperate, I would have to be desperate because you rather feel obliged to them after that. It is not a nice feeling but there are times when you've got to say to yourself, I've got to go cap in hand just to get it sorted out."

Respondents were also asked how in touch they felt management were with the way shopfloor workers felt about their jobs. Answers from both the main and control samples are given in Table 4.13. As can be seen, overall, less than half of the small firm workers believed that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.13</th>
<th>HOW 'IN TOUCH' RESPONDENTS THOUGHT MANAGEMENT WERE ABOUT HOW WORKERS FELT ABOUT THEIR JOB: SHOPFLOOR WORKERS ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Printing Firm Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Very in Touch'</td>
<td>5 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Fairly in Touch'</td>
<td>18 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not Very in Touch'</td>
<td>23 35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Out of Touch'</td>
<td>19 29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Other'</td>
<td>15 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Don't Know/No Response'</td>
<td>6 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 64 100.0</td>
<td>N = 5 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
management were aware of how workers felt about their jobs even if those who thought that management were 'Fairly in Touch' are added to those who thought they were 'Very in Touch'. The small firm electronics workers, the most favourable in their view of management here, still have one in three who felt that management were either 'Not Very in Touch' or 'Out of Touch'. The answers given by the main sample agree with previous views in that there is a larger proportion of small firm workers who believe management understand how workers feel about their jobs than among large firm workers, but the difference is by no means large enough to justify some previous views. It will be seen, indeed, that one sub-sample in the control sample, the printing workers, actually have a larger proportion who feel management are 'Very in Touch' or 'Fairly in Touch' than their small firm counterparts.

The extent workers felt that they were being taken into management's confidence was tested by asking how much information they received from management on how the firm was doing. The results, summarised in Table 4.14, indicate that, overall, less than one in four small firm workers felt that they were receiving 'Some' or 'A Lot' of information from management. There was a big difference in the replies given by workers in the control sample; while the large printing firm workers felt very badly informed, the large electronics firm respondents, in sharp contrast, felt the most informed of all sub-samples, regardless of size of firm or industry. The probable reason for this is that the National Radar Company circulates to all employees a monthly 'newspaper', attractively printed in colour, providing information on the company's activities. Coinciding with the publication of the Annual Report to Shareholders the newspaper prints a graphic, easily understandable, breakdown of the company's financial position and this was being circulated among respondents during the interview programme.

Respondents who said that they received at least some information on how the firm was doing were also asked how accurate they felt the information was. Of the 61 small firm workers who received some information, 32.8% thought it very accurate and 22.9% felt it was inaccurate; the remainder felt some was accurate, some inaccurate or could not say. The small electronics firm workers had most confidence in the information they were given; half of those who received at least some information believing that it was accurate. There were 47 large firm workers who said that they received at least some information from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'A Lot'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Some'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not Very Much'</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'None'</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Not State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
management and, of these, 19 or 40.4%, thought the information was accurate and 7 or 14.9%, thought it inaccurate. Among the large electronics firm workers, almost half, 45.7%, of those who said they received some information, thought it accurate which would suggest that 'if it's printed it must be true' still holds if the main source of information for workers in this firm was the company newspaper discussed above.

It may be suggested from the above that, on the whole, the small firm workers do not feel they are kept well informed on how the firm is doing. Only 20 shopfloor workers in the main sample, 16.9%, feel that they are receiving accurate information from management. Overall, more control sample respondents believe they receive accurate knowledge on how the firm is doing and the indication that this rests heavily on the company newspaper published by one of the large firms, only underlines the low proportion in the main sample who feel that they are kept informed by management about the fortunes of the firm.

Finally, workers were asked the general question "How would you describe worker-management relations at (name of firm)?" It can be seen from Table 4.15 that, on average, small firm workers more often felt that worker-management relations were either 'Good' or 'Very Good' than did control sample respondents. Yet there were substantial differences within the main and control samples. The small electronics firm workers believed very much more strongly than the small printing firm workers that relations were 'Good' or 'Very Good'. The small printing firm workers, in fact, do not appear to be very much more satisfied with relations with management than the large printing firm workers, while the large electronics firm workers appear by far the most pessimistic about these relations. Thus, the size relationship predicted from previous writings on the small firms would seem to hold only for the electronics firms.

A comparison of the data in Tables 4.13 to 4.15 suggests that respondents distinguish two separate dimensions of vertical communications: the extent they perceive management understands how they define their jobs, and the information provided by management on the activities of the firm. Each dimension may be seen as independent of the other. Thus, workers in a firm may feel that management broadly understands how they feel about their jobs but may also feel that management do not provide much information on how the firm is doing. But, of the two dimensions, it is workers' perceptions of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.15</th>
<th>VIEW OF WORKER-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS. (SHOPFLOOR WORKERS ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Printing Firm Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good'</td>
<td>4 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good'</td>
<td>21 (32.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Good'</td>
<td>17 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad'</td>
<td>6 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 64 100.0  N = 52 100.0  N = 61 100.0  N = 42 100.0  N = 118 100.0  N = 85 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
the extent to which management understands how they define the job which is most closely associated with respondents' assessment of the quality of worker-management relations. In other words, keeping workers informed on the firm's activities does not automatically promote good worker-management relations.

ATTITUDES TO PROMOTION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

A further hypothesis examined in the study concerned another difference in the occupational identity of the small firm worker thought to go with work experience in a small firm environment. This suggested that workers in small firms will have more individualistic as opposed to collectivist orientations compared to workers in large firms. Such a view may be derived from, for example, the article by Lockwood, mentioned earlier, which argued that small firm workers found it difficult to identify with workmates or more generally with the working class. Previous data also suggests that small firm workers are less likely to belong to trade unions. The small firm worker, therefore, has fewer links with his peers and is hence more open to influences towards identifying with other groups; the small firm might be a source of such influences.

Evidence of this might be derived from workers' attitudes to promotion and to going into business for themselves. Small firm workers might be expected to be more promotion minded than large firm workers and both more disposed towards entrepreneurship and more energetic in preparations for entry into entrepreneurship. Although as has already been shown, the small firm worker is, on average, less qualified and less experienced than the large firm worker, it has also been noted that the small firm owner-manager is less likely to promote on universalistic criteria and may be more likely to back his judgement of the individual man. Closer proximity to the owner-manager means that small firm shopfloor workers have a more visible role model for entrepreneurship than large firm workers.

Attitudes to Promotion

Table 4.16, which summarises the extent to which respondents reported they would like to become a foreman or equivalent, provides little support for the above hypothesis. There appears to be little difference between the main and control samples and, overall, only one in four respondents show any positive enthusiasm for promotion, with small firm workers being less enthusiastic than their large firm counterparts. (Those replying 'Not at Present' were mainly younger
## Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTENT TO WHICH SHOPFLOOR WORKERS WOULD LIKE PROMOTION TO FIRST LEVEL SUPERVISOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Printing Firm Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Very Much'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Quite a Lot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Indifferent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not Much'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not at Present'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Not at All'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 64 100.0  N = 54 100.0  N = 42 100.0  N = 42 100.0  N = 118 100.0  N = 83 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding
workers who realised it would be some time before they could realistically contemplate promotion.)

There were, however, differences in the reasons for not wanting promotion. Among the main sample three reasons occurred with the greatest frequency: the job had too much responsibility; the respondent did not want to be superior to workmates, and, the respondent thought he lacked the right personal characteristics. A 40 year old compositor gave a mixture of these three reasons:

"I don't like telling people what to do really, or the worry of it. I would rather be one of the workers than go around dishing out the jobs and telling other people what to do and what not to do. I am just not the type."

The theme of being 'the man in the middle', familiar from previous writing on the first level supervisor, also turned up in a number of answers:

"... when you're foreman, you are neither one thing or the other. It was exactly the same when I worked at... We had a good foreman there but he still wasn't one of us, if you know what I mean. But he wasn't one of them either. People on the other side don't really care about a foreman either. You're just stuck in the middle."

Among the control sample shopfloor workers the three reasons given most frequently for not wanting promotion were: the job was not well paid enough; the job had too much responsibility, and, the respondent thought he was too old to take the job on. The prominence of age as a reason is to be expected, particularly among the large printing firm workers, simply because the control sample contained a proportion of respondents aged over 50 when people are beginning to think about retirement.

It might be thought that the prominence of money reasons among the control sample and the prominence of not wanting to be superior to workmates among the main sample, tend to support the idea of the large firm worker being more extrinsically-minded and, conversely, of the small firm worker being more intrinsically-minded. However, it might be argued that, since the foreman's role in the large firm is, on average, a role with responsibility for more workers and tasks than the equivalent role in the small firm, relative reward levels between shopfloor workers and first level supervisors would be more prominent in the thinking of large firm workers. On the other hand, since the foreman's span of control is less in the small firm with closer face-to-face relations with subordinates, his small firm workers might be more conscious of the psychological costs involved
In the realignment in interpersonal relations required by promotion.

In other words, organisational differences between small and large firms may be as important in influencing attitudes to promotion as any orientations the worker might bring to the job. Certainly, there was no evidence of differences in orientations in the reasons given by respondents who wanted promotion; in both the main and control samples the two most frequent reasons for wanting promotion - with very similar levels of being mentioned - were, greater job satisfaction and more responsibility. It might also have been expected that, if small firm workers were more concerned with intrinsic rewards, a higher proportion would have wanted promotion than among the control sample because of the intrinsic rewards attached to the foreman's role. Finally, in answer to the question: "If you were promoted would you be upset if your workmates reacted unfavourably?" little difference was found between the main and control samples. Just over half of those respondents who gave a definite opinion on this question said they would feel upset.

The proportions among the present sample, in both small and large firms, saying that they would like promotion appear rather lower than those reported in other studies. Unfortunately, although Ingham asked his sample questions on attitudes to promotion, he does not report the results. Batstone, however, reports that: "...while only just over one-third of those from large plants expressed a desire for promotion, nearly two-thirds of those in small plants did so." (40)

Goldthorpe et al say that 49% of their manual worker sample would have liked promotion either 'very much' or 'quite a lot'. (41) Even among the Goldthorpe et al sub-sample least expressing a wish for promotion, the process workers, 34% were favourable, still more than the large firm workers in the present study.

Why the respondents in the present study express less ambition for promotion to supervisor, as compared to workers in previous studies or why they do not have higher levels of ambition than the large firm workers, as Batstone reported, is not entirely clear but it may be connected with perceptions of the chances of promotion. Only about one in five (21.2%) of the small firm workers thought that their chances of promotion were either 'very good' or 'good'. Among the large firm workers this percentage was even lower; no respondent thought his chances of promotion were 'very good' and only 16.9% of respondents thought their chances were 'good'. The reason for these
estimates of chances of promotion varied. Sometimes it was linked with the organisation of the firm as, for example, in a firm with a 'flat' organisational structure where respondents made the point that, with few supervisors in relation to the number of shopfloor workers, their chances were statistically not very high. In small firms respondents recognised that small firms necessarily have few supervisory positions and some also recognised that management might prefer to bring in outsiders rather than promote internally, either because no current shopfloor worker was thought capable or to avoid the interpersonal strains that might result from internal promotion.

The above is supported by the fact that Goldthorpe et al's manual workers were more confident about their chances of promotion. Although none of their respondents thought their chances of promotion were 'very good', 45% thought their chances were 'fairly good'. Among some sub-samples this percentage rose to over 60%. It may be that workers in the present sample, perceiving that chances of promotion were not good, adjusted their ambitions accordingly.

Respondents in the present study were also asked what they thought was most important in gaining promotion. As can be seen, there is, overall, a broad similarity in the replies of the main and control samples. Both agree that ability to do the job, selected by nearly half of all respondents, is most important. However, the large electronics firm workers are something of an exception in that they are less likely to pick this than any other group, although it is still the most important determinant in their view.

A final question on the possibilities of upward mobility asked: “If somebody showed the ability and worked hard, how far do you think he could get in (name of firm)?” Only 11 of the 139 small firm respondents, 7.9%, thought that a worker might become a director (as compared to 5 or 5.7% of the large firm workers). Over half of the main and control samples thought that a shopfloor worker could not expect, regardless of his abilities, to get much beyond his present job with no difference, virtually, between the samples.

**Attitudes Towards Entrepreneurship**

It was hypothesised that small firm workers because of both their assumed greater individualism and access to entrepreneurial role models would choose this occupational alternative to a greater extent than large firm workers. This might also help to explain the low level of support for the earlier part of the hypothesis that small
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time With Firm</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work Hard</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do the Job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Crawl and</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always Put Number One</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Relative/Friend of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Qualifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N = 64 | 100.0 | N = 56 | 100.0 | N = 41 | 100.0 | N = 52 | 100.0 | N = 118 | 100.0 | N = 83 | 100.0 |

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
firm workers would be more promotion-minded. Promotion within the firm might be rejected in favour of economic advancement by setting up in business for oneself.

Table 4.18 summarising answers to the question: "Would you like to have your own business or to become self-employed?" shows strong support for the hypothesis with nearly two out of three small firm respondents saying that they would like to have their own business compared to less than half of the large firm workers. Of course, the desire to become an entrepreneur is likely to be related to age; as people grow older, it may be suggested that they become less ambitious in this direction and more resigned to remaining an employee. In the sample as a whole, 71.6% of those under 30 years would like to have their own business as compared to only 47.7% of those aged 30 and over. However, among the small firm workers, 52.2% of those aged over 30 wished to have a business of their own which was still higher than the proportion among the control sample, 42.2%. But the difference between those aged under 30 and those aged 30 and over, in the proportions who would like to have a business of their own, was greater among the small firm workers than among the large firm workers. Although the present samples are cross-sectional, this might suggest that, although the small firm workers are consistently more ambitious on this issue than large firm workers, they have a greater rate of disenchantment with this occupational alternative as age increases. Alternatively, it may also be that the large firm workers, a substantial proportion of whom earn more than the small firm workers, find it easier to adjust to permanent employed status.

As might be expected from the above, desire for entry into entrepreneurship was related to marital status. Overall, while 70.4% of unmarried respondents would like to go into business for themselves, only 49.6% of married respondents had this ambition. Again, also, main sample married respondents were more likely to want their own business than control sample married respondents; while 58.7% of married small firm workers would like their own business, for large firm workers this percentage was 39.1%. However, within the main and control samples there was little difference between the two industries.

Respondents' reasons for wanting their own business clustered into three main groups with few differences between the main and
## Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Like to</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Not Like to</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/ No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 73^{(1)}100.0\]  \[N = 66\] 100.0  \[N = 44\] 100.0  \[N = 44\] 100.0  \[N = 139\] 100.0  \[N = 88\] 100.0

**NOTES:** (1) Supervisors are included since their responses parallel those of shopfloor workers, but partners in Silver, Brown and Stone excluded.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
control samples. By far the most frequently offered reason -
accounting for more than two out of three of all reasons for wanting
a business - were the feelings of freedom and autonomy that respond-
ents expected to follow:

"It's more responsibility and everything you do, you do for
yourself. You see the results of your work."
The next most frequent reason, given by about one in five respondents,
was the financial rewards of running a business. The third cluster
of reasons only slightly less frequently mentioned than financial re-
wards, were reasons related to feelings of achievement, personal
success or status.

Reasons for not wanting to own a business were more diverse,
but the reason given most often - by almost 40% of respondents who
did not want a business of their own - was 'too much responsibility'.
Other reasons mentioned with some frequency but without any one
forming a substantial proportion, were age, lack of capital, lack of
personal skills or experience, lack of business skills and, the state
of the economy. Again there were few differences between the main and
control samples.

The data suggests, therefore, that small firm workers are more
ambitious than their large firm counterparts but are they more serious
about their ambitions, as measured by actual preparations for entry
into self-employment? Only 16 respondents, 7% of the whole sample,
said that they were seriously making preparations to start their own
business and even this figure was probably an overstatement since
some of the preparations appeared minimal. The percentage of those
who wanted their own business making what they saw as serious prepara-
tions was, at 12.2%, identical for the main and control samples.

Comparing the present findings with those of previous studies
is difficult because most studies of manual workers have not investi-
gated attitudes to self-employment. Ingham did ask his respondents
about their ambitions in this area but does not report his findings.
Batstone implies that his sample of small firm workers were ambitious
to set up business on their own account but unfortunately gives no
precise figures. Goldthorpe et al, however, report that among their
manual workers, discounting those who had previous experience of self-
employment, 61% had thought about entry into self-employment. A
quarter of their manual respondents had seriously thought about this
occupational alternative as indicated by having made definite plans,
started saving and having tried to seriously investigate the chances of success.

Bearing in mind that Goldthorpe et al.'s sample were all married, the comparison would seem to indicate that the Luton large firm workers were about as ambitious to go into business for themselves as small firm workers in the present study. But the Luton sample were clearly much more ambitious than married large firm workers in the present study: under 40% of the latter wanted to go into business for themselves, that is, over 20% less than the proportion among the Luton workers. (Differences in the phrasing of questions and presentation of the data renders these comparisons rather inexact but the overall differences seem established.)

Of Goldthorpe et al.'s sample 12% had tried to run their own business in the past or were trying to do so on a part-time basis at the time of interview. About 15% of the present sample had been in business for themselves before coming to work for the firm at which they were interviewed and a small number were self-employed on a part-time basis outside their present job. However, comparison here is difficult because of differences between the industries in which the samples worked. Contract working in the electronics industry, for example, enabled some respondents to claim they had been self-employed in the past but essentially contract working reflects shortages of certain kinds of worker and a way of avoiding paying some income tax. At best, it might be seen as semi-self-employment since the worker, to all intents and purposes, works for an employment agency. The latter, therefore, inflates the 'true' level of previous entrepreneurial experience for workers in this industry.

The percentage among printing workers who had been self-employed in the past or did freelance work while holding the job at which they were interviewed, was 13.7% and the small firm workers were the most likely to be among this group. Again, however, it might be argued that printing workers find this easier to do than workers in some other industries; freelance graphics or printing letter-headings or invoices, requires very little equipment and some of the materials required - ink, paper etc. - can be 'liberated' from one's existing employer.

Keeping in mind the problems of comparison discussed above, an overall interpretation suggests that, although small firm workers in the present study appear to be more ambitious for self-employment
than workers in the control sample, they seem no more ambitious than those surveyed by Goldthorpe et al. Perhaps an important reason for this is the difference in the general economic situation in the early 1960's as compared to that in the middle of the 1970's. When Goldthorpe et al carried out their interviews, people were much more economically confident than when the present interviews were completed; several respondents in the present study thought it was not a good time to go into business because of the general economic situation and, in printing, because of the specific economic crisis in that industry.

**MATERIAL REWARDS AND THE SMALL FIRM**

A further aspect of the hypothesised higher level of moral involvement of the small firm worker concerns attitudes to material rewards. In the earlier discussion of the previous literature on the small firm worker it will be remembered that there was wide agreement on this aspect of his occupational identity. The Bolton Report, for instance, while admitting that it is extremely difficult to compare earnings of workers in different kinds of firms and industries, nevertheless felt able to quantify the difference as "of the order of 20 per cent" between small and large firms and quotes other research in support of this assertion. Inevitably also, given its stereotype view of the small firm worker, the Bolton Report linked the lower level of earnings in the small firm with the non-material satisfactions which were thought to "more than outweigh any financial sacrifice involved". It will also be remembered that this relative lack of concern with material rewards is a central plank in Ingham's depiction of the small firm worker as having what he calls a 'non-economistic-expressive' orientation to work.

The problem of comparing the earnings of different groups of workers has two aspects, each of which leads to further complexities. There is, first of all, an objective aspect concerned with the measurement of earnings in money terms. The complexities here concern what to include in the total. For instance, should earnings be defined in a narrow sense of the gross earnings figure, upon which income tax and other deductions are levied, or should fringe benefits to which a cash value can, albeit sometimes only with difficulty, be attached, be included? The latter consideration is important in the present context since differences in fringe benefit levels between small and large firms are likely to be non-random. Difficulties also
occur when an attempt is made to compare the levels of earnings of a sample of workers, such as those in the present study, with data published by, for example, the Department of Employment. As the Department itself admits:

"In view of the wide variations, between different industries, in the proportions of skilled and unskilled workers, in the opportunities for extra earnings from overtime, night-work and payment-by-results schemes and the amount of time lost by short-time working, absenteeism, sickness etc., the differences in average earnings shown ... should not be taken as evidence of, or as a measure of, disparities in the ordinary rates of pay prevailing in different industries for comparable classes of workpeople employed under similar conditions." (49)

An awareness of the differences between firms in the present study indicates the problems of comparing earnings even in the same industry.

The second aspect of any analysis of earnings, and one not taken into account in some previous writings, such as the Bolton Report, is the subjective aspect. Besides its own complexities this aspect may also be related in subtle ways with the objective aspects discussed above. By subjective aspects here is meant respondents' perceptions and evaluations of earnings, including those of other workers. Not only are these perceptions and evaluations important in themselves but it is also necessary to have some idea of the part they play in the worker's overall definitions of work. From a sociological perspective and especially one which makes actors' definitions a main element of analysis, a case can be made for giving the subjective aspect of material rewards primacy over the objective aspect. Perceptions act as a filter to influence the way in which the objective aspects - whether accurately perceived or not - are incorporated into the actor's definition of his position in the rewards structure of the enterprise and how he compares his position with that of others. Accordingly, a number of questions in the study attempted to explore this subjective aspect of material rewards and the findings emerge as important in understanding the small firm worker's view of his economic situation.

Objective Aspects of Material Rewards

Comparisons of objective earnings might, at first sight, seem comparatively easy but this was not the case for the present study. First of all, during the interviewing period there was an almost unprecedented rate of increase in manual worker earnings. Department of Employment data shows that between October 1974 and October 1975,
the period in which interviews were completed, male manual worker average earnings rose by 22.5%. This makes for problems in comparing the earnings of respondents interviewed at the beginning of the research with those interviewed towards the end. In this period also, many manual workers were paid a supplement to their normal earnings calculated in relation to the rate of inflation in the economy, the so-called 'threshold payment', but not all firms made this payment or, where they did, started to make the payments at the same time or at the same rates.

Some of the firms in the study also had special payments systems of their own of various kinds which makes comparisons even of basic earnings difficult. For instance, at Silver, Brown and Stone, the smallest of the printing firms, workers were paid for three hours overtime every week but normally worked these hours only if there was sufficient work to require attendance on Saturday mornings. Workers in the electronics industries firms worked varying basic working weeks. Three of the small electronics firms worked a 37 1/2 hour basic week while the two remaining firms had a 40 hour week. (The 37 1/2 hour week, the usual hours in many white collar jobs, may be seen as another indicator of the way distinctions between manual and non-manual jobs in the electronics industry are blurred; in many firms both kinds of workers have the same basic working week.) Newspaper compositors at the Surrey Printing Company had a complicated wages structure based on a nominal 40 hour week. In practice they usually worked about 35 hours being allowed to leave work as soon as their allotted tasks were completed. At certain times of the year, for example at Christmas, when there were extra pages of advertising, they had agreed to work any extra hours required without pay.

A further problem of comparison has to do with the age of respondents. The practice of the Department of Employment, of comparing only the earnings of respondents aged 21 and over has been adopted since this minimises the effects of the differing wage levels of apprentices and trainees but this does not entirely eliminate age effects. The earnings 'plateau' of manual workers does not begin exactly at the age of 21 but more towards 25-30 years of age. If a firm employs a high proportion of respondents in their early 20's this will tend to produce a rather lower average level of earnings than for firms with an older age force. Finally, firms will have differing
levels of overtime working, different skill mixes and different kinds of fringe benefits, such as the provision of subsidised meals, and these will also affect comparisons.

The data presented in Table 4.19, therefore, has to be treated with caution. In general, it supports the idea that the larger the firm the higher the rate of pay for shopfloor workers although there are areas of overlap and small differences may be due to factors such as those discussed in the preceding paragraphs. In the control sample firms, respondents have been divided into three groups which allows for a clearer comparison with the data from the small firms and especially a comparison of like with like. For example, the general composing room workers in the Surrey Printing Company are the closest to the printing workers in the small firms in the kind of work that they do and, similarly, the non-contract electronics workers in the National Radar Company have been separated from the contract and fabricating workers since this also provides the closest comparison - in terms of the work they do and terms of employment - with the small electronics firm workers. (The three contract workers in small electronics firm workers have been excluded for the purposes of calculating earnings).

It was very difficult to obtain precise information on the value of fringe benefits in the small firms. Owner-managers stressed the discretionary element in these benefits and were reluctant to provide clear rules upon which workers' entitlements could be assessed. But certainly workers in the control sample were entitled to higher levels of benefits and therefore differences in material rewards between the main and control samples were greater than is suggested in Table 4.19 although precisely by how much, is not possible to state. (The earnings data for large firm workers does not contain any element valuing fringe benefits).

A comparison with Department of Employment data for workers doing similar work to those interviewed in the present study in the same region, further supports the view that small firms paid less well. Thus, the Department reports that in October 1974 male workers aged 21 and over in general printing in this region, earned a gross weekly total of £58.86. Since most of the interviews in this industry were completed by April 1975, it seems reasonable to add 10% to the above to allow for increases in wages over this period as the Department's data for October 1975 indicates that gross earnings of workers in
general printing in this region, were £70.76, that is, a 20.21% increase over the year covering the period of data collection. This produces a new gross earnings total of £64.75. It will be seen from Table 4.19 that while the general composing room workers at the Surrey Printing Company earned less than this figure, all the small printing firm workers except the workers at Richmond Periodicals, earned even less. A proportion of the work at Richmond Periodicals was colour periodical printing and workers doing this work normally get paid at a higher rate than workers in general printing. In October 1974, for example, the Department of Employment data indicates that printers in this kind of work earned an average of £64.97 for a 38.9 hour week.

The Department's data for workers in electronics indicates that in October 1974 workers involved in the manufacture of similar products to those of the firms in the present study, earned £45.77 gross, per week and that by October 1975 the gross figure had risen to £58.19, a rise of 21.3%. Interviews with electronics workers took place between January and August 1975 and it is difficult to allow for inflation effects, especially because in some firms interviews took place in several segments to fit in with holidays and other organisational constraints. The mid-point of the earnings increase over the period is £51.98 and it will be seen in Table 4.19 that, as with the printing firms, the small firms in the electronics industry, with one exception, produce average gross totals below this figure. As in the control sample in the printing industry, workers in the large electronics firm generally earned substantially more than the gross figure calculated from the Department's data.

It must be stressed again that these comparisons are very inexact since they are based on a number of highly debatable assumptions concerning similarities between the various groups of workers being compared and do not take into account differences in payments systems of the kind discussed earlier. Nor do they reflect the prosperity of the firm at the time of data collecting (a small firm's order book may fluctuate substantially within any one year period which, in turn, affects levels of overtime earnings) or a range of other factors from differences in the age of the workforce to differences in the costs of travelling to work. Certainly, no precision of the kind implied by the Bolton Report's claim of a 20% difference between
### Table 4.19

**Average Earnings: All Shopfloor Workers Aged 21 Years and Over**

Firms in Order of Size in Each Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Basic Per Week £</th>
<th>Gross Per Week £</th>
<th>Net Pay Per Week £</th>
<th>Gross Per Hour p.</th>
<th>Net Per Hour p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, Brown and Stone*</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Lithographic</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadprint</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Periodicals</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Partners in Silver, Brown and Stone are excluded.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Printing Company</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Composing Room</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Compositors</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linotype Operators</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Instruments</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memaid</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Electronics</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero Electronics</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Radar Company</strong></td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Electronics Workers</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Workers</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricators/Fitters</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

All totals for average weekly earnings rounded to nearest 0.50p. Basic working week 40 hours except in Electronic Instruments, Medical Electronics and Aero Electronics where basic working week 37½ hours. Some workers in the Surrey Printing Company have an effective working week of less than 40 hours.
small and large firm worker earnings, seems warranted. All that can be safely stated is, that there appears to be an earnings difference in the expected direction, that is, large firm workers do seem to earn more than small firm workers, but that the difference is subject to a considerable degree of variation and it is quite possible that there are overlaps in the earnings of workers in firms of very different sizes.

Subjective Aspects of Material Rewards

This stress on the inexactness of the objective data on material rewards available to the academic researcher is worth making because it has implications for any examination of workers' perceptions of material rewards. If the researcher has such problems in making comparisons, it is likely that the shopfloor worker, with little access to any objective data, will also have problems in establishing accurately how the material rewards in his present firm compare with those in other firms he might contemplate working for or who might employ him. Previous research (55) has suggested that manual workers have inaccurate perceptions of relative levels of rewards in society both of manual workers like themselves and of non-manual workers. But this does not, of course, prevent workers having opinions on relative material reward levels and it is these, rather than the objective data discussed above, that may be taken as the important influence on their interpretations of present and alternative possible rewards obtainable from employment.

Table 4.20 gives some indication of the uncertainty among small firm respondents on the differences in earnings between small and large firms. There is no clear majority answer to the question of whether respondents thought that small or large firms paid better although the wording of the question invited them to regard their present firm as small. (See Appendix p.13, Question 23). The proportions who feel that small firms sometimes pay better or as well as large firms (44.6%) is about the same as the proportions who feel that small firms do not pay as well with little difference between the two industries.

Large firm workers were asked whether they thought that large firms paid better than small firms. Again, there was a lack of a clear consensus. Just under half of the large firm workers, 48.9%, thought that large firms paid better, 12.5% thought that small and large firms paid about the same and 29.5% thought that large firms sometimes paid better than small firms. Thus, the largest category with a firm opinion believed that large firms paid better, but the majority of respondents were uncertain on this.
### Table 4.20

**Small Firm Respondents' Opinions on Whether Small Firms Paid Better Than Large Firms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Firms Pay Better</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Firms Do Not Pay Better</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes Small Firms Pay Better/Sometimes Large Firms Pay Better</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Large Firms Pay the Same</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Say/Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                              | 73                         | 66                             | 139                    | 100.0                  |

**Notes:** (1) Large firm workers were asked whether they thought large firms paid better than small firms. The answers are therefore not directly comparable.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Small firm workers often supported their view that small firms sometimes or always paid better than large firms with economic arguments. For example, some respondents pointed out that a small firm needed a high quality workforce with no 'dead wood', because the firm was small - a point repeatedly made by small firm executives themselves. The firm, therefore, might find it necessary to pay at least as well as other firms, small or large, to achieve this. Other respondents argued that small firms tried to offer plenty of overtime since this produced lower overall labour costs than employing a larger workforce. Several respondents made the point that small firms rarely offered canteen facilities or other fringe benefits offered by large firms so they could afford to pay more than large firms.

On the latter point, of the relative advantages of large and small firms in terms of working conditions, respondents were much more sure; 77% of the small firm workers firmly believed that large firms offered better working conditions than small firms. This was a slightly lower proportion than among the control sample (82.9%) but given that over three out of four small firm workers were agreed on this, it indicates a high degree of consensus. It should be added, however, that neither respondents in small nor large firms felt that good working conditions, in terms of, for example, canteen facilities or social clubs supported by the firm, were central in their assessment of a job. If such benefits were attached to a job well and good, but if they were not then their absence was not felt unduly.

A further check on respondents' opinions of alternative jobs and earnings was provided by asking them whether they thought the firm for which they were working at the time of interview, paid better or worse than other firms they could work for. Two-thirds of the small firm workers, as Table 4.21 shows, believed that the firm they were currently working for paid the same or better than other firms for which they could work. They were less likely to give this answer than the large firm workers (where 76.1% said that their present firm paid as well or better than alternative firms they could work for) but it is nevertheless an important point in a discussion of the occupational identity of the small firm worker that only one in four believe they could earn more working at another firm.

It could be argued that, the discrepancy between the proportion of small firm respondents who feel that small firms do not pay as well as large firms (42.4%) and the proportion who feel that the job they
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Firm Pays...</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>13 17.8</td>
<td>19 28.8</td>
<td>17 38.6</td>
<td>12 27.3</td>
<td>32 25.0</td>
<td>29 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>36 49.3</td>
<td>25 37.9</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>24 54.5</td>
<td>61 43.9</td>
<td>38 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>18 24.6</td>
<td>16 24.2</td>
<td>9 20.4</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
<td>34 24.5</td>
<td>13 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Could Not Say</td>
<td>6 8.2</td>
<td>6 9.1</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
<td>12 8.6</td>
<td>8 9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73 100.0 \( N = 66 \) 100.0 \( N = 44 \) 100.0 \( N = 44 \) 100.0 \( N = 139 \) 100.0 \( N = 88 \) 100.0

NOTES: (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
have pays as well or better than any other job they could get (66.9%) might be explained by the differing market situations of the main and control samples. Many of the small firm respondents, particularly in the printing industry, who believed that large firms paid better than small firms, also felt that they had little chance of getting a job in a large firm because they had not completed an apprenticeship or did not have the kind of previous work experience large firm personnel departments wanted or did not have a union card. So in saying that their present job in a small firm paid as well as any job they could get they were frequently simply admitting that the chances of obtaining a better paid job in a large firm were not high. (As with any of the perceptions being discussed here, the accuracy of this admission is not at issue; it may be that some small firm workers, because of their less orthodox work histories have less confidence in seeking better paid jobs even where no formal barrier, such as lack of a union card, exists.) In support of this, the proportion of small firm workers who believe their job at the time of interview paid as well or better than other jobs they could get, rose to over 70% when only workers aged 30 or more are considered. These older workers, it might be thought, are likely to feel market situation restrictions more keenly than younger workers.

Respondents were also asked whether they thought that their wages ought to be higher than they were at the time of interview. Almost two out of three of the small firm workers (62.6%) thought their wages should be higher; in the control sample the percentage was 55.7%. While this difference is not large, it does not support the notion of small firm workers being less concerned with material rewards than workers in large firms or the view, derived from previous research, that the small firm worker's occupational identity is distinguished by an acceptance of the effort-bargain in material terms.

Further, many small firm respondents also felt that the firm could afford to pay them more. Two out of three (64%) believed that the firm could afford to pay them more and although this was a lower proportion than among the control sample (76.1%) again this does not suggest that small firm workers are highly satisfied with the effort-bargain in the small firm. Although it might be argued that the form of the question invites an answer critical of the status quo in the firm's reward structure, it may still be suggested that, at the very least, the replies indicate a good deal of latent doubt about material
rewards in the firm.

A final finding, supporting the above, comes from the replies to the question on whether respondents were thinking seriously of leaving their present job. In the small firms, overall almost one in five respondents claimed to be seriously looking for another job at the time of interview (19.4%) and money reasons were the most frequent reason given for looking for an alternative job, (51.3% of all reasons mentioned.)

Another important source of material rewards for manual workers is overtime working. But again the reasons workers have for working overtime may be related to their wider definitions of work and the firm. It was hypothesised that if small firm workers were more morally attached to the firm then this would be likely to show in the reasons given for working overtime. Even if the main reason given by respondents was money, small firm workers would still be more likely than large firm workers to offer reasons indicating greater moral attachment to the firm, such as a wish to help management get the work out or because of personal commitment to the work task.

Both small and large firm workers reported a high level of overtime working. Between 81% and 82.7% of all respondents said they worked overtime regularly or sometimes. (The higher percentage refers to the small firm workers). The majority worked overtime regularly and overtime accounted for a sizable proportion of their total working week. Thus, of the 115 small firm workers who worked overtime regularly or sometimes, 38.3% said they worked ten hours or more a week. This high level was particularly apparent among the small printing firm workers where over half of those who worked overtime did ten hours or more a week. These overall levels were mirrored closely by those for the control sample where 31.5% of respondents who worked overtime, claimed to work ten hours or more a week. However, in the large firm samples it was the large electronics firm workers who reported the highest levels of overtime working with 51.7% of those who worked overtime, working ten hours or more a week.

Naturally, the amount of overtime worked is not simply a matter of the worker's choice; it also depends on the firm's level of prosperity and management policy. But the data does suggest that small firm workers were more likely to feel that there was too much overtime in their firms. Overall, 22.2% of small firm workers thought that there was too much overtime in their firm as compared to 15.6% of large firm
respondents. This was especially the case among small printing firm workers where over one in three of those who worked overtime felt that there was too much overtime (34.2%). But, equally, small firm workers were also the most likely to feel that there was too little overtime working in their firm: 19.4% stated this as compared to 12.5% of the large firm workers. The probable reason for this is that small firms tend to have fluctuating levels of overtime, depending on the flow of orders and the acceptance of orders with quick completion dates, while large firms tend to have production planned over longer periods and a steadier flow of orders. From the small firm worker's point of view, fluctuating levels of overtime, frequently combined with a lack of choice on whether overtime is worked or not (management often insist that working overtime, as and when required, is virtually a condition of employment) disrupts out of work social life and personal budgeting.

The data on the reasons given by respondents on why they worked overtime provided only slight support for the hypothesis outlined above. Among the small firm workers who worked overtime, 141 identifiable reasons were offered on why overtime was worked and, of these, 75.2% mentioned money and 19.8% mentioned reasons connected with helping the firm to get the order out or the worker's interest in the work. Among the large firm workers 81.3% of reasons were connected with money and 16% with helping the firm or the worker's interest in the job. It must also be added that, almost invariably, the mentioning of non-monetary reasons by small firm workers followed the mention of monetary reasons. Again and again respondents mentioned the importance of overtime working in attaining a standard of living, even where they disliked the idea of having to work overtime.

ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNIONISM AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

An important element in the accepted view of the small firm is that it has few industrial relations problems and a low level of worker-management conflict. The main reason normally offered for this supposed state of affairs is good vertical communications between management and shopfloor. This, it is claimed, removes the need for unionisation and strikes.

Such a view contains a number of questionable assumptions. One is that industrial conflict manifests itself solely in the forms of strike action and workers joining trade unions, an assumption rarely
questioned in writings on the small firm.\(^{(56)}\) That conflict in the small firm may be expressed in other ways is rarely considered and the fact that small firm workers in industries such as printing, a small firm industry par excellence, are, to a great extent, already in trade unions, is usually ignored.\(^{(57)}\) (In the present sample, for example, almost three-quarters of the small printing firm respondents were trade union members.)

Attitudes to industrial relations and trade unions have important implications for the two hypotheses concerning the supposed individualism of the small firm worker, his moral involvement in the firm and identification with management. If the small firm worker is indeed more individualistic than the large firm worker, then it might be expected that this would be expressed in an antipathy towards trade unions and other forms of collectivist action and thinking. Equally, if he is also more morally involved in the firm and identifies more strongly with management and management goals, then fewer indications of conflict between worker and manager might be expected, as compared to the large firm. More generally, respondents' thinking on industrial relations is relevant to determining other aspects of their occupational identities. Questions to respondents on trade unionism and industrial relations fell into two groups: those concerning the immediate firm and those on industrial relations in industry and the wider society in general.

Union Membership in the Sample Firms

The present study included unionised and non-unionised firms although the two industries were very dissimilar in this respect. Three of the small printing firms were unionised with Baker Lithographic, the second smallest, the exception. In Silver, Brown and Stone all six partners (as well as the non-partners) were union members. This resulted from their previous shopfloor experience and all continued to hold a union card mainly because this helped in obtaining orders from commercial customers with a policy of placing work only with unionised firms. In contrast, none of the small electronics firms were unionised although some of their workers were union members as a result of joining in a previous job and continuing membership while in the present firm. Thus, as Table 4.22 shows, 58 of the shopfloor workers in the main sample (41.7%) were trade union members at the time of interview.

In the large firm control sample, a similar contrast existed between the two industries. While all the respondents at the Surrey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing (1)</th>
<th>Small Electronics</th>
<th>Large Printing</th>
<th>Large Electronics</th>
<th>All Small</th>
<th>All Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union Member at the Time of Interview</td>
<td>N=73 %</td>
<td>N=66 %</td>
<td>N=44 %</td>
<td>N=44 %</td>
<td>N=139 %</td>
<td>N=88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 72.6</td>
<td>5 7.6</td>
<td>44 100.0</td>
<td>20 45.5</td>
<td>58 41.7</td>
<td>64 72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Trade Union Member But Not a Member at Time of Interview</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
<td>26 39.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16 36.4</td>
<td>36 25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are or Have Been a Member of a Trade Union</td>
<td>65 86.3</td>
<td>31 47.0</td>
<td>44 100.0</td>
<td>36 81.8</td>
<td>94 67.6</td>
<td>80 90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone although all partners were trade union members.
Printing Company were trade union members (the apprentices having special associated membership status) only 20 (65.8%) of the respondents at the National Radar Company were. Most of the latter were non-electronics workers involved in fabricating equipment housings. Only one permanent electronics worker was a union member plus four of the contract workers. Overall, 64 (72.7%) of the control sample were union members.

Of the 20 small printing firm workers not in a union at the time interview, 10 had previously been members but had allowed their membership to lapse. Despite the fact that the electronics industry has a low level of unionisation overall, a surprisingly high proportion of respondents who were not members of a union at the time of interview, had been members at some time in the past. Among the small electronics firm workers 36 (39.4%) of those non-union members at the time of interview, had been members previously and of the 24 non-union members interviewed at the National Radar Company, 16 (36.4%), had been members in the past. Thus, overall, just over three-quarters of the total worker sample in the study - 174 (76.6%) - were or had been, members of a trade union.

The large difference between the main and control samples in the proportions of union members cannot, a priori, be put down to differences in the attitudes of respondents in firms of differing size. It is much more difficult to organise workers in small firms and unions may feel that attempts to organise small firm workers are an inefficient use of recruiting resources. Unions are also likely to encounter greater employer resistance in the small than the large firm. It is likely, therefore, that union membership in small firms is as related to these factors as to any differences in attitudes.

The reasons given by respondents for joining trade unions are detailed in Table 4.23 for respondents who were union members at the time of interview. Clearly the single most important reason is an involuntary one; over three-quarters of respondents mentioned that one reason impelling them to join was a closed shop agreement or equivalent. Joining a union for reasons of belief or solidarity with workmates was mentioned by only 14 respondents (11.5%). This might seem surprisingly low, especially for the printing industry where the occupational community has been seen as influencing workers toward an ideological view of union membership. However, just as the reasons for taking a job may not be the reasons for staying in it, so also
TABLE 4.25

REASONS FOR JOINING A TRADE UNION. ALL RESPONDENTS WHO
WERE MEMBERS OF A TRADE UNION AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed Shop or Similar Pressure</td>
<td>N=53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed Membership Gave Higher Pay, Security or Other Benefits</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined Because Believed in the Principle of Unionism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined Because Workmates or Friends Were Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed Shop or Similar</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed Membership</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave Higher Pay,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security or Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined Because</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle of Unionism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined Because</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates or Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Members</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No Response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: (1) Excluding partners in Silver, Brown and Stone. (2) Number of reasons exceeds number of respondents because some respondents gave more than one reason.
the reasons for joining a union may differ from the reasons for remaining in the union. Workers who said they joined because they felt they had to, often said that they later came to feel that workers should belong to a union as a matter of principle or that union membership brought with it worthwhile material advantages. A high proportion of union members joined a union when they had little experience of industry and arrived at a further view of the union - favourable, or unfavourable - only after they had been working for some time.

The samples of union members from the small and large printing firms offered very similar patterns of reasons for joining a union but the respondents in the large electronics firm offered a greater spread of reasons. One obvious reason for this is that workers in this industry have less frequently been in a workplace with a closed shop. The general pattern does not change if the reasons of those who had previously been union members but were not at the time of interview, are also included. If the reasons of former union members in the small electronics firms are added to those who were members at the time of interview, then the resulting pattern of reasons resembles that of the electronics workers in the large firm, with closed shop pressures comprising just under 40% of the reasons offered and instrumental reasons - material benefits of one kind or another - accounting for a further 27.9% of reasons. Only 16.3% joined for ideological reasons and 7% because friends or workmates were members. In other words, the data does not, overall, suggest any large differences in the reasons offered by workers in the main and control samples for joining a union. To this extent, the data indicates that opportunity to join a union is at least as important as attitudes in accounting for union membership among both main and control samples.

**Effectiveness of Trade Union and Size of Firm**

Two of the small printing firms could be seen as conventionally unionised - Leadprint and Richmond Periodicals - while the remaining fully unionised firm, Silver, Brown and Stone, is a rather more complex case. Since in the latter firm all six partners were also union members (of the same unions as non-partners in the firm) worker-management relations cannot be seen in the usual way and this firm is therefore excluded from comparison here.

It might be thought that, if the union were of only peripheral importance to worker-management relations in the small firm because
of the efficiency of normal channels of communication between management and workers, then respondents would be more likely to see the union as ineffective than workers in the large firm. However of the 50 union members in the above two small unionised printing firms, 80% thought the union either 'very effective' or 'fairly effective'. In the large printing firm the comparable percentage was 81.8%. (This comparison is, of course, not possible for the electronics firms because none of the small firms were unionised.) A comparison here is provided by Wedderburn and Crompton who asked their respondents in a large chemical works: "How well do you think your union does its job?". They reported that 52% of their workers felt that their union did its job 'very or reasonably well'. While there are differences in both the wording of the respective questions and in the types of workers surveyed, the comparison does not indicate that respondents in the small unionised firms in the present study felt that their unions are less effective than these large firm respondents. Thus, the data for the small firm respondents does not support the idea of the union as being peripheral to worker-management relations.

A further test of the salience of union membership in workers' occupational identities is provided by the data on the frequency respondents discussed union affairs with workmates. Among the two conventionally unionised small firms, 64% of union members claimed to discuss union affairs 'very often' or 'quail a lot' with workmates. Among the respondents in the large printing firm, the corresponding percentage was 63.7%. Goldthorpe et al also questioned their respondents on how frequently they discussed union affairs with workmates. They report that, among their manual worker sample, on average, 37% discussed union affairs 'very often' or 'a good deal'. The highest level of discussion was among the craftsmen who are perhaps the closest to the union members in the present study, but even among this group the percentage discussing union affairs 'very often' or 'a good deal' was only 51%. Again, therefore, the data provides no support for the notion that even where the small firm is unionised - perhaps due to external pressures towards unionisation in a highly unionised industry - the union is less central to workers' definitions of the work situation. In both small and large firms a high proportion of respondents are, on both the above measures, union-minded.

Attitudes to Unions in Non-Union Firms

Turning to the non-unionised small firms - mainly the small electronics firms - respondents were asked whether they thought that it
would be a good idea if the firm were unionised and whether, if the
firm did become unionised, they would join the union. Of the 79 res-
pondents in the five non-union firms, 15 (19%) would definitely approve
if the firm were unionised while another 9 (11.4%) were undecided.
Fifty-three (67.1%) would not approve of unionisation. While a number
of small printing firm workers answering this question was only 13 -
all from the single non-unionised small printing firm - the indications
were that they were more favourable to unionisation than the small elec-
tronics firm workers. This might be expected given the lower level of
unionisation in the electronics industry. (The exclusion of super-
visors' answers on unionisation would not alter the findings greatly;
among shopfloor workers only, 20.3% definitely approved of unionisation,
14.1% were undecided and 62.5% were against unionisation).

However, if the firm did become unionised, 30.4% of the shopfloor
workers in the non-unionised small firms would definitely join while
another 16.4% were undecided. Again the respondents in the non-union
small printing firm were rather more likely to join than those in the
small electronics firms. In other words, while as many as two-thirds
of respondents in non-unionised small firms would not approve of their
firm becoming unionised, if it did become unionised, under half feel
certain they would not join.

The comparative strength of these levels of enthusiasm for the
unionisation of the firm and willingness to join a union are difficult
to estimate because there are few studies of workers in similar situa-
tions, especially in small firms. Attitudes to unions and unionisation
of the firm are not simply reflections of opinions on relations between
workers and management in the firm but are also related to definitions
of, for example, the purposes and behaviour of unions in general. For
example, one of the most frequently offered reasons (offered by 15.6%
of shopfloor workers) for wishing the firm not to be unionised was a
disbelief in unions as such. It might be suggested that, while non-
union member respondents in the non-unionised small firms are largely
unfavourable to either the firm becoming unionised or to joining a union,
they still display a level of union-mindedness higher than some might
expect.

Management-Worker Relations: Conflict and Consensus

A question which focused more directly on the experiences of res-
pondents in work situations and the generalised meanings resulting
from these experiences, was a version of the well known question asking
respondents whether they saw industry in teamwork or conflict terms. This question, used in a number of studies of manual workers, was asked in the present study because of the available comparative data as well as for its immediate relevance in revealing the meanings of respondents in this area. Table 4.2a, summarising the responses to the question shows that, overall, there is little difference between the main and control samples. In both samples just over half chose the teamwork view but there are some interesting differences between some of the sub-samples which appear to be unrelated to size.

Unexpectedly, perhaps, the large printing firm workers, the most unionised sub-sample, were also the most prone to choose a teamwork view. In contrast, the large electronics firm workers, of whom under half were union members, offered the lowest support for a teamwork view of any sub-sample, regardless of industry or size of firm. (This might indicate that a teamwork view of management-worker relations was partly connected with feelings of being able to negotiate with management on more equal terms through having the backing of a strong union.)

The two industry sub-samples drawn from small firms supported a teamwork view at levels intermediate to the two large firm sub-samples, a finding somewhat inconsistent with the hypothesis on small firm worker orientations being examined. When age is controlled for younger respondents in small firms favour a teamwork view to a greater extent than respondents aged 30 and over. Among respondents aged 29 or under, 26.8% favour a conflict view of employer-worker relations as compared to 40.4% of those aged 30 and over. This relationship holds for respondents in both the small printing and the small electronics firms. In other words, the lower average age among small firm respondents is reflected in a higher proportion selecting a teamwork view; if the average age of small firm respondents was higher we would expect a higher proportion to choose a conflict view.

The findings from the present study, when compared with those from several other studies, suggest that the main sample respondents are typical of manual workers in general. Thus Goldthorpe et al, asking an identical question to that in the present study, reported that 67% of their manual worker sample chose a teamwork view; this fell to 59% among the craftsmen, the most similar to respondents in the present research. Wedderburn and Crompton, reported that, on average, 66.5% of their respondents chose the teamwork view. Hill, who studied a sample of London dockers, traditionally thought of as having a conflict
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'A Firm is Like a Football Side...'</td>
<td>3.2% 53.1</td>
<td>35 61.1</td>
<td>29 70.7</td>
<td>18 42.8</td>
<td>67 56.8</td>
<td>47 56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Teamwork in Industry is Impossible... Employers and Men are on Opposite Sides'</td>
<td>26 40.6</td>
<td>13 24.1</td>
<td>10 24.4</td>
<td>23 54.8</td>
<td>39 35.0</td>
<td>33 39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response/Other</td>
<td>4 6.2</td>
<td>8 14.8</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>12 10.2</td>
<td>3 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 6 100.0
N = 5 100.0
N = 41 100.0
N = 42 100.0
N = 118 100.0
N = 83 100.0

NOTES: (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
view of worker-management relations, found that 36% selected a teamwork view. Finally, Cotgrove and Vanpiew, studying process workers in various parts of England and Wales, report that between 53% and 85% of their sample (depending on the geographical location of the site from which the workers were drawn) opted for a teamwork view. All these studies, it will be noted, were of workers in large - in some cases very large - plants.

Batstone, who asked his sample a similar question, reported that almost 82% of his small firm manual workers chose a teamwork view of worker-management relations. This seems a high level when compared with the levels reported above. However, the level among his large firm manual workers was, at 78%, very similar to that among his small firm respondents and it might be suggested that such high levels are connected with the community in which his firms were located. This point will be discussed further later in the chapter.

Thus, the present study's findings, supported by those on manual workers in previous research, strongly suggest that small firm workers are no more likely to see worker-management relations in harmonious terms than workers in large firms. Again, therefore, if attitudes are taken as a guide to identification with management and management goals, the small firm worker is shown to be as aware of differences in the interests of workers and management as workers in larger enterprises.

Attitudes to Striking

Some interesting further data on these issues is provided by the data on respondents' attitudes to striking. Respondents were presented with a card on which was printed the following four statements (the order of presentation was, as with all card questions, randomised over the sample as a whole):

- I don't believe going on strike will benefit me and I would not do so under any circumstances.
- I would be prepared to go on strike if I were a member of a union and the strike was officially called by the union.
- I would be prepared to strike if necessary to get a fair deal if my mates also agreed, even if we didn't belong to a union.
- I would be prepared to strike at any time if it was necessary to support the interests of workers and help the working class movement anywhere in the country.

As is readily apparent, the statements reflect a range of attitudes to going on strike from an absolute refusal to a strong generalised identification with other workers in society. If, as has been hypothesised, workers in small firms are more individualistic and more likely to
identify with management than workers in large firms, the proportions of respondents selecting various statements should reflect such differences.

Table 4.25 reports respondents' selections of the statement that came closest to their own view. The Table shows there is little difference overall in the proportions who would not strike under any circumstances. Just over 10% held this view but there is a marked difference between the two industries with electronics workers being very much more loath to strike, again regardless of the size of firm. There is also a marked difference between the two industries in the proportions opting for the second and third statements which, it may be suggested, is related to the degree of unionisation in the industries. Printing workers were much more likely to follow union leadership on whether to strike, while electronics workers showed, as might be expected in an industry with a low level of unionisation, a wish for agreement with their immediate fellow workers on such a decision. Some of the printing workers in selecting the second statement remarked that, although their union (mainly the National Graphical Association) rarely called a strike, if one were called, they would feel bound to strike, regardless of their personal opinion. Conversely, taking unofficial action, which some felt was implied by the second statement, would be frowned upon by the union so that they felt this was an unwise course of action.

The high proportion selecting the third statement among the electronics workers suggests two points, both of which tell against the hypotheses being considered. First, for both the main and control samples, the data indicates that, although the industry is not very highly unionised, there is a strong latent tendency towards collective action under some circumstances. Workers are willing to contemplate strike action and can conceive that a situation where strike action was appropriate could occur. Secondly, the data from the small electronics firm respondents suggests that they are no more individualistic on this measure than their large firm counterparts. Indeed, if anything, the experience of working in a small firm might well promote a higher level of solidarity with immediate fellow workers since the proportion opting for this statement among the small firm workers is appreciably higher than among the control sample.

Finally, the data in Table 4.25 shows a surprisingly high level of support for the most radical of the statements - the fourth - where respondents indicated identification with other workers in general. That one in five respondents chose this statement over the others is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would Never Strike</td>
<td>3 4.7%</td>
<td>11 20.4%</td>
<td>1 2.4%</td>
<td>9 21.4%</td>
<td>14 11.9%</td>
<td>10 12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Strike if Union Officially Called Strike</td>
<td>26 40.6%</td>
<td>8 14.8%</td>
<td>23 56.1%</td>
<td>11 26.2%</td>
<td>34 28.8%</td>
<td>34 41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Strike if Mates Agreed</td>
<td>16 25.0%</td>
<td>25 46.5%</td>
<td>8 19.5%</td>
<td>14 33.3%</td>
<td>41 34.7%</td>
<td>22 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Strike at Any Time to Help the Working Class</td>
<td>18 28.1%</td>
<td>9 16.7%</td>
<td>8 19.5%</td>
<td>6 14.3%</td>
<td>27 22.9%</td>
<td>14 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did Not State</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>1 1.8%</td>
<td>1 2.4%</td>
<td>2 4.8%</td>
<td>2 1.7%</td>
<td>5 3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 64 100.0  N = 54 100.0  N = 41 100.0  N = 42 100.0  N = 118 100.0  N = 83 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
somewhat unexpected if some views on worker consciousness widely
accepted in industrial sociology, are taken as the base of comparison.
Goldthorpe et al. for example, suggested that manual workers are
becoming 'privatised', seeing trade unions and industrial relations in
essentially instrumental terms. Attitudes to unions and collective
action are becoming solely related to personal economic success and
security. Action expressing solidarity with those in a similar econo-
omic situation is, it is argued, increasingly a thing of the past, an
expression of an earlier, more ideological phase of industrial relations
in our society. Doubts on the validity of this view have been expressed
by several writers although without much empirical support mainly
because researchers have inadequately explored workers' attitudes in
this area, confusing attitudes to trade unions with attitudes to other
aspects of industrial relations.

In the context of the present study, it is important to note that
the small firm workers were no less likely than the large firm workers
to select the most radical view. The differences between industries
in the proportions opting for the other statements, and particularly
the first statement (refusing to contemplate striking under any circum-
stances) is reflected in the proportions opting for the last statement.
Nevertheless, as many as 15.6% of the electronics industry respondents
roughly equally divided between the large and small firm respondents
selected the radical statement. Among the small printing firm workers
this percentage was 28.1% making them the most likely of all sub-samples,
regardless of size of firm, to select this view.

We must, of course, be careful not to assume that attitudes stand
in a simple one to one relationship with behaviour and that in opting
for this radical view, respondents are displaying any strong across
the board working class consciousness. To assume this would be to
make the same kind of simplistic analysis that previous researchers
have frequently made from single questions on industrial relations issues.
Some respondents in selecting this statement were, in the researcher's
opinion and in the light of answers to related questions, displaying a
streak of romanticism not unlike that found among other groups in society
such as students, in their attitudes to their fellow men. But again
the fact that one in five respondents in the main sample did select
this statement and in proportions similar to those in the control sample,
dermines any hypothesis suggesting that the occupational identity of
the small firm worker differs from that of the large firm worker in
that he is less aware of his shared economic situation with other workers,
of the chances of conflict with management and the possibilities of collective action in relation to such conflict. What is different, it may be argued, is the opportunities for workers in different sized firms and different industries to act in specific ways since this depends on situational factors such as the workers' market situations and levels of unionisation.

TRADE UNIONS, INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND THE WIDER SOCIETY

The issues in the above section were mainly connected with industrial relations in the immediate work-place but respondents were also asked their opinions on industrial relations more generally since it was hypothesised that perceptions of industrial relations in the work situation itself might differ from views on industrial relations in the wider society where respondents' knowledge would mostly come from indirect sources and especially the mass media. Three issues were chosen to explore this issue: attitudes to other workers striking; views on the power of trade unions in society, and attitudes to the 1971 Industrial Relations Act.

Attitudes to Other Workers Striking

In the case of attitudes to other workers striking, it was hypothesised that, if small firm workers have the occupational identity attributed to them they would be much more hostile to the idea of other workers striking than large firm workers. Striking would be seen much more in terms of the media view of 'greedy' workers, attempting to increase their material rewards or indulging in mindless, disruptive activity. A large proportion of the interviews in the study took place when the attention given to industrial conflict in the media and by politicians was greater than usual. In the period 1970-75 there was a higher level of striker days lost than at any period since before the Second World War, and this was given considerable media coverage. In the run-up to the February 1974 General Election, members of the Conservative Government and Party made industrial relations a central issue and the Election itself was seen by many as a face-to-face confrontation between the Conservative Government and the National Union of Mineworkers then in dispute with the National Coal Board.

Respondents were asked what they thought were the main reasons why workers went on strike. Table 4.26 shows the wide range of reasons offered. At first sight, the idea that workers mainly strike to gain material advantages receives strong support since, overall, this reason is the most frequently given by far with 32.2% respondents mentioning...
it. However, there is little difference between the main and control samples. Of course, not all the respondents who offered this reason thought that workers were 'greedy'. Some respondents saw striking as the only way in which workers could obtain their legitimate increases in an inflationary period. Other believed that workers were entitled to strive to obtain as high a level of rewards as possible since, given the high rewards received by non-manual workers, it was difficult to see how ordinary workers could be overpaid or greedy.

The Department of Employment publishes data annually on the causes of strike activity and while it is important to accept that, by their nature, such statistics are somewhat questionable because the publicly stated cause of a dispute may very well be symbolic of some other cause, in recent years money issues have been estimated by the Department to be responsible for between 50% and 65% of stoppages. Although it is unlikely that respondents in the present research were aware of these figures, the frequency with which money was mentioned as a reason for workers striking, as shown in Table 4.26, does not suggest that respondents in either small or large firms tended to overstate the degree that money issues led to strikes.

It is also clear from the Table that, the idea that workers strike because of the activities of 'agitators', another theme emphasised by the media and politicians in their 'explanations' of strikes, was not an interpretation which greatly appealed to respondents. Overall, one in five respondents mentioned this reason and although the small electronics firm workers mentioned it most frequently, the large printing firm workers mentioned it next most frequently. In other words, there appears to be no strong relationship with size in the propensity to cite this reason for workers striking.

A number of the reasons offered may be seen as 'sympathetic' reasons. Reasons such as working conditions, management behaviour, boredom, frustration, strikers' feeling that they have no alternative and poor management-worker communications, suggest a sympathetic view is being taken of the actions of striking workers. When totalled, such reasons form a large proportion, 37.5%, of all reasons offered. On this measure, large firm workers are shown to be the more 'sympathetic'. Such reasons form 40.9% of those mentioned by large firm workers as opposed to 34.8% of those mentioned by small firm workers but the difference cannot be described as substantial.

Among small firm workers, membership of a trade union did not seem


**TABLE 4.26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Money/Material Benefits</strong></td>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=54</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Agitators'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration/Feelings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there is No Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Worker-Management Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reasons (1)</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** (1) Some respondents gave more than one reason.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
to make a respondent more 'sympathetic'; about one in three respondents, regardless of union membership, mentioned this kind of reason. However, among the control sample union membership made a substantial difference with between 54.5% (printing workers) and 65% (electronics workers) of union members offering 'sympathetic' reasons compared to only 12.5% of the non-unionised large firm workers. This difference, however, may be connected to the presence of the 12 contract workers in the National Radar Company sample. There is a mutual antipathy between trade unions and contract workers. Unions tend to regard contract workers as undermining the normal employment contract between workers and employers. For example, employers do not have to pay National Insurance contributions or holiday pay to contract workers and can dispense with their services at an hour's notice. Contract workers are usually aware of the attitudes of unions and see unions as restricting their freedom to maximise earnings. It is, therefore, not surprising that only the four contract workers who were union members at the time of interview, gave 'sympathetic' reasons for workers going on strike. While the exclusion of contract workers from the subsample of non-union members does not bring the proportion of respondents who gave 'sympathetic' reasons up to the level among large firm trade union members it does reduce some of the difference.

In short, there seems little obvious relationship between being 'sympathetic' to workers on strike and size; the small observed differences may be as related to union membership or to differences in industrial sub-culture but the data does not allow any firm statement here. The hypothesis that small firm workers, as one aspect of their occupational identity, would be more hostile than large firm workers to other workers striking is therefore not very well supported by this data. Indeed, the sample as a whole - small and large firm workers - offer a wide variety of reasons and appear to be able to resist the tendencies in the media to adopt simplistic and unsympathetic (to workers) interpretations of the strike activities of other workers.

The Power of Trade Unions in Society

The second issue on which respondents were asked their views, as an indication of their wider views on industrial relations, concerned the power of unions in our society. As with the question on willingness to strike discussed earlier, respondents were presented with a card, listing a number of statements and asked which they most agreed with:
- Unions are not strong enough in Britain and cannot ensure that their members' standard of living keeps up with those of other groups in society.

- Unions represent their members' interests fairly and strongly to ensure workers have as much influence in Britain as other groups.

- Unions have become too powerful in Britain and this may result in permanent harm to the national economic interest.

Table 4.27 summarises the findings on this question and again the main difference is not so much between small and large firms as between the two industries. The electronics industry workers were the most likely to see unions as too powerful in Britain with well over two out of three, 72.2%, choosing this view. The small printing firm workers were the sub-sample least likely to accept this view, regardless of size of firm or industry. Relating the findings to age shows that, overall, there is little difference between those under 30 and those aged 30 and over in the proportions agreeing that unions are too powerful in our society. However, respondents in small firms aged 30 and over, are much more likely to agree with the view that unions represent their members' interests fairly and strongly than younger respondents. Younger respondents, on the other hand, tend to be more uncertain, as indicated by the higher proportion who find it difficult to agree with any of the statements.

The major difference among respondents on the power of trade unions in society was between union and non-union members. Thus, among non-union member small firm workers, 71.2% felt that unions were too powerful in society but among union members only 19.2% agreed with this view. Similarly, among large firm workers, 71.6% of non-union members felt that unions were too powerful but only 35.4% of union members felt that this was so (which, it will be noted, was considerably higher than among the small firm worker union members, a surprising finding in some ways.)

Again, therefore, any hypothesis that small firm workers are more hostile to unions generally and more likely to believe that unions have come to harm the national interest is not strongly supported by the present data. While it is true that large firms are more likely to be unionised than small firms and that opinions on union power are linked to union membership, it has already been argued earlier that level of union membership may vary independently of average size of firm in an industry and that, therefore, hostility to unions cannot be seen as typical of the occupational identity of the small firm worker.
### Table 4.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Unions are Not Strong Enough...</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions Represent Members' Interests Fairly...</td>
<td>5 7.8</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>3 7.1</td>
<td>6 5.1</td>
<td>4 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions have Become too Powerful</td>
<td>31 48.4</td>
<td>12 22.2</td>
<td>18 43.9</td>
<td>12 28.6</td>
<td>43 36.4</td>
<td>30 36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>10 15.6</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>2 4.8</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>12 10.2</td>
<td>3 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 64 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 54 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 41 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 42 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 118 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 83 \quad 100.0\]

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
Goldthorpe et al asked their respondents a similar question and report that, overall, 41% of their manual worker sample thought that unions had too much power in society. Unfortunately, the form of their question: "Some people say that the trade unions have too much power in the country: would you agree or disagree, on the whole?" may be argued, biased in favour of answers agreeing with the statement. (It was for this reason that the rather different form of the question in the present study, which allows respondents a freer choice, was devised). Allowing for this possible bias, it seems that, overall, respondents in the present study were more inclined to see trade unions as too powerful in society than Goldthorpe et al's respondents. However, trade union members in the present study - who because of their skill level and the fact that almost 90% of Goldthorpe et al's manual sample were unionised, may be seen as the most comparable - agreed less frequently that unions had become too powerful than Goldthorpe et al's sample, and it was the small firm trade union members who were the least likely of all to hold this view. Of course, a difference, making comparisons between the two studies difficult, was what may be termed the 'atmosphere of confrontation' which existed in the media and in politicians' speeches throughout much of the period of the present research. But, in any event, the comparison does not support the notion of the small firm worker as especially hostile to trade unions and their place in society.

Attitudes to the 1971 Industrial Relations Act

The Industrial Relations Act, 1971, was the climax to a protracted debate in the media and among politicians of both major political parties, on industrial relations in Britain and their supposed need for reform. After the Act's introduction (it was never to be completely brought into effect before its repeal in 1975) there was a good deal of resistance from unions and workers affected by its provisions. The result was a continued debate in the media on the implementation of the Act - especially in the form of the activities of the National Industrial Relations Court - which lasted up to the General Election campaign of February 1974.

It was decided that the Act would provide a basis for assessing attitudes to industrial relations and respondents were asked whether they approved of the Act, whether they felt that it benefitted them as workers and whether they felt they had a good knowledge of the Act and its provisions. Unfortunately, towards the end of the interviewing
programme in 1975, the Act received less and less media attention as it was allowed to wither away as Conservative Party policy and as the succeeding Labour Government refused to implement the provisions already activated. This was reflected in an increasing proportion of respondents who could not bring the Act to mind or who confused it with other government policies. This trend produces some problems of analysis which are referred to below where relevant.

Following from the hypotheses tested in the above sections, it was hypothesised that small firm workers in the study would show a higher level of approval for the Act and would feel that they benefitted from the Act to a greater extent than would large firm workers. For instance, one provision of the Act, given great publicity, was the right not to belong to a trade union and to be able to seek redress if discriminated against for not joining. If, as the stereotype of the small firm worker suggests, small firm workers are more anti-union than large firm workers, one reason for this might be that they feel that union membership confers an unfair advantage and they might be expected, therefore, to support legislation which promised to reduce this disadvantage.

Table 4.28 shows that the proportions of respondents who expressed approval or qualified approval for the Act, in each of the main sub-samples, never exceeded 40.8% and averaged only 31.8% overall. A comparison of the main and control samples shows virtually no difference between them but does show that, the difference between industries observed in relation to previous hypotheses on attitudes to unions is repeated, with electronics industry respondents showing much more approval for the Act than those in printing. Younger workers (those aged under 30) were consistently less likely to approve of the Act than older workers regardless of industry or size of firm. Younger workers were also more likely to feel that they were unable to express any clear opinion on the Act. Thus, the lower average age among small firm workers meant that a higher proportion felt doubtful about the Act than would have been the case if small and large firms had similar age distributions. For example, among all small firm workers aged 30 and over, 40.8% expressed at least qualified approval for the Act; among large firm workers aged 30 and over, the corresponding proportion was 33.9%.

This distrust of the Act among younger workers appeared to be related to a generalised distrust of authority in society especially
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers %</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers %</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers %</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers %</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers %</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers %</th>
<th>All Respondents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Approval</strong></td>
<td>7 10.9</td>
<td>15 27.8</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>8 19.0</td>
<td>23 18.6</td>
<td>13 15.7</td>
<td>35 17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Disapproval</strong></td>
<td>29 45.3</td>
<td>10 18.5</td>
<td>19 46.3</td>
<td>14 33.3</td>
<td>39 33.0</td>
<td>33 39.7</td>
<td>72 35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liked Some Aspects of Act: Disliked Others</strong></td>
<td>9 14.1</td>
<td>7 13.0</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>8 19.0</td>
<td>16 13.5</td>
<td>13 15.7</td>
<td>29 14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>19 29.7</td>
<td>22 40.7</td>
<td>12 29.5</td>
<td>12 28.6</td>
<td>41 34.7</td>
<td>24 28.9</td>
<td>65 32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{N} = 64 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 54 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 41 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 42 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 118 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 83 \quad 100.0 \quad \text{N} = 201 \quad 100.0\]

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
that seen to emanate from the actions of older people such as those in government. In other words, this attitude had a good deal to do with age cultures rather than simply industrial relations but given the lower average among small firm workers, this may be seen as another way in which non-work latent social identities play a part in occupational identity formation. It may also be that older workers were more exposed to influences towards supporting the Act through greater contact with the media, especially television, because they lead a less active social life outside work.

A more expected relationship was that between attitudes to the Industrial Relations Act and membership of a trade union. Almost twice the proportion of non-trade union members expressed complete approval of the Act as trade union members. The sub-sample most opposed to the Act were, as might be expected, the unionised printing workers. However, this did not mean that non-union respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of the Act; only 38.9% of non-union members expressed even qualified approval for the Act and a large proportion, 40.9%, were unable to give any clear opinion on the Act.

On the two further questions asked of respondents - whether they felt the Act benefitted them as workers and whether they felt they had a good knowledge of the Act itself - the great majority of respondents replied that they felt it had not affected them, or was likely to, and they knew very little about its provisions. Only one sub-sample - the one most opposed to the Act, who were mainly members of the National Graphical Association - produced any reasonably sized proportion who felt they did know something about the Act. The union had circulated detailed information and members found this much easier to understand than the information supplied by the mass media. Therefore, it is not surprising that most respondents did not feel the Act benefitted them and the small proportions who did feel this did not differ between the main and control samples; overall, only 15.9% of shopfloor respondents felt they benefitted. Even among the sub-sample most in favour of the Act, the small electronics firm workers, only nine respondents claimed a good knowledge of the Act. However, the researcher's impression was that their knowledge was very sketchy. One reason for this was that some of the interviews were, as pointed out earlier, carried out when the Act had become something of a dead issue but this by no means accounts entirely for this finding. Both the Conservative Government and the media (largely in favour of the Act) apparently failed dismally
to get their account of the Act across to this sample of workers just as they apparently failed to convince the majority that the Act was beneficial to industry and workers themselves.

Thus, the hypothesis that small firm workers would display a higher level of approval for the Industrial Relations Act receives little support. The links established between age, trade union membership and attitudes to the Act show no definite relationship with the occupational identities of small firm workers. Indeed, in the case of age, the data suggests that because small firm workers tended, on average, to be younger than workers in large firms, this produced a lower than average level of support for the Act which, it was surmised, was connected with attitudes to authority held by younger workers. The seemingly rather stronger connection between trade union membership and attitudes to the Act has only an indirect relationship with working in a small firm. Data discussed earlier in the chapter, suggested that opportunities to join a union, which are less available to small firm workers, are perhaps more important in determining levels of union membership than any vast difference in orientations between small and large firm workers.

It might be argued (especially when it is remembered that the large printing firm workers, who received information of the Act from their union, were also the sub-sample most strongly opposed to the Act) that union membership itself might go a long way to explaining the difference - 12.4 percentage points - between the proportions among union and non-union members expressing at least qualified approval for the Act. Trade union membership has been frequently reported in previous research as being associated with a low level of ideological commitment to unionism and it is not suggested that respondents in the present study were any more highly committed than is normal among British manual workers (even the printing workers do not show any markedly higher level of commitment, despite the claims of some previous research). But it may be suggested that union members were more likely to see the Industrial Relations Act as a restriction on their union's ability to protect their interests. It should also be remembered that it is a difference between two minority groups within the small firm worker sample that is being discussed; even among non-union small firm workers, only a minority - 36.4% - expressed even some approval for the Act.
CONCLUSIONS: AN OVERALL VIEW OF ORIENTATIONS TO THE JOB, THE FIRM AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

In this chapter several aspects of the small firm workers' occupational identity - those related to definitions of current job, firm and worker-management relations - have been examined in detail in relation to five initial hypotheses adopted for the research. The results suggest that considerable modifications to existing views on the small firm worker are both possible and necessary for a fuller understanding of his economic and social situation.

Expectations and Satisfactions

In the first substantive section of the chapter the worker's involvement in his job was examined on a number of dimensions. Respondents' assessments of the levels of physical strain revealed that small firm workers found their jobs more physically tiring than large firm workers. Partly this was connected with differences in the types of products produced and the organisation of work in the various firms but it also seemed related to size of firm. Printing illustrates how the product and organisation of work affects perceived levels of physical strain. Shopfloor work in this industry involves a lot of standing and moving of heavy objects whereas the typical electronics worker sits at a bench for most of his working day. (The exceptions to the above were the workers, in the large electronics firm especially, who were fabricating housings for equipment). The way size of firm is related to physical strain appears to lie in the small firm management goal of using labour as intensively as possible. The absence of unions in most small firms (and even where a small firm has a union the latter may be more amenable to management in this context) means that management is both able to ensure the minimum manning compatible with efficiency and widen work roles to include a greater range of activities.

On boredom, the findings do not support the notion that small firm workers find their jobs more interesting than large firm workers. On the contrary, the data showed that small firm workers were over twice as likely an large firm respondents to unequivocally say their job was boring. If the proportions of respondents who say their job is boring 'Sometimes' are added to those who find the job unequivocally boring, they form a majority. Of course, it might be that small firm workers have higher levels of expectations than large firm workers on how interesting a job should be and this point is relevant to the further data on small firm respondents discussed below, but it remains
the case that small firm respondents felt boredom more acutely in relation to their jobs than did control sample respondents. Put another way, small firm workers may, as shown in Table 4.2, more frequently say that the most important thing about a job is that it is interesting or that it has plenty of variety but on the present data there is no evidence that the small firm has a specific capability for meeting these wants.

The findings on nervous strain were inconclusive. Some respondents found the phrase 'nervous strain' difficult to interpret so there are problems in comparing responses. The proportions reporting that they found their job a nervous strain did not, however, appear related to size since the levels among workers in the main small firm sample were sandwiched between those reported by respondents in the two large firms.

A detailed exploration of aspects of job satisfaction was made with especial reference to the alleged intrinsic-mindedness of the small firm worker as compared to his large firm counterpart. First of all, respondents were asked what they thought was most important about a job to build up a picture of their expectations about work. Some caution is necessary in interpreting the results because of methodological problems arising out of differences in the meanings attached to various aspects of work by respondents but the resulting data produced one of the most important sets of findings in constructing a more adequate view of small firm worker occupational identities.

It was found that an apparent difference that small firm workers did, as suggested in the initial hypotheses, have a higher level of intrinsic-mindedness was closely connected with differences in age, marital state, level of authority and type of employment contract, between the main and control samples.

Thus, when age, level of authority and marital state were taken into account, there was a marked convergence in the proportions of respondents stressing extrinsic aspects of work. Older, married workers in small and large firms displayed similar levels of preference for extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of the job. The most intrinsically-minded workers, regardless of size of firm, were those aged below 24, unmarried, employed on a permanent basis and in a position of first line supervision. All these aspects were related to size of firm since, on average, small firm workers were just over nine years younger than large firm workers, less likely to be married, less likely
to be contract workers and, because of the way small firms are organised, more likely to be supervisors. The intrinsically-minded small firm worker, emphasised in previous research and the generally accepted view of this kind of worker, is, in other words, likely to be young and unmarried where he exists at all. This finding fits well with the discussion in the previous chapter where it was argued that, a major difference between small and large firm workers relates to job seeking patterns among younger workers and the way this shapes their respective market situations over time. The younger small firm worker through accepting and leaving jobs, either as a result of particular job-changing decisions or through external influences, gradually develops a different market situation to that of his large firm counterpart. This, in turn, it is suggested, leads to an adjustment in the worker's occupational identity so that he comes to stress intrinsic aspects of the job rather than the increasingly less easily obtainable extrinsic rewards associated with jobs in larger firms.

However, the development of the occupational identity towards a stress on intrinsic aspects of work in the early years of work experience comes under strain when marriage occurs and especially when a family is started. Changes in non-work life lead workers to reconsider their definitions of work and the importance attached to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Extrinsic wants related to non-work life lead to the intrusion of extrinsic definitions into the occupational identity and pulls against the adjustment to a relatively poor market situation which the tendency to intrinsic-mindedness in the occupational identity of small firm workers may derive from.

Previous discussions of small firm workers have either ignored the impact of non-work influences on occupational identities or, as in the case of Ingham, argued that there is no impact at all. To argue the latter is, at the least, implausible but also goes against other studies which have suggested a relationship between the life cycle and the meaning of work. Indeed, Goldthorpe et al, whose ideas and research had a great influence on Ingham's work, make the point themselves:

"...once the economic obligations associated with the roles of husband and father are assumed, then the motivation to give higher priority to extrinsic, economic returns is likely to increase, and a different pattern of wants and expectations in regard to work may be expected to develop."

and,

"...while no exact statistical treatment is possible, a rough
estimate from our data suggests that most of the workers in
the sample who expressly preferred some previous job to their
present one (55% overall) left the former work only after
they became 'family' men." (81)

Hollowell, in his study of lorry drivers, which had the advantage of
studying both married and unmarried respondents (Goldthorpe et al's
sample consisted of married respondents only) found a similar re-
definition of work in more material terms with the onset of marriage
and family responsibilities:

"... drivers tend to take up long distance work to provide extra
money for the family as the pay in local driving is likely to
be less." (82)

and,

"... the lorry driver [enters] long distance lorry driving in
order to provide for the needs of his family in the early and
most costly stages of building a home. At a later stage in
the lorry driver's career he will tend to change out of long
distance driving into shunting or local driving as the need for
money is less great in the later stages of family life when the
household payments are less of a burden, and ... when the
children have grown up and left home ... the primacy of adap­
tation is of occupation adapted to family needs rather than
vice versa." (83)

A further point, not mentioned in the literature, is that marriage
and the creation of a family unit provides a new area of social life
for the satisfaction of intrinsic wants. The highly affective relation­
ships characteristic of much family life in our society provide an
alternative and, it might be argued, superior source of intrinsic
satisfaction to those previously associated with peer group, family
of origin and work. In this way, therefore, the redefinition of work
in more extrinsic terms, may well be more easily accomplished than
might be first thought.

It will have been noted that the shift in orientations is less
marked for the large firm worker than for the small firm worker and
this may be because the large firm worker is already closer to the
limit of extrinsic benefits that he perceives as possible from his
occupational identity. It is also important to stress that the above discussion is not intended to suggest any
kind of total redefinition of the worker's occupational identity.

Earlier the point has been repeatedly made that an occupational iden­
tity is a complex mix of meanings both intrinsic, extrinsic and even,
on occasion, inconsistent with each other. Thus, the influence of
the industrial sub-culture in the electronics industry, which it was
argued in Chapter 3 emphasises an intrinsic view of work as compared
to that of the printing industry, remains an influence in the occupational identity formation of the married small electronics firm workers. This is evidenced by the way the level of intrinsic orientations of the married small electronics firm workers is still higher than that of the married small printing firm workers. Similarly, as shown later in this chapter, promotion, which normally brings with it higher material rewards, is not automatically wanted by married respondents; the high material rewards may be weighed against certain psychological deprivations perceived by respondents as accompanying greater responsibilities.

The above arguments are further supported by the data on how well the job at the time of interview was rated by respondents for the things they thought most important about a job. Overall, size did not appear to be important in aggregate levels of satisfaction but when the level of satisfaction was related to other factors, differences did appear. Although caution is required in generalising about findings related to age and position in the family life cycle due to their cross-sectional character and the small sample size of particular sub-groups, job satisfaction appeared to be lower among older, married workers. Since the small firm workers were, on average, considerably younger than the control sample, the result of standardising for age is to suggest that the congruency between work expectations and their satisfaction is lower among the small firm workers. In other words, small firm workers were as satisfied as large firm workers only when the small firm worker was at an early part of the life cycle and had relatively more freedom in choosing a job. Later in the life cycle, this relative freedom (which, as argued in the last chapter, is so easily exaggerated) declines for small firm workers because of their poorer market situation and especially because of the marked preference of small firm managers for younger workers. This decline appears to be accompanied by an increasing incongruency between expectations about work and the worker's perceptions of these expectations being met by his current work experience.

The examination of the levels of satisfaction among married workers in terms of how well expectations were met for the aspects of work the respondent thought most important shows, as might be expected from the above argument, a lower level of congruency than among unmarried respondents. However, for the control sample the differences were smaller and the difference was, in the case of the large printing firm workers in the opposite direction to that found among the small firm workers, that is, married large printing firm workers were more
satisfied than unmarried respondents. The interpretation here is that the higher material rewards - particularly for the married workers in the newspaper composing room where the majority of the younger married workers worked - were perceived by respondents as very high for a manual worker.

Obtaining a permanent position in the newspaper composing room was much sought after and usually only attained after working in the general composing room for a period so that, at the earliest, a worker would be in his mid-twenties on winning this coveted job. In other words, in this firm becoming married and a parent with its accompanying redefinition of the meaning of work frequently went with an increase - a very large increase, comparatively - in material rewards. Thus, both small firm workers and large firm workers face restriction on their abilities to cope with life cycle changes but the large firm worker is in a more favourable situation.

Previous thinking about small firm workers argued for a high degree of self-selection into the small firm work environment due to the special occupational identity they develop. The examination of job satisfaction among workers in the small firms in the present study, has suggested that while there is, in a limited sense, a tendency for intrinsic orientations to develop among younger small firms workers, the failure to take into account the influence of non-work life experiences on occupational identity formation in later periods of the life cycle means that a simple self-selection view of the small firm worker is quite inadequate.

Horizontal and Vertical Social Relations Within the Firm

The information gathered on horizontal interaction between shop-floor workers was marshalled to test two hypotheses derived from previous thinking on the small firm worker which were, in effect, contradictory: that because the small firm was small, workers were more friendly with each other or, conversely, that because the small firm worker identifies with management to a greater extent than the large firm worker, he is less likely to form attachments with shopfloor peers. It was found that small firm workers did, on average, feel that relations between workers were more friendly than did workers in the large firms but this findings was modified by the data collected to assess the quality of these relations.

When the quality of peer relations was tested by asking how many respondents regarded workmates as 'close' friends, a slightly higher
proportion of large firm workers had close friends among workmates than did small firm workers. On the more severe test of the extent to which in-work relations were continued out of work, small firm workers were more likely to continue in-work relations out of work. However, when marital state was controlled for, the differences were greatly reduced. In other words, if small firm workers continue in-work social relations out of work (although they are no more likely to have close friends at work than large firm workers) a main reason for this is that small firms contain a higher proportion of unmarried workers. When people marry they come to center more of their non-work life on their wife and children and premarital male friendships tend to suffer.

A comparison of the findings from the present study with those of Goldthorpe et al. indicated that the small firm workers in the present study were no more likely to continue in-work relations out of work than Goldthorpe et al.'s 'privatised' workers. The findings, indeed, neither support the view of Lockwood, that small firm workers are less likely to form horizontal affective relations with peers, nor the hypothesis of Ingham, that such workers were more likely to form such relations. Several reasons were suggested for the failure of the latter hypothesis and several other findings (see Chapter 5) suggest that the small firm worker is not a good approximation of the deferential worker so it is no surprise that Lockwood's view is not supported.

On the existence of an occupational community among the printing workers, the findings on peer relations in and out of work indicate that, either previous research has exaggerated its existence, which seems unlikely given the quality and degree of independent replication involved, or that, more likely, it has weakened in recent years due to technological and economic changes. On the measure of the extent that in-work social relations (no higher, on average, among the printers than among the electronics workers) were continued in non-work life, only the large printing firm workers showed a higher propensity to do this. The difference was not large but was also reflected in a higher proportion of married respondents continuing work relations into their non-work life than among other married respondents in the study. No such difference was revealed for the small printing firm workers and this might be taken as an indicator that their different market situation, demonstrated in Chapter 3, is paralleled by a lower
participation in any occupational community as compared to large printing firm workers.

It is argued, therefore, that while there are some differences between small and large firm work environments with regard to the possibilities of forming strong horizontal relations, the various influences involved may be self cancelling and the intensity of relations, as measured by willingness to continue such relations out of work, is slightly higher among the small firm workers not because, on balance, the small firm fosters such relations, but because small firm workers are more likely to be unmarried.

The study was just as concerned - if not more so - with vertical social relations in the firm. These were divided into two kinds: those between shopfloor workers and first line supervisors and those between shopfloor workers and owner-managers or senior management. The object was to further test the hypothesis, discussed above, on the supposed greater identification with superiors among small firm workers, as well as to test the hypothesis that the small firm worker occupational identity has, as a central element, an individualistic orientation as opposed to the collectivist orientation of the large firm worker.

On shopfloor worker-supervisor relations, large firm workers reported 'good' relations more frequently than small firm workers. But there was also some important differences in the character of this interaction which appeared to be related to size of firm and the industrial sub-culture. In the large firm the supervisor's span of control tended to be much wider than in the small firm. (In some cases, the supervisor's department in the large firm was larger than the whole of a small firm.) This meant that worker-supervisor relations were inevitably more functional and impersonal in the large firm. In the small firm the supervisor, because the department was smaller, was constrained to practice a personal, 'human relations' style, of supervision. However, this did not necessarily lead to satisfying relationships between supervisor and workers; in fact, it provided greater opportunities for interpersonal conflict between superior and subordinates which helps to explain the overall lower level of satisfactory relations reported by small firm shopfloor workers.

The relative emphasis in the frequency respondents mentioned rate

ness of interaction with supervisors and the personal style of super-
visors was very similar to that reported by Ingham. That is, large
firm respondents more frequently mentioned the impersonality of relations with supervisors while small firm workers were more likely to discuss the foreman's personal characteristics. Ingham attributed this to differences in expectations held by small and large firm workers about relations with supervisors. But this is to neglect the organisational differences discussed above which shape the relations between workers and supervisors. It also neglected differences in industrial sub-cultures which may affect these relations.

The differences in the sub-cultures of the printing and electronics industries had effects on worker-supervisor relations which were partially independent of size of firm. In printing the shopfloor worker is a 'journeyman', a craftsman who has gained that status after a long formal training. The journeyman's relations with the supervisor should, in the journeyman's view, be minimal. The journeyman needs virtually no supervision and can organise his own work. The large printing firm with large departments approximates to this ideal more closely than the small firm since the supervisor has less opportunity to 'interfere' in shopfloor workers' activities: in the small firm the organisational pressures of the small department and firm tend to constrain the supervisor to violate the craftsman's expectations. This is all the more so where, as is often the case in small, non-union printing firms, skill levels of shopfloor workers vary so that some require more supervision than others and the promotion of a supervisor may not be directly connected with his skill as a printer.

In the electronics industry, on the other hand, worker-supervisor relationships are rather different. Shopfloor workers do not, despite the advanced technology used in the industry, receive much formal training as compared to workers in printing. Supervisors are, on the whole, more qualified and experienced than the workers they supervise and these considerations are important in promotion to supervisor. The relationship between shopfloor worker and supervisor is, therefore, a more consultative one than in the printing industry. Workers use the supervisor as a technological resource and defer to his expertise. The ethos of science and its collegial norms, which, it was argued in Chapter 3, form a distinctive aspect of the industry's sub-culture, prevent worker-supervisor relationships becoming authoritarian.

Thus, on balance, situational and cultural factors distinct to the electronics industry produce a greater likelihood of good worker-supervisor relations in the small firm than the large firm. In this
aspect, the relationship between size of firm and industrial sub-culture produces very different results in the two industries. In printing, because of the way the journeyman defines his job, worker-supervisor relations might be expected to be better in the large than in the small firm but in electronics the opposite would be expected because the small firm provides a superior organisational arrangement for the realisation of the norms and values of the industrial sub-culture. The importance of both organisational and cultural factors in worker-supervisor relations suggested by the present findings, again shows the limitation of any interpretation which is concerned solely with worker orientations.

The second aspect of vertical interaction in the firm - that between the shopfloor worker and the directors of the small firm - has been central to much of the writing on the alleged special character of the small firm. It is suggested that there is a special relationship between the workers and owner-managers and that this accounts for the assumed high commitment of workers to the firm and the low level of industrial conflict. These ideas were tested in a number of ways by the data and were found to be, at best, an exaggeration of the positive aspects of this variety of vertical interaction.

Overall, the questions exploring various aspects of worker-manager relations produced a consistent picture. There was little evidence that workers felt they had close personal relations with owner-managers or - with exceptions - with other directors. Only 33 small firm workers, 28% of the small firm sample, felt that they knew the managing director either 'Very Well' or 'Fairly Well' and the data for other directors was similar. Most small firm workers rejected the idea of the managing director or other director as a source of help for personal or family problems. Even those workers who said that they would go to a top manager for aid, usually qualified this by saying they would do so only as a last resort. While the small firm workers say that they will go to the owner-manager or other director for help more often than respondents in the control sample would go to a senior manager, the difference between the two samples is less than 10% overall.

Most small firm workers did not feel that owner-managers or other directors appreciated how shopfloor workers felt about their jobs. The differences between the main and control samples on this point were much less than might have been expected from the literature with, in fact, some overlap between the main and control samples. Nor did
the small firm workers feel to any great extent that they were taken into managements' confidence; less than one in five felt that they received any accurate information on the firm's activities from management. A relatively simple management strategy in one of the large firms, a company newspaper, had a much more marked effect on workers' perceptions of how much information on the firm they were being given than the results of normal vertical interaction between workers and directors in the small firms.

Although differences on perceptions of the quality of worker-management relations were smaller than expected, there was a consistent indication that small firm workers have closer relations with management. But, it may be argued, the evidence still does not provide strong support for the hypothesis presented earlier; while management-worker relations are closer in the small firm than the large firm, the data from the present study suggests that much of the previous writing on the small firm exaggerated the intimacy and particularism of management-worker relations.

One probable reason for this exaggeration is that much of the previous writing is based on the views of owner-managers and other senior managers in small firms. A prime example of this bias is the Bolton Report itself which commissioned research involving interviews with owner-managers yet failed to balance this out with any research on the way small firm workers themselves define their work. Owner-managers of small firms, understandably if not accurately, tend to see their relations with their workers in very favourable terms, emphasising their own abilities to relate to their workers. In the interviews with small firm executives in the present research this bias was very clear. Where friction with workers was admitted, it was usually linked to personality or moral weaknesses of the workers involved.

But part of the existing views of relations between workers and managers in small firms rests on research data and some attempt needs to be made to show why the present research offers a consistently different perspective on the small firm worker's occupational identity. At this point, in relation to the hypothesis on vertical interaction in the firm, it can be argued that part of the differences result from certain dissimilarities in the general life situations of the present small firm worker sample as compared to small firm workers in previous studies. Some of the other differences, however, arise out of methodological considerations.
Batstone, in his research on small firm workers in Banbury, provides an example of dissimilarities in life situation which leads to differences in the intensity and quality of worker-management relations in the small firm. He found that small firm workers conformed closely with Lockwood's ideal type of the deferential worker in their relations with owner-managers. They valued the diffuse particularism of relations with owner-managers, stressing the rewards derived from these relations above economic rewards.

However, the probable reason for these differences in findings emerges when Batstone discusses the ethos of small town capitalism. The key point in relation to the present discussion, is that small firm workers in Banbury have their relations with owner-managers in the work situation reinforced by out of work contacts. Small businessmen hold major roles in the local political order and in other local organisations and are well known to their employees outside work. Conflicts between businessmen and the local aristocracy have been important in Oxfordshire's history and workers have often sided with local businessmen. The social distance between 'gaffer' and worker is often very little and both workers and owner-managers are sometimes descended from families who have known each other for a generation or more. In short, these small firm workers interact in work and non-work spheres with their employers, knowing them economically and socially.

The workers in the present study live in a very different kind of locality in which the position of the owner-manager is very different and in which the opportunities for out of work interaction with employers are limited or non-existent. The local political order is almost 'invisible' in that local politics are the concern of a very small proportion of the population. Most of the workers in the present study, as will be seen in Chapter 5, take little interest in local politics. In fact, the workers in any single firm will live in a number of local government areas so that they have little in common at this political level. Nor are local politics dominated by small businessmen; none of the owner-managers in the present study were openly politically active at the time of the research or even lived in the same localities as their workers. The Surrey area has a large middle class presence surrounding pockets of working class localities. This, in effect, produces almost two societies whose lives interpenetrate only superficially; there is no 'community' in the sense that it is possible
to talk about social relations in Banbury. Owner-managers are able to orientate themselves to the middle class society and live their non-work lives within it. Some of them were clearly middle class in their background, education, speech and lifestyle but even those from humbler backgrounds were orientated to the middle class showing little identification with their workers.

These differences, it may be argued, help to explain the lower level of identification with owner-managers of small firm shopfloor workers as compared to that reported by Batstone. Whether such differences would explain the higher levels of identification with management that Ingham reports for his small firm workers, is difficult to say since his study is unfortunately an example of a study of workers that 'stops at the factory gates'. He tells us little about the kind of locality in which his small firm workers live or how the small firm and its owner-managers fit into that locality.

Ingham's study does, however, provide examples of the methodological weaknesses which have, in previous studies, tended to exaggerate the degree of particularism in worker-management relations in the small firm. One example is similar to the one pointed to in Chapter 3 in relation to tracing the supposed build-up of a stable small firm worker identity over time, that is, the reliance on a single question or very few questions to establish a very complex set of orientations. In eliciting respondents' attitudes to owner-managers Ingham's schedule contains only four questions which could be seen as directly concerned with this issue, two of which refer to the strictness of management in enforcing rules. (87)

Of greater seriousness, but connected to the above criticism, is the form of the questions which Ingham takes as important in establishing the character of worker-manager relations. In asking workers about their interaction with owner-managers and directors, he asked respondents first, did they see anybody above works manager level on the shopfloor, then, did they think it was a good thing that they saw the directors or managing director and, finally, did they ever talk to the directors? None of these questions seems designed to gather data on the quality of worker-director relations. Talking to directors does not in itself, mean very much since, as was observed in the present study, owner-managers and directors may inquire after the health of a respondent and his family but such exchanges need not be indicators of any deeper relationship. Respondents may find such exchanges
pleasant but whether they attach any profound significance to them is another matter.

It is argued, that in the present study the wider set of questions used to elicit workers’ attitudes to management helped to correct for these methodological weaknesses. Of course, this is not to say that the present study completely explored workers’ views of top management, but it is argued that, together with other questions particularly those concerning industrial relations, they provide a more accurate account of workers’ attitudes to owner-managers and directors. This account shifts the emphasis in worker orientations away from a tendency to idealise aspects of the vertical interaction in the small firm towards a more conditional view in which workers’ reservations about these relations are given proper recognition.

A major plank in Ingham’s argument that workers in small firms identify closely with management, is that small firms have lower levels of absenteeism than large firms. He notes that this covers not only absences not related to health but also those for which a medical certificate is produced; the small firm worker is so committed to the firm that he is unwilling even to extend an absence due to sickness beyond what is absolutely necessary. Unfortunately, it was not possible to obtain detailed information on absenteeism in the small firms in the present study mainly because managers did not usually keep detailed records. But, impressionistically, the small firms in the study appeared to have lower levels of absence than the large firms. But there is an alternative and, in some ways, simpler explanation for this occurrence than that offered by Ingham. It is noticeable that Ingham does not say whether his small firm workers were paid for absences, especially when sick. The small firms in the present study did not, on the whole, pay for any absence except on an ex gratia basis, normally given only to long serving or highly valued workers. The large firms, on the other hand, were more likely to pay for absences for certified sickness and, in addition, were more generous in allowing workers to be absent (sometimes with pay) for other reasons. As other research has shown, absenteeism increases when workers are paid for absences which can be ‘justified’.

In his concentration on workers’ commitment, Ingham also neglects to examine the wider structure of sanctions - normative and material - which may be levelled against the worker who absents himself and how this structure differs between small and large firms. In small firms
the worker is typically a member of a smaller department than in large firms and certainly this was so in the present study. The department, as Ingham himself points out, is also usually more tightly organised in the sense that roles are less likely to overlap so that the possibility of substitution of one worker for another on a temporary basis is doubly reduced. Absence, therefore, has a greater impact (particularly if it happens without warning) on production than in a large firm. In turn, this means a greater impact on peers - on their ability to do their work and on their perception of the absentee as a person. Therefore, it may be argued, normative pressures against absenteeism are greater in the small firm than in the large firm.

It has already been pointed out that small firm managements are less likely to pay for absences, a considerable material sanction in itself, but because management are aware of the effects of absenteeism on the department's productivity and social relations, they are also constrained to take a more serious view of absenteeism than large firm management. Moreover, the absence or lower level of union activity in the smaller firm allows management to act more decisively and quickly than in the large, unionised firm where there is generally an agreed procedure of warnings and sanctions to be exhausted before a worker is sacked for absenteeism.

The neglect of these differences in the sanctions orders of small and large firms, undermines any attempt to offer an explanation of lower levels of absenteeism simply in terms of worker orientations. As has been argued earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 3, a person's occupational identity, of which orientations to work form a major part, is not simply a matter of experience and a free choice by the actor. Rather it is a mixture of an element of choice with a set of definitions which are the result of the worker's perceptions of the constraints on his actions he sees arising from the way work and society are organised. While outsiders may argue that many of these constraints are simply in the actor's mind and that, if he chose to, he could act to negate them, what is important is that the actor believes the constraints exist and defines his life accordingly. In other instances, such as absenting oneself from work in the small firm as compared to doing so in the large firm, the outside observer may conclude that the worker's appreciation of the situation is sound and that a lower level of absenteeism in the small firm reflects this realism.
Promotion and Getting Ahead

One possible dimension of identification with management is the extent to which superiors are taken as role models. A test of this dimension was provided by the strength of desires for promotion and entry into entrepreneurship. Desire for promotion may also be seen as a test of the hypothesis that the small firm worker is more individualistic and less likely to identify with his fellow workers. However, the data shows that the small firm workers were no more promotion-minded than workers in the control sample. Less than one in four small firm workers expressed any enthusiasm for promotion to supervisor, a slightly lower level than that found among the control sample.

There were, however, some interesting differences in the reasons offered for not wishing to gain promotion. Among small firm respondents the most important group of reasons were those connected with the possible interpersonal problems that might be associated with the supervisor’s role while among the large firm respondents the main reason given was the lack of material rewards. This difference is consistent with the notion of the greater extrinsic-mindedness of the large firm worker but it also might reflect the organisational differences surrounding the supervisor’s role in small as compared to large firms. The smaller size of the department and narrower span of control of the supervisor in the small firm brings to the fore interpersonal skills and conflict. In the large firm the larger department and its correlate of greater administrative responsibility, means that the supervisor’s job is much more a managerial role, clearly distinct from the shopfloor worker role and hence it is not surprising that workers feel that material rewards should reflect this.

An important insight into the way shopfloor workers perceived worker-management relations was revealed by the small firm respondents’ beliefs on what was most important in determining promotion to supervisor. Nearly three-quarters of them selected ‘Ability to do the Job’ and ‘Willingness to Work Hard’. What is especially interesting is the relative lack of emphasis on some factors. For instance, only three of the 118 small firm shopfloor workers thought being a relative or friend of the boss was the most important determinant of promotion; only about 10% felt that ‘Ability to Crawl and Always Put Number One First’ was most important. (Respondents were also asked what they considered the next most important factor in gaining promotion and these second choices produced a similar pattern of responses with the
above factors again receiving relatively little emphasis.) In no instance were these particularistic factors more frequently chosen by small firm workers than large firm workers.

That factors related to particularism - length of time with the firm, being a friend or relative of the boss, or cultivating close relations with management - were so seldom mentioned by small firm respondents may be taken to indicate workers' perceptions of the influence of management attitudes to them as persons on their chances of promotion. Small firm workers, as much as large firm workers, believed that the most important influences on promotion to supervisor were relatively independent of personal relations with management, that is, the ability to do the job and willingness to work hard, which reflect the worker's economic value to the firm.

There was support for the hypothesis that exposure to the role model of entrepreneur was associated with a greater desire among small firm workers to have their own business. However, in terms of practical preparations for entry into entrepreneurship, small firm workers were no more likely to be making such preparations than workers in the control sample. The workers in the present study show a lower propensity to both desire the role of entrepreneur and be ready to prepare for it, as compared to manual workers in previous research but this may be due to the greater economic pessimism and the accompanying recession of the present time, as compared to previous periods. It might also be that the lower level of ambition for owning a business among large firm workers was influenced by the fact that at least two groups in this sample were, at the time of interview, very well paid in comparison to other manual workers (the newspaper printers at the Surrey Printing Company and the contract workers at the National Radar Company) and this influenced them towards a feeling that having their own business would produce no substantial further advantages.

Material Rewards

An issue which has received a lot of attention in discussions of the small firm worker as compared to his large firm counterpart, concerns levels of material rewards. The main hypothesis derived from previous writings, was that small firm workers were paid less than large firm workers and that they consciously exchanged material rewards for intrinsic rewards in order to work for a small firm.

Summing up the data on material rewards and the occupational identities of small firm workers, the idea that small firms pay less
well than large firms is supported by the findings from the present sample of firms - at least at a level of precision possible within the limits defined by differences in a number of important factors associated with overall levels of material rewards. Problems of comparison are salient here because there is a tendency to assume that data on gross earnings from official sources, such as the Department of Employment, unequivocally establishes the difference in earnings levels between small and large firms but it has been shown that such apparent precision may be misleading and neglects the beliefs that workers themselves hold about earnings levels in firms of various sizes.

Beliefs and meanings about material earnings held by workers are, it is easy to argue, of much greater importance in establishing the importance of material rewards in occupational identities than objective data, however precise this might be. A certain lack of consensus was found among workers in small and large firms on the relative advantages, in terms of earnings, of small and large firms. In asking workers in small firms whether they felt their firm at the time of interview paid better or the same as other firms they could work for, there were indications that they may have had different considerations in mind when answering the question than the large firm workers. Respondents did, on the whole, believe that large firms probably paid better than small firms but not all workers apparently considered they had a complete choice of alternative employment. In line with the findings and analysis of previous work experiences in Chapter 3, it may be argued that the data on perceptions of material rewards indicates that the small and large firm respondents do not assess their market situations in the same ways. The majority of small firm workers, in reporting that their present job was as well paid as any other they could go to, were at least tacitly admitting that their market situation, as measured by qualifications such as having served a recognised training, length and quality of previous work experience and membership of an appropriate union, often closed off certain better paid occupational alternatives they might otherwise choose.

This analysis is consistent with the rather higher proportion of small firm workers who believed that their wages should be higher than among the large firm workers; the small firm workers recognise that their effort-bargain is less favourable than it might be. Thus, it is argued that, the findings on material rewards show not so much that such rewards are less important to small firm workers than large firm
workers, but that defining them differently in relation to their overall economic situation, they assess them in a different way. Previous thinking on the small firm worker frequently assumed that he defines the structure of available material rewards in the same way as the large firm worker and then chooses to give this less overall importance than non-material rewards. But the perception of available material rewards (or non-material rewards for that matter) and the importance attached to such rewards in relation to other kinds of rewards, are logically independent. Such logical independence does not, of course, mean that there is no relation between perceptions of available rewards and attaching importance to them. Here it is argued that perceptions of fewer opportunities for high material rewards at work by the small firm worker, as compared to the large firm worker, leads to an accommodation to this perception which can take the form of accepting the small firm as an acceptable place of work. Among younger workers, as was seen earlier in the chapter, this accommodation in the form of a preference for intrinsic aspects of the work situation, is common but it comes under strain when changes in non-work life such as entering marriage and starting a family, lead to a greater concern with material rewards.

The assumption that there is a necessary exchange of intrinsic rewards for extrinsic rewards, which seems to underly much of the thinking about the occupational identity of the small firm worker, is therefore highly questionable. A perceived deficiency in material rewards on the part of manual workers may be reacted to in a number of ways and not simply by attempting to go to work for a large firm or, and this seems especially important in relation to the present sample of small firm workers, by substituting intrinsic rewards as some kind of compensation for perceptions of such a deficiency. Moreover, any reaction need not be a permanent one; changes in non-work life especially may lead to changes in interpretation of work and its level of material rewards. Overall, the data indicated that the likely development of orientations was not, as suggested in earlier writings, towards a stable small firm worker occupational identity stressing intrinsic rewards but the opposite, a development towards a greater concern with material rewards at successive stages of the life cycle. The acceptance of the effort-bargain by small firm workers, therefore, did not appear to be either the result of simple self-selection or of accompanying stable orientations built up over time encouraging such self-selection.
The last section of the chapter analysed respondents' attitudes to industrial relations. The initial hypotheses guiding data collection on this topic were based on the most frequently offered view in the literature that, because of the special relationship between the worker and his employer in the small firm, levels of industrial conflict will be far below those in large firms and that, the individualistic orientation of the small firm worker is associated with an antipathy towards unions and unionisation. The evidence for these ideas, that small firms have few strikes and that small firm workers do not join unions, was questioned on the grounds that strikes are not the only form of industrial conflict. For instance, one possible expression of conflict is withdrawal from the situation and it was noted, in Chapter 3, that labour turnover rates in the small firms in the present study were higher than in the large firms. It is not suggested that all labour turnover is an expression of conflict but, for small firm workers, it is an easier mode of expression than one based on collective behaviour such as striking. Equally, not all small firm industries have low levels of unionisation, as the printing industry itself illustrates, and joining a union where the firm is not unionised is more difficult than where there is a union, regardless of the individual's attitudes.

Attitudes to industrial relations among the present sample were studied in relation to the immediate work-place and industrial relations in general. One test of the salience of union membership for those workers already in a union was to find out whether they felt that the union was effective. It might be argued that, if in small firms communication between workers and managers are adequate for industrial relations purposes, then respondents would see the union as ineffective as compared to respondents in the control sample. The data did not support this; over 80% of small firm workers in the unionised firms saw the union as 'fairly' or 'very effective', almost exactly the same proportion as in the fully unionised large firm, the Surrey Printing Company.

A further indicator on the above might be the extent that workers discuss union affairs with workmates. If the union was peripheral to worker-management relations in the small firm, then it might be expected that they would discuss the union less frequently than workers in a large unionised firm. Again the data did not support this argument. In the unionised small firms and the unionised large firm very
similar proportions - about two out of three - said that they discussed union affairs with workmates either 'quite a lot' or 'very often'.

In the non-unionised small firms respondents' attitudes to possible unionisation were investigated and 67.1% said that they would not approve. If, on the other hand, the firm were to become unionised, 30.4% would definitely join and a further 16.4% were unsure. These findings are in accord with the initial hypothesis although how they would compare to replies from respondents in a non-unionised large firm is difficult to estimate. For instance, among respondents who were already union members, two out of three said they originally joined because of the existence of a closed shop, that is, an involuntary reason and, at most, about 30% said they joined for such positive reasons as a belief in the principle of unionisation or because they believed it would result in higher benefits or wages.

A more basic question was whether respondents saw industry in teamwork or conflict terms. On the initial hypotheses adopted for the study, small firm workers would, of course, be expected to opt for a teamwork view rather than a conflict view as compared to members of the control sample. Yet, overall no difference was found in the proportions choosing either view in the main and control samples with both choosing a teamwork view about as frequently as respondents in most previous research where this question has been put. There were, however, intra-industrial differences. The small electronics firm workers chose a teamwork view more frequently than their rather more highly unionised large firm counterparts but among the printing workers it was the large firm respondents who chose the teamwork view more often than respondents in the small printing firms. Thus, on balance, the data does not support the initial hypothesis very well; small firm workers do not see the firm in more harmonious terms than large firm workers.

Another basic question concerned attitudes to striking. The initial thinking for the study suggested that small firm workers would be much more against the idea of striking than large firm workers. Overall, about 12% of respondents said they would not strike under any circumstances but there was no difference between the main and control samples on this. The differences were again between industries rather than firms of varying size. Among small printing firm workers under 5% said that they would never strike while for the small electronics workers the percentage was just over 20%. In each case
respondents in the large firms offered the same levels of support for this view as their small firm counterparts. Over three-quarters of the small electronics firm workers could conceive of circumstances in which they would be willing to strike, a rather higher proportion than among their large firm counterparts, but among the small printing firm workers 93% could conceive of circumstances under which they would strike, a level almost exactly the same as that in the large printing firm.

Perhaps more surprising was the level of support among small firm workers for striking at any time to support the interests of workers and the working class anywhere in the country. Overall, just over one in five small firm workers selected this statement, a rather higher proportion than among the control sample. (The sub-sample most frequently selecting this view were, in fact, the small printing firm respondents). It is felt that this high level of apparently radical attitudes should be treated with caution but it must be remembered that this view was selected as an alternative to three less radical views seen by respondents at the same time. Whatever the lack of correspondence between declared views and future action accompanying the selection of this statement, the point is that the small firm respondents are no less 'radical' here than their large firm counterparts. Small firm workers are shown to have no lower potential for identification with fellow workers.

Attitudes to industrial relations in general were examined by asking respondents their views on other workers striking, the power of trade unions in society and the 1971 Industrial Relations Act. Asked why they thought other workers went on strike there was little difference, overall, in the pattern of reasons offered by the main and control samples. Both thought that material rewards were the most important reason but there was not a high level of support for the 'agitator' theory of striking except among the small electronics firm workers where about 35% of respondents mentioned this reason. But this was not particularly a small firm worker view since the same reason was mentioned by only about 12% of the small printing firm workers, a percentage close to the average level (11%) among large firm workers.

Several of the reasons mentioned by respondents were classified as 'sympathetic' in that they implied that respondents believed that workers might have good cause for striking. Overall, one in three small firm workers mentioned 'sympathetic' reasons and while this was
below the level among the large firm control sample (47%) it neverthe­
less suggested an unexpectedly high degree of sympathy in rela­
tion to accepted views of small firm workers in the literature.

On attitudes to the power of trade unions in society, no consis­
tent size relationship was found. The small electronics firm workers
came closest to the stereotype of the small firm worker, with almost
three-quarters feeling that trade unions were too powerful in society
but, conversely, the small printing firm workers showed a level of
support for this view below that offered by either sub-sample in the
control sample. Overall, therefore, there was little difference be­
tween the main and control samples. The greatest difference was not
between small and large firm respondents but between union and non­
union members. Indeed, small firm trade union members were markedly
less likely to agree that trade unions were too powerful in society
than trade union members in the control sample.

It was hypothesised that there would be much more support for
the 1971 Industrial Relations Act among small firm workers than among
the control sample. However, overall, there was little difference
between the main and control samples with only a minority in either
expressing even qualified support for the Act. There were inter-indus­
trial differences with electronics workers offering a higher level of
approval but there was little difference between the small and large
firms in this industry.

Younger workers were less likely to support the Act which had
the effect of reducing support among small firm workers because they
were, on average, younger than large firm workers. But the greatest
difference was between union and non-union members with trade union
members being very much less likely to approve of the Act. However,
even among non-trade union members, there was no majority even expres­
sing qualified approval. Most respondents felt they did not know
very much about the Act and did not feel that it benefitted them; to­
wards the end of the interviewing programme, when the Act was no
longer a focus of media attention, a substantial proportion of res­
pondents had difficulty in recalling the Act or its provisions.

Thus, overall, the main theme of the initial hypotheses adopted
from previous writing and research, that small firm workers will have
a consistent and hostile attitudes to trade unions, collective action
by workers and would fail to identify with other workers was not
supported. One object of the analysis was to ascertain whether orientations to industrial relations within the work-place paralleled those to industrial relations issues in the wider society. Broadly, it may be argued, the samples showed a high level of consistency in their orientations to both sets of issues, even allowing for sub-sample variations. Overall, it was shown in the discussion of attitudes to industrial relations in the work-place that many of the accepted views on attitudes to such relations thought to be distinctive of the occupational identity of the small firm worker, were highly questionable. Even where, as in the case of the small electronics firm workers, some approximation to the accepted view was found, it was argued that other factors, particularly access to union membership, might be important intervening variables. Similarly, in the analysis of attitudes to out of plant industrial relations issues, it was shown that the differences between the small firm workers and the control sample were much smaller than might be expected from previous characterisations of the small firm worker.

Thus, the data showed that small firm workers were, overall, not a source of support for anti-union views in general and did not take a stance hostile to other workers in society on, for example, collective action such as striking. It might have been thought for instance, that small firm workers would have been a major source of the support that the Conservative Party claimed existed among 'ordinary workers' for the 1971 Industrial Relations Act but, as has been seen, this was not so.

What the data does show is that the small firm workers display as much variation in their attitudes to industrial relations as those in the large firms. Differences were shown to be related to the age compositions of the labour forces in the small and large firms and to trade union membership. There is a strong trend in Britain at the moment towards increased trade union membership with much of the increase occurring among groups, such as white collar and female workers, who have been traditionally hard to recruit. It may be argued that, although unions have, because of the high cost in resources, been previously reluctant to concentrate on organising small firm workers, this may change in the future. Two reasons may be suggested for such a change. First, the just under one-fifth of the labour force who work in small firms will become the most fruitful remaining source of new members as other sectors and groups become increasingly
organised. Second, changes in government policy which followed the repeal of the 1971 Industrial Relations Act and notably the provisions of the 1975 Employment Protection Act, will make it easier for unions to organise workers in small firms.

As the data from the present study indicated, there is a good deal of latent support for collective action among non-unionised small firm workers as well as awareness of the differing interests of workers and employers. It has been argued that the changes in white collar worker orientations which have resulted in an increasing proportion joining unions, stem, in part, from a recognition that membership brings advantages not otherwise obtainable, a recognition which has perhaps been unwittingly promoted by the media's continued emphasis on the alleged power of manual worker unions. If this is so, then perhaps the level of union-mindedness found among the non-union respondents in this study which has been shown to be much higher than the characterisation of the occupational identity in the previous literature would suggest, is evidence of a similar shift in orientations among small firm workers.

Some previous writers have assumed a simple relationship between size of firm and union membership but, as pointed out earlier, there are industries, such as printing, where union membership is high while average size of firm is small. Moreover, this assumption has been linked with the further view that this relationship exists because of the antipathy to unions and collective action which forms a distinctive aspect of the small firm worker occupational identity. But the data from the present study shows that the proportion of small firm workers with attitudes favourable to trade unions and who show evidence of identification with fellow workers, is much higher than previous views would suggest. What has not been given sufficient weight in previous writing is the barriers to trade union membership and collective expression of attitudes for small firm workers. The present findings indicate considerable latent support for unions and identification with fellow workers in and beyond their present firm among small firm workers. In other words, at the very least, the stereotype of the small firm worker occupational identity which the present study set out to test, underestimates the level of union-mindedness and grossly exaggerates the degree of identification with management.

In this chapter an exploration of respondents' attitudes towards both their job and firm has led to some previous views of the occupational identity of the small firm worker being severely questioned.
Any approximation to the stereotype small firm worker occupational identity of previous writing is likely to be found only among a segment of small firm workers and is likely to be closely related to the individual's position in the life cycle.

The high level of identification with management, said to be characteristic of the small firm worker, was little in evidence. Respondents in the small firms did not feel they had a special relationship with management, they did not feel that management had any high degree of insight into the way ordinary workers felt about their jobs, nor did they feel that they were taken into management's confidence. Small firm workers seemed as aware of the potential conflict of interests between themselves and their managers as large firm workers. Conversely, the alleged lack of identification with fellow workers in terms of a lack of awareness of shared economic situation, or low level of union-mindedness, was equally absent in the attitudes of a high proportion of the small firm workers.

The tenuousness of feelings of attachment to job and firm felt by respondents in the small firms was reinforced by the finding that almost 20% of the small firm workers claimed to be seriously looking for another job (compared to just under 15% of the control sample) at a time when unemployment was already high and increasing. A further 42% said that they had thought about leaving their job (compared to 39% among the control sample.)

What emerges very clearly in the overall pattern of replies to questions on attitudes to the job and firm is the pervasiveness of the cash-nexus relationship upon which participation in the enterprise is grounded. Relations with others - fellow workers, supervisors and especially managers - all turn on this basic relationship. The limits on the degree of affectivity in relations resulting from the constraints imposed by this essentially economic reason for interacting were as evident in the small firm as in the large. The limits placed on the possibilities for alternative patterns of interaction inherent in the capitalistic mode of organising an economic enterprise have been much underemphasised in the rather rosy views of much of the previous writing on the small firm. Statements made by respondents often implicitly assumed these constraints but some respondents were much more explicit. One respondent, indeed, summed up the views of many small firm workers when he said:

"In a large firm you're just a number; in a small firm you're just a name."
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CHAPTER 5.

COMMUNITY, SOCIAL CLASS AND POLITICS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the workers' more general image of society and the links between work and non-work life. A weakness of many studies until comparatively recently, was a tendency to neglect non-work life. The most important study in recent years attempting to avoid this weakness has undoubtedly been that of Goldthorpe et al. Yet, it can be argued, even this study provided an unbalanced treatment of the relationships involved, especially in over-emphasising the importance of orientations developed prior to entering present employment as opposed to orientations arising out of current work experiences themselves and orientations developed as a result of subsequent non-work experiences.

Most recent studies have, with certain notable exceptions, regressed on this issue. Ingham must be classed among the latter, providing little data on non-work life and even arguing, rather implausibly, that there are no connections between, for example, family life cycle position and orientations to work. Batstone is more satisfactory here, presumably because his study was part of a larger re-study of Banbury.

In analysing the data presented in the two previous chapters the anchor constructs have been 'occupational identity' and 'industrial sub-culture'. Hypotheses and the data used to test them, were all connected with the development and specific character of the occupational identities in the main and control samples and their relations with the respective industrial sub-cultures. In this chapter the central construct is 'image of society', which refers to the worker's ideas, beliefs and values which go to make up his overall view of society.

Of course, as with the study of occupational identities and industrial sub-cultures, there is no intention, still less any attempt, to provide an exhaustive account of the images of society held by respondents. As argued in Chapter 2, this would be virtually impossible for at least two reasons. First, the complete exploration of the typical individual's image of society is beyond the capabilities of current research strategies and theorising. Secondly, any attempt to provide an exhaustive account of respondents' images of society assumes respondents have well developed images of society in relation to whatever aspect the research concerns. This assumption is highly questionable. For a number of reasons, respondents are unlikely to have consciously
and systematically developed their ideas on many aspects of life in the wider society. For example, there is no reason for an individual to have developed ideas on issues which he has not perceived as strategically impinging on his life. On many aspects we are likely to find:

"... unorganised and often diffuse representations of social structure held by members of particular occupational groups. The relationship between unorganised images and organised consciousness is complex and ramified and the one should not be assimilated to the other." (8)

The present research, therefore, has a much more modest aim than a total exploration of respondents' images of society. The existing literature suggests there is a reciprocal relationship between work and non-work experiences which lead the small firm workers' image of society to be distinct from that of the large firm worker. The suggested differences have formed the basis for three main hypotheses on areas where respondents are likely to have relatively well developed views. However, in questioning respondents on such areas, care was taken not to press for answers where it was clear that views were vague and fragmentary. (It is for this reason that the 'Other' and 'Could Not State' totals in several Tables in the chapter are larger than is sometimes the case in research into social and political imagery.) In addition, respondents were also questioned on certain aspects of behaviour taken as indications of having a particular image of society or lifestyle.

THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES

The three main hypotheses tested in the present chapter are:

(i) That small firm workers are more integrated into the community than the large firm workers as measured by:
(a) participation in voluntary associations and activities, and,
(b) more extensive interaction with non-kin drawn from a wider range of social strata.

(ii) That small firm workers are more likely to support the Conservative Party as measured by reported voting behaviour and to hold ideological views favouring a conservative political order, than large firm workers. Conversely, small firm workers may also be expected to have anti-Labour Party views.

(iii) That small firm workers are more likely to hold a strongly deferential image of society which will be indicated by a distinct view of the class order and conversely, to manifest a lower level of class consciousness than large firm workers.
Community Integration

The notion that small firm workers are more integrated into the wider society has been suggested previously by several writers. Lockwood, for example, in generating his ideal type of the deferential worker, suggests that the latter identifies closely with those he regards as his social superiors. He works in occupations or economic environments, such as the small firm, which bring him into close contact with employers or other middle class influentials. In non-work life he tends to live in a community which fosters identification with status superiors. By implication it may be suggested that, where a community does not entirely display such characteristics, the deferential worker will seek out areas of non-work interaction allowing close relations with status superiors. Since the deferential image of society holds to an interactional status system, resting on face-to-face relations, it might be expected that this would further reinforce tendencies to seek out others in the community who would help sustain this image.

The major empirical support cited by Lockwood for this view was Stacey's first study of Banbury. She reported that, at that time (1951) Banbury was a 'dual' community with a 'dual' economy. On the one hand, was the aluminium rolling mill, the only large scale industrial establishment, employing mainly immigrants, that is, workers who had come to Banbury for the new jobs in the mill and who found themselves 'outsiders' in the local social order. On the other hand, was the established local community whose leaders held the elite political and social roles based economically upon small firms owned and managed by this local elite. Thus, small firm workers mixed socially with their employers in and out of work so that, overall, the degree of social connectedness in the wider community was high.

In their re-study of Banbury, carried out in 1967, Stacey et al claimed that, while the dual community and economy had markedly declined, considerable elements nevertheless remained. Like Lockwood, they stressed the continuing mutual support between the work and non-work experiences of small firm workers:

"The small plant employee ... enjoys involvement with managers and owners in the workplace, accepts their help and advice in his private life and their leadership in social and political affairs." (12)

The large firm worker, in contrast, is often described as 'privatised'. This is characterised by a lack of involvement in the wider
society which goes with a lack of attachment to fellow workers and to the firm. Work is defined in instrumental terms as a means to a lifestyle centred on home and the family on a council or low cost, private housing estate. These are estates of social isolates with few kinship ties who lack "the facility for readily creating middle class patterns of sociability."[14] In short, these workers again have mutually reinforcing work and non-work experiences but experiences which are the opposite of the small firm deferential worker. The Luton study by Goldthorpe et al, offered empirical support for this view.[15] However, the ways in which subsequent studies of manual workers have undermined this view will be noted below when the relevant findings from the present study are analysed.

Political Allegiance

The second hypothesis, suggesting that small firm workers are more likely to support the Conservative Party, rests partly on the reasoning and research already discussed and on that discussed below in relation to the third hypothesis, as well as on research on voting behaviour.[16] However, the support here is not complete since at least two recent studies have reported voting patterns among small firm workers which diverge from the previously accepted view. Ingham, found an inconsistent relationship between workers in plants of different size and support for the Conservative Party.[17] While in one of his two large plants support for the Conservatives was much lower than among small firm workers, in the other large plant the level was very similar. He also argues, further, that the meanings associated with support for the Conservatives among small firm workers differed from those associated with support for the Conservatives among large firm workers.[18]

Batstone also found that his data was inconsistent with the accepted view of the small firm workers' political behaviour.[19] His sample of small firm workers were more likely to vote Conservative (and Liberal) than large firm workers but they still voted Labour more frequently than Conservative or Liberal. Like Ingham, Batstone also reports that there were ideological differences between small and large firm workers which did not show a simple one-to-one relationship with reported voting behaviour.

There is also some evidence linking support for the Conservative Party with not belonging to a trade union and since small firms are usually non-unionised, this provides a further suggested connection between working in a small firm and supporting the Conservatives. Of
course, this simple association of small firm employment or trade union membership with political beliefs begs the question of the effect on political orientations of non-work influences such as kin and friends and especially the mass media. In the analysis to be presented some of these further complexities are taken into consideration.

**Deference and Class Consciousness**

The reasoning behind the third hypothesis above also derives partly from Lockwood's ideas as well as those of a number of other writers including the early Marx. In Lockwood's formulation, the deferential workers' consensus view involves a prestige or hierarchical model of society whose top strata are authentic or natural leaders. He believes that these leaders exercise leadership in the national rather than a sectional interest. He regards others who strive for national leadership as spurious and their followers as misguided. Similarly, Parkin argues:

"In small workshops and factories where men are involved in face-to-face relations with managers or owners, there is a tendency for paternalistic, master-servant type relationships to develop which obstruct the growth of the collectivist and anti-capitalist ideologies that spawn so freely on the shopfloor of large industrial enterprises." 

Since the guiding hypotheses for the present research were set up, the concept of the deferential worker has come under considerable critical scrutiny with several further empirical attempts to locate deferential workers. However, the complications introduced by more recent work may be dealt with more conveniently in the presentation of the relevant data. (A similar problem exists in relation to the notion of 'class consciousness', also mentioned in the hypothesis, and this will be dealt with in the same way.)

A final point worth making here concerns the special problems surrounding the analysis of political and social class imagery which have arisen in recent years. These phenomena are inherently very difficult to investigate but, in addition, there is clear recent evidence that many of the assumed stabilities in political orientations and class views of the 1960's no longer hold. For instance, both major political parties have received a declining proportion of the total vote at recent General Elections. In the five years 1970-74, there were three General Elections and government changed hands twice. Liberal Party support fluctuated sharply over the three Elections and, for the first time since the Second World War, Parliament contained a number of minority parties. Interviewing for the present research covered the
period of the two Elections in 1974 and most of the following year. The immediate issues of these Elections may, therefore, be expected to have influenced respondents' views and behaviour.

Probably the issue in these Elections was Britain's economy. For the first time in the working lives of many respondents real living standards declined and this was combined with the effects of a high rate of inflation. From previous studies, it is clear that a strong, if complex, association exists between perceptions of economic well-being, class orientations and images of society. The sharp reversal in economic expectations since 1970 may a priori be expected to have had a variable impact on respondents' images of society making comparisons with previous data especially difficult. Nor is it possible to estimate the rate of impact on respondents of these changes over the 18 months of interviewing. What seems certain, however, is that this decade is developing a social, economic and political climate very different to that of the 1960's and previous studies must be increasingly questioned as a guide to workers' political and social imagery.

**Community**

Before the first hypothesis is examined the notion of 'community' itself must be discussed as well as the character of the wider social environment of the present sample of respondents. The notion of community is controversial in sociology and an aspect of the neglect of workers' non-work lives has been an avoidance of this controversy. One result of this has been a considerable understatement of the variability of non-work social environments and hence a failure to give full consideration to this variability in interpreting the social situation of the manual worker. This has led to a serious mistake in emphasis in assessing the various influences on the formation of workers' occupational identities and images of society.

The word community has become a value laden one often implicitly assuming a good deal about the social relations of those to whom it is applied. For sociologists, as Hillery's well known article showed, community is also even more vague than is usual with sociological terms. Most usages seem to stress three elements: a geographical area; a local network of social institutions; and, a sense of belonging felt by those who form the community. But the problems of refining these elements into a clear, agreed construct usable in research appear insurmountable. There is no agreement on the extent of the geographical area involved, on the social institutions which might constitute a local as opposed to a wider, societal social order and no solution to the problem of coping
with variations in the extent and strength of actors' perceptions of 'their' community.

One theme in the discussion of urban-industrial social environments - the kind in which the present sample live - is the 'disappearance' of the community. Usually the community in the writer's mind is apparently a traditional, semi-agrarian social order in which an immobile population lived its entire existence in a complex social network permeating every sphere of social life. Contemporary industrial societies are, it is argued, becoming devoid of localised social relations as people become increasingly geographically and socially mobile, commute to jobs in firms orientated to a national economy, realise that political decision-making is centralised, withdraw from organised religion and, through television, come to see themselves as part of a national social order. Many of these ideas are summed up in the stereotype of anomic suburban life.

Yet, as Bell and Newby argue, abundant evidence exists to show that the view that local social orders have withered away is simply inaccurate. Almost any locality, however arbitrarily defined, has its schools, local political parties, associations and clubs, housing estates, shopping areas and religious groups. People share to a greater or lesser degree in the facilities provided by these institutions and although many institutions will be part of the national social order, they have their local variations. To dismiss this local social life or to evade a discussion of its impact on peoples' lives and worldviews is, therefore, no solution to the conceptual problems associated with the notion of community.

In the present research it is proposed to adopt Stacey's argument and strategy. She argues that the term community should be abandoned because of its in-built value judgements, its frequent non-sociological basis and the sheer confusion surrounding its conceptualisation. Instead, she suggests we define our interest as social relations in a particular locality. This avoids the value judgements associated with the term community, makes unnecessary any precise initial definition of geographical boundaries or assumptions about participation in social relations beyond the nuclear family.

The interest in respondents' involvement in social relations in the locality in the present study primarily concerned their involvement in local voluntary associations and the kind of people they mixed with in their leisure time taken as indicators in relation to the first
hypothesis. (The term community will subsequently only be used where
the wording of the original hypothesis is being cited and should be
treated as synonymous with locality in the sense discussed above.)

The Social Environment of the Sample

The present respondents came mainly from Surrey, north of
a line from Camberley to Oxted, with a minority from the Outer London
Boroughs of Kingston and Richmond-upon-Thames. That the sample comes
from such a comparatively large area is partly due to the ten firms
themselves being spread over a wide area but also to the point that
workers in any particular firm might live as much as 50 miles from
each other.

The area is highly urbanised and contains heavily populated
outer suburbs of London plus a number of towns ranging in size from
Woking (population 73,000) to the more typical Chertsey (population
45,000). At the same time, there is a good deal of common land, woods,
and beauty spots such as Box Hill. By modern standards, much
of the mainly 1930's housing has generous gardens masking to some extent the high level of urbanisation. Roads are good and travel in
the area is comparatively easy with motorways (M3 and M25) running
north-east to north-west through the northern part of the county and
south through the south-east corner of the county, respectively. Public transport is also generally superior to that found in most parts
of Britain, mainly because of the need to maintain commuter links with
inner London and the density of the population over the area as a whole.

Economically, the area is part of Britain's most successful economic region, the South East. As one writer has summed it up:

"The South East ... is topmost in earnings, in per capita and
per household income, in gross domestic product per head ... each worker ... produces on average about 10 per cent more of
gross domestic product than the average British worker." Unemployment is low, and has been since the end of the Second World
War. In the 1970's the region has become economically less dynamic
but this is much more evident in the region's centre, Greater London,
than in the outer areas where the present sample mainly live and work.
Moreover, this change had not, at the time of the interviews, become
obvious to the ordinary manual worker (although he was, of course, aware of the down turn in the national economy). This long period of economic success has bred expectations and a self confidence quite unlike those in areas with a history of economic decline, above average un-
employment and where people are aware of their relative standing.
compared to more prosperous regions.

The county itself is an economically expanding one.\(^{[58]}\) The largest single employment sector in 1971 was services (including insurance, banking and other administration) employing 62.4% of the workforce compared to 55% nationally. It is also a growing sector, expanding 6.9% in the 1966-71 period. The primary sector, on the other hand, is small providing only 2.2% of all jobs - mostly in agriculture - and declining.

Manufacturing, the area of the industries in the present study, provides 27.2% of all jobs and expanded in 1966-71 by 4.1%, rather less than the overall expansion of employment in the county (4.6%). The main expanding sectors are white collar work and warehousing. There are several reasons for this. Planning permission for office development has appeared easier to obtain than for factory development as well as more profitable for developers. The decline of the London Docks, the growth of Heathrow and Gatwick airports and motorway development, helps to account for the expansion in warehousing.

Most non-primary industry is concentrated in the northern part of the county where the largest single employer is the British Aircraft Corporation at Weybridge. This firm, together with Hawker-Siddeley Aviation another aircraft manufacturer at Kingston-upon-Thames, exerts considerable influence in the local economy. It has been estimated that at least 40 other firms in the area exist to supply goods and services to these two firms including, of course, some electronics firms.

Paper and printing employed 6,300 in 1971 or just under 1% of the county's labour force, a decline of 11% since 1966. Unfortunately, there are problems in assessing the level of employment in the sectors of the electronics industry containing the firms in the present study because of the difficulties in defining the various sectors within the industry as well as the exact boundaries of the industry itself. However, the electronics industry, as a whole, is expanding. In 1971 there were 9,500 electrical and electronics workers or 2.5% of the county's labour force and between 1966 and 1971 the total expanded 3%. In other words, the national contrast in the relative prosperity of the two industries noted in Chapter 2, is repeated in the area from which the sample is drawn.

Socially, Surrey can be described as a 'dual society' but it is a duality unlike that of the Banbury of Stacey's 1960 study, and one
probably found nowhere else in Britain. The basis of this dual society is social class. Surrey contains the highest representation of the middle class of almost any county in England and Wales. The 1971 Census indicated that 39.1% of the employed male population were in the top two of the Registrar General’s five classes and a further 14.8% were in the non-manual section of class three. This compares with the 19.9% of the male population in the Registrar General’s top two classes in England and Wales as a whole and 12.6% in the non-manual section of class three. Thus, allowing for the inevitable crudeness of this classification, just over half the employed population in Surrey were in broadly middle and lower middle class occupations compared to under 35% of the population as a whole.

Two further points may be stressed in support of this ‘dual society’ view of the area. First, the much higher than average representation of the middle class results in a highly visible middle class lifestyle. As noted in Chapter 4, one effect of this is that small firm owner-managers and executives firmly separate their non-work lives from their work lives as far as contact with manual workers is concerned. The middle class have a highly self-contained lifestyle catered for by a host of specialised suppliers from restaurants to shops to garages.

In many parts of Britain towns and cities are dominated by the working class — particularly in terms of non-work life — with the middle class living in a thinly spread fringe surrounding the centres of employment. In Surrey, middle and working class centres of population alternate with each other. Often council housing estates closely adjoin expensive private housing developments but more important is the sheer visibility of the middle class and its way of life.

A further distinctive aspect of Surrey is that both sectors of the dual society commute to work. Commuting is normally closely linked to white collar employment and this is as true in Surrey as elsewhere in the South East where over one-third of the working-population travel more than 30 minutes each way to work. Less frequently commented upon, however, is manual worker commuting. Manual workers often work in one district but live in another. In the present study, for example, 29.5% of respondents travelled over 30 minutes to work every morning. One reason for this is the ease of travel in the area noted earlier, another is the higher than average level of car ownership and a further reason is the problems of accommodation created by the dual society itself. Firms in Richmond-upon-Thames, for example, where two of the
small firms in the present study were located, expected to recruit most of their workers from elsewhere simply because housing, at a price manual workers can afford, is so scarce in Richmond itself.

The phrase 'dual society' should clearly not be taken to indicate the total separation of the two classes. As the points in the previous paragraphs suggest, there is contact between the two classes. Competition for accommodation, for example, is associated with 'the commuter village' where white collar workers have purchased housing to provide a 'rural' way of life impossible in London or its suburbs. Often this has meant a steep rise in property prices so that local manual workers can no longer afford to buy or rent. In areas of formerly cheap housing, young middle class workers have entered the market, purchasing and converting artisan dwellings and raising prices beyond the means of many manual workers. Overall, the region has the highest level of house prices in the country.

Another point of contact is a casual yet important aspect of non-work life. Leisure activities outside the home for manual workers involve a wider choice than in areas dominated by the working class. Public houses, for example, often have a clientele drawn predominantly from one class or the other, each with its own distinct atmosphere. A similar range is offered by restaurants and other places of entertainment. This is not to assert that manual workers and their families have or are adopting a middle class leisure style but rather that the established middle class lifestyle makes the range of leisure choices and possible class contacts greater than in many parts of Britain.

Outlining some of the more distinctive aspects of the social environment of the sample underlines the differences between this social environment and the environments of manual workers in other studies. Later it will be argued that such differences have important implications for both the worker's occupational identity and image of society. Equally important, however, is that the distinctive social environment of the sample shows the inadequacy of traditional notions of community. Where work and home may be so separated geographically for those who live near each other or those who work alongside each other; where much of the local economic order is controlled from outside the area or by people who are unknown to most workers; where the local political order is remote and unlikely to coincide with the area in which a person lives and works, and where leisure and kin relations may encompass yet another geographical area, conventional definitions
of community fail completely. The approach proposed by Stacey again seems much more sensible.

### Geographical Mobility

The main and control samples showed similar levels of geographical immobility. Respondents were asked: "Have you always lived in this district?" and among small firm workers, 34.5% said that they had compared to 39.8% of the control sample. The word 'district' was deliberately not defined for respondents to elicit indications of how they perceived a district. If respondents replied that they had not always lived in the same district, they were asked where they were born and the main places they had lived at since. From replies it was clear that most respondents saw 'the same district' as covering a very small geographical area. Thus, if those respondents saying they had always lived in the same district are added to those who were found to have been born within 20 miles of their home at the time of interview, then 62.6% of the main sample may be classified as immobile. Among the control sample this proportion was 67%.

However, there were inter-industrial differences since electronic industry respondents, in both small and large firms, had been more mobile. Among main and control sample printing workers, 77.8% were living in the same district or had been born within 20 miles of their present home. The comparable percentage for electronics industry workers was only 50%. The difference was, therefore, much greater than that between small and large firm respondents.

Living in the same district or within a few miles of the place of birth, does not rule out the possibility that the individual may have moved about a good deal in the intervening period. All respondents who had not always lived in the same district were asked to name the other places they had lived in besides their place of birth. One in four small firm workers (25.2%) had lived in at least three other places excluding where they were living at the time of interview. Among large firm workers this rose to nearly one in three (31.8%). Again there was a difference between industries and again it was electronic industry workers who were the most mobile. Whereas 32.7% of electronic industry respondents had lived in at least three other places excluding their home at the time of interview, only 23.1% of the printing workers had done so.

Some of these mobility differences are, of course, related to the age distributions of the samples. Large firm workers are, on
average, older and therefore have had more opportunity to be mobile. Comparing older workers not only helps control for this age difference, but reduces the effect of parental influences on geographical mobility. A younger respondent may appear highly mobile but this may have been due to parental decisions rather than his own. Among those 25 years old and over, however, only large electronics firm workers showed a markedly higher rate of geographical mobility than other respondents. This was mainly associated with two groups within this sub-sample. Contract workers, through their decisions to 'go contract' imply a greater willingness to be mobile and, in fact, had previously been more geographically mobile than other respondents. The other group who displayed greater geographical mobility were those making equipment housings (who formed a higher proportion of the sample at the National Radar Company than their equivalents in small electronics firms.) In both cases it might be argued that these differences were related to job opportunities and employer selection practices. Small firm employers avoided employing contract workers to a greater extent than large firm employers and the need for people making equipment housings is less in small firms where it is usually more economical to buy these from specialist outside suppliers.

Geographical mobility is possibly also related to integration into local social relations since high rates of mobility might be expected to be inversely related to participation in local social institutions. It is clear that differences between the main and control samples on geographical mobility are less than the differences between the samples in the two industries but the slightly higher rate of mobility among large firm respondents should favour the hypothesis on community integration.

Membership of Clubs and Associations

A main test of the first hypothesis on community integration was provided by data on membership of local clubs and associations. In addition to membership itself, some attempt was made to gauge the social class character of such clubs or associations. As the data in Chapter 4 showed, there was little interaction between owner-managers and their workers outside working hours and certainly none resembling that reported by Batstone in the study noted earlier. Nevertheless, given the high representation of the middle class in the locality, it would still be possible for workers to have contacts with high status others through non-work activities.
Table 5.1 provides data on reported membership of clubs or associations and on the kinds of clubs or associations to which respondents belonged. An important first finding is that over 40% of small firm workers belong to no club or association of any kind, while among the control sample this proportion is only 23%. This difference appeared unrelated to marriage among the main sample but in the control sample married respondents seemed slightly less likely to belong to such bodies. A clearer relationship was, however, revealed between age and participation in clubs and associations.

As might be expected, older respondents reported fewer memberships. In the main sample 39.6% of those under 25 years of age stated they belonged to no club or association; for those aged 25 and over, this percentage rose slightly to 41.9%. Among the control sample the corresponding percentages were 11.8% and 25.3%. If those who were aged 45 and over are compared the relationship between age and participation emerges more clearly. Thus, among small firm workers, 64.7% of those aged 45 and over belonged to no clubs or associations but among the large firm sample the proportion was only 30.8%. In other words, if the age distributions of the main and control samples were similar (instead of the main sample respondents being, on average, 9.2 years younger) then the differences in club or association memberships would probably have been even greater than those shown in Table 5.1. This result, therefore, goes strongly against the hypothesis on community integration.

The average number of memberships of clubs or associations per respondent among those who were members indicates that not only are large firm workers more likely to be 'joiners' but they join more clubs and associations. Among small firm workers who were voluntary club or association members each had, on average, 1.44 memberships but among large firm respondents this rose to 1.73 memberships. Again, this finding undermines the hypothesis.

A simple claim to a club or association membership without any measure of attachment, may be highly misleading. As Table 5.1 shows, several respondents reported membership of parent-teacher associations but questions on frequency of attendance and involvement showed clearly that these associations usually met infrequently, that respondents did not always attend and often did not feel they fully understood the association's purpose.

One obvious measure of attachment is to ask association or club
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Teacher Association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Men's Club</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Legion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents'/Tenants' Association</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Church Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Club</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Club</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of memberships per respondents:

- Small Printing: 0.94
- Small Electronics: 0.72
- Large Printing: 1.43
- Large Electronics: 1.23
- All Small: 0.84
- All Large: 1.33

Notes: (1) One respondent was not asked this question. (2) Partners in Silver, Brown and Stone excluded.
members how frequently they attend. This may vary from twice a week to, for example, a working men's club, to once or twice a year for a parent-teacher association. An overall measure for each of the four main sub-samples was estimated by constructing a weighted index for all respondents for whom information was available. The method of construction of the index and the results are presented in Table 5.2. The higher the value given to a sub-sample the higher the frequency of attendance and the results indicate, therefore, that small firm respondents attended more frequently than large firm respondents. The differences between the main and control samples are clear-cut and suggest that small firm workers, if they join a voluntary body, are more involved, as measured by frequency of attendance, although this has to be set against the finding that a much lower proportion report such memberships than among the large firm workers.

A further measure of involvement in voluntary associations and clubs is the extent to which members take on official positions. As Table 5.3 shows, 16.3% of respondents report holding an official position but that small firm workers are less likely to hold such a position, despite their more frequent attendance. Indeed, the small electronics firm workers, with the highest score in the frequency of attendance index in Table 5.2, had the lowest proportion of all sub-samples holding an official position. Conversely, the large firm workers, who attended their clubs or associations less often, nevertheless managed to hold an official position of some kind more frequently. To some extent, therefore, the data in Table 5.3 undermines that given in Table 5.2 and it may be suggested that, the balance of evidence from the three measures so far goes against the hypothesis that small firm workers are more involved in local voluntary bodies.

Voluntary Associations and Social Class

It is interesting to try to assess the class character of the voluntary associations to which respondents belonged. If small firm workers are more integrated into local social relations then we might also assume they would belong to clubs and associations in which a larger proportion of members are from higher social strata. It is, unfortunately, not easy to assess the class character of voluntary bodies without a lengthy questioning of respondents who may have thought very little about this aspect of the clubs or associations to which they belong.

The obvious associations with a class-based character are working
### Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club or Association</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of construction. Frequency of attendance was weighted as follows: attendance at least once a week was given 5 points; attendance once in two weeks was given 4 points; attendance once in three weeks was given 3 points; attendance once a month was given 2 points and attendance less frequently than once a month was given 1 point. The total points gained by all respondents in a sub-sample claiming membership for club or association I was divided by the number of such respondents to give the above index figure. This was repeated for club or association II and the resulting index figure was added to those for club or association I to arrive at the total. Further club or association memberships were not included because the number of respondents in each sub-sample claiming membership in a third or fourth club or association was too small. Where the activity of the club or association was seasonal, frequency of attendance in the season was used for the purposes of calculation. The partners in Silver, Brown and Stone were excluded.
## Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents Claiming Membership of a Club or Association for which Information is Available</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Reporting that they Held an Official Position</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all respondents in the sub-sample:</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes (1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone and one respondent who, although he claimed membership of a voluntary club or association, did not say whether he held an official position. For the same reason one respondent has been excluded from the sub-sample of large firm electronics workers.
men's clubs and the British Legion both generally accepted as being predominantly working class. Table 5.1 shows that small firm workers are less likely to belong to either of these associations than large firm workers. Whereas over one in five (22.9%) of large firm workers belong to one of these, among small firm workers 15.1% do so. Unfortunately, political parties, probably one of the best indicators in this context, had few members in the present sample but, of the five small firm workers who reported membership of a political party, only one was in the Conservative Party matching the single member found in the control sample.

The class character of sports clubs was also generally difficult to estimate. For example, there is no obvious class bias in such sports as karate and football which, a few years ago, would have been firmly classified as working class, can now no longer be so easily categorised especially in an area with such a big middle class population. Necessarily, therefore, an estimate of the extent to which participation in sports clubs involves contact with those of higher social status must be tentative. However, there appeared to be few differences between the four sub-samples.

The class character of social clubs to which respondents belonged was almost as difficult to determine as that of sports clubs. Social clubs were very diverse ranging from a nurses social club to the social clubs of firms (although the Surrey Printing Company was the only firm in the study with an active social club.) Perhaps most important is that it is the large firm workers who were most likely to be social club members with one in three claiming membership, just over twice the level among small firm workers.

If we assume that the membership of these social clubs is made up predominantly of people from similar social backgrounds to those of respondents then clearly small firm workers have substantially less contact with the working class in out-of-work social life. If, on the other hand, we assume, although there is no evidence for this, that participation in social clubs is a major source of contact with status superiors for small firm workers, then clearly only a small proportion, 15%, are using this channel to interact socially with the middle class.

Most of the other categories in Table 5.1 are comparatively small and provide little data in relation to the aspect of the hypothesis concerned with relations with other social classes. In other instances, attendance was so infrequent that the club or association could not
be seen as an important source of interaction. Thus, membership of residents' or tenants' associations account for a little over one in ten memberships in both the main and control samples yet attendance was usually very infrequent often being confined to the association's annual meeting. The same point was also made earlier about parent-teacher association membership. Indeed, one small printing firm respondent illustrates both points:

"There's the PTA I suppose that's a couple of times a year and the Tenants' Association. I say I'm a member because the estates got a Tenants' Association and I live on the estate. You pay your 10p or whatever it is a year and you're automatically a member of the Association, but I don't take an active part in it."

Evening classes were attended mainly for vocational rather than social reasons and concerned very few respondents. Finally, the 'Other' category in the Table contains a mixture of items. Some, such as one respondent's membership of a postal cactus club, were irrelevant to participation in the local social order, while others, such as the few memberships of the St. Johns Ambulance Brigade and the Scouts, were difficult to categorize in relation to the hypothesis.

These findings may be compared with those from other studies of manual workers on participation in voluntary clubs or associations. Goldthorpe et al\(^\text{46}\) reported that 52% of their manual worker sample belonged to no clubs or associations, that the average number of memberships per man was 0.9 and that 9% held an official position. Ineichen, in a more recent (1969) study of manual workers in and around Bristol, found that 46% of husbands and wives belonged to no voluntary association and 6% of the sample held an office of some kind.\(^\text{47}\) Finally, Stacey et al in their second Banbury study, also found that 46% of manual workers did not belong to a voluntary body of any kind (but excluding political parties or religious associations) and that they were under-represented on voluntary association committees\(^\text{48}\) as compared to members of other social classes.

A comparison with the above data suggests that control sample respondents in the present study had a higher propensity to join voluntary bodies and to hold official positions although, naturally, differences in the availability of associations in a particular locality and other factors make strict comparisons difficult. It might also be suggested that the higher proportion of the middle class in the area in which the present sample live produces a greater number and range of associations than where the middle class is less well represented and that this may account, to some extent, for the higher
percentage in the sample being involved in voluntary associations. Small firm workers, on the other hand, appear to show only a slightly higher propensity to join such bodies, with about the same number of memberships per respondents as in the Goldthorpe et al sample and a similar likelihood of holding an official position. Overall, it seems that, despite the probable greater availability of voluntary associations in the locality, small firm workers are less likely to participate in the wider society than large firm workers.

Although it is difficult to be precise about differences between the main and control samples on the social character of the associations to which respondents belong, it could be argued that, the data suggests that small firm workers seem less likely to belong to clearly working class associations, such as working men's clubs and to be no more likely to belong to predominantly middle class associations. In other words, if it is also remembered that they are less likely to belong to any kind of association, they appear more socially isolated than large firm workers from associations in the wider society which would integrate them into its main class-based social groupings. This interpretation, therefore, provides little support for the hypothesis.

Relations with Non-Kin and Kin

As a further test of respondents' integration into local social relations, data was collected on relations with people outside the immediate family and kin network. Married respondents were asked whether they considered that they and their wives knew another couple who they regarded as especially close friends. Just over 67% of large firm married respondents reported close friends of this kind compared to 62% among small firm married respondents. Respondents were also asked what the husband of the couple did for a living to establish whether such friendships were an important source of social interaction with the middle class for small firm workers. The data provided little support.

Among small firm married respondents, 63% of the husbands in couples regarded as close friends, were manual or supervisory workers compared to 44.2% among the control sample. In other words, it is the large firm respondents who have non-manual friends. Moreover, the non-manual friends of large firm married respondents were also more likely to have middle level white collar jobs, such as teacher or office manager, rather than lower level white collar jobs such as clerk or shop assistant. Few respondents in either the main or control samples had friends with solidly middle class, higher level white collar jobs.
Since the average age of married respondents was higher among the control sample it is likely that their friends' average age was also higher and that, therefore, they had more opportunities to be upwardly mobile. But, even allowing for this difference, small firm married respondents' friends were still more likely to be manual workers.

In Chapter 4 the existence of an occupational community among the printing workers was questioned. The extent to which work-social relations were continued out of work was taken as one indicator of an occupational community and printing workers were found not much more likely than electronics workers to do this. The present data offers another opportunity to explore this topic by noting the proportions of married printing workers who reported that the husband of the couple they regarded as especially close friends also worked in printing. Of the 45 married printing workers seven, or 15.5%, had close friends where the husband worked in printing.

In comparison, although it is more difficult to say whether a particular job is in the electronics industry because of problems of precisely defining the industry, three out of 24 (12.5%) married respondents who had close friends and whose jobs were industry-specific, reported that the husband did a job similar to their own. (By 'industry-specific' here is meant jobs solely to do with electronics and, therefore, other respondents involved in fabricating housings for equipment, whose skills could be used in a range of industries, were excluded.)

A higher proportion of small printing firm married respondents had close friends where the husband worked in printing than in the control sample. The numbers here are, of course, small so whether this difference should be seen as genuine is questionable. But it might be suggested that, if the difference is genuine, it may be related to the more limited circle of potential non-work friends among married small firm respondents. Since they participate less in local social activities, work is a more important source of such friends than for large firm married respondents. This interpretation is supported when it is noted that only one of the five respondents where the husband of the couple regarded as close friends worked in printing, belonged to a local club or association in more than a nominal sense.

It is concluded, therefore, that the present data is consistent with the interpretation in Chapter 4 and further strengthens the view that printing workers do not show the participation in an occupational
community suggested by previous research. At best, the extent to which work-social relations are continued in non-work life is only slightly higher than that among electronics industry workers.

Another possible source of interaction with the middle class for married respondents was through the wives' family of origin. Respondents were asked their father-in-law's occupation and a clear difference emerged: 61.8% of the father-in-laws of married small firm respondents were manual workers or supervisors compared to only 43.7% among the control sample. This potential source of middle class interaction is, therefore, much more restricted for the small firm married workers.

All respondents were asked to complete a leisure questionnaire covering the period Friday evening to Sunday evening immediately following the main interview. Among the activities listed on the questionnaire (reproduced in the Appendix) were several possibly indicative of a middle class lifestyle such as visiting or being visited by friends, eating out at a restaurant or going to the theatre or a concert. The extent of such activities was monitored for the Friday and Saturday evening periods for all respondents who returned the questionnaire.

Overall, no marked indulgence in these activities was apparent and few differences between the samples emerged. Among small firm respondents, 15.3% reported visiting or being visited by friends compared to 14.5% of the large firm respondents. Only 3.6% of small firm respondents reported going to a theatre or concert or eating out as compared to 8.3% of large firm respondents. Although the response rate for the leisure questionnaire was 75.8% of all respondents interviewed and there may have been differences among respondents in interpreting phrases such as 'went out to a restaurant', there is little indication from this data that small firm respondents engaged in more middle class leisure activities compared to control sample respondents. In particular, the very low participation in eating outside the home, attending theatres or concerts among small firm workers indicates a lack of identification with the middle class as well as fewer opportunities for inter-class interaction.

Local Newspaper Readership and Interests in Local Activities

Finally, in the assessment of interests outside the family and kinship network, respondents were asked if they took a local newspaper and, if they did, what was their main reason for doing so. Unfortunately, the data on these questions was less helpful than it might have been. First of all, unmarried respondents often saw a local newspaper purchased
by parents so that obtaining the paper was no test of their interest in local social activities. More seriously, respondents at the Surrey Printing Company received copies of any of the local newspapers printed by the company free of charge. The level of reading among this subsample could not, therefore, be used for comparison with levels reported by other subsamples.

A way of dealing with the problem of parents purchasing a paper was to consider the data from married respondents only and here the two small firm subsamples produced very different levels of readership. While 41.9% of married small printing firm respondents claimed to take a local newspaper, 60.6% of the married small electronics firm respondents claimed to do so. At the National Radar Company 45.2% of married respondents took a local newspaper. (Among the Surrey Printing Company respondents, the effect of easy access to newspapers helped to produce the non-comparable but high proportion of 87.9% of married respondents who said they read a local newspaper.)

Respondents gave a wide variety of reasons for taking a local newspaper, many having little or nothing to do with an interest in local social relations. It will be remembered from Chapter 4 that a high proportion of respondents - especially small firm workers - were more or less seriously looking for another job and so it was not surprising that many mentioned local newspapers in connection with alternative employment. Others mentioned information about cinema programmes or second-hand household goods as main reasons for taking a local newspaper. This kind of reason, it may be argued, indicates no strong interest in local social relations as such, since a respondent might buy a paper for these reasons wherever he lived.

However, a high proportion of married respondents who took a local newspaper did mention an interest in local affairs as a reason for doing so. The small firm married respondents who took a paper produced similar proportions offering this kind of reason; 63.1% among the small printing firm respondents and 60% among the small electronics firms sample. Among the large electronics firm married respondents who took a local newspaper, 50% mentioned this reason. Again respondents at the Surrey Printing Company produced a result which is difficult to interpret or compare. No less than 72.4% of married respondents who took a local newspaper, said they did so because of an interest in local activities. But since they mostly received their papers free of charge this high percentage may be the result of reading
the paper itself rather than a reason for taking it. Easy access to a local newspaper, in other words, may promote an interest in local affairs.

Disregarding the finding for this sub-sample and using the remaining large electronics firm sub-sample as the main comparison, produces one of the few instances where the data in this section provided support for the contention that small firm respondents are more involved in local social relations than large firm workers. It is not, however; overwhelming support since the sizes of the sub-samples involved - those married respondents who take a local newspaper - are not large. (Thus, among the main sample 39 married respondents took a local paper and 24 offered an interest in local social affairs as a reason for doing so and among the fully comparable large firm sub-sample from the National Radar Company, only 14 married respondents took a paper and only 7 offered the same reason).

Privatisation and Non-Work Social Life

Comparing data from the present study with that of other studies is not easy because previous studies have rarely explored non-work social life in any depth for broadly similar samples and localities. However, one issue which the present data has a bearing on concerns 'privatisation' among manual workers. In the original formulation of this notion, workers with a privatised lifestyle avoided participation or interest in local social activities outside the nuclear family and kinship network and the local social environment encouraged the development of a 'pecuniary' model of society. The area in which the present sample live would also seem favourable to this development in its affluence and highly visible middle class lifestyle. Further, as shown in Chapter 4, out of work contacts with fellow workers were no higher than those reported by Goldthorpe et al, when allowance is made for the differences between samples, work environments and the geographical 'spread' of residence. Yet it is the small firm workers in the present study who show a closer approximation to a privatised lifestyle which is surprising given the previous literature on small firm workers discussed earlier and especially the notion that small firm workers are likely to be working class deferentials seeking contacts in non-work life with status superiors and adopting a middle class lifestyle.

Earlier in the chapter it was shown that, while small firm workers belong to voluntary clubs or associations to a greater extent than the Goldthorpe et al Luton sample, their participation was markedly below that of the control sample. Small firm workers, in other words, show
a greater approximation to a privatised lifestyle on this measure. Where small firm workers did join clubs and associations although they were more frequent attenders they were socially less successful, as measured by holding an official position. But, further, the social character of the clubs or associations to which they belonged appeared to be less working class but no more middle class than that among large firm workers.

A further comparison can be made with Goldthorpe et al's data on close friends of married respondents. The Luton respondents were asked about the occupations of couples they entertained in their homes. Unfortunately, because of differences in the form of the question and the reporting of results, an exact comparison is not possible. Goldthorpe et al, for example, omit to report what proportion of their sample entertained non-kin at home or the extent to which they visited friends at the latter's home. But of all couples entertained, kin and non-kin, 68% were of manual status while a further 9% were of 'intermediate' status (the latter included supervisors, shop assistants or self-employed on a small scale, such as window cleaner.)

In the present study, 63% of husbands in couples regarded by small firm married respondents as close friends were classified as manual or supervisory workers. In comparison with Goldthorpe et al's figures this understates slightly because it includes a small number who would be put in the lower middle class in the present study. A further understatement might be expected to result from Goldthorpe et al's inclusion of couples who were respondents' kin. Statistically, we might expect that kin are more likely to be of the same social class as respondents than non-kin couples and, therefore, if non-kin only were included in the Luton percentage, it would have been lower.

The percentage of manual or supervisory workers among close friends of married respondents in the control sample was, at 44.2%, very much lower. Even allowing for understatements resulting from the differences in classifying occupations in social classes, noted in the above paragraph, as well as from excluding non-kin couples in the present study, the control sample married respondents appear more likely to have non-manual close friends than the Luton sample. However, whatever the problems of comparison here it could be argued with some confidence that the small firm married respondents most approach the patterns of sociality associated with privatisation. This conclusion again implies little support for the first hypothesis.
The privatised worker is held to be family and kin-centred as opposed to sociable with non-kin. As we saw above, small firm married workers were less sociable with non-kin but what is perhaps equally surprising is that they also apparently had fewer contacts with kin. Among the items on the weekend leisure questionnaire were visiting or being visited by relatives. Among small firm married workers 24 (39.4%) of the 61 respondents for whom information is available, reported at least one such weekend visit but among large firm respondents 25 out of 50 or 50% of respondents reported such contact. In short, the data suggests that not only are the small firm married respondents more privatised as measured by relations with non-kin, but they are also more privatised in relations with kin. Overall, therefore, the data strongly suggests that small firm workers are much more socially isolated than the large firm workers and again this clearly goes against the first hypothesis.

POLITICS

The second hypothesis, that small firm workers are more likely to support the Conservative Party and to hold a Conservative ideology, is linked with the extensive debate on the working class Conservative Party supporter. In turn, this debate is connected with the controversy surrounding the notion of 'deference'. Since the third section of this chapter will deal with social class imagery, the main discussion of deference among small firm workers will be postponed but, inevitably, the analysis of political attitudes and behaviour touches upon this issue. The association of political attitudes and voting behaviour with size of firm is well illustrated by Ingham who, after noting that variations in local community social structure may be important, stressed factors in the small firm environment which encourage support for right-wing political parties. He sees the small firm as isolating the worker from other members of the working class and exposing him to contacts with employers who, Ingham assumes, are normally Conservative Party supporters. Ingham then suggests further ways in which the small firm social structure:

"... may play a part in determining in a more direct way the worker's consciousness and perception of society and its power relationship." (54)

After offering the familiar view of the large firm in which the conflicting economic interests of workers and management are starkly visible promoting an awareness of shared interests among fellow workers,
he argues:

"In the small firm the situation is quite different; here the worker's identification with the enterprise is facilitated by the fact that his actions and decisions can be seen (if the firm is small enough) to influence the functions and the operation of the firm. Thus, to some extent at least, the firm's problems - that is, the boss's problems - are seen by the worker as his own problems. The power of big business and its conflicts with labour are less visible in such a situation due to the fact that they are not directly experienced by the worker."

In analysing his data Ingham even claims that the small firm work situation fosters a special variety of Conservatism. Among his large firm manual worker Conservative supporters, allegiance was, he argued, instrumental; they supported the Conservatives because they believed they benefitted materially when the Conservatives were in power. Conservative Party supporters in his small firm sample, on the other hand, were held to be ideological Conservatives, agreeing strongly with Conservative policies and disliking Labour Party policies. Ingham is, to be fair, hesitant in treating this as clearly established because of the smallness of the sub-samples involved. The large firm Conservative Party supporter sample numbered seven while the small firm equivalent sample numbered fourteen. Nevertheless, overall, he believes:

"... it is possible to conclude that this evidence indicates that size of plant has an independent effect on political attitudes."

Batstone, who also explored the relationship between size of firm and voting behaviour, is more inclined to stress non-work influences on voting and political attitudes. He found that although at the 1966 General Election his small firm workers were more likely to have voted Conservative than his large firm workers, nevertheless 44.7% or almost half had voted Labour. He also found that, when asked which party provided the 'best' government, small firm workers were less likely to mention either of the two main parties or to have a clear opinion. Yet, as noted in Chapter 4, his small firm respondents reported close and valued relations with owner-managers. He therefore argues that, since such close relationships did not produce a more marked shift to the right in political orientations and voting behaviour, a more plausible explanation of the orientations and behaviour of respondents is related to:

"... the general ethos linked to the traditions, myths and history of the groups involved; this is itself maintained by - or (if it is to continue) receives only a limited challenge from - the product and labour markets."
source. Small businessmen are significant political others in Banbury holding important positions in the local political order but this is the result of a wider set of historical and current influences rather than simply a reflection of their owner-manager roles.

It was remarked earlier that a persistent weakness of social action research has been the neglect of other actors who interact closely with the focal group under study. Ingham, for example, neglected the employment practices of owner-managers of small firms in discussing the alleged self-selection of small firm workers. Equally, in assuming that small firm owner-managers are an important source of political orientations for small firm workers, it is also often assumed that small firm owner-managers are Conservative supporters. Batstone, however, found that small firm businessmen are:

"...typically strong adherents of the ethos of small town capitalism." (59)

This ideology stresses local individual achievement in business and that those who hold influential positions in the local social order should have earned them. The small businessman has a duty to assume local leadership roles and to defend the town's interests against interference from 'outsiders'. Batstone's small businessmen were aware that they were losing the battle to sustain a local social reality corresponding to this world-view. The local political order was increasingly dominated by national government; 'outsiders' had invaded the community seeking influence in local affairs; political parties, including the Conservative Party, were becoming increasingly bureaucratic and controlled by Central Office.

Of course, Banbury has, as emphasised earlier, a distinct local social and political order which differs sharply from that in the area in which the present sample live. But many of the elements in the small firm owner-managers' political orientations reported by Batstone may be held by small businessmen generally. In particular, there is evidence of a dislike and distrust of both major political parties in Britain. (60)

Small firm owner-managers generally have an ideology more appropriate to earlier phases of industrialisation. They are suspicious of the Conservative Party which they suspect is primarily interested in big business because of its close links with the CBI (whose most influential members are large companies) and its focus on the national economy. The Labour Party, on the other hand, is seen as collectivist and anti-private enterprise and too close to trade unions and the TUC. Both
parties are seen as linked with the growth of central bureaucracy with its 'ever increasing demands for form filling' and flow of regulations limiting the small businessman's freedom. As one writer has put it:

"Thousands of people are always trying to make a go of a ... small business ... As Marx pointed out, they exhibit within themselves a contradiction of the capitalist system, for they are both capitalists and workers. In respect of ownership of their own capital ... they are capitalist; but part of what they get paid is merely wages for their labour. This curious situation in fact tends to make them feel separated from both capitalists and workers ... They fear big business and its ally, the state apparatus, and socialism equally. Hence they exhibit that political vacillation which is the hallmark of the petit bourgeoisie."

In short, we may doubt whether the small firm owner-manager is a source of ideas leading workers to support the Conservatives. This may be further doubted where, as in the present study (and contrary to the findings of, for example, Batstone) personal contact between small firm owner-managers and shopfloor workers is limited at work and non-existent in non-work life.

The simple dichotomising of possible sources of small firm worker political attitudes between community and work-place is inadequate. At least two other possible sources can be cited and evidence offered in respect of each, to demonstrate a measurable influence on political orientations and behaviour. First, is kin which should, as the privatisation thesis emphasises, be seen as separate from non-kin contacts in out of work social relations. For instance, Goldthorpe et al found that Conservative Party supporters among their manual workers had clear white collar affiliations, including white collar kin. More generally, studies of political socialisation have repeatedly shown the importance of kin and parents on the development of political orientations.

The second source of influence on political orientations which must be taken into account is the mass media and especially television. Conventionally, surveys of the influences of the media on political attitudes tend to conclude that the broad effect is to merely reinforce existing attitudes and to influence relatively few voters to change their allegiances. More recently, however, there has been a reassessment giving the media greater importance in influencing political views. In fact, some researchers see the media as being of great importance in the emergence of instabilities in party preferences in the 1960's and 1970's.

"It should occasion no surprise that the years just after television had completed its conquest of the national audience were the years in which the electoral tides began to run more freely."
A link has also been made between the increase in media influences on political orientations and the decline of the 'community':

"At the same time parochial cultures and socially isolated communities are declining as a source of political identity or influence, and the national media ... predominates as sources of political information and mobilisation. In effect, the proportion of voters subject to intensive face-to-face contact with a network of overlapping primary groups of unvarying political persuasion, which instils and activates a deeply entrenched partisanship, is almost certainly diminishing rapidly." (66)

To the extent that manual workers are privatised we should expect that kin and media sources will have more influence on political orientations. As seen earlier, the most privatised workers in the present study were the main sample small firm workers. In the discussion below of politically significant others, the importance of the mass media as a link between these others and respondents will be shown.

Finally, some reference should be made to Butler and Stokes' contention that working class Conservatism is associated with age. They argue that the emergence of the Labour Party as one of the two major parties only within the last half century or so, means that many working class voters have parents who reached political adulthood before Labour became a major party and, therefore, could not 'inherit' a preference for the Party. However, this has gradually changed through successive age cohorts, producing declining support for the Conservatives among the older working class. The extent to which this change might be observable in the present sample and how it relates to other sources of political meanings, is difficult to assess because of the relatively narrow age range of the main sample. But this again points up the potential importance of influences on political orientations outside the dichotomy of current work and non-work experiences usually seen as the sole sources of the political orientations of small firm workers.

Voting Behaviour

In testing the hypothesis on political preferences, it is easiest to begin with respondents' reported voting behaviour. The relative ease of collection of data on voting behaviour should, however, be accompanied by a recognition of its limitations. For example, no simple one-to-one relationships can be drawn between expressed party preference, actual voting behaviour and political orientations. A respondent may, for instance, prefer the Labour Party yet vote Liberal - a phenomenon thought to have occurred with some frequency at the February 1974 General Election. This 'tactical voting' occurred, for example, where Labour supporters felt their Party had little chance of defeating the
Conservatives but the apparently increasing support for the Liberals meant the latter might win. Equally, a strongly anti-Conservative voter might not vote at all if he believed that a Conservative victory was inevitable.

Data on voting behaviour was collected for four General Elections, those of 1966, 1970, February 1974 and October 1974. The February 1974 and October 1974 Elections occurred while the interviewing programme was underway and the information collected, therefore, does not cover all Elections for all respondents. In particular, there is a lack of data on small printing firm workers for the October 1974 Election because most of the interviews with this sample were completed before the Election.

Table 5.4 represents an overall view of all voting behaviour for shopfloor respondents for the three General Elections for which the most data is available. Despite the fact that the Table is a statistical aggregation, taking no account of changes of behaviour between one Election and another, it offers a broadly accurate picture of the central findings on voting behaviour for the main and control samples. (Supervisors are excluded in Table 5.4 and subsequent Tables in this section because their over-representation among the small firm sample and greater likelihood of voting Conservative, distorts the comparison between the main and control samples.)

It will be seen immediately that support for the three main parties does not divide neatly into small firm/large firm categories. Labour, for example, receives more support, overall, from large firm workers than from those in small firms. Yet, while small electronics firm workers offer the lowest level of support for Labour, the small printing firm respondents report a rather higher level of support than those in the large electronics firm. In fact, there is a much larger difference in support for Labour between the two industries than between the small and large firm groupings.

The Conservatives receive similar levels of support from both small firm sub-samples and the large electronics firm workers with only the large printing firm workers offering a markedly lower level of support. The Liberals, on the other hand, fare very much better with the large printing firm respondents than with any other sub-sample, a finding consistently repeated for all three Elections. But just as relevant is the level of not voting; small electronics firm respondents clearly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers (1)</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>37 39.8</td>
<td>27 24.5</td>
<td>53 49.1</td>
<td>58 36.9</td>
<td>64 31.5</td>
<td>91 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>22 23.6</td>
<td>28 25.4</td>
<td>14 15.0</td>
<td>22 21.3</td>
<td>50 24.6</td>
<td>36 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>13 14.0</td>
<td>12 10.9</td>
<td>31 28.7</td>
<td>17 16.5</td>
<td>25 12.3</td>
<td>48 22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>3 2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.9</td>
<td>5 2.5</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>17 18.5</td>
<td>31 28.2</td>
<td>6 5.5</td>
<td>19 18.4</td>
<td>48 23.6</td>
<td>25 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/ Could Not Recall</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>9 8.2</td>
<td>4 3.7</td>
<td>5 4.8</td>
<td>11 5.4</td>
<td>9 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 93 100.0 N = 110 100.0 N = 108 100.0 N = 103 100.0 N = 203 100.0 N = 211 100.0

(1) Data on voting behaviour of 113 small printing firm respondents for the 1966 General Election was also collected. An Analysis of this data produces an almost exact replica of the percentages shown in the above Table for this sub-sample. Partners in Silver, Brown and Stone are excluded.
stand out as least likely and the large printing firm workers as most likely to vote. These sub-sample differences on virtually every point of comparison mean that the differences in the two right-hand columns of the Table cannot be taken at their face value. In particular, although the overall results favour the view that small firm workers are more likely to vote Conservative than large firm workers, it will be argued that an over-concentration on this finding obscures several more interesting findings in relation to the hypothesis being tested.

Tables 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7 offer a detailed view of voting behaviour at the Elections being considered. They confirm the point made above concerning the broad similarities in behaviour over the three Elections. This is not to say that there are no differences between Elections but merely to suggest that the differences do not substantially affect the hypothesis being considered. For instance, the data shows that several of the shifts in voting behaviour observed nationally, were reflected among the present samples. Thus, Liberal support increased among the main sample at the February 1974 Election, reflecting the reported 'revival' of Liberal support nationally but these differences do not alter the main overall finding that large firm workers were more likely to vote Liberal than small firm workers.

It would have been helpful to have an idea of the proportions of working class voters who supported each of the main parties at the General Elections and to be able to compare these with the actual levels of support reported by the samples. However, establishing such a comparison is very difficult. Although opinion poll data gathered close to the Elections is a guide to the way the classes voted, this data is not very helpful for the present study for a number of reasons. First of all, opinion poll data is itself subject to a wide margin of error and secondly, is mainly gathered on a national basis and, therefore, does not take into account the special local factors associated with the present sample. For example, the sample lives in a region where working class support for Labour is thought to be lower than in other regions, even after allowance is made for differences in the representation of the different classes. A highly middle class area is also usually itself seen as associated with lower Labour support among manual workers. The sample also contains a high proportion of home owners, another factor connected with lower support for Labour. Labour support is also usually associated with trade union membership and since fewer small firm respondents than large firm respondents belonged to trade unions, lower support for Labour might again be expected. All these factors,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
<td>10 28.6</td>
<td>18 58.1</td>
<td>15 44.1</td>
<td>31 36.0</td>
<td>33 50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>15 29.4</td>
<td>9 25.7</td>
<td>5 16.1</td>
<td>8 23.5</td>
<td>24 27.9</td>
<td>13 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4 7.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 19.3</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>4 4.6</td>
<td>10 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>2 3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>8 15.7</td>
<td>11 31.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>19 22.1</td>
<td>5 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>5 14.5</td>
<td>2 6.4</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>6 7.0</td>
<td>4 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 51 100.0   N = 55 100.0   N = 31 100.0   N = 36 100.0   N = 86 100.0   N = 65 100.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>11 25.0</td>
<td>18 67.4</td>
<td>12 34.5</td>
<td>24 30.0</td>
<td>30 41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>7 19.4</td>
<td>9 20.4</td>
<td>5 13.1</td>
<td>7 20.0</td>
<td>16 20.0</td>
<td>12 16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>8 22.2</td>
<td>9 20.4</td>
<td>12 31.6</td>
<td>6 17.1</td>
<td>17 21.2</td>
<td>18 24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Vote</td>
<td>7 19.4</td>
<td>10 22.7</td>
<td>2 5.3</td>
<td>8 22.8</td>
<td>17 22.2</td>
<td>10 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/ Could Not Recall</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>4 5.0</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 36 100.0 N = 44 100.0 N = 38 100.0 N = 35 100.0 N = 80 100.0 N = 73 100.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (19.3%)</td>
<td>17 (45.8%)</td>
<td>11 (32.3%)</td>
<td>9 (24.3%)</td>
<td>28 (38.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (32.2%)</td>
<td>4 (10.2%)</td>
<td>7 (20.6%)</td>
<td>10 (27.0%)</td>
<td>11 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
<td>13 (33.3%)</td>
<td>7 (20.6%)</td>
<td>4 (10.8%)</td>
<td>20 (27.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (32.2%)</td>
<td>4 (10.2%)</td>
<td>6 (17.6%)</td>
<td>12 (32.4%)</td>
<td>10 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>2 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Recall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=6 \quad N=31 \quad 100.0 \quad N=39 \quad 100.0 \quad N=34 \quad 100.0 \quad N=37 \quad 100.0 \quad N=73 \quad 100.0\]

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding
it will be noted, would lead to a downward revision of 'expected' levels of Labour support among the main sample. However, the sample is all male and, especially among small firm workers contains relatively few older respondents. These factors have been suggested as likely to go with higher than average support for Labour among working class voters. It is, therefore, difficult to gauge the extent to which small firm respondents deviate from typical working class voting patterns. But the only obviously politically 'deviant' sub-sample are the small electronics firm workers. Their support for Labour is well below the average for respondents as a whole and is almost half that of the sub-sample reporting the highest level of Labour support, the large printing firm workers. Yet this lack of support for Labour among small electronics firm workers is not balanced by a noticeably higher than average level of Conservative support.

It might be thought that the Liberal Party, which sometimes claims the 'middle ground' in British politics, would win strong support from small firm workers. If small firm workers are less exposed to pressures towards supporting Labour or the Conservatives then perhaps the Liberals might benefit. But, as the Tables show, this is not supported by the data. Indeed, it was the large printing firm workers who most supported the Liberals, the same sub-sample who most supported Labour. The Liberals gained relatively little support from either small firm sample at any of the Elections compared to their support from the control sample.

Tables 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 present data collected for the three General Elections in another form which allows some comparisons with the national results for the Elections. The national turnout at the 1970 Election was 71.3% and respondents in the present study, with the notable exception of the small electronics firm workers, were, therefore, more likely to vote than the typical voter. In 1970 Labour won 43.3% of the votes in English constituencies, the Conservatives 48.4% and Liberals 13.6%. Thus, all sub-samples gave higher than average support for Labour, lower than average support for the Conservatives (the small electronics firm workers came close to being an exception here) but above average support for the Liberals. However, not too much can be made of this comparison because the samples, especially for the small electronics workers, are not very large and, of course, because of the class, regional and other differences between the present sample and a national sample.

The right-hand column in Table 5.8, 'Relevant Constituencies',
### Table 5.8
Voting 1970 General Election of Shopfloor Workers and Voting in Selected Relevant Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>Relevant Constituencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=42 100.0  N=19 100.0  N=29 100.0  N=27 100.0  N=61 100.0  N=56 100.0  100.0

Turnout (2) 84.0 63.3 100.0 84.4 76.0 91.5 70.6

(1) The meaning of 'relevant constituencies' and the basis of calculation for this column is given in the text. The data is taken from The Times, 20th June 1970.

(2) Calculated as the percentage of all voters voting for whom information on voting behaviour is available. Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
# Table 5.9

VOTING AT THE FEBRUARY 1974 GENERAL ELECTION - SHOPFLOOR WORKERS ONLY AND VOTING IN SELECTED RELEVANT CONSTITUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>Relevant Constituencies (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour</strong></td>
<td>13 46.4</td>
<td>11 35.5</td>
<td>18 51.4</td>
<td>12 46.1</td>
<td>24 40.7</td>
<td>30 49.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservative</strong></td>
<td>7 35.0</td>
<td>9 29.0</td>
<td>5 14.3</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>16 27.1</td>
<td>12 19.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal</strong></td>
<td>8 28.6</td>
<td>9 29.0</td>
<td>12 32.3</td>
<td>6 23.1</td>
<td>17 28.8</td>
<td>18 29.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>2 3.4</td>
<td>1 1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnout (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=28 100.0</th>
<th>N=31 100.0</th>
<th>N=35 100.0</th>
<th>N=26 100.0</th>
<th>N=59 100.0</th>
<th>N=61 100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour</strong></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The meaning of 'relevant constituencies' and the basis of calculation for this column is given in the text. The data is taken from The Guardian, 2nd March 1974.

(2) Calculated on the percentage of all voters voting for whom information on voting behaviour is available. Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>Relevant (1) Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>6 30.0</td>
<td>17 50.0</td>
<td>11 42.3</td>
<td>9 37.5</td>
<td>28 46.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>10 50.0</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>10 41.7</td>
<td>11 18.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>13 38.2</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>4 16.7</td>
<td>20 33.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 5.0</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=5**  
N=20          100.0      N=52       100.0      N=26       100.0      N=24       100.0      N=62       100.0

| Turnout        | 66.7                      | 89.5                      | 81.2                      | 66.7                      | 85.7                  | 75.0                  |

(1) The relevant constituencies are the same as those in Table 5.8. All data is from The Guardian, October 12, 1976.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
gives an indication of voting patterns in the constituencies in which most of the sample lived. This helps to control for some of the factors noted above if only in a crude way. The column was calculated by selecting the six constituencies in which the sample lived and averaging the results. It should be emphasised that the results have not been weighted in relation to the degree of concentration of respondents in each constituency and some respondents lived outside the selected constituencies. (A closer comparison was difficult because respondents lived in over ten different constituencies and the proportions in each of the four sub-samples in some constituencies were very small. Moreover, boundary changes between Elections made inter-Election comparisons between such small sub-samples worthless.) It will be seen, however, that all sub-samples gave more support to Labour than the typical voter in these relevant constituencies and less to the Conservatives. The above average support for the Liberals in all sub-samples except the small electronics firm workers, seen in Table 5.5, is repeated here and suggests that this is not simply the result of regional factors.

A further point shown in Table 5.8, which recurs in the data for the two subsequent Elections, concerns differences in the level of turnout among sub-samples. Overall, it is clear that small firm respondents, especially small electronics firm workers, were less likely to vote. In part, this accounts for the point that, although Table 5.5 shows that small electronics firm respondents were less likely to support Labour, they did not show a correspondingly higher level of support for the other two main parties. No small electronics firm respondents reported voting Liberal and, while they showed the highest level of Conservative support in Table 5.6, a comparison with Table 5.5 clearly shows this is due to the high proportion of non-voters among this sub-sample. Putting this another way, not voting is more popular among small electronics firm workers who could vote than voting for any single party.

The February 1974 General Election was somewhat unusual. Edward Heath called the Election at short notice basically in connection with a dispute with the National Union of Miners. The central theme, put simply, was 'Who Rules Britain?' Other issues, notably inflation and the state of the economy, were, however, closely related to this clash between Government and miners. One Government decision which greatly helped to dramatise the Election was the three day week, instigated to save energy and to increase Government bargaining power vis-a-vis the National Union of Miners.
Two indications of just how the February 1974 General Election differed from previous General Elections were the level of turnout and the pattern of voting. Turnout at British General Elections had steadily declined between 1950 (82.5%) and 1970 (72%) but in February 1974 it increased to 78.1% (falling back to 72.8% in the October General Election of the same year). Secondly, from having had a two party system since the Second World War, with single party majority government, the results in February 1974 produced a multi-party system and a Government with no overall majority. From 1945 to 1970 the Liberals and other minor parties received, on average, only 7% of the United Kingdom votes but in February 1974 they increased this to 25%. A further indication of the greater fluidity in politics was the increase in the frequency of General Elections. Between October 1964 and October 1974 there were five General Elections and an increase in the frequency of Government changing hands at these Elections.

It might, therefore, be expected that respondents' reported voting behaviour for the February 1974 General Election would depart somewhat from that reported for the 1970 Election. Tables 5.6 and 5.9 show some of these departures which were broadly similar to those shown nationally. Thus, in all sub-samples there are indications of an increase in support for the Liberals. Even the large printing firm workers, who were the most likely of all sub-samples to vote Liberal in 1970, increased their support for the Liberals to just over one-third. Similarly, the national falls in support for Labour and the Conservatives in the February 1974 Election, as compared to June 1970, were paralleled among all sub-samples. Turnout followed the upward national trend among the small firm voters but showed a slight fall among large firm workers. However, it was 91.5% of all who could vote among the latter in 1970, which is already very high and, therefore, unlikely to go higher. The actual level reported in February 1974, 85.9%, was still higher than among small firm respondents and higher than the national level of 78.1%.

The right-hand column in Table 5.9, 'Relevant Constituencies' is not strictly comparable with the same column in Table 5.5 because constituency boundaries were re-organised between the 1970 and February 1974 Elections. But increased Liberal support in these constituencies was apparently sufficient to push Labour into overall third place. National support for the Liberals rose from 7.5% in 1970 to 19.3% in February 1974, but in the area where the present sample voted it seems that, after being more popular than nationally in 1970, the Liberals increased their support in February 1974 by a rather smaller percentage.
which still pushed their overall level above that of the national figure. Some commentators, as noted earlier, saw this as partly resulting from 'tactical voting' and this area as one where this was very likely to occur.

The general relations between sub-samples shown for 1970 were broadly repeated in February 1974. The lowest level of Labour support and turnout was again found amongst the small electronics firm workers. The highest level of support for both Labour and the Liberals again came from the large printing firm workers. The latter remained the least likely to support the Conservatives but among all other sub-samples Conservative support was broadly similar. Overall, there was again more support for Labour and less for the Conservatives among control sample respondents than among main sample respondents. The Liberals, as in 1970, received more support from the control sample than from the main sample and again small firm respondents were markedly less likely to vote.

Finally, Tables 5.7 and 5.10 show voting behaviour for the October 1974 General Election. This may be examined briefly since the results broadly confirm the findings for the two previous Elections. It will be seen, however, that Labour did less well in October 1974 among all sub-samples, regardless of size of firm and that support for Labour falls from 1970 to October 1974 in all sub-samples, again regardless of size of firm. The Conservatives, on the other hand, do not show a corresponding increase in support from either the main or control samples. True, among small firm respondents the Conservatives received more support in October than in February 1974 but the difference is small, the sub-sample not large, and support in October 1974 is almost exactly the same as that in 1970. Overall, therefore, the small firm sample cannot be described as predominantly Conservative even though they support the Conservatives rather more than large firm workers. Moreover, the higher level of Conservative support cannot be seen in isolation but must be related to other factors to provide an accurate view of small firm respondents' voting behaviour.

The Liberals again provide a somewhat odd set of results. Nationally, their overall level of support dropped slightly but less than in the 'Relevant Constituencies' in Table 5.10, where they fell back into third place behind Labour and the Conservatives. As in 1970 and February 1974, large firm respondents provided most support for the Liberals. Indeed, Liberal support among large firm respondents was decidedly higher than that for the Conservatives. Again this was
mainly due to the voting behaviour of the large printing firm workers. In all three Elections the Liberals received less support from the small firm workers than from the control sample and only in February 1974 did the small firm workers give more support to the Liberals than the typical voter in the constituencies in which they lived. Even in February 1974 their support was only slightly higher than that given by the typical voter, so that, overall, small firm workers do not appear to be a special source of support for the Liberals.

Turnout in October 1974 was much lower among small firm workers (66.7%) than large firm workers (85.7%). This again follows the pattern in the two previous Elections but was even more marked at this Election, with almost one in three small firm workers who could have voted, not doing so. Not voting was the most popular 'choice' among small firm workers since more did this than supported any single party. Among large firm respondents, conversely, turnout remained very similar to that of February 1974 but in both was lower than in 1970. At all three Elections, large firm respondents' turnout was clearly higher than that for the electorate as a whole. They also gave the Liberals more support than the typical voter, a finding again repeated for all three Elections.

The data for the October 1974 General Election underlines the point made earlier that the only sub-sample offering a voting pattern consistent with the hypothesis being considered, is the small electronics firm workers. The latter, as Table 5.10 indicates, provide the highest level of Conservative support of any sub-sample (50%) and the lowest support for Labour (30%). Again, however, the more interesting finding here is not so much the level of support given to the main political parties but the high proportion - found in all three Elections - who do not vote at all and which in 1970 and February 1974 was higher than the proportions supporting any single party.

Voting and Age

Given the important differences in the age distributions of the main and control samples it was necessary to examine whether voting behaviour was related to age. At the 1970 Election there appeared to be few relations overall. Just over half of the respondents aged under 35 voted Labour matching the proportion among those aged 35 and over, (54.4% and 52.4% respectively.) Similarly, while 31.6% of those aged under 35 voted Conservative, of those aged 35 and over, 31.7% voted Conservative. Rather more of those aged 35 and over voted Liberal
and those aged under 35 (10.5%) but the sub-samples were small.

A stronger relationship between age and reported voting behaviour appears among the small than the large firm respondent samples but the differences may result from the smallness of the sub-samples voting for particular parties and they cancel out when the two small firm sub-samples are aggregated. That is, the small printing firm sample has a higher proportion of respondents aged under 35 voting Labour than among those aged 35 and over but the reverse occurs among small electronics firm respondents. Similarly, small electronics firm respondents under 35 are more likely to vote Conservative than those aged over 35 but this is reversed for small printing firm respondents. What, however, is consistent across all sub-samples is that younger respondents (those aged under 35) are less likely to vote than those aged 35 and over. Among small firm respondents 84.3% of those aged 35 and over, who could vote, did so in 1970 compared to 71.4% among those aged under 35. Among the large firm respondents the equivalent proportions were 94.6% and 84.6%.

Thus, small firm respondents generally and also younger respondents in both small and large firm samples, were less likely to vote. However, the higher proportion of younger workers in small firms meant the difference in the likelihood of voting would be less if the age structures of the work forces in small and large firms were more similar but this would not entirely account for differences in propensity to vote between the main and control samples.

The data for February 1974 provided clearer relationships between age and reported voting behaviour than those in 1970. In both main and control samples, for instance, older workers (those aged 35 and over) were more likely to support Labour and less likely to support the Conservatives than those aged under 35. The differences were slightly more marked in relation to small firm respondents but the similarity is the more important finding. There was also slightly more Liberal support among older workers and again the relationship appeared in both the main and control samples.

The clear finding reported for 1970 that younger respondents were less likely to vote was replicated for both the main and control samples. In February 1974 among small firm respondents aged under 35, 75% voted compared to 82.6% of those aged 35 and over. The corresponding proportions among large firm respondents were 80.6% and 91.4% respectively. The implication which might be drawn here, therefore, is that had the
age distributions of the main and control samples been similar then the difference in the levels of support for Labour shown in Table 5.6 between the two samples would have been less. Equally, the slightly higher level of Conservative support among small firm respondents might have been entirely eliminated.

In short, the data for the February 1974 Election, provides clearer age-related differences in political orientations than the 1970 data and echoes similar findings reported in the previous chapter on other attitudes and behaviour. In all these instances when age is controlled for a convergence between the attitudinal and behavioural patterns of small and large firm respondents occurs. The main exception to this concerns level of turnout. An examination shows that, even after allowance has been made for differences in the age distributions of the small and large firm worker samples, small firm respondents are still less likely to vote than large firm respondents.

Finally, it might be noted that in February 1974 although support for the Liberals appeared slightly higher among older workers the various age sub-samples in the two industries often reported very dis-similar levels of support. For instance, both small electronics firm workers and large printing firm workers show very much higher levels of Liberal support among respondents aged under 35, but the opposite is found among small printing firm and large electronics firm respondents. The sub-samples are sometimes small here but there seems little relationship between age and size of firm or industry, in levels of support for the Liberals at this Election.

Unfortunately, the data on age and voting behaviour at the October 1974 Election is less reliable because of the smallness of some sub-samples. The directions of the relationships shown in the available data repeat some of those reported for February 1974 but others suggest some rather different relationships. Thus, as in February 1974, respondents aged 35 and over were more likely to support Labour regardless of size of firm. Among small firm workers older workers were again less likely to vote Conservative but among large firm workers there was little relationship between age and support for the Conservatives. The sub-samples were, however, small.

The relationships between age and support for the Liberal Party in October 1974 were different to those found in June 1970 and February 1974 for both the main and control samples. More small firm respondents aged under 35 voted Liberal than those aged 35 and over but the reverse
was the case for large firm respondents. However, again the sub-samples, especially among small firm workers, were very small and no great reliance can be placed on these findings.

Finally, as in both previous Elections, younger workers (aged under 35) were much less likely to vote at all than older workers. In October 1974, 33.3% of younger small firm workers, who could have voted, did not compare to 26.6% of those aged 35 and over. For large firm workers the comparable proportions were 26.9% and 2.9% respectively, again supporting the point made in relation to previous Elections, that even where age is controlled for, small firm workers are much less likely to vote than large firm workers.

For the three General Elections analysed distinct relationships between reported voting behaviour and age have been shown for the two most recent Elections and some less marked relationships for the June 1970 Election. Not all relationships were, however, related to size of firm. Sometimes differences between industries in the main or control samples were as great as differences between size groupings. An amalgamation of all the data for every respondent is shown in Table 3.11. This provides overall support for the main age relationships found. In both the main and control samples, older workers (those aged 35 and over) were overall more likely to support Labour. The only sub-sample departing from this finding were the small printing firm respondents. However, the relationship between voting Conservative and age seems to be more related to industry than size of firm. Older printing workers were generally more likely to support the Conservatives than younger workers but the reverse was found in the electronics industry. Overall, little relationship could be found between age and size of firm or age and type of industry and voting Liberal. The findings which are strongly confirmed in the amalgamated data in Table 5.11 are the lower propensity of younger respondents to vote at all and, especially important for the present hypothesis, that small firm respondents, regardless of age, are much less likely than large firm workers to vote.

It might be argued that, overall, the broad conclusions to be drawn from the relationships between age, size of firm and reported voting behaviour provide a firm finding that small firm workers regardless of age are less likely to vote at all. But there was also a higher degree of similarity of voting behaviour in relation to age regardless of size of firm. In other words, whatever the influences which lead respondents to vote in particular ways, size of firm appears only slightly more related to such preferences than age; both have some
### Table 5.11

**Voting and Age at Three General Elections**

All Shopfloor Workers Who Could Have Voted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
<td>Under 35 and 35 over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>29 (41.4) 8 (32.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.8) 19 (36.5)</td>
<td>20 (45.4) 35 (51.6)</td>
<td>20 (33.9) 18 (40.0)</td>
<td>37 (28.9) 37 (35.1)</td>
<td>50 (38.8) 51 (46.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>14 (20.0) 7 (28.0)</td>
<td>17 (29.3) 11 (21.1)</td>
<td>4 (9.1) 10 (15.6)</td>
<td>15 (25.4) 8 (17.8)</td>
<td>31 (24.2) 18 (23.4)</td>
<td>19 (18.4) 18 (16.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>8 (11.4) 8 (32.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.8) 6 (7.7)</td>
<td>16 (34.1) 16 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (6.8) 13 (28.9)</td>
<td>16 (12.5) 12 (15.6)</td>
<td>19 (18.4) 29 (26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>2 (2.9) -</td>
<td>1 (1.7) 2 (3.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (3.4) -</td>
<td>3 (2.3) 2 (2.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.9) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>15 (21.4) 2 (8.0)</td>
<td>19 (32.8) 12 (23.1)</td>
<td>4 (9.1) 2 (3.1)</td>
<td>16 (27.1) 3 (6.7)</td>
<td>36 (26.6) 14 (18.2)</td>
<td>20 (19.4) 5 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/Could Not Remember</td>
<td>2 (2.9) -</td>
<td>5 (8.6) 6 (7.7)</td>
<td>1 (2.3) 3 (4.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.4) 3 (6.7)</td>
<td>7 (5.5) 4 (5.2)</td>
<td>3 (3.9) 6 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N=70 | N=25 | N=58 | N=52 | N=44 | N=44 | N=59 | N=45 | N=128 | N=77 | N=103 | N=109 |

*(1) Each respondent is included for every election at which he could have voted.*

*Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.*
relationship with voting and associations also appear, in some instances, with type of industry. Clearly, the size of sub-samples here are, unfortunately, too small to allow further disentangling of these relationships.

'Age' and 'size of firm', of course, each stand for a further complex of influences and the analysis of data on reported voting behaviour does not indicate what these are. But age, it might be suggested, may well be connected with a whole range of influences many of which will be grounded in non-work life. If this is accepted, then this underlines the point that an over-emphasis on work situation influences on worker orientations should be avoided. There may well be, however, as will be argued below, a mutual reinforcing of influences from various sources which may lead to distinct differences in voting and political orientations between small firm and large firm workers.

Voting and Trade Union Membership

An examination of the relationships between reported voting behaviour and trade union membership clearly revealed the expected finding that trade union members were more likely to vote Labour than non-trade union members. Among small firm trade union members, 44.4% of those who could vote reported voting Labour at the 1970 General Election as compared to only 25.6% of non-trade union members. The comparable levels among the control samples were 53.2% and 42.1%. (Not very much can be made of the smaller difference between trade union and non-trade union respondents in the control sample because there were so few non-trade union members.) Conversely, trade union members in both main and control samples were less likely to vote Conservative than non-trade union members. These findings are consistent across all sub-samples indicating that small firm trade union members vote in similar ways to large firm trade union members.

Less expected was the finding, again consistent for all sub-samples, that there was greater Liberal support from trade union members than non-trade union members. The sub-samples are again rather small but, as will be seen below, the findings from the two subsequent Elections broadly confirm this tendency. Finally, non-trade union members were less likely to vote than trade union members in all sub-samples. In the sample as a whole, 9.8% of trade union members did not vote in 1970 but among non-trade union members this proportion was 34.2%. Among the small firm sample these proportions were 15.6% and 27.9% respectively and for the control sample, 4.3% and 15.8%. In short, trade union
membership had a similar relationship with propensity to vote in the
main and control samples but this did not appear to eliminate the
tendency of small firm workers to be less likely to vote overall.

The data for the February 1974 Election on voting and trade union
membership broadly repeats the above findings. In 1970, as noted above,
44.4% of small firm trade union members voted Labour; in February 1974
this proportion was 43.5%. Among small firm non-trade union members
the levels of Labour support at these two Elections were 25.6% and 25%
respectively. The Conservatives again received a distinctly lower
level of support from trade union members than from non-trade union
members. However, the finding reported for 1970, that the Liberals
received more support from trade union members than non-trade union
members was not so apparent in February 1974. Among small firm workers
trade union members gave almost exactly as much support to Liberals
as non-trade union members. However, among large firm workers the
Liberals, as in 1970, received much more support from trade union mem-
bers. The tendency for non-trade union members to be less likely to
vote, was repeated but not among the main sample where both trade union
and non-trade union members showed similar levels of not voting.

The relationships between voting behaviour and trade union member-
ship in October 1974 parallel those at the two previous Elections.
Trade union members were more likely to vote Labour and less likely to
vote Conservative than non-trade union members, regardless of size of
firm. The differences, however, were more marked for large firm than
small firm respondents in October 1974 whereas in 1970 and February
1974 the differences were similar and clear-cut for both main and con-
trol samples. The Liberals again received more support from trade union
members than non-trade union members in both small and large firm
samples. Trade union members in October 1974, as in both previous Elec-
tions, were more likely to vote than non-trade union members although
there remains the same difference between small and large firm trade
union members on level of turnout. Overall, therefore, at all three
Elections differences between trade union and non-trade union members
do not obliterate differences associated with size of firm and likeli-
hood of voting.

Table 5.12 provides an aggregation of the data on trade union
membership, industry and size of firm. Labour clearly received more
support from trade union members than non-trade union members regardless
of size of firm or industry and the reverse finding consistently holds
TABLE 5.12
VOTING AND TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP AT THREE GENERAL ELECTIONS, ALL SHOPFLOOR WORKERS WHO COULD HAVE VOTED (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TU Member</td>
<td>Non-TU Member</td>
<td>TU Member</td>
<td>Non-TU Member</td>
<td>TU Member</td>
<td>Non-TU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>28 (43.1)</td>
<td>9 (30.0)</td>
<td>4 (40.0)</td>
<td>23 (25.0)</td>
<td>53 (48.6)</td>
<td>19 (37.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>12 (18.5)</td>
<td>9 (30.0)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>26 (26.0)</td>
<td>15 (13.8)</td>
<td>9 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>11 (16.9)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (10.0)</td>
<td>11 (11.0)</td>
<td>31 (28.6)</td>
<td>10 (19.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parties</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (3.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (3.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>12 (18.5)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>28 (28.0)</td>
<td>6 (5.5)</td>
<td>7 (13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Say/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (9.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=65  N=30  N=10  N=100  N=109  N=51  N=53  N=75  N=130  N=160  N=53

Notes:
(1) Each respondent is included for every election at which he could have voted.
Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
on support for the Conservatives. However, differences in the level of Labour support between trade union and non-trade union members in small firms were almost twice as large as among large firm respondents. On the other hand, the difference in the level of support for the Conservatives among trade union and non-trade union members in small firms was not nearly so large as the differences among large firm respondents. In short, while trade union membership shows a consistent relationship with the direction of support given to the two main parties there are, nevertheless, differences between small firm and large firm respondents which appear independent of trade union membership.

Liberal support appears unrelated to trade union membership or industry among small firm respondents. Among large firm respondents, on the other hand, trade union members show a higher level of support for Liberals than non-trade union members, especially in the large printing firm. But this is much less marked among the large electronics firm respondents.

The higher propensity to vote among trade union members, shown for the individual Elections, is clearly revealed again. However, the differences in the small firm samples were very small whereas among the large electronics firm respondents trade union members were much more likely to vote. The completely unionised large printing firm respondents showed the highest level of turnout of any sub-sample.

A comparison of the data on the relationship between size of firm, type of industry and age and trade union membership respectively, suggests a stronger association between trade union membership and size of firm and industry than among the same factors and age. Again, as with age, the small size of many of the sub-samples at particular Elections renders further analysis not worthwhile.

However, the above findings are broadly what might be expected from the literature on voting, age and trade union membership. For example, in assessing the weight which might be attached to various factors associated with working class voting, argues that trade union membership has more influence than age. The present data strongly suggests that, if trade union membership were to become more common among small firm workers (a possibility which was argued for in Chapter 4) then Labour support might be expected to increase and, conversely, support for the Conservatives to fall. If this did occur, levels of support for the two main parties might become broadly similar among small and large firm workers. If, at the same time, increased trade
union membership in small firms restricted employers from discriminating against older workers, the rise in the average age of small firm workers might also contribute to a further increase in Labour support and a further decrease for the Conservatives.

The Liberals' support shows the fewest relations with the variables analysed in this section. Among small firm respondents neither age nor trade union membership has a clear-cut relationship with Liberal support. The relations found were mainly confined to the control sample with large firm trade union members being more pro-Liberal. In relation to age no consistent relations were found.

Consistency and Voting Behaviour

Despite the broad similarities in findings on voting behaviour at the three Elections it would be superficial to assume that this provides a complete picture. One important aspect is the consistency of behaviour from one Election to another. It would be unwise, for example, to simply assume that the very similar proportions of small firm respondents supporting Labour at the 1970 and February 1974 Elections consist of the same respondents. An examination of consistency of voting behaviour at the three Elections reveals some important ways in which the political commitments of small firm workers differ from those in the large firms.

Table 5.13 reports data on consistency of reported voting behaviour for all shopfloor respondents for whom information is available and who could have voted at the 1970 and February 1974 Elections. The clear finding is that small firm workers are much less stable in their political allegiances. While just over 70% of large firm voters voted for the same party at both Elections, only 32.1% of the small firm respondents reported doing so. The Table also shows the more varied pattern of changes in behaviour among small firm as compared to large firm respondents. It was not simply that small firm workers were more likely to switch from one party to another, they were also more likely to vote at one Election but not at the other.

It might be argued that some of the sub-samples in Table 5.13 are small and that this weakens the conclusions drawn from the data. But confidence is substantially increased when the same examination is made between the two General Elections of 1974. Among large firm respondents, 65.2% of those who could have voted, voted for the same party at both Elections compared to 42.9% of the main sample. Similarly, 42.9% of small firm workers voted at one Election but not at the other or switched
### Table 5.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voted for Same Party at Both Elections</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for Different Party at Each Election</td>
<td>8 28.6</td>
<td>10 35.7</td>
<td>22 75.9</td>
<td>19 65.5</td>
<td>18 52.1</td>
<td>41 70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote 1970 But Voted Feb. 1974</td>
<td>2 7.2</td>
<td>2 7.2</td>
<td>1 3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 7.1</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted 1970 But Did Not Vote Feb. 1974</td>
<td>4 14.3</td>
<td>7 25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 6.9</td>
<td>11 19.6</td>
<td>2 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote at Either Election</td>
<td>3 10.7</td>
<td>3 10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 17.2</td>
<td>6 10.7</td>
<td>5 8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 28 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 28 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 29 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 29 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 56 \quad 100.0 \quad N = 58 \quad 100.0 \]

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
parties compared with 26.1% among the control sample. Again, a higher proportion of small firm workers than large firm workers failed to vote at both Elections.

The data suggests, therefore, that not only are small firm respondents not overwhelmingly Conservative Party supporters but that, further, they are less likely to be firmly committed to any particular party. Remembering from Table 5.4 that small firm workers are also less likely to vote at all, then it may be argued that small firm workers appear less involved in politics than large firm workers both in terms of breadth of involvement (as measured by the percentage actually voting) and in terms of depth of commitment (as measured by consistency of support for a particular party.)

In the preliminary discussion of existing thinking on small firm worker party preferences above, Ingham's observation that small firm Conservatives differed from large firm Conservatives in their reasons for supporting the Party was noted. In the present study, however, problems emerged in attempting to test this assertion further. It was found that respondents often had difficulties in clearly stating reasons for supporting a particular party or the reasons given did not fit easily into Ingham's 'ideological' and 'instrumental' categories. 'Because my parents voted Conservative', for example, does not appear to indicate either and several reasons offered, particularly in relation to the February 1974 Election, were clearly linked to the immediate issues of the Election.

A more serious problem arises when 'commitment' is examined. It is unclear whether Ingham was able to measure commitment to the Conservatives in terms of votes cast at successive Elections. It might be thought that serious commitment involves support at more than one Election. If a respondent voted Conservative at one Election but at the previous or subsequent Election supported another party or failed to vote at all, then it is questionable whether a term as strong as 'commitment' is appropriate. This is perhaps even more questionable when this commitment is described as 'ideological'.

The importance of the above point is borne out when consistency of support for the Conservative Party is examined for the present sample. Of the small firm workers who could have voted in the 1970 and February 1974 Elections, only 17.9% voted Conservative at both (compared with 17.2% among large firm respondents.) At the February and October 1974 Elections, 17.8% of all small firm respondents who could have voted
at both, voted Conservative. Overall, therefore, less than 15 small firm respondents voted Conservative at any two successive Elections and even if, implausibly, all were 'ideological' Conservatives, in Ingham's sense, they would remain a minority among the small firm sample. Nor could their political orientations be said to be typical of small firm workers. Other orientations, especially a lack of interest in politics, as measured by exercising the right to vote or instability of allegiance seem more important overall and much more characteristic of small firm workers as compared to large firm workers.

Respondents in the present study were, of course, asked why they voted the way they did but this question was framed before the high level of inconsistency in voting behaviour among the small firm workers was known. Moreover, questions about voting at the 'last' Election referred to four possible Elections, depending on the time of interview, and this produces problems in comparing respondents' replies. It is, therefore, not intended to attach too much weight to this data, especially as many of the resulting sub-samples would be very small indeed.

These kinds of problems have been rarely discussed in previous studies of worker voting behaviour and political orientations but clearly interpretations based on replies to voting behaviour at a single Election must be highly suspect. It may, of course, be that these problems have only arisen recently as a result of the increase in political volatility since the late 1960's. Goldthorpe et al, in discussing the voting behaviour and attachment to party of their sample, found that 71% were 'solid' supporters of either of the two main parties, that is, they had voted for the same party whenever they were eligible. In the present study, 'solid' supporters were defined as those respondents who had voted for the same party on at least two successive occasions when eligible. This appears a more stringent definition than that of Goldthorpe et al, who seem to include as solid supporters those respondents who may have only voted once for a party, having only been eligible to vote once previously. This seems a somewhat premature classification since it is reasonable to assume that some of these will not vote in the same way at their next opportunity. Allowing for such differences, it is clear that small firm workers in the present study were more volatile than Goldthorpe et al's sample but the large firm workers were similarly or more committed to a single party given the more rigorous definition of commitment adopted here.

Butler and Stokes, employing a similar approach to voting consistency to that of the present study, show a marked decline in consistency
for the period 1959-1970 with a final proportion closer to that reported for the small firm workers than the large firm workers in the present study. Martin and Pryer found that among their manual worker sample, 67% were 'consistent' supporters of either Labour or the Conservatives. Carried out in 1968/69, this study was subsequent to Goldthorpe et al's study but completed around the same time as the later surveys of Butler and Stokes. The existing data, therefore, is rather unclear on this point suggesting that previous research has given insufficient attention to this issue.

Differences Between the Main Parties

Respondents were asked a number of questions to elicit attitudes to specific political issues and these reveal further differences between the main and control samples. An advantage of these questions was that respondents often found it easier to express an opinion on a distinct issue than on more abstract issues such as their overall reason for a particular pattern of political support. For instance, respondents were asked whether they thought it made 'a lot of difference whether Labour or Conservatives win the Election?' Table 5.14 shows the replies to this question for all respondents (if supervisors are excluded virtually no changes in the proportions shown occur.)

Although, overall, large firm workers were more likely to think that it did make a difference, there was considerable variation within the main and control samples. Thus, the small printing firm workers were less likely to feel that it made a difference than the large electronics firm workers, so that the difference between the two industries was much larger (18.3%) than between the small and large firm samples (9.2%).

No clear differences between trade union and non-trade union members on this question emerged in the main sample but among large firm workers, non-trade union members were much more likely to feel that it made little difference. Of course, because most large firm trade union members were in printing, this finding may be as related to the industrial sub-culture as trade union membership. (However, since the meanings associated with trade union membership form a part of the industrial sub-culture in a highly unionised industry it is very difficult to separate these two sources of influence.) Similarly, among small firm workers opinions on this question appeared unrelated to age but among large firm respondents there was a clear difference. Younger respondents (those aged under 35) were more likely to say they felt it made little difference which party won. (Among younger workers 51.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=67 100.0 N=56 100.0 N=62 100.0 N=36 100.0 N=123 100.0 N=78 100.0 N=201 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
That so high a proportion of respondents, 49.2%, felt that whichever way they voted it made little difference is an interesting finding in itself. This may be compared to the results of similar questions asked by Butler and Stokes in several surveys between 1963 and 1970. The highest proportion they report feeling there was 'not much' difference between 'the parties' was 44% in 1969 while on other occasions it ranged from 26% to 38% (88). Goldthorpe et al reported that 34% of their manual workers said "it would not make much difference which party won the Election" (89). In other words, in the present study, seeing little or no difference between the main parties appeared more pronounced than in previous studies and this was especially marked among the small firm workers.

Many respondents found it difficult to offer reasons for thinking there was little difference between the two main parties but those who could offered two main reasons. First, that both parties were the same because their actions in government made little difference to the lives of ordinary people. Second, that politicians of either party were incapable of governing because they had no real solutions to economic problems or the economic factors involved were beyond political influence.

A 45 year old worker in a small printing firm said:

"Well it's just a feeling. I'm not an expert on these things but I've got friends who I've spoken to who seem well genned up on these things and they seem to think that although, of course, politics do influence the Government and the country, naïve as that may sound, it really all boils down to, well, it's only the heads that change. The system doesn't change very much."

Another printing worker provided an example of the second reason:

"Well I think it has mainly to do with the world, world finance if you like. Finance rules everything in the end. I think they get their hands tied and they can't do anything."

Small firm workers - especially in the small electronics firms where 60.7% held the view - were more likely to feel that there was little difference between the parties. It could be argued that this further supports the view suggested earlier that small firm workers were less involved in politics. Not only are they less committed to individual political parties and less likely to vote at all, they also feel that political parties or governments have less impact on their lives or determinately on the political process as a whole.

Influencing the Political Process

A clear implication from the above is that a substantial proportion of respondents felt they had little influence on the political
process. A more precise indication on this point is provided by answers to the question: 'Do you think people like yourself have enough say in the way the country is run?' As Table 5.15 shows, overall, well over half the sample (57.5%) believed they did not have enough say and only a little over one in five (21.8%) definitely believed they had sufficient influence. There is a rather higher proportion among small firm respondents who believe they have little say than among the control sample which is consistent with the earlier analysis on political involvement among small firm workers. If they are less likely to vote at all, more likely to switch parties and to feel it makes little difference which main party wins an Election, then it is not surprising they also more often believe they have little say in how the country is run.

The rather high proportion of respondents classified as 'Other' or 'Don't Know' in Table 5.15 results from the policy of not pressing respondents into giving a reply when they appeared to have no firm opinion. The 'No' replies are, however, slightly inflated because some respondents felt that, although they did not have enough say in how the country was run, this was a result of their own choice. If they wished to have more influence they could do so. As a small printing firm worker put it:

"Well a straight answer to that is that I think all the potential is there. All the facilities are there if we really wanted to have a say. In my own case, I don't really think I take advantage of it."

This view was held by only a minority of respondents who were as common in the control as in the main sample. Much more typical was the small firm worker who said:

"You're allowed to vote. You can vote for a party but it's like voting for the lesser of two evils in a way and that's about as far as it goes I think. If there's something you don't like about the area, like they're building a bypass or something like that you can always go and complain to your local MP that's about as far as it goes. As I am now, I've got practically no say at all in this country."

Overall, non-trade union members felt they had more say in the way the country was run than trade union members. Unfortunately, the industry sub-samples of trade union and non-trade union members within the main and control samples are small and no reliable comparison is possible at this level. (As Table 5.15 shows, many respondents had no clear opinion on this issue also making sub-sample comparisons difficult.) But age was related to opinions on this issue with large firm older respondents (those aged 35 and over) feeling they had more say than younger workers. Within the main sample, however, no real differences emerged except
TABLE 5.15

'DO YOU THINK PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF HAVE ENOUGH SAY IN THE WAY THE COUNTRY IS RUN?' ALL SHOPFLOOR RESPONDENTS WHO COULD HAVE VOTED AT THE PREVIOUS GENERAL ELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/ Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=59 100.0  N=45 100.0  N=38 100.0  N=33 100.0  N=104 100.0  N=71 100.0  N=175 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding
that younger workers (those aged under 35) had greater difficulties in offering an opinion (a finding also repeated among the large firm younger workers).

Overall, therefore, it might be tentatively argued that, if the small firm sample had a more similar age distribution to that of the large firm sample and a higher proportion of trade union members, the differences between the main and control samples would probably still remain. A more similar age distribution among the main sample would probably tend to remove some differences between the main and control samples shown in Table 5.15, but this would be offset if trade union membership were higher since trade union members tend to feel they have less influence on politics.

Comparisons with previous research on this issue are interesting. Rose and Mossawir, in a 1964 study, found that 14% of their sample felt that people like themselves had a lot of influence upon the way the country is governed, 38% felt that they had little influence and 27% no influence. Rose, reporting a later (1973) survey, reports that 18% of working class respondents felt they had enough say in how the Government ran the country but that the vast majority felt they did not. Nordlinger found in his sample of manual workers (interviewed in 1964) that 14% felt that people like themselves had a good deal of influence; 49.2% that they had little influence and 36.5% that they had no influence. Butler and Stokes asked their respondents in 1963 and 1969 whether they felt that the Government paid attention to what people thought when it decided what to do. In 1963, 50% felt that the Government did not pay much attention to what people thought; in 1969 the proportion was 61%.

Thus, allowing for differences in question wording and the composition of the various samples, there is broad agreement with the findings in the present study. Clearly, the majority of manual workers do not feel they have much influence on the political process and this perhaps explains why the differences between the main and control samples in this study are rather small. If such a high proportion of manual workers in general feel so politically impotent, then it leaves little room for sub-groups within the manual worker population to express even higher levels of impotence. Nevertheless, a higher proportion of main sample respondents than control sample respondents felt they had little or no influence and this is strongly consistent with the other findings on political orientations and voting behaviour presented earlier.
The Locus of Influence in Society

If over half of the workers in the study feel they have little say in the way the country is run, while about another fifth were unable to give an opinion at all, who did they feel had the most influence on how the country was run? Replies to this question are given in Table 5.16 which shows that respondents chose a wide range of groups although a substantial proportion could not name any group. (Again, respondents were not pressed to answer if, after some thought, they still could not give a clear reply.)

Overall, most respondents in both the main and control samples saw the locus of power in society linked with the economic structure. Over half of those who were able to give a positive view chose representatives of one or other 'side' of industry. The Table may even underestimate here since those who chose the 'Upper Class' or 'Ruling Class' and some classified as 'Other', may also have had economic considerations in mind when giving their opinion. Among the small firm sample it is the owners and controllers of industry who are thought to have the most power in society. The small printing firm workers were the most likely to pick this group as most influential in society but even among the small electronics firm workers this group was thought at least as influential as any other in society. Large firm workers presented a clear contrast since they were much more likely to pick the 'other side' of industry, organised labour. It is particularly interesting that the most highly unionized sub-sample, the printers at the Surrey Printing Company, were also the most likely to pick organised labour as most influential in society.

Conversely, comparatively few respondents chose groups associated with the conventional view of the political order which locates power in Parliament and the party political process. Overall, only about 17% of those who offered a positive view chose a group connected with Parliament and the political process with little difference between the main and control samples. There was, however, an industrial difference with printing industry respondents being much more likely to name a group closely associated with the economy and much less likely to mention groups associated with Parliament or the political process, than electronics industry respondents.

'Others', which formed a substantial proportion in some sub-samples, contained a mixture of groups. Examples of the latter were the Civil Service, 'foreigners' and 'the working class' but none were
mentioned with any frequency. Some respondents also felt they could not decide between several groups as to which had most influence in society. These are also classified as 'Other'.

Distinct differences in views about who had most influence in society occurred in relation to both age and trade union membership. In the main and control samples, older workers (35 and over) were more likely to see the owners and controllers of industry as most influential while, conversely, younger workers (under 35) were more likely to pick organised labour. Older workers were also more likely to have a conventional view of politics being more likely than younger workers to name groups associated with Parliament and the political process.

Trade union members in both the main and control samples were more likely than non-trade union members to think that the owners and controllers of industry had the most say in society. Non-trade union members in the main sample gave more influence to trade unions and the Trades Union Congress than trade union members. In the large firm sample, however, there was little difference. Trade union and non-trade union members had similar, low levels of belief that the most influential groups in society were connected with Parliament and the conventional political order. Less than 15% of trade union and non-trade union members thought that groups of this kind were the most influential.

Small firm workers, in feeling that owners and controllers of industry were most influential in society, were clearly not referring to small firm owners. Rather it was 'big business' or some anonymous, ill-defined group such as 'the rich' or 'capitalists'. The fact that they were more likely than large firm workers to pick this locus of power could be linked to their experience of working in a small firm. In Chapter 3 it was argued that the self-selection thesis was defective because for many small firm workers choice of job was restricted by their particular market situation. Awareness, at however vague a level, of the aspects of their market situation which made it difficult to work for a large firm could be linked to perceiving the owners and controllers of such firms as the most powerful people in society.

Although levels and quality of contact between owner-managers of small firms and shopfloor workers was shown in Chapter 4 to be much lower than had been previously thought, owner-managers may still be a source, if only a minor one, of political meanings. Earlier in the chapter it was noted that small firm owner-managers were unlikely to be unequivocal Conservative Party supporters mainly because they often
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.B.I., Big Business, Capitalists, The Rich.</td>
<td>25 39.1%</td>
<td>11 20.4%</td>
<td>8 19.5%</td>
<td>7 16.7%</td>
<td>36 30.5%</td>
<td>15 18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions, T.U.C.</td>
<td>10 15.6%</td>
<td>12 22.2%</td>
<td>13 31.7%</td>
<td>9 21.4%</td>
<td>22 18.6%</td>
<td>22 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class/ Ruling Class.</td>
<td>7 10.9%</td>
<td>2 3.7%</td>
<td>1 2.4%</td>
<td>6 14.3%</td>
<td>9 7.6%</td>
<td>7 8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government, M.P.'s, Parliament, Political Parties.</td>
<td>6 9.4%</td>
<td>11 20.4%</td>
<td>5 12.2%</td>
<td>7 16.7%</td>
<td>17 14.4%</td>
<td>12 14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others.</td>
<td>9 14.1%</td>
<td>12 22.2%</td>
<td>5 12.2%</td>
<td>7 16.7%</td>
<td>21 17.8%</td>
<td>12 14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know.</td>
<td>7 10.9%</td>
<td>6 11.1%</td>
<td>9 21.9%</td>
<td>6 14.3%</td>
<td>13 11.0%</td>
<td>15 18.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N=64 | 100.0 | N=54 | 100.0 | N=41 | 100.0 | N=42 | 100.0 | N=118 | 100.0 | N=83 | 100.0 |

(1) The exact wording of the question was: 'Which group in our society has the most say in your opinion, on how the country is run?' Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
felt the Conservatives favoured big business rather than small business. It might be, therefore, that a belief held by small firm owner-managers that the owners and controllers of large firms had considerable influence on the political process is communicated to shopfloor workers. This might also help to explain why small firm workers are more likely than large firm workers to feel that such groups are the most influential in society.

This emphasis among small firm workers on the power of owners and controllers of industry in society might have been even greater had the age distribution and level of trade union membership more closely resembled those among the large firm workers. Older workers and trade union members, both under-represented among the main sample as compared to the control sample, were, as seen above, more likely to feel that these groups were the most influential in society. This held not only among older workers and trade union members generally but among the same groups within the small firm sample itself.

The proportions of respondents selecting trade unions as most influential in society must be considered as rather low when it is remembered that throughout much of the interviewing programme, the Conservative Party and the mass media emphasised the power of trade unions even over Parliament itself. But as Table 5.16 shows, less than one in five of small firm workers picked trade unions as most influential in society. Even among younger workers, with less experience of industry and employment and hence perhaps more receptive to views on trade union power in the media, this proportion rose to only 25% and is again lower among small firm workers. Equally, trade union members themselves often do not accept the media view of trade union power in society; only 16.6% picked trade unions as most influential in society. But neither were non-trade union members much more likely to hold this view with 25% picking trade unions as most influential in society.

These findings do not, therefore, provide any strong support for the hypothesis being considered. The small firm respondents did not appear to hold ideological views favouring a Conservative view of society and power. Indeed, if anything, some of their views on the locus of influence in society seem less Conservative than those of large firm workers. Of course, an opinion on the location of influence in society does not, of itself, indicate the respondent's view on the desirability of the perceived location. A respondent might feel 'The Rich' were most influential in society and that this is as it should be since
possession of wealth confers a moral right to control others. Similarly, not all respondents who thought the trade unions the most influential thought this morally reprehensible. Yet it appears reasonable to infer that respondents, in selecting owners and controllers of industry as most influential in our society, were not expressing a personal commitment to this state of affairs. This inference is fully consistent with the voting data presented earlier and the data on class imagery to be presented below.

Significant Political Others

An attempt was made to identify respondents' significant political others. The results, it was hoped, would be relevant to a number of issues being discussed in this chapter ranging from the influence of work experiences on political opinions, to the importance of local social influences on political views, to the extent that membership of an occupational community might be a source of significant political others. The latter has been strongly argued in previous research on printing workers.\(^{(95)}\)

However, as Table 5.17 shows, half the respondents were unable to name anybody in answer to the question: 'Who would you say has had the most influence on your political views?' This was not entirely unexpected as previous research has produced similar results. Goldthorpe et al found that 82% of their respondents were unable to name anybody whose political views "carried a lot of weight" with them.\(^{(96)}\) (In formulating a similar question for the present research, a wording was chosen which, rather than asking who had a great influence on the respondent's political views, simply asked who had the most influence.\(^{(96)}\) In this way it was hoped that a higher proportion of respondents would be able to name someone and, as Table 5.17 indicates, this strategy was quite successful.)

Nevertheless, it must be remembered that positive answers provide information only on those significant political others of whom respondents are aware. As might be expected, however, it was younger workers who were least able to name anybody as influencing their political views which, as seen earlier, were often extremely vague. Some workers may also have been unwilling to name anybody because they felt this implied an inability to think for themselves on political matters. It should also be noted that a named significant political other might have a positive or negative influence on respondents' views. National political leaders - who form the largest group in Table 5.17 - by expressing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronic Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling or Kin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Politician or T.U. Leader</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Politician</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmate or Friend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Name Anybody</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=73 100.0  N=66 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=44 100.0  N=139 100.0  N=88 100.0

(1) Excludes partners in Silver, Brown and Stone.

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
a view or policy or by some personal mannerism might influence a respondent into adopting the opposite view or favouring another party. Usually negative influences of this kind did not cause respondents to switch party allegiances but confirmed them more strongly in their existing views.

Despite the reservations which the above considerations entail, the data offers indicators on several issues. First, there is a high degree of similarity in the findings for all sub-samples and the main and control samples. The data provides little support for the small firm as a special source of significant political others. Not one small firm respondent named a superior at work as a significant political other, and workmates were also very infrequently mentioned. This provides further support for the view, developed in Chapter 4, that the importance of the occupational community among printers has been overstated. Workmates and friends were no more frequently mentioned as political others by printers than by electronics workers.

Table 5.17 also provides additional support for the conclusions on the importance of the local community in respondents' lives offered earlier in this chapter. Only five respondents (2.2% of the whole sample) named a local politician as a significant political other. Even if these are added to the proportions naming a workmate or friend this raises the total of local significant political others to under 10% overall.

In the earlier discussion of thinking on workers' political attitudes, it was noted that some recent writers on influences on political orientations gave the mass media a much greater influence than previously. The most important significant political others of the present respondents are clearly national politicians or trade union leaders and most workers will have had contact with these only through the mass media and especially television. This is also consistent with the view of the increasing importance of the mass media as a source of information and values and the decline in importance of local social relations. The lack of social integration into the local social network, suggested by the data examined earlier (almost certainly lower than in areas like Banbury and Bradford where previous research on small firm workers has been carried out) may mean this result is more pronounced for the present sample. A similar argument might also be developed in relation to the small firm itself and the occupational community among printers as sources of political views; the mass media and especially television,
may well have largely supplanted both as sources of political views.

SOCIAL CLASS

The third and final hypothesis to be tested in this chapter concerns respondents' class imagery. It suggests that small firm workers are more likely to have a deferential image of society and to have a lower level of class consciousness than large firm workers. A number of writers were cited earlier as arguing this view but it was also noted that direct empirical support was slight. In the present study a good deal of data on respondents' class imagery was obtained and this allows a refinement of previous views.

Theorising and research on social class imagery is, unfortunately, attended by extensive controversy and methodological problems and this provides special problems where, as in the present research, the subject of class imagery was only one facet of a much larger project. For instance, the concept of the 'deferential' worker has become increasingly ambiguous due to the varying usages of different writers and a host of methodological problems in research.

In the thinking preliminary to the present research, the conceptualisation of 'deference' adopted was that of Lockwood who, in his original formulation, noted his dependence on earlier work, particularly that of political scientists. Even in this early formulation he admitted:

"... how refined his [the deferential worker's] image of the status hierarchy really is, or how exactly he perceives his own position in it, is not known. It is merely suggested that he has a conception of a higher and unapproachable status group of leaders, his 'betters', the people who 'know how to run things', those whose performance is guaranteed by 'breeding'; and that he himself claims to be nothing grander than 'working class'." (97)

In a more recent paper he further admits that his own original formulation was:

"... by no means as complete or explicit as it should have been." (99)

Subsequently, the literature on the deferential worker has proliferated to the extent that an overall account is difficult to provide. At one extreme is the structural-functionalist abstractions of Shils, offering a highly elaborate conceptualisation of 'deference' unrelated to empirical study and with no direct suggestions for its application. (100) At the other extreme is the pessimism of Kavanagh who, after examining the vague conceptualisation and application of 'deference', suggests it be withdrawn from academic currency. (101)

Newby has recently incisively criticised much of the existing thinking on the notion of deference especially in its concentration on
deference seen as a form of behaviour or as a set of attitudes. He argues that a lot of so-called 'deferential' behaviour is habitual or calculative rather than deferential as conventionally understood. Attitudinal approaches to deference are deficient because they imply a fixed social imagery unaffected by social experiences and specific events. Instead, Newby proposes that deference should be seen as a form of social interaction involving those whose hierarchical relations are based on traditional authority.

One effect of this reconceptualisation, however, is to restrict the application of the notion of deference very severely to those few areas of society where a Weberian traditional authority could be said to predominate in local social relations. Certainly, such a view of deference has little application to the respondents in the present study and their social relations with others as the data in Chapter 4 and this chapter shows.

Another piece of influential thinking here is that of Parkin who has been concerned with the theme of deference for some time (103). Parkin's analysis of deference is contained within a larger discussion of the major meaning systems by which people make sense of social inequality. He suggests there are three such meaning systems in modern society:

1. The dominant value system which is seen as "a moral framework which promotes the endorsement of existing inequality; among the subordinate class this leads to a definition of the reward structure in either deferential or aspirational terms." (104)

2. The subordinate value system - "a moral framework which promotes accommodative responses to the facts of inequality and low status." (105)

3. The radical value system - "a moral framework which promotes an oppositional interpretation of class inequality." (106)

Enlarging on the deferential view, he writes:

"Deferential interpretations of the rewards and status hierarchy stem from acceptance of the dominant value system by members of the subordinate class. It should be emphasised here that deference as a general mode of understanding and responding to the facts of low status does not necessarily entail a sense of self abnegation. Rather, it tends to be bound up with a view of the social order as an organic entity in which each individual has a proper part to play, however humble. Inequality is seen as inevitable as well as just, some men being inherently fitted for positions of power and privilege. To acknowledge the superiority of such people is not to demean or belittle oneself, since all must benefit from their stewardship of society." (107)

Parkin stresses, therefore, that acceptance of the dominant value system does not automatically lead to deference. It may, alternatively, lead to a view emphasising the possibilities of individual self advancement.
The similarities between Parkin's thinking and that of Lockwood are obvious but Parkin's thinking has the advantage of the further theorising and research which largely stemmed from Lockwood's original article. (108) Lockwood himself, in reviewing his earlier ideas, has not chosen to attempt any substantial updating. (109) However, Parkin, in specifying the social correlates of a deferential image, clearly reveals the continuing lack of clear empirical support. He mainly recapitulates Lockwood's view that this image will be held by members of the working class who have a lot of contact with status superiors both in and out of work. There are apparently two main reasons for this lack of advance. First, the methodological issues involved in investigating class imagery and second, the interpretation of findings from studies. The two reasons are, of course, closely related to each other.

The methodological issues here turn on the behavioural responses taken as indicative of the possession of a deferential image. Researchers are by no means agreed on these. Voting behaviour and especially support for the Conservatives might, at first sight, be taken as one indicator of deference among the working class but it has been argued that deferential attitudes do not preclude support for the Labour Party. Support for a particular party at an election may be 'tactical' as for the Liberals in February 1974 or for instrumental reasons unconnected with any overall social class imagery. (110)

An examination of studies of deference reveals the inconsistencies among researchers on indicators of a deferential image. For instance, McKenzie and Silver see opposition to trade unions and support for big business as indicators while Nordlinger accepts opposition to trade unions as an indicator but also opposition to big business. (111) Some researchers find it possible to accept findings which to others might seem inconsistent with a deferential image. Martin and Fryer, for example, in reporting research which they claim vindicates Lockwood's view of the deferential worker, are nevertheless compelled to report that those they labelled 'deferential' were about as likely as non-deferentials to believe that workers' and managers' interests were opposed, that people should join unions because workers should stick together and that management was solely concerned with making profits. (112)

The concern with the conceptualisation and measurement of deference may be overstated; even if in the past some proportion of manual workers had a deferential image it may now be much less evident.
As Rose argues:

"This historic importance of government by hereditary noblemen has made contemporary social scientists conscious of the potential importance of deference ... But successive survey studies have demonstrated one thing unequivocally: the proportion who defer to politicians on grounds of birth is no more than about one tenth of the electorate. Moreover, even among working class Conservatives - the group considered most prone to a deferential outlook - individuals are more likely to be 'secular' or 'pragmatic' ... than deferential. These studies do not refute the significance of deferential outlooks in the nineteenth century transition to universal suffrage, but rather measure the distance between 1867 and contemporary England." (114)

Even Martin and Fryer, who claimed to have found 'deferentials' among their sample, admit that these were predominantly among those aged over 50. They argue that adverse economic circumstances, such as the threat of unemployment, may also lead to a fall in the proportion holding a deferential image. (115)

These doubts on the general applicability of the notion of deference as well as the methodological and interpretive issues raised above, are consistent with Newby's argument discussed earlier. However, it is still argued that, given the widely accepted view of the small firm worker as a 'deferential' it is well worth examining respondents' social imagery for evidence of such a view. It is true that the data considered here is largely attitudinal and behavioural but this may be integrated with the data on social relations in the firm and in non-work life examined earlier. As will be seen, the data combines overall to provide a clear test of the hypothesis.

'Class consciousness', the second of the problematic terms in the hypothesis about to be examined, has as its obvious starting point, the Marxist view of an inevitable development within the working class of an awareness of their shared position in relation to the capitalist economic order. The components of class consciousness are an awareness of belonging to the working class; an awareness of an oppositional position vis-à-vis the ruling class and an awareness of - and willingness to adopt - the actions required to further those interests, ultimately to the overthrow of capitalism. It is, in the well known phrase, the process by which 'a class in itself' becomes 'a class for itself'. (116)

A legion of critics have argued that there is little evidence of the development of class consciousness conceived in this way in Britain during this century. (117) Even advocates of the Marxist position admit:

"... of radical opposition to the established order - of dissent from its premises - there is much evidence in the history of
British labour. There were the makings that might have become - and might still become - a revolutionary impulse: grumbling at most times under the surface of accommodation and erupting at some, though to no effect so far." (118)

Nevertheless, as the above quotation implies, optimism remains on the possibilities of full class consciousness emerging. Other Marxist writers have generated an 'explosion of consciousness' thesis. This argues that, at this stage in the development of capitalism, most workers are basically 'accommodative' but from time to time in particular situations - the sudden declaration of mass redundancy, for example - class consciousness may emerge. (119) This, however, is temporary and when the immediate situation is resolved, accommodative attitudes re-emerge. But the experience of genuine class consciousness leaves its psychological mark, making it easier for workers to reach the threshold of class consciousness on later occasions. This increases the chances of such a state lasting long enough to achieve a revolution. Proponents of this thesis also often maintain that this intermittent character of class consciousness makes survey methodology especially unsuitable for its detection since research rarely coincides with consciousness inducing events. Moreover, the interview is too superficial a research strategy to tap latent class consciousness.

Such an argument makes large assumptions in asserting that such a process is indeed cumulative or that class consciousness, born of industrial conflict, will necessarily translate itself into wider political demands. Even Marxist writers have recognised this possible disjunction. Lenin himself suggested that such processes might halt at 'trade union consciousness', that is, opposition might remain confined to relations with employers and become political only in the form of demands that government introduce legislation relevant to such relations. (120)

Some critics have even argued that the changing socio-economic and political structure of capitalism has led, if anything, to a decline in class consciousness or to circumstances unfavourable to its development. Both Parkin and Goldthorpe et al, have argued that technological and economic changes as well as urban redevelopment, have undermined the existence of the kind of community which fostered the growth of class consciousness or even trade union consciousness. (121) This argument, indeed, underlies Goldthorpe et al's thesis of the 'new working class', alleged to be emerging in the 1960's.

The present decade presents a new set of conditions against which
views on deference and class consciousness may be observed. Levels of
the strike form of industrial conflict have oscillated sharply. In
1972 the level was the highest since 1926, the year of the General
Strike, while in 1976, in terms of the number of workers involved it
was lower than in all but two years of the previous decade. Unemploy­
ment and economic insecurity have been higher than since the end of
World War Two and real living standards have fallen for the first time
in the adult lives of most workers.

The main aim of the present research was to explore respondents' social class imagery in relation to the third hypothesis. By social class imagery here is meant those definitions and views, cognitive and effective, which relate to economic activities, inequality, prestige and power. In the light of previous thinking and research on class consciousness in a strictly Marxist sense, it would be very unlikely to find this present among the present sample. Rather the differences and similarities between the main and control samples on social class imagery might be expected to be very much a matter of degree. Never­theless, as will be seen, such differences are revealed by the data.

In turn, the unsuitability of survey methodology for this purpose, alleged by Marxists for the reasons discussed above and even by those such as Lockwood, who have been much attached to this research strategy in the past, is not accepted. The interview with open questions can provide information in a way which would be difficult or impossible to achieve by other strategies where workers in very different work situations are being compared.

**Self-Rated Social Class**

The present sample are, by virtue of their manual occupations, sociologically defined as working class but it is also usual to see how respondents define themselves in class terms. Table 5.18 shows social class self-rating by shopfloor respondents and indicates that only slightly over half saw themselves as working class with little difference between the main and control samples. In both industries small firm workers were rather more likely to see themselves as working class than large firm workers. Large firm workers, on the other hand, were more likely to see themselves as middle class although the differ­ence was not large. The opportunities in the small firm for inter­acting with status superiors - which as Chapter 4 showed, remain largely unexercised - do not, therefore, appear to increase the chances of small firm workers identifying with the middle class to the extent of seeing themselves in that class.
The remaining categories in Table 5.18 require some explanation. In order to maintain the unstructured character of questions, the interviewer declined to give any definition of social class. Any request for a definition was politely diverted by saying that it was the respondent's own opinion which was wanted. Ambiguities in replies to the question; 'Which social class would you say you belonged to?' were probed in a neutral way to try to resolve them. The 'Other' category in the Table, therefore, consists of those who, after probing, offered labels other than 'Working Class' or 'Middle Class' such as, 'the ordinary', 'those who get by', and 'the reasonably well off'.

The next two categories 'Belong to No Class' and 'Denies Class Exists' are often amalgamated in previous research but if the present research is any guide, this leads to a misleadingly high proportion being reported as denying the existence of class. Several respondents said they belonged to no class but this did not mean they denied the existence of class. Sometimes they had genuine doubts about whether to define themselves as working class or middle class but more often they were refusing to place themselves in a class because they morally condemned class divisions even though they recognised their existence. The proportion of respondents absolutely denying the existence of class was, in fact, only 1%. A further 5% felt unable to answer the question.

The present data is not easy to compare with previous data. There is a tendency to assume that the proportions of manual workers who define themselves as 'Working Class' and 'Middle Class' remains roughly constant. Usually, it is thought that about 70% of manual workers see themselves as working class and about 25% as middle class. But, in fact, there is a good deal of variation here. For example, Goldthorpe et al found that 22% of their manual workers were prepared to regard themselves as middle class and note that this is somewhat lower than in earlier studies where proportions from 12% to 40% have been reported. As they correctly point out some of these differences result from differences in the wording of questions and others to sample composition which, like their own, may be unrepresentative of manual workers as a whole. Butler and Stokes, in their 1970 study, for instance, found that 20% of their unskilled manual male heads of households saw themselves as middle class as against 26% of their skilled manual workers.

Broadly, the present sample might be seen as somewhat more prone to regard themselves as middle class and less prone to see themselves as working class, than manual workers in previous studies. Three reasons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Working Class'</td>
<td>36 56.2</td>
<td>28 51.8</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>20 47.6</td>
<td>66 54.2</td>
<td>42 50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Middle Class'</td>
<td>16 25.0</td>
<td>15 27.8</td>
<td>14 34.1</td>
<td>13 30.9</td>
<td>31 26.3</td>
<td>27 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 7.8</td>
<td>5 9.3</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>3 7.1</td>
<td>10 8.5</td>
<td>7 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs to No Class</td>
<td>4 6.2</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 5.1</td>
<td>3 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies Class Exists</td>
<td>1 1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 0.8</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Give No Answer</td>
<td>2 3.1</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>2 4.8</td>
<td>6 5.1</td>
<td>3 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64 100.0  N=54 100.0  N=41 100.0  N=42 100.0  N=118 100.0  N=83 100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

*Respondents who described themselves as belonging to a subdivision of a class e.g. 'the lower middle class', are categorised by the main class label they applied to themselves.*
may account for this. First, the locality in which the samples live. As Runciman showed, manual workers living in the South are more likely to see themselves as middle class than workers in some other parts of the country. Second, the present sample contains a high proportion of home owners and home ownership among manual workers has been found to be associated with middle class self-rating. Thirdly, the bulk of the present sample were skilled manual workers and, as the Butler and Stokes 1970 study cited above noted, such workers are more likely to see themselves as middle class.

However, the main findings in the present study are the lack of differences between the sub-samples in the proportions who define themselves as working class and the rather higher proportion among the large firm sample who see themselves as middle class. The latter may be linked to home ownership and skill levels. Among married large firm workers aged 30 and over, 81.2% owned their own home compared to 52.5% among comparable small firm workers. Chapter 3 amply demonstrated the superiority in documented skill levels and experience among the control sample.

It is usual to stress in an analysis of social class self-labelling that respondents often have very different criteria in mind when placing themselves in different social classes. The present sample were no exception here but, despite this, self-rated social class was related to other attitudes and behaviour. For example, among small firm workers who voted Labour at the most recent General Election, 53.3% saw themselves as working class and 33.3% as middle class but among those who voted Conservative, 14.3% saw themselves as working class and 71.4% as middle class. A similar relationship was found among the large firm respondents. These findings were entirely as expected on the basis of previous research.

Self-rated social class was also related to age. Among small firm workers, older workers were much more likely than younger workers to see themselves as working class. Of the 81 small firm shopfloor respondents aged under 35, 45.7% labelled themselves working class, compared to 73% of those aged 35 and over. Conversely, 33.3% of those aged under 35 saw themselves as middle class compared to only 10.8% of those aged 35 and over. However, among large firm workers, the opposite was found. Younger large firm workers were more likely to see themselves as working class than older workers and older workers were more likely to see themselves as middle class.
It may be that this difference between the main and control samples on self-rated social class and age is related to a third factor, income. For instance, among the large firm workers, where the age distribution provides a reasonably sized sample of respondents aged 35 and over, it is possible to discern an association between income and self-rated social class. If the 35 large firm respondents aged 35 and over, for whom information is available, are divided into two groups, 'low earners' (those whose gross earnings at the time of interview were less than £65 per week) and 'high earners' (those with gross earnings of £65 per week or more) then the 'high earners' were much more likely to see themselves as middle class. Of the 35 large firm shopfloor respondents aged 35 and over, 18 were 'high earners'; of these 38.9% labelled themselves working class. But of those classified as 'low earners', 64.7% labelled themselves working class. A reverse finding was found among those labelling themselves middle class, that is, 'high earners' were more likely to see themselves as middle class.

Unfortunately, because the proportion of respondents aged 35 and over with gross earnings of £65 per week or more is so small in the main sample, the comparison is not worth making. However, it could be that older workers in the main sample who earn relatively high wages are also more likely to see themselves as middle class. This relationship between income and self-rated social class has been found previously by Runciman, but he stressed that this need not be taken as evidence of embourgeoisement. The worker may define himself as middle class by using fellow manual workers as a reference group rather than the middle class as understood by sociologists. High earners, in other words, are high earners in relation to other manual workers and this may be their reason for seeing themselves as different to 'ordinary' manual workers. (Runciman also found that younger manual respondents were more likely to designate themselves middle class but because of the cross-sectional character of his sample he is unwilling to make much of this.)

Self-Rated Social Class and Politics

Self-rated social class was also related to some of the attitudes discussed in the examination of the second hypothesis above. For instance, it will be remembered that over half of all respondents felt that they did not have enough say in how the country was run. (See Table 5.15). It was those who labelled themselves as working class in the main sample who felt least able to influence the political process. Of the 59 small firm workers who labelled themselves working class and for whom full information is available, 83% felt they had little or no influence.
Among small firm respondents seeing themselves as middle class, there is still a majority who felt they had little say but the proportion is nevertheless lower at 64.7%. However, the control sample shows the opposite relationship. A majority of large firm respondents who saw themselves as working class as well as of those who saw themselves as middle class felt they had little influence on the political process but those who saw themselves as middle class showed a rather higher level of such feelings. Given the size of the sub-samples involved, however, this difference may not be very great and no great dependence can be placed upon it.

There was an apparent relationship between feelings on whether it made a difference if Labour or the Conservatives won a General Election and self-rated social class among the small firm workers but less so among the large firm workers. Among small firm workers, 66.6% of those labelling themselves working class believed it made a difference who won an election but among those seeing themselves as middle class, 21.7% felt it made a difference while 40.3% felt it made no difference. Among large firm respondents who saw themselves as working class, 33.2% felt that it made a difference which party won an election and 47.4% felt it made no difference. Of those large firm respondents who designated themselves middle class, similar proportions, about one in three, felt it made or did not make a difference.

Self-Rated Social Class and Industrial Relations

Fewer relationships were found between trade union membership and self-rated social class. Similar proportions of trade union and non-trade union members labelled themselves as working class or middle class. However, among small firm workers who rated themselves as working class, 51.8% were trade union members as compared to 39.4% among those who saw themselves as middle class but it must be remembered that only five small electronics firm workers were trade union members so this finding should probably be disregarded.

Other industrial relations issues show a similar small relationship with self-rated social class. For example, the proportions of respondents who chose a 'team' view of industry as opposed to a 'conflict' view who rated themselves working class were similar in the main and control samples. But the proportions holding each of these views among the small firm workers who self-rated themselves middle class did differ; 35.0% of those who chose a team view saw themselves as middle class as compared to 20.5% who chose a conflict view. Among the control sample, however, again it did not greatly differ.
Turning the relationship around, of the 55 small firm respondents who self-rated themselves working class and who had definite views on whether industry should be seen in teamwork or conflict terms, 60% chose a teamwork view. And among those who saw themselves as middle class this rose to 75%. However, among the control sample while 58% of those who saw themselves as working class chose a teamwork view so did 52% of those who saw themselves as middle class.

This divorce between attitudes concerned with work issues and self-rated social class is well illustrated by attitudes to going on strike. The latter question appeared to tap workers' feelings of loyalty to fellow workers and produced a surprisingly high proportion who agreed with the 'radical' view that they would be prepared to strike at any time to support the interests of workers. Yet, the propensity to choose this view appeared unrelated to self-defined social class among small firm workers. The opposite view, being unwilling to strike under any circumstances, was also found to be unrelated to self-rated social class among this sample.

However, as with the other aspects of industrial relations, differences were found among the control sample. Here, as might have been expected for all respondents, those who saw themselves as middle class were less likely than those who saw themselves as working class, to feel prepared to strike at any time to help other workers. There was, however, little association between being unwilling to strike under any circumstances and self-rated social class.

The final aspect of industrial relations examined here was attitudes to the power of trade unions. In both samples, respondents who labelled themselves as middle class were more likely to see trade unions as too powerful. Thus, in the small firm sample, 68% of those respondents who saw themselves as middle class, thought that trade unions had become too strong compared to 40.6% of those who saw themselves as working class. Among the control sample, the comparable proportions were 68% and 45.4% respectively.

So, although differences do appear when attitudes on various aspects of industrial relations and trade union membership are related to self-rated social class, the differences are often small or appear only in one sample and sometimes are not consistent with each other. The clearest relationship appears on the final issue considered, the position of trade unions in the wider society, where respondents who labelled themselves middle class are clearly more anti-trade union,
regardless of whether they work in a small or large firm. However, when this issue was analysed in Chapter 4, it was found that respondents were often talking about 'trade unions' in the abstract. These were usually not the trade unions to which respondents themselves belonged but a kind of 'them'. In contrast, the other industrial relations issues discussed are linked more closely to the workplace and relations with fellow workers and it is this kind of issue which shows less association with self-rated social class. It might, therefore, be tentatively suggested that this analysis indicates that the workplace itself is not a powerful or consistent source of social class meanings for the actor's view of his position in society.

**Number of Classes in Society**

Self-rated social class, of itself, tells us little about other important aspects of respondents' social class imagery. Respondents may use the same label - 'working class' or 'middle class' - to describe their own position in the class order yet still have very different models of the class order in mind. One aspect of interest here is the complexity of the class order in terms of the number of strata distinguished. Lockwood, in his original article on working class imagery, argued that deferential workers were more likely to have a complex view of social class than either traditional or privatised workers because of the emphasis on status in this image as opposed to power or material wealth. Thus, the deferential worker "thinks in terms of at least a fourfold division of society."[131]

In the present study the question of how many social classes respondents thought there were in society, was followed by questions on how respondents would name the classes, who they thought belonged to each class and the influences which put people into different classes. There was a slight tendency for respondents to adopt a more complex model, that is, to increase the number of strata, as successive questions were put and Table 5.19 was compiled from the most complex model eventually offered by the respondent. This favours the detection of respondents with a deferential image of society if Lockwood's view is accepted. However, as the Table shows, on this measure, small firm respondents appear no more deferential than large firm respondents. Overall, only 21.1% have a model of the class order with four or more strata in it. Large firm respondents tend to have more complex models of the social class order than small firm workers although there is an overlap between the small printing firm and the large electronics firm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Class Only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Classes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three &quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four &quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five &quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64     100.0   N=54     100.0   N=41     100.0   N=42     100.0   N=118    100.0   N=83     100.0

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
workers. It will also be noted that the replies imply little support for the frequently asserted view of politicians and others that 'We are all one class now'. Only one respondent thought there was only one class in society.

In the main sample, older workers, those aged 35 and over, tend to have more complex models of the social order than younger workers. Of the 37 small firm workers aged 35 and over, 32.4% had a model of the class order with four or more classes compared to only 16% of the younger workers and this held for both industrial sub-samples among the small firm workers. However, among the control sample respondents the opposite was found. In the large firms younger workers had more complex models of the social class order than older workers; 29.5% of younger workers had a class model with four or more strata compared to 20.1% of the older workers. There is little indication in the data on why this difference should exist and, of course, the sub-samples involved are often very small. It must also be remembered that it is a minority of respondents who are being discussed; 67.7% of all respondents have a class model of three classes or less.

However, if age is controlled for there is a convergence in the proportions in the main and control samples who have complex models of the class order. Thus, if the age distributions of the main and control samples were closer we might expect the differences between the two samples to become minimal, still not supporting the idea that small firm workers have more complex models of the class order than large firm workers. On this measure, therefore, there is little indication that the small firm worker sample contains a higher proportion of respondents holding a deferential image of society.

The findings from the present study may be compared to those of Batstone who found that none of his respondents distinguished more than three classes. He found that 42% of his small firm workers and 69% of his large firm workers had a three class model. Some of the differences between Batstone's findings and those in the present study may be due to the smallness of Batstone's samples. It is, after all, somewhat implausible not to find a single respondent who held a class model of more than three classes. However, despite the differences, neither set of results supports the notion that small firm workers are, on this measure, likely to have a deferential image of society.

Martin and Fryer found that 65% of their manual worker sample believed "there were several classes in Britain" and "only 23% ...
believed in the classic two class model. In the present sample only 15.9% held a two class model. Again, however, this may be the result of differences in the questions asked and the research strategies employed. In particular, Martin and Fryer's questionnaire lacked questions on what kind of people respondents placed in the 'working class' and 'middle class', which in the present study sometimes led respondents to revise their model of the class order towards greater complexity.

The findings, however, remain of interest because Martin and Fryer's sample was of workers employed by a highly paternalistic employer which might be expected to go with a deferential class image. The authors themselves describe their sample as having a low level of class consciousness, respect for authority and acceptance of the status quo. If by 'several classes' is meant three or more classes then respondents in both small firms and large firms in the present study have more complex models of the class order. Among small firm workers, 76.2% had a model with three or more classes compared to 71.1% among the large firm respondents. The small firm employers in the present study were not very paternalistic, nor did the localities contain dominant employers with strongly paternalistic ideologies and, as Chapter 4 showed, workers themselves resented paternalism. It may be argued, therefore, that the differences in findings are probably due to methodological differences in examining this very complex aspect of social imagery.

A final comparison on perceived complexity of the class order may be made with Goldthorpe et al's findings. They report that 33% of their manual workers "distinguished no more than two major classes" ... "48% ... distinguished only three major classes" and "11% had multi-class (i.e. more than three) models." The research strategy used in Goldthorpe et al's study was a 'relatively unstructured' discussion and appears to be closer to that used in the present study than that of Martin and Fryer. A comparison with Table 5.19 suggests that Goldthorpe et al's sample contained a much higher proportion of respondents with a dichotomous class order, about the same proportion with a three class order and a smaller proportion with a class order having four or more classes. Again precisely what the differences in findings indicate is not easy to say; clearly, respondents in the present study are much more likely to have a complex model of social class order than Goldthorpe et al's but whether this is due to differences in methodology, work situation, community, structure of the sample or other possible influences
is impossible to ascertain. All that can be said is, that the main sample in the present study did not show any greater departure from Goldthorpe et al's findings than the large firm control sample; if anything, their models of the class order were more similar.

Social Class Labelling

After stating how many classes they thought there were in society, respondents were asked to name each one. There was a very wide range of class labels yet certain labels occurred with considerable frequency. In discussing the label for their top strata, 'top', 'upper' or 'higher class' were used by over half of all respondents. Equally interesting was the rarity of some labels used for this strata. For instance, only six respondents used the labels 'managers', 'management' or 'businessmen', consistent with the view that businessmen do not have high prestige in our society. Nor were labels explicitly indicating a traditional top strata very frequent; 14.4% of small firm workers and 13.2% of large firm workers used the label 'royalty' and 'aristocracy' for their top strata (although, of course, other labels such as 'upper class' may have been referring to a traditional top class.) Few differences emerged between sub-samples on labelling this strata but, as will be seen below, respondents often had rather different ideas on who they would place in their top strata and the criteria for membership.

The 'middle class' were, on the whole, seen as a relatively large, undifferentiated strata. Among small firm workers, 72% used the label 'middle class' for the strata in their class model immediately below the top strata. (Compared to 66.3% of the control sample respondents.) Relatively few respondents (22% among the small firm respondents and 15.7% among those in large firms) subdivided this strata into a 'lower' or 'upper' middle class.

The lower strata in respondents' class models, on the other hand, were usually more complex. While 58.2% of small firm respondents used the label 'working class' for the strata below their middle strata (or, for the small proportion of respondents with a two class model, the lower of the two strata) other labels, such as 'lower class', 'middle working class' and 'lower working class', were also used. 'Lower class' was particularly popular, being used by just over one in five small firm respondents. This pattern was paralleled in the control sample where 61.4% used the label 'working class' and there was a similar spread of other labels, 'lower class' again being the most popular.

At this level - the labelling of social strata in class models -
there is, therefore, a good deal of consistency between sub-samples and between the main and control samples. However, the same label may mean different things to different users and the mere labelling of strata says little about the complexity or coherence of respondents' class models. Variations on the latter were, in fact, very great indeed. Many respondents had clearly never thought out their ideas on social class and some indicated that in their ordinary lives they rarely talked or thought about class. In many cases also, respondents were developing and revising their ideas as they answered successive questions.

However, it would be wrong to assume that because respondents' class models lacked coherence that class had no salience in their image of society. Meanings which go to make up such an image should not be seen as simply either fully articulated or totally non-existent. In relation to many aspects of life, meanings may well have a shadowy, background place in the actor's overall image of society to emerge more clearly as and when situations provide a stimulus. This is similar to the view held by some Marxist writers discussed above concerning class consciousness but here the less extreme view is being put that certain situations may stimulate the articulation of meanings in relation to class (among which may be an interview situation as in the present study) as understood by the sociologist. The relationship between the presence of such meanings in the actor's image of society and behaviour is, of course, a different issue, as is the question of what other situations bring class meanings to the forefront of the actor's thinking.

Criteria of Social Class Membership

The criteria used by respondents for putting people into different classes was investigated in two ways. First, after saying how many classes they thought there were and naming them, respondents were asked to say who they thought were in each of their classes. Second, respondents were asked what were the important influences which put people into different classes. For both questions, but especially the first, extensive probing was used to obtain as much detail as possible on respondents' views.

This strategy indicated that most respondents had complex multi-dimensional models of the class order and, what is more, often varied the dimensions applicable to different strata or varied the importance given to a particular dimension or criterion. This point is important because previous studies of class imagery have often tended to imply
that respondents had a simple, one-dimensional model of the class order. Goldthorpe et al., for example, after admitting that their respondents' class images exhibited considerable diversity, were sometimes vague and that "to account for them exhaustively on the basis of a relatively small number of categories ... would be difficult and most probably a dubious undertaking". Nevertheless, they tend to reduce this variation to a simple 'money' model of class. Equally, Lockwood's original paper on working class images of society strongly implies uni-dimensional models in terms of class conflict (proletarian traditional working class) status (deferential working class) or money (privatised working class).

A neglected dimension in the examination of class imagery is strata size. Respondents who have the same number of strata in their class model may still distribute the population very differently between strata. Although respondents in the present study were not directly asked how they would allocate the population to the various strata it was very clear that there was a good deal of variation on this dimension. One problem in investigating this aspect of respondents' class models is that few respondents draw well defined boundaries between classes. However, perceived differences in strata size may well be important, for example, in discussing the 'working class'. At one extreme the 'working class' may be defined by respondents as 'all those who work', including all members of society who receive a wage or salary, from dustmen to dentists. At the other extreme, the 'working class' may be a small segment of the population containing employed unskilled and semi-skilled manual workers only, with a sub-class of very poor and unemployed below and a middle class of skilled manual and white collar workers above.

Finally, there is the dimension of 'class distance', that is, the degree of social separation respondents see between classes and the extent to which they feel members of one class may enter another class. The latter point is, of course, closely connected to social mobility, discussed below, but on the separation between classes, respondents revealed considerable differences in opinion. On the whole, respondents were inclined to blur the distinction between the working class and the middle class, often claiming it was almost impossible to see a clear difference and that there was a good deal of overlap in membership. But equally, many respondents saw their top strata as socially apart and closed. Often the core of this top strata was composed of those who, by birth or some other ascribed quality, had a membership beyond dispute. Other members of society 'could never be like them', whatever changes in
job, income or wealth might occur. This is not, however, necessarily a deferential image; this special upper strata might be seen as entirely 'above' politics or mundane social concerns.

These considerations mean that codes for responses to questions on class order composition and criteria were especially difficult to devise. Inevitably, a good deal of the fine detail of respondents' opinions is lost in the tabular presentation of results although in the analysis below this deficiency is countered by the use of the qualitative material from the respondents' tape recorded views. The simpler of the two main questions on this issue may be analysed first although, in the actual sequence of questions, it was the second question put. The reasons for this sequence were methodological. Respondents were asked to describe what kind of people they would put in each of the strata they had named and then what they thought were the main influences which put people into different classes. This sequence, it was hoped, would help respondents to bring out multiple criteria for placing people in different classes because it would follow an overall description of the respondents' class model, thus providing a more accurate picture of respondents' thinking.

Table 5.20 provides an initial indication of respondents' thinking on the dimensions of stratification. The differences between the main and control samples are slight on every dimension, never exceeding 6.3 percentage points. The largest difference is on the dimension of wealth or income and is in the expected direction, that is, large firm respondents are more likely to mention this criterion than small firm respondents but the difference is not large.

In fact, the biggest difference by far is not between small and large firm respondents but between respondents in the two industries. Thus, while 41.9% of the printing industry workers mentioned wealth and income as a criterion for placing people in different classes, only 27.1% of electronics workers did so. Printing industry workers were also more likely than electronics industry respondents to mention family of origin or breeding; 42.9% of printers mentioned this criterion as opposed to 30.2% of electronics industry workers.

A large difference also appears in relation to occupation. By 'occupation' here is meant the status or prestige of a job rather than its market aspects; where the latter were mentioned, it was coded as indicating the wealth/income dimension. Over one in ten electronics workers mentioned occupation in this status sense, compared to only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=64 %</td>
<td>N=54 %</td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=42 %</td>
<td>N=118 %</td>
<td>N=83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wealth/Income</strong></td>
<td>25 39.1</td>
<td>14 25.9</td>
<td>19 46.3</td>
<td>12 28.6</td>
<td>39 33.0</td>
<td>31 37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>8 12.5</td>
<td>10 18.5</td>
<td>9 21.9</td>
<td>5 11.9</td>
<td>18 15.2</td>
<td>14 16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family of Origin/Breeding</strong></td>
<td>28 43.7</td>
<td>17 31.5</td>
<td>17 41.5</td>
<td>12 28.6</td>
<td>45 38.1</td>
<td>29 34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td>2 3.1</td>
<td>8 14.8</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>3 7.1</td>
<td>10 8.4</td>
<td>4 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life-style/Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>5 7.8</td>
<td>9 16.7</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>3 7.1</td>
<td>14 11.9</td>
<td>8 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>5 7.8</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>6 14.3</td>
<td>9 7.6</td>
<td>9 10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Could Not Say</strong></td>
<td>4 6.2</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>7 16.7</td>
<td>7 5.9</td>
<td>9 10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Percentage refers to the proportion of respondents mentioning the influence.

The number of reasons exceeds the number of respondents because some respondents gave more than one reason.
three printing workers (3.9%). This may be interpreted as linked to industrial sub-culture differences. Electronics, as argued in Chapter 4, has taken on some of the cultural ethos attached to science and this may lead workers to emphasise what a person does in his work rather than the rewards received for doing it and, therefore, to give more emphasis to status criteria in constructing their class models. (The large electronics firm workers do this less than the small electronics firm workers probably because the large firm sample contained more respondents with skills not specific to the industry and who, therefore, might be expected to have a lower involvement in the industry's sub-culture.)

The printing workers, on the other hand, were, as also previously seen in Chapter 4, more money conscious. The recent decline in the industry's fortunes and feelings of relative deprivation felt by printing workers who believe other manual workers have usurped their top place in the manual worker earnings league, may be responsible for the greater emphasis on wealth and income in their class imagery. But printers, although the most money conscious of all sub-samples, still could not be described as having a simple money model of the class order. More printers actually mentioned family of origin and breeding than mentioned money (although the difference is small) and in terms of the diversity of reasons offered, the printers offer as wide a range as any other sub-sample. The stress on family background and breeding may be linked to the craft consciousness of printers. Traditionally, as craftsmen, they have placed themselves at the top of the working class or in the lower middle class and this may go with more general feelings of status superiority.

It might be argued that the frequency with which a reason is mentioned is not necessarily an indication of its salience in respondents' overall class imagery. The Marxist perspective, for example, argues that although people do mention lifestyle, education and family background, wealth, in the form of owning or controlling the means of production, is the most important dimension and is likely to be recognised as such. As Table 5.20 indicates, wealth and income were mentioned by a high proportion of all respondents (34.6%) but this is by no means a majority. It is also possible that some of the other dimensions had a relationship to wealth and income. For instance, family of origin and breeding may have been seen as the outcome of a superior position in the economic order. But a problem with this argument occurs when the sophistication of respondents' social class imagery is examined. For instance, a large proportion of respondents were careful to point out in their description of the various strata in their class model, that the dimensions of
stratification had varying importance in relation to specific classes. For many respondents, the core members of the upper strata were, as noted earlier, defined in non-economic terms. In contrast, other members of the strata were often defined in classic Marxist terms as owners and controllers of industry. Or again, a substantial proportion of respondents who were seen as 'middle class' were defined in terms of their striving to create or maintain a distinctive lifestyle: 'People who pretend to be better than ordinary people' rather than in occupational or income terms.

At the same time, this is not meant to imply that class consciousness in a Marxist sense was entirely absent. On the contrary, as will be seen below, what might be termed a 'primitive' class consciousness was present to a marked degree. But class imagery was more complex than any uni-dimensional models of stratification can allow for (the Marxist perspective is often presented in as uni-dimensional terms as the non-Marxist views of those who stress status or instrumentalism as dominating class imagery) and a great deal depends on how respondents are questioned and the sequence of questions. Respondents' views on the influences which put people into different classes followed their description of the class order and mentioned a wide variety of influences as having an effect on class membership. To reduce this to a single influence would be, at the very minimum, inaccurate and misleading.

**Criteria of Class Membership and Age**

On the majority of dimensions mentioned by respondents in describing their image of class, older and younger workers were in general agreement. On education, however, there was a clear disagreement; in every sub-sample, older workers (those aged 35 and over) thought education was a much more important influence on class position. Among small firm workers aged 35 and over, 32.4% mentioned education as an important influence on placing people in the class order, compared to only 7.4% of those aged under 35. Among the control sample the corresponding proportions were 25% and 9.3%. This emphasis on the importance of education among older workers echoed answers to an earlier question asking respondents what they thought was most important in helping a person get on in the world. Older workers were again more likely to think education was important than younger workers.

Within age sub-samples, younger workers in small firms were inclined to mention family of origin or breeding more than any other dimension; 37.8% mentioned this influence as important in putting people...
into classes. Only wealth and income, mentioned by 30.9% of those respondents, approached this level of frequency. In fact, no other influence was mentioned by more than 10% of younger respondents. Large firm younger workers, on the other hand, reversed this order with 41.9% mentioning wealth and income and 34.9% family of origin or breeding.

The emphasis on the importance of education among large firm workers meant that they stressed three dimensions with broadly similar frequencies: wealth and income, education, and family of origin or breeding. This pattern held for both large and small firm older workers but, in addition, older workers in small firms were also likely to put greater emphasis on lifestyle and behaviour.

One interpretation of the importance given to education by older workers is that they were brought up in a generation that saw itself as educationally deprived. The promise and optimism surrounding secondary education reforms introduced after the Second World War (which many older respondents did not have the opportunity to benefit from) may have produced a heightened expectation of the benefits of education combined with feelings of educational deprivation. It may also be that, older respondents had stronger feelings about what they might have achieved if their education had been better. As manual workers grow older they may increasingly see a lack of education as a barrier to personal advancement while younger workers are more optimistic about personal advancement simply because they are nearer the beginning of adult life.

Finally, it was noted that older workers in both the main and control samples had more complex social class images as measured by the number of influences mentioned. This was particularly apparent in the small firm sample. Again, this may well simply be the result of experience. Older workers have had more opportunities to observe the range of influences which can influence a person's life and this may be imported into views on social inequality and class.

The Structure of Social Classes: Two Class Models

Having looked at the dimensions of stratification that respondents mentioned as important in their class models the overall descriptions of class models can now be examined. This provides rather more detail since it shows the variations in the way criteria were applied to different levels of a class model. The easiest group to begin with here are those with a two class model of the class order. This was not a very large group (15.9% of all respondents) and was equally represented
in the main and control samples. There was, however, an inter-industrial difference with almost one in five (19%) printing industry workers having a two class model compared to 12.5% among the electronics industry respondents.

There has sometimes been a tendency to assume that where respondents hold a two class model this may be equated with a Marxist model of the class order, although most recent interpretations of Marx's theory stress that his division into two classes was meant to be analytical rather than descriptive. In the present study, of the 32 respondents with dichotomous models of class, only a minority (eight respondents) defined their classes entirely in terms of relations to the economic order. The test of a Marxist model here was stringent because respondents not only had to define all classes in economic terms but also, in reply to the succeeding question, to state that such criteria were the main influence putting people into different classes. (However, strictly, even defining the class order solely in terms of relations to the means of production need not necessarily imply class consciousness in the Marxist sense). Respondents' dichotomous models of class did not always offer a ruling class/working class division; some respondents had a model containing an upper class and a middle class based on a belief that nobody was working class any more or a model containing a middle class and a working class or lower class associated with the belief that the upper class had disappeared.

In other words, the majority of respondents with dichotomous models of the class order described the two classes in a mixture of terms mainly referring to economic criteria but generally combined with criteria denoting lifestyle or prestige aspects. Mixed criteria were used mainly to refer to the upper strata in the model; virtually all these respondents described their lower strata entirely in economic or occupational terms. For their overall choice of a main influence putting people into different classes, the majority chose factors such as family of origin or breeding or other non-economic influences, albeit frequently combined with economic influences. It would, therefore, be risky to conclude that these two class models showed much evidence of class consciousness in a Marxist sense.

The Structure of Three Class Models

The majority of respondents had a trichotomous model of the class order although in the control sample the proportion was, at 45.8%, below half. Most respondents in all sub-samples described the members of the three strata in terms of economic criteria or occupation. 'Occupation',
however, as noted above, may refer to lifestyle or prestige rather than economic criteria. This ambiguity is suggested by the finding that the majority of respondents with a three class model also used non-economic criteria in describing the strata making up their class model. Thus, only 40.8% of these respondents described their three strata solely in terms of economic or occupational criteria. There was no difference between small and large firm workers on this but there was a difference between industries. Electronics industry respondents were more likely to describe their model solely in economic terms (49.1% of the 55 respondents with three strata models) than respondents in printing (31.3% of the 48 respondents with three strata models).

The extent that descriptions solely in terms of economic criteria suggest class consciousness in a Marxist sense may be more severely tested by noting the proportion of respondents who not only gave such descriptions but also picked economic influences as the sole main influence placing people in different classes. (Some might still argue that this test is not severe enough since a person might have such a model yet still not see the strata as in conflict with each other.) However, only nine respondents would qualify on this test.

A less severe test would allow respondents to use non-economic criteria as well as economic criteria in describing some or all strata and to pair economic criteria with other criteria as the main influences putting people into different classes. But even on this test the proportions of respondents with such models are not large; 23.1% of the small firm workers with a three strata model and 25.9% of the large firm workers. It must be stressed that given the inherent problems in investigating class imagery these findings must be treated with great caution. They should be seen merely as indications of the proportions of respondents with a three strata model who, in their descriptions of the class order, might be seen as the most likely to have a degree of class consciousness. Whether they were, in fact, class conscious in a Marxist sense is doubtful. In any event, the findings, however crude, suggest in relation to the third hypothesis that class consciousness is not high in the sample as a whole and, more important, that there is no difference between the main and control samples. This conclusion is also consistent with the findings for respondents with two class models reported above.

The other aspect of the hypothesis being tested concerns respondents with a deferential image of society. This might be indicated by
defining the upper strata solely in prestige or lifestyle terms and claiming that family of origin, breeding and lifestyle are the most important influences putting people into different classes. Again this is not a watertight test since a respondent might define his upper strata in this way yet see prestige or lifestyle as the outcome of achievement rather than ascription. Even on this rough and somewhat generous test, the proportions in the sub-samples are not large. Among small firm workers, 15.4% of respondents with a three strata model might, on this measure, be seen as 'deferentials'. This compares with 5.3% of the large firm respondents with a three class model. This difference is not as large as it might first appear because it must be remembered that respondents with a three strata model were only about half of the whole sample. In other words, the ten respondents among the main sample who comprised the 15.4% of respondents with a three strata model who might be seen as deferentials, were only 8.5% of all small firm shopfloor workers. Further, applying this measure of a deferential image to respondents having a trichotomous image of the class order involves ignoring the idea that deferentials will have models of the class order with four or more strata.

A minority of respondents (seven or 6.8%) with three strata models of class placed themselves in the middle strata. Usually, the lower strata was described as containing the poor, ill paid or the old but some respondents also saw this strata containing those who refused to work. This small number of respondents were almost equally distributed between the main and control samples.

More Complex Models of Class

As Table 5.19 indicates, 31 respondents (15.2% of the small firm workers and 15.7% of the large firm workers) had four strata models of the class order. A further 15 respondents (5.9% of small firm workers and 9.6% of large firm workers) had class models containing five or more strata. In relation to the present hypothesis, it might be thought that these respondents were the least likely to be class conscious and the most likely to have a deferential image. Class consciousness is usually seen as indicated by an image of class dividing society into two great classes in conflict with each other. Images containing many strata are usually seen as indicating low class consciousness. Lockwood, for example, associates a deferential image with a multi-strata model of class and adds:

"There are few instances of lower status groups who both accept the legitimacy of the status hierarchy and fail to discover groups with an even lower status than their own." (142)
In a sense, the tests adopted for isolating respondents whose class imagery indicates a level of class consciousness or a deferential image are more difficult to meet for respondents with a complex class model. Each additional strata provides a further possibility of deviating from the selected indicators. Partly this arises from the simplicity of prevailing thinking on class imagery among manual workers which, because it tends to assume that respondents hold uni-dimensional models of the class order, accepts relatively crude indicators of the presence of class consciousness or a deferential image. In the present study, however, the findings show that the assumption of simple images of the class order is highly suspect for a majority of respondents.

Using the tests applied to respondents with trichotomous models of the class order, the findings for respondents with four or more strata indicate little likelihood of the presence of either class consciousness or a deferential image. Thus, on the potential class consciousness test (all strata described in economic or occupational criteria and economic influences seen as the sole influence putting people into different classes) two small firm respondents emerged. Where the less severe test was applied (all strata described in terms of economic criteria which could be combined with other criteria in discussing the main influences placing people in different classes) one further respondent appeared in the main sample. Among the control sample, two respondents met the more severe test and no respondent the less severe test.

The test for a deferential image (top strata defined solely in prestige or lifestyle criteria and seeing family of origin, breeding and lifestyle as the most important influence putting people into different classes) produced only four respondents in the main sample, two of which were questionable. Of the four, only one placed himself in a strata above the lowest strata in his model. In the control sample only two respondents with multi-class models conformed to this test. Both worked in the large printing firm and both placed themselves in a strata above the bottom strata in their models.

Summing up this examination of class imagery in terms of respondents' descriptions and the influences they selected as most important in placing people in different classes, it may be argued that two sub-populations have been isolated in the main and control samples with a potential for class consciousness or having a deferential image of society. Adopting the severer test of class consciousness described earlier 20 respondents were isolated, 8 in the main sample and 12 in
the control sample. This suggests, as Table 5.21 shows, that potential class consciousness is higher among the control sample and hence supports the hypothesis.

The less severe test of potential class consciousness discussed above allows more main sample respondents to be included. Before drawing any firm conclusions on this data a number of important reservations must be made. First, although the data has been analysed in some depth it must be stressed that all that is being claimed is that sub-samples have been isolated whose members may be seen as potentially class conscious. The qualitative analysis of the recorded interviews indicated that very few of these respondents had an unambiguously classic Marxist image. Those that had such an image had clearly been exposed to Marxist ideas at some time.

As argued earlier, there are advantages in seeing class consciousness on a continuum rather than as a discreet, all or nothing phenomenon. If this is accepted then, overall, rather less than one in five respondents show potential class consciousness defined as seeing the class order predominantly in economic terms. The more severe test reduces this to about one in ten. It would, of course, be possible to examine these respondents further by, for example, noting whether they see industry in teamwork or conflict terms but the sole effect would be to further reduce the size of the sub-populations and reduce the differences between the main and control samples. However, in the final section of this chapter a further test will be applied which tests class imagery in another way than has so far been discussed. For the present, the data slightly favours the hypothesis that small firm workers show a lower level of class consciousness although the difference between the main and control samples is not great and only a minority of respondents in either sample are indicated as having a degree of class consciousness.

Deferential imagery is even more difficult to discuss and the tests employed had to ignore some of the attributes which have been seen as characteristic of a deferential image but this has always been to allow for a test more favourable to the hypothesis being considered. No respondents with a two strata model of the class order met the test of having a potentially deferential image and this would not be expected from previous writing. The test did produce potential deferentials among those with three strata models although this called for suspension of two conditions allegedly associated with deferential imagery; a multi-strata model of the class order with at least four strata and not placing oneself in the lowest strata. Among respondents with a model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=54</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness (Severe</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test) (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness (Less</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Test)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deferentials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The basis of the tests applied to isolate respondents who might be seen as potentially class conscious or deferentials is given in the text.
containing four or more strata the condition of not placing oneself in the lower strata was also partly suspended.

Allowing for the above qualifications, again the findings slightly favour the hypothesis that small firm workers are more likely to have a deferential view of the class order. But again, also, the application of further tests such as the qualitative analysis of the recorded answers to questions on class, reduced the size of the sub-sample. If, in addition, a relational aspect was introduced insisting that deferential imagery should be combined with relations with superiors in and out of work based on traditional authority, the hypothesis is further undermined. Neither in the examination of vertical social relations in the firm nor participation in local social relations was there data suggesting the presence of traditional authority to any marked degree. Given the problems surrounding the investigation of deference it is better to see the findings as, at best, isolating a sub-sample showing some potential for holding a deferential image of the class order rather than as having established a group with a deferential image. This sub-sample is, however, a good deal smaller in both the main and control samples than that showing potential class consciousness.

Clearly, the bulk of the main and control samples do not appear to have class images showing a tendency towards either a high level of class consciousness or a strongly deferential image. Nearly 70% of the small firm shopfloor workers and 75% of the large firm shopfloor workers have class images involving a mixture of dimensions and strata which would be extremely difficult to categorise into simple types. The methods of analysis and measures used in the present research make comparison with previous research difficult mainly because of the present attempt to eliminate some of the inadequacies of previous approaches. However, it should be noted that most recent research on levels of class consciousness and deference has come to a broadly similar conclusion that only a minority of manual workers are likely to hold either image to a marked degree. (143)

Social Mobility

Further indications in relation to the third hypothesis may be gathered from respondents' views on social mobility. For example, one aspect of a deferential image is a belief in the ascriptive character of the class order. If you are born to a lowly position in society then you are unlikely to move very far above it and certainly it is very unlikely that you would move into the highest strata,
Equally, a Marxist class conscious image of society would see upward mobility as virtually impossible because the tendency in a capitalist economic order is to ensure that the lower strata remain in that strata and even that it becomes larger as the forces of competition push more and more of those on the fringe of the dominant class into the proletariat. An inspection of beliefs about upward social mobility also throws further light on the beliefs of respondents who showed little tendency towards either class consciousness or deference. Finally, it might be thought that small firm workers, who were generally aware that the owner-managers of the firm had either established the business themselves or were the sons of founders, might feel that social mobility was easier than large firm workers.

However, as Table 5.22 shows, overall, there is little difference between the main and control samples on beliefs about social mobility. Almost two out of three respondents thought there was some difficulty and almost 30% thought it either very difficult or impossible to move up from one class to another. But there is a marked difference between the two industrial sub-samples with electronics industry respondents believing that upward mobility was easier than respondents in printing. This contrast is especially sharp between the large electronics and the large printing firm workers. Again, this might be interpreted as being related to the sub-cultures of the two industries. In Chapter 4, it was noted that electronics firms often lack the sharp separation between shopfloor and white collar workers characteristic of most industries. Neither in style of dress - many people wear white coats, regardless of their position in the firm's hierarchy - nor in relations between people, is hierarchy emphasised to the extent that it is in the more traditional printing industry. It may well be, therefore, that this is reflected in electronics industry workers' beliefs about the ease of upward mobility.

Those believing in easy upward mobility often emphasised they were referring to short range mobility. Moving up from, say, the working class to the middle class might be possible but long range mobility was often thought impossible. In other words, the relatively low proportions saying that mobility was possible usually did not have in mind anything like an 'open society'. Certainly, few respondents felt that hard work or ambition were what helped most in getting on in the world. Only nine shopfloor small firm respondents (7.6%) thought that hard work most helped a person get on and among large firm workers this proportion, at 3.6%, was even lower. Ambition was thought most helpful
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Easy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Easy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Say / Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=64, 100.0</td>
<td>N=54, 100.0</td>
<td>N=41, 100.0</td>
<td>N=42, 100.0</td>
<td>N=118, 100.0</td>
<td>N=83, 100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
in getting on by 16.9% of small firm shopfloor workers and 19.3% of their large firm counterparts. Ascriptive reasons, "being born in the right family, knowing the right people or luck, on the other hand, were more frequently mentioned in both samples. In Chapter 4 it was also reported that only one in five small firm workers thought their chances of promotion were either 'very good' or 'good', and that among large firm workers this percentage was even lower.

Among small firm shopfloor workers age may have been associated with opinions on mobility. While 18.5% of younger workers (aged under 35) thought mobility was fairly or very easy, 29.7% of older small firm shopfloor workers (aged 35 and over) held such beliefs. But among the large firm workers opinions on mobility seemed unrelated to age; 21.8% of younger shopfloor workers felt mobility was fairly or very easy compared to 17.5% of older workers. However, since the samples were not large, not too much importance should be attached to the differences among small firm workers. For the whole sample in the study, there was little difference between younger and older workers or between the two industrial sub-samples.

Surprisingly, there is little in the literature on manual worker beliefs about social mobility. Goldthorpe et al, for example, do not report such data despite their study's concern with embourgeoisement. Ingham asked questions on perceptions of the class order but not on perceptions of social mobility. Batstone, however, reports that among his small firm workers there was a much stronger belief in mobility through occupational advancement than among large firm workers.* As already noted, Batstone's findings conflict with those of the present study on beliefs and attitudes to occupational mobility. It may also be argued that attitudes to occupational mobility ought to be distinguished from beliefs about social mobility in general. An individual might well believe that occupational mobility was difficult yet also believe that, in general, social mobility was much easier and vice versa.

Some comparable data on perceptions of social mobility is reported by Cousins and Brown who asked a sample of shipbuilding workers in Tyneside: 'Do you think it is possible to move from one class to another?' One in three replied that they did not think it was possible which compares, allowing for differences in question form, with the 32.2% of small firm respondents and 36.5% of large firm respondents in the present study who thought it very difficult or impossible to move up from one class to another. However, they interpret their data as...
showing that the majority of their sample thought mobility was possible but, as the present data indicates, respondents may have very different probabilities in mind while still believing mobility is possible.

It might be argued that, in relation to the third hypothesis, the data on attitudes to social mobility supports the point made earlier that, even if small firms do contain a higher proportion of deferential workers than large firms, the difference is not large. The deferential image is usually thought to be associated with a belief in social immobility but the small firm workers do not appear to believe more strongly in immobility than large firm workers. By the same token, this argument might be applied to the other aspect of the hypothesis concerned with the assumed greater degree of class consciousness among large firm workers. Earlier data showed only slight support for this proposition and the relative lack of differences in beliefs on social mobility might again be taken as support for a lack of marked differences in patterns of class imagery between the two samples. As with previous aspects of class imagery, the differences have seemed to be much more marked between industries than between the size groupings.

A Final View of Class Imagery

Finally, in the sequence of questions and probes on social class imagery, respondents looked at three statements on social class in Britain and were asked which came closest to their own view. The position of the question, at the end of a discussion on class, is important in interpreting the replies and in relating them to earlier findings. The type of question - statements on a card - is also important because it will be argued that this led respondents to answer in a particular way. Different questions tap different parts of the complex of meanings held by respondents but the replies to this question can be related to the answers to earlier questions on class imagery.

Table 5.23 lists the three statements offered to respondents (presented in random order to the sample as a whole) and the proportions selecting each statement. These three statements were intended to offer a range of views which would provide indications of the salience of class to respondents. Although previous research would not lead us to expect a class consciousness in the Marxist sense, it was thought that respondents might still show at least a 'primitive' class consciousness, that is, an awareness of the importance of class based on relationships to the economic order in society. This need not be seen as necessarily leading to class consciousness in the Marxist sense. Neither does it
necessarily imply that respondents with such an awareness will act in particular ways. Such an awareness, for example, might well go with feelings of fatalism or resignation rather than with an attempt to radically change society.

As Table 5.23 shows, very few respondents thought class unimportant in Britain. Rather less than one in four (23.4%) opted for the second statement, which recognised the existence of class but deemed it unimportant, and there were few differences between the main and control samples. These proportions should probably be rather higher since a few respondents in both samples agreed with the first part of the statement (that class was not important) but still felt that mobility was not easy. These respondents were categorised as 'Other'.

The majority of respondents clearly found the third statement closest to their own views with again little difference between the main and control samples. As with several previous indicators of class imagery and in a way quite consistent with previous findings, the differences were much more between industries than between the small and large firm samples. Two out of three printing workers (63.6%) opted for the third statement but only about half (51%) of the electronics workers. This finding, taken to indicate a lower level of 'primitive' class consciousness among electronics workers, is consistent with the previous findings that they were much less likely to see wealth and income as the main influences putting people into different classes (Table 5.20) and were more optimistic about the possibility of upward social mobility (Table 5.22).

Virtually no differences were found between younger and older workers on these statement apart from a slight tendency for older workers to opt for the third statement and for younger workers to opt for the second statement. This suggests that if the age distribution among the small firm workers had been closer to that of the large firm workers there might have been an even higher proportion choosing the third statement.

As might be expected, a marked relationship was found between trade union membership and indications of 'primitive' class consciousness. Over two out of three trade union members (67.3%) chose the third statement compared to less than half of the non-trade union members (45.4%). This relationship was even stronger among small firm workers where 75% of trade union members chose the third statement compared to 56.1% of non-trade union members. This suggests that the higher level of unionisation which, it was argued at the end of Chapter 4 might occur in small
### Table 5.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views on Social Class. Shopfloor Workers Only</th>
<th>Small Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Small Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Printing Firm Workers</th>
<th>Large Electronics Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Small Firm Workers</th>
<th>All Large Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Class is a thing of the past - we are all equal now in Britain'.</td>
<td>2 3.1 %</td>
<td>4 7.4 %</td>
<td>1 2.4 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 5.1 %</td>
<td>1 1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'There are classes in Britain but they are not important and people can move easily from one to another'.</td>
<td>13 20.3 %</td>
<td>12 12.2 %</td>
<td>7 17.1 %</td>
<td>15 35.7 %</td>
<td>25 21.2 %</td>
<td>22 26.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'There are two main classes in Britain - those who work and those who get others to work for them'.</td>
<td>41 64.1 %</td>
<td>28 51.8 %</td>
<td>26 63.4 %</td>
<td>21 50.0 %</td>
<td>69 58.5 %</td>
<td>47 56.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>8 12.5 %</td>
<td>10 18.5 %</td>
<td>7 17.1 %</td>
<td>6 14.3 %</td>
<td>18 15.2 %</td>
<td>13 15.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentages may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
firms in the future, will also possibly go with higher levels of class consciousness as defined here.

Overall, the findings provide the clearest indications in relation to the third hypothesis. They are consistent with the argument presented earlier that only a relatively small proportion of respondents were potential deferentials and that this image was unlikely to be more prevalent among small firm workers than large firm workers. Clearly, they are also consistent with the view that potential class consciousness is a more frequent element in respondents' class imagery than deference and that again small firm workers are as likely to have such an element in their imagery as large firm workers.

One reason why the findings on class consciousness are so much more clear-cut here is the position in the interview of this last question. It was asked after a lengthy exploration of respondents' class imagery and political beliefs and respondents had had some time to think about a subject which perhaps ordinarily they did not discuss in depth. A more important reason perhaps is the form of the question. Card statement questions of this kind may be seen as a special kind of 'leading' question, that is, they may prompt respondents to answer in certain ways rather than others, particularly where, as in the present case, the subject being discussed is complex and respondents are relatively inarticulate. Normally, it is considered poor methodology to 'lead' respondents but, it may be argued, that in questioning relatively inarticulate respondents about complex and subtle phenomena, this strategy has advantages provided certain safeguards are adopted. The main safeguards should be that 'leads' should cover the range of possible views of the issue in question; they should all be given to the respondent at the same time, so that he can weigh them against each other; and that respondents should not be pushed into selecting any view about which they are not happy. All these safeguards were strictly adhered to in the present research.

Respondents often made the point that the statement 'There are two main classes in Britain - those who work and those who get others to work for them' expressed what they themselves would have liked to say earlier in the interview. Sometimes respondents also admitted that in choosing this view they were perhaps being inconsistent in terms of the answers given to some previous questions but this statement was a 'truer' representation of their views. Finally, some respondents also admitted that some of their previous answers contained ideas on what society ought to be like, reflecting a moral preference for a classless
society but that the third statement was, in their view, more accurate about actual class relations in Britain.

Overall, therefore, this sequence of questions and probes on social class imagery produced a good deal of information but no strong support for the hypothesis being considered. Small firm workers were not shown to be markedly more deferential or to display much lower levels of class consciousness than large firm workers. The major differences found were between industries which, it was argued, were linked to industrial sub-cultures and levels of unionisation. Thus, the impact of specific social influences associated with size of firm seems minimal. Social class imagery may be influenced by a variety of sources and, for the present sample, it can be argued that the highly visible middle class in the localities in which most live and work may be even more of a source of meanings than the work situation. Nor can the mass media, especially television, which was shown to influence political orientations, be ignored in relation to class imagery. This is, after all, a major source of opportunities to view the elite of society. As with politics, class imagery seems as much the result of influences outside as inside work.

CONCLUSIONS: AN OVERALL VIEW OF COMMUNITY, POLITICS AND SOCIAL CLASS

This chapter has been concerned with the non-work lives of small firm workers which, arguably, has been the most neglected aspect in the study of such workers. Yet failure to consider this side of the worker's life is to fail to see how work and non-work mutually influence each other and to see how occupational identity is linked to participation in the wider society and image of society. Three main areas were selected for examination: participation in local social activities; political attitudes and behaviour and social class imagery and, on the basis of previous theorising and research, three guiding hypotheses were formulated and tested.

Community Participation

The first hypothesis concerned community participation and asserted that small firm workers were more integrated into the wider society, as measured by participation in voluntary associations and activities and interaction with people drawn from a wider range of social strata, than large firm workers. However, it was argued that the term 'community' was value laden, vague and especially unsuitable in the present context. It was proposed instead to discuss this aspect of workers' lives in terms of participation in local social relations, leaving the precise
meanings of 'local' and 'social relations' to emerge from the research findings themselves.

The social environment of the sample was in many respects highly atypical compared with other parts of Britain. Socially, the area was described as a 'dual society' based on class. Surrey, the county in which most of the sample live, has one of the highest concentrations of the middle class of any county in the country. According to the 1971 Census, over half the population are in white collar jobs and over one-third are in the Registrar General's top two classes. The main result of this, it was argued, was the existence of a highly visible middle class lifestyle and supporting economic infrastructure which constitutes one half of the dual society. The other half of the dual society, the working class, lives and works in areas which interpenetrate those of the middle class. Each lives and works alongside the other, shares many of the amenities and each is continually reminded of the other. Opportunities for non-work activities are probably more plentiful and offer a wider range of alternatives than in most other parts of Britain. Economically, the area is one of the most dynamic and successful in Britain and, even in the present recession, remains buoyant.

The social and economic environment, therefore, might be seen as highly favourable to the hypothesis, offering maximum opportunities for small firm workers to associate with their social superiors. The findings on geographical mobility also favoured the hypothesis since almost two out of three small firm workers were living within 20 miles of the place where they were born. There was, however, as on several other issues, a difference between the two industries. Respondents in the electronics industry were more mobile than those in printing and the difference was greater than that between the small and large firm groupings.

Participation in Local Associations

A main test of the hypothesis on community integration was participation in local voluntary clubs or associations and the findings were strongly against the hypothesis. Under 60% of small firm workers belonged to a local club or association as compared to 77% of the large firm workers. Moreover, large firm workers belonged, on average, to more clubs and associations than small firm workers and, further, they were more likely to hold official positions. In favour of the hypothesis, was the finding that where small firm workers did belong to a club or association, they attended more frequently. However, on balance, the
data was held to undermine rather than support the hypothesis.

Although it was not easy to assess the class character of clubs and associations, small firm workers were less likely to belong to strongly working class associations. Yet, analysis of the frequency of attendance and class character of other clubs and associations suggested that, at best, only about 15% of small firm workers could be interacting with the middle class on more than a very casual basis.

A comparison with other studies of manual worker participation in voluntary clubs or associations suggested that, overall, respondents in the present study were rather more likely to join such bodies. This might be expected in an area with such a high middle class representation which is likely to be associated with a large number and wider range of such associations. But it was the large firm workers rather than the small firm workers who took advantage of these additional opportunities. For the small firm worker, therefore, such bodies did not appear to be a major source of interaction with status superiors.

Other Non-Kin and Kin Relations

The hypothesis was further tested by investigating the extent to which married small firm workers maintained close relationships with other couples and the class background of the husband in the latter couple. The findings again did not support the hypothesis. While broadly similar proportions of married respondents in the main and control samples had such close friends, the husbands of the small firm workers' friends were much more likely to be working class. In other words, such friendships did not provide greater opportunities for interaction with status superiors than for the large firm married respondents. The data on such friendships also provided little evidence of the existence of an extensive occupational community among printers. The husbands of couples who were the close friends of printing workers appeared to be no more likely to work in the same industry than the husbands of couples who were close friends of electronics industry respondents.

Relations with kin, especially through the kin of wives of married respondents, might have been a further source of contact with status superiors. Again, however, the data goes strongly against the hypothesis. Small firm married respondents were much more likely to have father-in-laws who were manual workers or supervisors than large firm married respondents. Indeed, data on weekend contacts with kin showed that, overall, married small firm respondents were less likely to have contact
Leisure Activities and Local Newspaper Reading

An investigation of weekend leisure activities showed that patterns of reported activities differed little between the main and control samples. Indications of middle class lifestyles, such as being visited or visiting friends at home, going to the theatre or a concert, or eating out at restaurants were reported by only a minority of respondents and the proportions were similar in both samples. This data was taken not only as a further indication of a lack of opportunity for interaction with status superiors but also of a lack of identification with such groups and this was subsequently reinforced by findings on class imagery.

Local newspaper readership emerged as a problematic indicator on involvement in local social relations. Many respondents saw a newspaper because their parents purchased it while others received free copies because their firm printed the paper. In neither case, therefore, could taking a paper be seen as an accurate test of interest in local social relations. The findings themselves were not helpful either in that, when all respondents receiving free copies were excluded and married respondents only were considered, differences between small and large firm respondents were not consistent. Thus, while married small electronics firm respondents were the most likely of all sub-samples to take a local newspaper, the levels among the married small printing firm and large electronics firm workers were very similar. Purchasing a local newspaper does not automatically imply a particular reason for doing so but analysis of the reasons offered by respondents suggested that, on balance, it was small firm married respondents who were more likely to take a paper because of an interest in local affairs. However, the samples here were not large and the differences between them not great.

Thus, overall, it is argued that the evidence in relation to the first hypothesis did not provide strong support. Small firm workers were seen to lead a much more privatised life than large firm workers, as measured by participation in voluntary clubs or associations and mixing with kin and non-kin. Membership of clubs and associations appeared to be possible sources of interaction with status superiors for only a small minority of small firm workers. Contacts with non-kin and kin were also less likely to involve interaction with status superiors among small firm workers than among control sample respondents. Neither of the two findings which support the hypothesis, that small
firm workers, where they do belong to voluntary bodies, are more frequent attenders, or that they are rather more likely to take a local newspaper out of interest in local affairs, more than marginally reduces confidence in the large body of data contrary to the hypothesis.

The stereotype of the small firm worker as someone who has escaped the deprivations of the modern urban environment by avoiding contact with the large scale economic enterprise and carefully maintaining affective relations with others is clearly not supported. The small firm worker on the present data appears even more detached from society than the large firm worker.

**Political Behaviour and Orientations**

The second hypothesis examined argued that, in terms of political behaviour and orientations, small firm workers were more likely to support the Conservative Party and to hold anti-Labour views. The small firm was held to be an important source of political socialisation, reinforced by non-work social relations in ways suggested by the first hypothesis examined above.

Obviously, the conclusions on the first hypothesis cast an immediate doubt on non-work social relations as a source of deferential political orientations. But it was also argued that the small firm and especially the small firm owner-manager, was unlikely to be an influential source of support for the Conservatives since previous research suggests that he has considerable reservations about the Conservative Party in relation to himself and small firms. It is possible, however, that he is a source of anti-Labour orientations. It was also stressed that, while the existing literature tended to plump for either or both local social relations and the work-place as the main sources of influences on political orientations, it might be that other influences, particularly the mass media in the form of television, have become much more important in recent years.

Data on respondents' reported voting behaviour was analysed in relation to the three General Elections held in this decade. Differing patterns of party support between the main and control samples were found for all three Elections. Broadly, these may be summed up as providing mild support for the hypothesis but as also suggesting alternative, and in the light of other findings in the research, more interesting differences between the two samples.

Overall, the Conservatives did receive a higher average level of
support and Labour a lower level of support from small firm workers than from large firm workers. But it was noticeable that the small printing firm workers' level of support for Labour was much higher than that among the small electronics firm respondents and was similar to that among the large electronics firm respondents. Equally, the small printing firm respondents' support for the Conservatives was lower than that of the small electronics firm respondents and approached the level among large electronics firm workers. In other words, differences in support for the two main parties between the two industry sub-samples were often greater than those between the size groupings. Certainly, no evidence that small firm workers were predominantly Conservative supporters emerged.

The Liberal Party received more support from large firm than small firm workers at all three Elections. This was thought to go against the second hypothesis. The Liberals might be seen as more representative of consensual views and of the dominant ideology than Labour and, therefore, we might have expected a higher level of Liberal support among the small firm than the large firm respondents if the hypothesis had been correct.

A comparison with published data on voting patterns in constituencies in which the majority of respondents lived showed, as expected, that such constituencies were strongly Conservative. Existing thinking argues that living in such constituencies tends to reduce support for Labour and increase support for the Conservatives among manual workers. To some extent this may help to explain the lower level of Labour support and higher than average support for the Conservatives found in both the main and control samples but it might also have been expected that this would have produced a much higher difference between the two samples if the small firm workers were so susceptible to local sources of political influence.

Naturally, given the differences in age distribution and levels of trade union membership between the main and control samples, an attempt was made to see how these were related to voting patterns. Although for the 1970 General Election age was not clearly related to reported voting behaviour, at the two subsequent Elections differences did appear. Older workers, those aged 35 and over, were more likely to support Labour, less likely to support the Conservatives and more likely to vote than younger workers. But when age was controlled for, small firm workers were still less likely to support Labour, still
more likely to support the Conservatives and still less likely to vote at all. Voting Liberal, on the other hand, seemed much less related to age.

Trade union members, as expected, were more likely to vote Labour and less likely to vote Conservative than non-trade union members. The relationship between trade union membership and support for the Liberals was less clear-cut but there was, on the whole, greater support for the Liberals from trade union members. However, even when trade union membership was controlled for, small firm workers were still less likely to vote. Overall, as also expected from previous research, relationships between trade union membership and voting patterns were stronger than those between age and voting patterns.

The two most important and distinct differences in the voting patterns of the main and control samples emerged after examination not only of voting at the three Elections but also after an examination of the consistency of behaviour from one Election to another. The first difference was that small firm workers were much less likely than large firm workers to vote at all. Over the three Elections, twice as many small firm workers, who could have voted, failed to do so as compared to large firm workers. Sometimes more respondents among the main sample failed to vote at an Election than supported any single party.

The second difference was that small firm workers were much more volatile in their political allegiances than large firm workers, as measured by switching support between one or another of the main parties or not voting at one Election but voting at another. This lack of consistency tells against the hypothesis. Previous research asserted that not only were small firm workers more likely to vote Conservative but they were also more likely to be committed Conservatives. The present data shows that they are less committed to any party, as measured by support at successive Elections, than large firm respondents. This point is reinforced by the further finding that over half the small firm workers thought it made no difference which of the two main parties won a General Election. This proportion was substantially higher than that among control sample respondents.

Aspects of Political Influence

The underlying theme linking the above findings is the greater political detachment or isolation of the small firm workers as compared to the large firm workers. This is reinforced by the findings on political influences. Small firm workers were rather more likely to feel
that people like themselves had little influence on how the country was run. This feeling was most evident among the small electronics firm workers who, on such measures as extent of exercising their right to vote and whether it made a difference whether either of the two main parties won a General Election, were the most politically detached. Feelings of political isolation among small firm workers may well be reinforced by their ideas on who has most influence in our society. Most small firm workers picked 'Big Business', the trade unions and the conventional political order and, since they do not work in large firms and are less likely to be in a trade union, it may well be that, compared to large firm workers, they feel less closely associated with what they see as the main sources of power in society.

The small firm workers were as likely as large firm workers to pick as significant political others, people who they will have only had any contact with through the mass media. Not one small firm worker picked a superior in the firm as a significant political other. Neither were workmates more often seen in this role than among large firm workers. Equally, their lack of integration into local social relations as compared to large firm workers suggests this may also reinforce feelings of political isolation.

Overall, therefore, the findings on political attitudes and behaviour provide only slight support for the second hypothesis. Small firm workers did tend to support the Conservatives more and Labour less than large firm workers but the differences were not large. Against the hypothesis were the findings that small firm workers were less politically committed to any party and politically more detached. These latter findings were much more clearly manifested and consistently repeated and are held to provide firmer indications of the distinctive character of the small firm workers' political orientations and behaviour.

Social Class Imagery

The third and final hypothesis examined in this chapter concerned the extent of deferential imagery and class consciousness among small firm workers. The findings on deferential imagery show that, on some indicators, such as the complexity of the respondents' class model, small firm workers showed no greater tendency towards a deferential image than large firm workers. On other indicators, such as an emphasis on family of origin, breeding and lifestyle, the findings mildly support the hypothesis. The differences were, however, more marked between the industries than between the two size groupings. This was seen as
connected with the sub-cultures of the two industries. The electronics industrial sub-culture, it was argued, encourages a less class conscious view of society. But this need not necessarily be a more deferential image. For example, electronics industry respondents were more likely to believe in the chances of upward mobility in society whereas a deferential image of society is thought to be associated with the belief that upward mobility is either difficult or impossible.

However, a major finding was the sheer complexity of respondents' social class imagery in terms of the criteria of class attributes and in their application to various strata. This means that any emphasis on the uni-dimensional models in previous formulations of class imagery such as those of Lockwood discussed earlier or the classic Marxist formulation of class consciousness, would be highly misleading.

Small firm workers were more likely to define themselves as 'Working Class' than large firm workers and this was thought to be principally linked to income. Large firm workers with higher incomes were very much more likely to define themselves as 'Middle Class' and appeared to be comparing themselves with fellow manual workers in this self-labelling rather than identifying with the middle class as defined sociologically.

On class consciousness it was found, as expected, that class consciousness of a strict Marxist kind was virtually absent. However, a 'primitive' class consciousness involving a consciousness of the importance of relations to the economic order in determining class positions, was found to be more prevalent than a deferential image. Differences in the kind of question asked produced different estimates of the extent of 'primitive' class consciousness but more important was that, regardless of the question asked, broadly similar levels of 'primitive' class consciousness occurred in both the main and control samples. That class consciousness - in the form defined here - was more prevalent than a deferential image is consistent with the earlier findings on political orientations and behaviour. If, as these findings suggested, respondents were relatively politically detached - especially the small firm workers - then it would be unlikely to find a high proportion with a deferential image involving a consensual view of society. Nor would such an image be consistent with the lower level of social integration into local social relations found among the small firm workers.

The links between social class imagery and size were, therefore, not clear. The main observed differences were related to other factors
such as industrial sub-cultures which are only indirectly connected with size of firm. The electronics industry sub-culture and the lower level of unionisation in that industry, combined to produce the closest approximation to the accepted view of the small firm worker image of society yet even this approximation was relative. The great majority of respondents in both the main and control samples showed neither strong indications of deference nor class consciousness. In this the present findings are in line with much of recent thinking on manual worker imagery (well represented by Parkin's views discussed earlier) which sees most manual workers as having a neutral, accommodative image of society.

Overall, the examination of the non-work lives of respondents in terms of integration into local social relations, political attitudes and behaviour and social class imagery has produced distinct differences between the main and control samples. Small firm workers have been shown to be less integrated into the wider society, to lead more privatized lives and to be more politically isolated. Rather fewer differences were found in relation to social class imagery but the deferential imagery thought to be characteristic of the small firm worker was only slightly in evidence. Size of firm may also be much less important than other influences such as the industrial sub-culture and exposure to trade union influences. Moreover, although it is difficult to give weight to the various influences which impinge on workers' images of society, the data strongly suggests that influences specifically associated with the size of the firm are among the less important.

What may be more important in producing a specific small firm worker image of society is his general economic situation in society. Working for a small firm is indicative of not being in the mainstream of the capitalist economic order whose standard bearer is the large firm. This poorer market situation appears to be associated with a lower tendency to involvement in local social relations and to feeling even more remote from politics than other manual workers. The class order in the small firm workers' image of society appears in most other respects to resemble that of other manual workers except that, a lack of exposure to trade union influence is linked to a somewhat more open model of the class order, placing a more equal emphasis on a wider range of stratification influences than is found among large firm workers. This is by no means a pronounced deferential image and includes a considerable degree of awareness of class in the classic economic sense.
There were, of course, some exceptions to this tendency such as: N. Dennis et al., Coal is Our Life: A Study of a Yorkshire Mining Community, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1956 but, on the whole, the generalisation remains valid.
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CHAPTER 6.  

CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The present research studied a sample of small firm workers in two contrasting industries, printing and electronics, a control sample of large firm workers drawn from the same industries and a sample of executives from the small and large firms employing these workers. In this final chapter the three sets of findings are used to generate an overall characterisation of the small firm worker in terms of the three main areas studied:

(i) the process of becoming a small firm worker;
(ii) the meanings, definitions and social relations associated with working in a small firm;
(iii) participation in non-work social relations and the world-view of the small firm worker.

The following characterisation of the small firm worker is not another attempt at an ideal type of the orientations of the small firm worker. In earlier chapters, the detailed examination of the findings from the current study amply demonstrated the inadequacy of this approach. There is no simple fixed set of orientations shared by small firm workers which permanently demarcates them from other and especially large firm workers. The category 'small firm worker' covers a very substantial proportion of the labour force - almost one in three in manufacturing, for example - who work in a very wide range of industries and firms. Manual worker orientations, like those of any other category of human beings, are subject to a wide variety of influences which are likely to lead to a good deal of redefinition over the normal 50 year working life. Equally, manual workers, like other categories of actors, do not usually have consciously and fully articulated orientations and world-views. Any characterisation of a particular group of manual workers must allow for the vagueness and inconsistencies likely to be found.

Secondly, the small firm worker should be seen as a social type in his own right rather than as simply the 'opposite' of the large firm worker. Studies of the 'size effect' in industry have usually, implicitly or explicitly, taken as their starting point the available data on manual workers, very much based on studies of large firm workers and combined this with a cultural stereotype of the small firm worker. The latter has usually seen the small firm worker as somebody who has escaped the manifold deprivations of modern large scale capitalism and
retained a high level of involvement and attachment to job and firm. The constraining effects of this combination of ideas has prevented most previous theorising and research from treating the small firm worker as a distinct social category with a good deal of internal variation related to a specific set of social relationships, experiences and influences. In other words, the small firm worker may be contrasted with the large firm worker but should not be defined in terms of the absence or presence of any particular set of characteristics held to be distinctive of the large firm worker.

Thirdly, the characterisation presented below contains elements of generalisation which go beyond the findings and original concerns of the present study. This is an inevitable and even desirable aspect of the research process. In testing the previous views which formed the basis of the set of hypotheses formulated for the present research, further ideas emerged which went beyond the boundaries of the original research design. These form part of the continuing data-theory interaction process which should accompany any study and suggest a further set of hypotheses which require testing in future research. The form that some of these hypotheses might take and some suggestions for testing them, are discussed at the end of this chapter.

AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW OF THE SMALL FIRM WORKER

The occupational identity and world-view of the small firm worker might best be seen in terms of an interplay between the interpretations and meanings which form his occupational identity and world-view, and a range of influences and experiences in his social environment. These influences and experiences may be broadly divided into two groups:

1. Those derived from direct social relationships with others. These others range from parents to marital partners to employers and managers. They might be designated significant others in relation to the formation of his occupational identity and world-view and one of the objects of research is to locate who these significant others are and the kinds of influences they exert.

2. Those objective influences which provide the constraints within which action may take place. These comprise such influences as availability of jobs, redundancy or other involuntary factors relating to job taking and non-work life. Ultimately, they result from the decisions of others but the 'others' in question are not usually involved in face-to-face interaction with the small firm worker or even aware of the effects of their actions on his life. Indeed, the small firm worker may not himself be consciously aware of these influences or how they affect his interpretations of work and the wider society. In many instances these influences may be conceptualised as summations of the interpretations and actions of others which come together to provide a more or less powerful influence on the small firm worker's perceptions and behaviour.
An obvious example of this kind of influence is the industrial sub-culture of the industry in which he works. Again the task of research is to identify the principal influence of this kind affecting the small firm worker's occupational identity and world-view.

The interplay between these two sources of influences and experiences and the small firm workers' occupational identity and world-view should be seen as a social process. Over time, configurations of significant others, face-to-face relations and objective influences will change and the interpretation and re-interpretation of these changes by the small firm worker will lead to changes in his occupational identity and world-view. The main aim of the present characterisation is to suggest some of the forms the occupational identity and world-view of the small firm worker may take and, in turn, to suggest some likely behavioural outcomes of having a particular occupational identity and world-view. It follows from this, however, that any attempt to neatly divide actors' interpretations and meanings into intrinsic-extrinsic or similar essentially static characterisations would, at best, be misleading and over simple.

Patterns of Employment Experience

The main previously accepted view, which the present research sought to test, was that small firm workers gradually acquired a particular set of orientations as their work experiences developed which led them to self-select themselves into small firms. What distinguished small firm worker orientations from those of workers in large firms, it was argued, was an emphasis on intrinsic aspects of work and rewarding social relations within the workplace. The small firm was held to be much more able to provide an environment which would meet this emphasis than the large firm.

An examination of existing theorising and research on occupational placement among manual workers (see Chapter 3) suggested that the idea of workers developing strong, persistent orientations to work leading to clear patterns of self-selection into firms of differing size was not well supported. Rather, a major problem for theorists on occupational placement has been the apparently haphazard, indeterminate character of much job changing among manual workers. The overall consensus among a good deal of this research was that, while it was relatively easy to delineate the major social structural constraints on occupational choice among manual workers such as those associated with social class, education and the labour market, any process of rational
decision-making in relation to constraints associated with personal orientations was rarely revealed. Moreover, even if such orientations were assumed, their influence on the overall process of occupational placement would be relatively unimportant compared to structural influences.

The present research carefully investigated a number of job change situations in the previous work experience of the samples beginning with finding and taking the first job ever. The results indicated a good deal of confusion and uncertainty on the part of respondents in the transition from full-time education to work, strongly echoing much of the previous research. Respondents usually claimed to have had few firm ideas about what kind of job they wanted and generally went along with the advice of others, the most important of whom were parents. Less important were other kin, teachers, peers, neighbours and the Youth Employment Service although each of the latter might have had some impact (usually reinforcing parental influences) on the taking of the first job ever. The tendency was for all significant others involved in this transition to emphasise intrinsic aspects of work and future rewards and to reject the seeking of immediate extrinsic rewards.

The objective constraints surrounding the transition from school to work were apparently much less prominent in the minds of respondents. True, some respondents who started work for the first time in the 1930's mentioned the constraints of economic recession and unemployment on finding a first job and respondents born outside the South East region sometimes mentioned that their original home was in an area dominated by a single employer or industry. But, on the whole, respondents mentioned these issues much less often than the individual decisions surrounding entry into employment.

There appeared to be a double reason for this lack of attention to objective influences. First, it seemed that respondents and those involved in helping them start their work experiences, were either largely unaware of such constraints or played down their importance. Parents were poorly informed about the availability of jobs and their prospects and, equally, about the full constraints of the local employment market. Other relevant significant others were inclined to stress what an individual could do rather than what he could not. This latter point links into the second reason why people were relatively less aware of objective influences, that is, the stress on personal choice in taking a job. Much of the doubt and uncertainty felt by respondents was a product of this emphasis on individual choice. In fact, the
actual choice available was probably much less, in objective terms, than that implied by significant others or thought to exist by respondents themselves.

Yet despite the uncertainty and haphazard nature of the transition from school to work, so evident in respondents’ descriptions of the start of their work experiences, it is possible to discern, even at this stage, an important difference between the small and large firm workers in the present study. This difference is associated with parental influence on occupational placement. Two points emerged which pointed to the ways in which small firm worker experiences might begin to diverge from those of the large firm worker to produce different patterns of occupational experience. First, small firm workers were much more likely than large firm workers to have had manual worker fathers. The latter were also more likely to have been semi-skilled or unskilled as opposed to skilled, manual workers. Secondly, parents of small firm workers appeared much more inclined to try and influence their children to take white collar jobs assuming that such jobs had superior long term prospects but also for reasons of social status.

The result of influences of this kind helps to account for the greater likelihood of small firm workers starting their work experiences in an industry other than the one in which they were working at the time of interview and to have failed to do an apprenticeship or other formal training. In other words, parents of small firm workers, perhaps because they had less knowledge of suitable jobs which might provide a recognized job training and good prospects, were less likely to ensure their sons got into such a job – despite their apparently equally strong beliefs that their sons ought to choose a job ‘with a future’. Ambitions in relation to the latter more often took the form of thinking that a white collar job promised such a future although, at least for the present sample, such jobs usually failed to meet these original hopes. It is also possible that the fathers of large firm workers who were more likely to be skilled manual workers themselves, had a greater knowledge of how to ensure their sons received a similar training, a stronger belief in the advantages of an apprenticeship and a lower opinion of white collar work.

For these and other reasons, the small firm workers showed a much higher propensity to have ‘got off on the wrong foot’ in their first job ever as far as getting a job which would ensure them a market situation comparable to other manual workers and especially those employed
in large firms. Such a disadvantage often proved cumulative. Small firm workers in the present study showed much higher levels of both employment and industry instability. They had more main jobs (that is, jobs held for at least one year) stayed at such jobs on average for a shorter length of time and had changed industries more often than their large firm counterparts. This instability was strongly associated with the relative lack of having done an apprenticeship or having had other formal training.

Influences, Constraints and Orientations

It is argued that the emphasis on social relationships with others in job changing and objective constraints is more helpful in interpreting differences between small and large firm workers than an emphasis on worker orientations. In terms of respondents' reported attitudes to work in their early employment experiences, there is little difference between the small and large firm workers. Both reported a strong emphasis on intrinsic aspects, on finding an interesting job which would provide a high level of job satisfaction. Immediate material rewards were usually quite clearly of secondary importance at this point. The ideal, in other words, was an intrinsically rewarding job which promised a reasonable level of material rewards and security in the long term. The large firm workers, through parental advice and other factors, came closer to realizing this ideal and hence, by the time they reached their early twenties, occupied a rather different market situation to that of the small firm workers.

The market situation of the worker is important in relation to the chances of working for small and large firms. The data in the present study in Chapter 3, showed the typically different employing practices of small and large firm employers. The small firm employer placed less emphasis on universalistic criteria in recruiting workers and had a strong preference for younger (and hence cheaper) workers. The large firm employer put more emphasis on previous experience, on having completed an apprenticeship or its equivalent and on a steady previous employment history. The large firm employer is also more constrained in choosing workers by the influence of trade unions and finds it more difficult to discriminate against older workers. Since large firms are more likely to be unionized than small firms, not having a trade union card may prevent some workers from working in large firms. Small firm workers are less likely to be union members and hence are often among those unable to work for a large firm.
In other words, discussion of occupational placement simply in terms of self-selection linked to differences in worker orientations fails to take into account important effects of social relations with significant others and objective constraints associated with the cumulative development of a distinctive market situation. Among the most important social relationships involved are those with parents, which shaped the initial stages of work experiences and those with employers at the point of finding a new job. Employers may be seen as 'gatekeepers' who exert a good deal of influence over whether a worker gets a job in a particular firm. To a lesser extent trade unions may have a similar influence in highly unionised industries such as printing. The objective constraints largely result from the cumulative effects of job changes on the workers' market situation but also obviously include local labour market characteristics and the general level of economic activity.

Becoming a small firm worker is the result of the interplay of these influences and workers' orientations. The result of this interplay tends to produce two overlapping labour forces, one more likely to find jobs in small firms and the other more likely to find jobs in large firms, regardless of orientations. This interpretation is strengthened by the failure, despite a detailed analysis of a large number of job changes and their associated decision-making, to find much evidence showing the development of any persistent orientations of an intrinsic or extrinsic kind among either small or large firm workers. Influences specific to the job change and especially involuntary influences, were found to be much more important overall. Even if workers had developed strong orientations influencing them to take jobs in small or large firms, these other influences would often operate to limit severely the exercise of any choice based on such orientations.

The two labour forces overlap because some workers can work in either size firm, although not perhaps doing the same job. For instance, a younger worker may obtain a more interesting and higher status job in a small firm than a large firm where such jobs rest to a greater extent upon seniority, experience and formal qualifications. But for many small firm workers, work in a large firm is not an available choice since they cannot meet the criteria of entry set up by the large firm personnel department in terms of formal qualifications, trade union membership and the like, except possibly by accepting a less well paid and a less interesting job.
Thus, many small firm workers are 'locked into' the small firm work situation and would find it difficult or impossible to self-select themselves into a large firm. This is very apparent from the data on married respondents aged over 21. The changes in non-work life involved in marriage, setting up a home and starting a family tend to lead to changes in orientation to work and especially to a greater emphasis on material rewards. On the whole, the small firm pays less well than the large firm, offers less security and less predictable levels of overtime. Large firms may also provide special opportunities for higher earnings for workers at this stage of the life cycle. For example, in the present research the large electronics firm was more likely to employ contract workers than the small electronics firms and contract working is especially attractive to workers who are at a stage in the family life cycle where they desire high levels of material rewards. Similarly, the large printing firm offered the opportunity of moving from general printing to newspaper printing, again producing higher earnings. In both firms these high earnings groups were, in fact, mainly composed of workers at this point in the family life cycle where material demands were at their strongest. It was, therefore, not surprising that levels of job satisfaction among small firm married workers with young families was much lower than among other small firm workers or comparable large firm workers. Ideally, in terms of their non-work life wants, the large firm would have been more suitable but given their market situation characteristics, this solution was not available.

On the other hand, the typical large firm worker, fully trained and experienced, may not be entirely attractive to the small firm employer except in limited numbers. Small firm employers will tend to employ some workers of this kind but otherwise staff the firm with less well trained and experienced workers. This reduces overall labour costs yet ensures that difficult or skilled work is satisfactorily completed. Further, the fully trained and experienced worker may be seen as having a lower level of loyalty to the firm simply because he can leave more easily. If, in addition, such a worker is more likely to be a trade union member, a small firm employer may feel that his presence might lead to other workers joining the union.

What is being argued here is that, while there may be differences in orientations between small and large firm workers which take the form of small firm workers placing greater emphasis on intrinsic
considerations, these can only be fully interpreted when related to social relations with others, market situation and life cycle factors. It may be further argued that, if there is greater emphasis on intrinsic factors among small firm workers, this may even be an adjustment to a market situation which prevents the worker from obtaining high extrinsic rewards as compared to other manual workers rather than the major independent variable explaining occupational placement in relation to size of firm. The concentration on worker orientations in occupational placement overemphasises the aspects over which the actor has some control to the neglect of those aspects over which he has much less control - the decisions of others and objective constraints.

The data on occupational placement decision-making did not, in fact, indicate that, even where intrinsic or extrinsic considerations were paramount in leaving or accepting a job, there was a close association with size of firm. Younger workers, regardless of size of firm, tended to emphasise intrinsic factors more than older respondents. Industrial sub-culture influences or non-work latent social identities in the family, as will be argued below, also often emerged as more important than size of firm in interpreting concerns with intrinsic or extrinsic aspects of work.

**WORKING IN THE SMALL FIRM**

The argument that, the rather greater emphasis on intrinsic aspects of work among small firm workers may be interpreted more plausibly in relation to other factors than an alleged congruency between orientations and the small firm as a work environment, may be developed further by reference to the findings from the present study on attitudes to the job and firm at the time of interview. Additional support is also provided by the findings on the character, extent and quality of social relations in the small firm.

The existing views, which provided the basis for the set of hypotheses examined in Chapter 4, argued that the small firm worker was more involved in the job and the firm as one aspect of the emphasis on intrinsic concerns in his occupational identity and this combined with certain features of the small firm as a work environment. Among the latter were the closeness of horizontal but especially of vertical social relations in the small firm, as compared to the large firm. This was held to account, for example, for the lower rates of absenteeism and labour turnover in the small firm as well as for the easier climate of industrial relations indicated by fewer industrial disputes and
lower levels of trade union membership.

A wide range of findings from the present research cast doubt on all these propositions and pointed towards an alternative interpretation of the differences between the small and large firm workers. This interpretation is all the more persuasive in that it is strongly consistent with the interpretations developed about differences in previous work experiences discussed above. For instance, labour turnover, far from being the same or lower among the small firm workers, turned out to be higher in the small firms under study. This went against the notion of a congruency between orientations and the specific characteristics of the small firm assumed to lead to higher involvement in the firm as well as the existence of the characteristics themselves. There was a greater emphasis on intrinsic aspects of the job among the small firm workers but it was almost entirely confined to unmarried respondents under 25 years of age. In fact, with age and marital status held constant, the small firm emerged as less capable of meeting the perceived wants of respondents than the large firm, an effect which became more pronounced as age increased.

Absenteeism levels did appear to be lower among small firm workers but this was apparently not so much an indicator of high involvement in the job or firm as an indicator of the important differences in the sanctions structure of small and large firms. Absenteeism in the small firm has a greater impact on peers because the smallness of most work departments means that a missing worker can put a very heavy burden on his fellow workers or even totally disrupt production. Equally, management in the small firm is especially sensitive to the effects of absenteeism on output for similar reasons. In the large firm, both fellow workers and management feel absenteeism to a lesser extent and there may even be a reserve of labour to fill the places of absent workers. Therefore, in the small firm fellow workers and management apply stronger moral and material sanctions against absenteeism than in the large firm. For example, small firms are less likely to pay for absent periods and management will be more ready to discard persistently unreliable workers. (The absence of trade unions in many small firms makes this generally easier than in large firms). Fellow workers are more likely to apply moral sanctions against anybody who appears to be absent too often without good reason.

Social Relations

The climate of social relations in the small firms also failed
to live up to previous interpretations. Horizontal social relations—those between fellow shopfloor workers—were closer as measured by
the degree to which such relations were continued outside the workplace but again when age and marital state are held constant these
differences virtually disappear. Younger, single workers lead more
active social lives and these include relations with fellow workers
but after marriage social life becomes much more home centred. In
short, it is only because small firms employ a high proportion of
younger unmarried workers that horizontal relations appear to be more
extensive. Answers to questions on the quality of internal social re-
lations between workers in the firm indicated few differences between
small and large firms. Most respondents thought that people got on
pretty well with each other mainly in order to get the job done and to
minimise the psychological costs of mixing with people largely thrown
together through the operation of the economic order.

More striking, however, were the findings on vertical social re-
lations in the small firm. Overall, small firm workers got on rather
close well with their supervisors than workers in the large firms. Two
main reasons seem to account for this difference. First, small firm
workers and their supervisors are less well trained and experienced
than their large firm counterparts and this provides greater possibilities
for misunderstandings and interpersonal conflict. Second, in the small
department in the small firm, workers and supervisors are much more
likely to be in frequent face-to-face interaction than in the large
firm where the average size of department is larger and the supervisor's
span of control wider. Respondents in small and large firms stressed
the attractiveness of distant social relations with supervisors; a
supervisor should be available when needed but should 'not always be
looking over your shoulder'. In the small firm this ideal is generally
less easy to realise. However, as will be seen below, the influence
of the industrial sub-culture may operate to emphasise or reduce this
effect.

The stereotype view of the small firm stresses the close personal
relations between the small firm owner-manager and his workers. The
data from the present study, however, failed to support this view.
Most respondents said they did not know the managing director of the
firm very well and described the interaction that did occur as very
superficial. Most small firm respondents would not ask their managing
director for help in solving a personal problem and even those who
would seek such help, stressed that this would only be as a last resort. The comparison of responses on whether respondents saw the firm in 'team' or 'conflict' terms showed little difference between the small and large firm workers; indeed, if the age distribution of the small and large firms had been more similar, small firm workers might have been more prone to see worker-management relations in conflict terms.

Small firm workers did believe that managers understood their problems and point of view as shopfloor workers to a greater extent than did large firm workers. But this was cancelled out by feelings that management did not keep them very well informed on how the firm was doing or even misled them on certain issues. On the whole, workers in the small firms seemed as aware as their large firm counterparts of the differences in interests between themselves and their employers. In other words, the greater particularism of worker-management relations in the small firm did not result in genuinely close personal relations between the two groups. Workers strongly resented any hint of paternalism from management and management had reservations about their workers involvement, as well they might given the labour stability levels found typical in the small firms in the study. Such doubts were further supported by the high proportion of small firm workers who claimed to be seriously seeking another job at the time of interview, a proportion which was higher than among the large firm workers.

Earnings and Orientations

A good deal has been written about the lower earnings of small firm workers as compared to those of large firm workers. The acceptance of lower earnings, for instance, has mainly been seen as indicating the less central place material rewards occupy in the occupational identities of small firm workers and the small firm has been argued to be a source of other, intrinsic rewards which compensate for lower earnings. The above discussion of attitudes to job and management already makes such an interpretation suspect and this is further supported by data on earnings and workers' attitudes to earnings.

Thus, frequently, the examination of the earnings of manual workers in small and large firms has not really been a comparison of like with like. Job titles have been taken as indicating similar levels of skill, experience and so on but the data from the present study shows that people occupying ostensibly the same work role in small firms often have less training and experience than their counterparts in a large
firm. In other words, the differences in the levels of earnings between small and large firm workers is probably much less than official statistics (themselves not very precise) imply.

Respondents in small firms found it difficult to say whether small firms or large firms paid better and a substantial proportion believed large firms paid no better than small firms. Similarly, many small firm respondents did not believe they could earn more working for other firms. The interpretation placed upon this is that small firm workers, in making such comparisons, were also making allowances for their different market situation as well as often being unaware of the exact differences in earnings between firms in their industry in the area. Either way, they were not, apparently, consciously exchanging intrinsic rewards for extrinsic rewards by staying in the small firm.

Attitudes to Trade Unions

The view that the absence of trade unions in small firms should be taken as indicative of the high quality of worker-management relations must also be questioned on the present findings. Small firm workers were found to be less sympathetic to trade unions than large firm workers but this finding requires careful interpretation. Manual workers, despite the high proportion who are members of trade unions, have regularly been shown not to be strongly committed to unionism, regardless of size of firm. However, those who are in a trade union tend to be more favourable to unionism, particularly to the trade union to which they belong if not to trade unions in general. Most workers, seemingly, become union members not through a positive act of joining reflecting a clear commitment but through a closed shop or similar pressure. If they go to work in a firm with a union they join because most other workers also belong to the union although later, as the present data suggests, they often come to see the benefits of union membership more positively. A major reason why small firm workers are less likely to be trade union members is that they are less frequently exposed to such influences because unions find the administrative problems and costs of organizing small firms too high. In industries such as printing or footwear manufacturing, predominantly small firm industries where, for historical reasons, trade unions have managed to organise, levels of union membership can be very high.

Further support for the above can be taken from other data collected in the present research. A large proportion of small firm workers in both industries were or had been trade union members. Those
who had ceased to be members had not done so out of a failure of ideological commitment or because of the special rewards arising out of social relations in their present small firm but simply through changing jobs to a firm without a trade union. Most would probably join a trade union if the firm did become unionised and it was argued that we may even expect increasing levels of trade union membership in small firms in manufacturing industry because they are rapidly becoming the only remaining source of further members for manual worker unions in this economic sector.

Similarly, attitudes to striking were also not as expected; indeed, small firm workers were sometimes more willing to strike than large firm workers under certain conditions. Equally, small firm respondents were no more in favour of the 1971 Industrial Relations Act than the large firm workers. Overall, therefore, the view that small firm workers are less favourable to trade unions is supported but this finding requires qualification. Certainly, it is not legitimate to infer from this that small firm worker-management relations are such that trade union membership is rendered superfluous or that they are the major reason why membership of trade unions is low in small firms.

The Small Firm as a Source of Employment

That the stereotype view of the occupational identity of the small firm worker and of social relations in the small firm is not supported by many of the findings in the present study is also consistent with an examination of the small firm in the modern economy. The basis of social relationships in the small firm is the same as in any other firm organised on a capitalistic basis - the cash nexus between sellers and buyers of labour. People take jobs in firms primarily to earn a living and, as the previous discussion showed, their choice of job may be severely circumscribed by a whole range of factors from a lack of knowledge to employers' preferences for different kinds of workers. Starting a social relationship on this basis limits its potential to develop into something more affective especially as the cash nexus basis is renewed at the end of every week and differences in the interests of those involved may emerge and re-emerge at any time. As the data in the present study also showed, a high proportion of small firm workers were to some extent unsatisfied with the effort-bargain struck between themselves and their employers and this is likely to influence their definitions of other aspects of their participation in the firm.
It was argued in Chapter 1 that, in many ways, the small firm in the modern economy was more capitalistic than the large firm. Firstly, the small firm owner-manager is more likely to define the firm and worker-management relations in terms of a laissez-faire ideology than the modern large firm executive. His managerial style is much more likely to contain elements of paternalism and autocracy and his view of the worker is unlikely to resemble that of the modern large firm manager trained to adopt an approximation of the human relations view of the self-actualising worker. In large firms the cash nexus between worker and employer is masked by personnel policies emphasising non-monetary aspects such as the provision of social clubs, help to workers in family crises and so on, which the small firm employer usually cannot afford to provide.

The small firm, as an economic unit, is more at the mercy of the market than the large firm. Its lines of credit and markets are more easily threatened. Output and demand fluctuate more because of its narrower product mix and the greater impact of a given change in demand on a lower absolute level of production. In turn, management must act more decisively to deal with such external changes and their decisions inevitably have an effect on workers' lives and their definitions of work, job and firm. Small firm workers, therefore, are likely to be more aware of the insecurities and impersonal forces of the capitalist mode of production than those in many large firms. All these influences, it may be argued, will tend to work against the development of the close, affective relations between the small firm owner-manager and his workers emphasised in much of the writing on the small firm. The latter has overemphasised the positive aspects of social relations in the small firm but tended to ignore the negative aspects which arise out of the special position the small firm occupies in the economy.

SIZE OF FIRM, OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITY AND INDUSTRIAL SUB-CULTURE

One of the most important and repeated findings in the present study has been the extent to which relationships between occupational identity and world-view of the worker and size of firm have been shown to be less important than the relationships between occupational identity and world-view and industrial sub-culture. For example, the closest approximation in the present study to previous views of the small firm worker in the literature was clearly provided by the small electronics firm workers. Yet, it was shown that, on many of the main dimensions of occupational identity and world-view examined, the
similarities between the small electronics firm and the large electronics firm workers were greater than the difference between the main small firm worker and large firm worker control samples, that is, industrial sub-culture influences were more important than influences related to size of firm. The small printing firm workers, on the other hand, often displayed attitudes more in accord with the established view of the large firm worker in the literature and, indeed, often showed a closer resemblance to this view than the large electronics firm workers. Thus, the alleged central emphasis on intrinsic considerations in the occupational identity of the small firm worker was not found in the small printing firm worker sample. They were, for example, the most money-minded of all sub-samples in the study.

To some extent, the importance of the industrial sub-culture in printing was expected because of the previously established existence of a well developed occupational community among printers. The present study, however, suggested that the strength and extensiveness of this occupational community had either been somewhat exaggerated in previous studies or, possibly, had declined in recent years due to the insecurity and loss of worker autonomy resulting from the effects of recent fundamental changes in the industry. Printers, for example, have been seen as highly involved in their work and to have high levels of job satisfaction. But, on measures of involvement, job satisfaction and boredom in the present study, printers were shown to differ little from the workers in the electronics industry. Similarly, membership of the occupational community in printing was not shown to lead to extensive out of work contacts among respondents. Small firm workers were found to be rather less socially and economically involved in the occupational community in printing but, nevertheless, a good deal of their occupational identities were derived from meanings which form part of those that go to make up the occupational community and hence, were independent of size of firm.

The findings on the industrial sub-culture among workers in the electronics industry were less expected because relatively little research exists on workers in this industry and because the industry is a relatively modern, rapidly changing one which might have been thought to inhibit the development of a pronounced industrial sub-culture. Yet, not only was there a well developed industrial sub-culture but again, as a source of meanings influencing occupational identity formation among respondents, it was found to be more important than size of
Indeed, its effects were such that it appeared to counter some of the effects on the occupational identity derived from changes in the family life cycle which were found more generally among small and large firm workers.

The link between science and electronics was a central element in this industrial sub-culture. Some of the ethos of science, such as the emphasis on expertise rather than hierarchical authority, was strongly in evidence in the occupational identities of workers and in social relations within the firms. For example, relations between workers and supervisors were found to be less conflict prone in electronics than in printing and this was attributed to the way in which the shopfloor worker in electronics tends to see the supervisor not as an authoritative figure but as a resource for technological help and advice. Supervisors, who were usually either more qualified or experienced than shopfloor workers, equally were constrained to play the supervisory role in terms of these shopfloor worker expectations. This blunting of overt expressions of authority was, in fact, obvious at every level of authority in the electronics firms and produced an organisational climate which was much more relaxed and open than that found in the printing firms.

The occupational identities of workers in the electronics industry showed a closer resemblance to those of the traditional craft worker - stressing intrinsic aspects of the work, involvement and a strong interest in the final product - than was found among the printing workers. Partly, this was due to the type of product made by the firms in the electronics industry sample (small batch, technologically sophisticated equipment) but, despite the assertions of some previous researchers, it is difficult to see how the product in the typical printing firm could ever produce similar feelings and the recent changes in printing technology seem likely to reduce even further the level of craft mindedness. Again, the distinct craft orientation among electronics workers derived not so much from the size of firm as these elements in the industrial sub-culture which come from the status of electronics as a strongly science-based industry whose products have transformed many peoples lives and especially their leisure lives.

The electronics firm is, of course, regardless of size, still a capitalistically organised enterprise, but the industrial sub-culture to some extent works against the antagonisms which normally follow from organisations set up on these principles, reducing conflict in
social relations. Similarly, the public status of electronics and its rapid rate of technological innovation operate to counter the de-skilling, boredom and meaninglessness which has become characteristic of so much of manual work in other industries in this century.

Characteristics associated with size of firm, such as size of department, were sometimes related to industrial sub-culture but not in any simple, predictable way. For instance, worker-supervisor relations in the printing industry came less close to the ideal relationship defined in the industrial sub-culture in the small firm because the smaller size of the department made it more difficult to maintain the 'proper' distance between journeyman and supervisor. In the electronics industry, however, the industrial sub-culture defines the supervisor as a technical consultant for the shopfloor worker and the smaller size of department makes this ideal easier to realise.

The effects of the industrial sub-culture, which may be seen in the present study as an external influence which constrains the ways in which definitions are generated and action occurs, cut across many differences related to size of firm and underline the weakness of assuming that there is a single small firm worker occupational identity. In other words, the effects on workers' definitions which come from characteristics associated with size of firm or more general previous work experiences (that is, experiences not in the industry in which the worker was employed at the time of interview) appear to be largely secondary in relation to a wide range of elements in workers' occupational identities. This finding is important and results from the way the research design in the present study attempted to control for differences between industries, something which previous studies have largely ignored, and points towards ways in which future research might expand our knowledge of the small firm worker. (This point is discussed further in the final section of this chapter.)

NON-WORK LIFE AND WORLD-VIEW

The third main area of interest in the present research concerned the non-work life and image of society of the small firm worker. The main view tested in this area was that the small firm worker's closer relations with his employer was reflected in a higher level of integration into the community than is found among large firm workers. This view has also often been summed up in the notion of the small firm worker as a working class deferential. Two aspects of the latter notion were tested in hypotheses suggesting that the small firm worker was
more likely to vote Conservative and less likely to be class conscious.

A further issue explored in this area was whether differences in the socio-economic and political characteristics of the locality in which respondents lived might not also be relevant to the formation of workers' occupational identities and images of society. This point seemed important because the area in which the present respondents lived differed in many ways from other areas in the country and especially from areas in which other studies of small firm workers have been carried out. Some previous research (see Chapter 5) has demonstrated the links between the specific characteristics of the local socio-economic and political structure, workers' occupational identities and image of society but these links have not been systematically explored. In particular, it was hypothesised that the economic success, affluence and high representation of the middle class in Surrey would affect respondents' occupational identities and world-views in very specific ways.

Integration into Local Social Relations

The findings showed no support for the proposition of a high level of integration into the local community among small firm workers. On the contrary while over 75% of large firm respondents belonged to local clubs or voluntary associations of some kind, only 60% of small firm workers did so. Even where they did belong to clubs or associations, small firm respondents reported fewer memberships on average. However, when they were members they were slightly more frequent attenders (though less likely to hold an official position of any kind) but this should be seen in relation to the findings on contacts with kin and non-kin which were also lower than those found among large firm workers.

The idea that, even though small firm respondents were less likely to belong to any kind of club or association they might still nevertheless concentrate their participation in such activities in bodies likely to bring them into contact with their status superiors, received little support. There was no evidence to suggest that small firm workers were members of predominantly middle class voluntary associations to any greater extent than large firm workers. But they did belong to fewer clubs or associations of a solidly working class character such as working men's clubs than did large firm respondents.

This lack of integration into local social relations through
membership of clubs or associations was not compensated for by contact with friends and kin. Married respondents in small firms had only about the same proportion of close friends outside the family as married respondents in the large firm. However, the friends of small firm married respondents were much less likely to be middle class. Nor were fewer contacts with non-kin apparently compensated for by more frequent contacts with kin. Although the data on leisure time activities is incomplete, it indicated fewer contacts with kin among married small firm workers. Moreover, the family background of small firm respondents and of the wives of married respondents was also much more clearly working class than among large firm respondents. Finally, leisure activities among small firm respondents were very similar to those of large firm respondents in that neither indulged in middle class leisure activities to any marked extent.

Overall, therefore, several indicators point toward the small firm married respondents having a much more privatised lifestyle than large firm married respondents. They are more socially isolated from local social activities and less likely to interact with members of either their own or other classes. The notion that privatisation and relative affluence go together, stressed in previous theorising, may require modification to allow for the above findings; indeed, the data points towards the idea that a lack of affluence may equally lead to a privatised lifestyle.

Political Imagery

The political imagery and behaviour of small firm workers which emerges from the findings in the present study, contains elements echoing the privatisation in other areas of non-work social life. The expected findings of a high level of Conservative support indicating possible political deference was not found. Small firm voters were more likely to vote Conservative than Labour but this finding is heavily qualified by several further findings. For instance, a reciprocal relationship between industrial subculture and political imagery was suggested by the finding that printing workers — including those in small firms — were more likely to vote Labour than respondents in either small or large electronics firms. But the two characteristics which most distinguished small firm voters from those in large firms was their marked tendency not to vote at all and their lack of political allegiance to any party as measured by voting for a party at successive General Elections.
The greater disengagement of small firm respondents from the political process was further evidenced by their greater likelihood of believing that it made little difference which of the two main parties won a General Election and of feeling that they had little say in how the country was run. However, again industrial sub-cultures also seemed related to such views although differences between respondents in small and large firms remained greater than those between industries.

What was also clearly shown was that small firm owner-managers had little effect on the political attitudes of their workers. First of all, as noted earlier, relations between owner-managers and shop-floor workers were not close and workers were aware of the differences of interest between themselves and their employers. Secondly, as previous research has indicated, although small firm owner-managers support political parties favouring a free enterprise economy, they are by no means sure that the Conservative Party is not too involved with big business to the disadvantage of the small firm. In short, small firm owner-managers are not likely to be unambiguous supporters of and hence recruiters of support for, the Conservatives among their workers. Finally, small firm respondents did not see their bosses as political influential and they were more likely than large firm workers to see big business as politically powerful.

These findings on the influence of small firm owner-managers on the social and political imagery of small firm workers conflict with the findings of, for example, Batstone (see Chapter 5). But this difference is explained almost entirely by the differences in patterns of local social relations in Banbury and the area of the present study. Small firm owner-managers in Banbury are influential in the local social and political order and interact extensively with their workers outside of work. In the present study neither condition was met and the social separation between employers and workers found in the firm becomes total outside the firm. Each lived their non-work life in a network of social relations largely composed of people similar to themselves and, as seen above, this was especially true of the small firm workers.

In the Surrey area, the high representation of the middle class means that small firm owner-managers are very much a minority in the local socio-political order. None of the owner-managers of the small firms in the present study were known to take an active part in local
social and political affairs. The existence of such a large middle class also allows owner-managers to adopt a lifestyle which involves no out of work social contacts with their employees. Finally, the area lacks a strong focal point for local socio-political relations such as exists in a town like Banbury. Employees live over a wide geographical area and, in fact, have relatively little out of work contact with each other.

Overall, therefore, the small firm respondents showed few indications of being political deferentials. Rather, as with participation in local social relations, political participation was substantially lower than among the large firm workers. This lack of political participation is strongly tinged with feelings of political alienation, indicated most clearly by feelings of having little or no influence on the political process and difficulties in understanding it. In much recent discussion and research, political alienation among manual workers in general has been seen as an increasing phenomenon in the 1970s. Among the small firm workers in the present study this trend is clearly even more pronounced than among the large firm workers and is one of the main ways in which their political imagery differs.

Social Class imagery

The class imagery of small firm workers was as complex as that among large firm workers and reducing this imagery to any simple overall characterization is not possible since there is no way the findings can be fitted to typologies of the 'traditional-deferential-privatised' variety. Nevertheless, there were differences here on a number of issues which point to the inadequacy of some previous views and to a distinct class imagery among small firm workers. Thus, while small firm workers were as likely as large firm workers to label themselves working class, they were less likely to see themselves as middle class and this was interpreted as linked to differences in their market situation. The tendency among large firm respondents to label themselves middle class seemed associated with an awareness that, compared to other manual workers, they were materially relatively well off. Small firm workers, on the other hand, could have few feelings of this kind since their earnings levels were generally lower. However, younger small firm workers were more likely to see themselves as middle class than younger workers in the large firms and this was interpreted as a reflection of the status aspirations of their parents which were shown earlier to have more often influenced small firm respondents.
into seeking jobs with a supposedly higher social status.

Whether deferential class views were common among small firm workers was not easy to test because of the difficulties of operationalising the notion of deference but on the tests adopted, more small firm respondents were found to have attitudes consistent with such an image than large firm workers but, at best, this proportion seemed unlikely to have exceeded 15%. Indicators on social relations with others in and outside the firm, similarly implied an absence of deference. On the complexity of the class order in respondents imagery, which has also been seen as positively correlated with a deferential view, large firm respondents had more complex models of the class order.

Again size of firm was sometimes less important than industrial sub-culture (including trade union membership) in class imagery relationships. For instance, printing workers - regardless of size of firm - were more likely to see wealth or income as a main determinant of class position in society. The electronics respondents, on the other hand, thought the kind of job a person did was more important and that the class order was more 'open' in terms of the chances of upward mobility than did printers. This might be seen as a reflection of the status of the electronics industry in society and the rapid changes which have taken place in the industry in recent decades leading to perceptions of a more fluid and less hierarchical society.

One previous view of the small firm worker, which formed part of the hypothesis on class imagery tested, was that small firm workers were less class conscious than large firm workers. The concept of class consciousness, like deference, also gave rise to problems of operationalisation but while no sub-sample in the present study displayed a class consciousness of a full-blown Marxist variety, there were considerable indications of what was termed a 'primitive' class consciousness among small firm workers even if rather less than among the large firm respondents. A majority of respondents in both small and large firms connected class with economic relationships and very few thought class unimportant.

LINKS BETWEEN WORK AND NON-WORK LIFE

In drawing the separate elements of this overall characterisation of the small firm worker together it is possible to make a link between the earlier occupational identity findings and the later findings on participation in society, politics and class imagery. The small firm
worker, it was argued earlier, has a different and even inferior market situation compared to his large firm counterpart in several respects. His choice of job is more limited, his earnings rather lower and his occupational experiences are more unstable. It might be, therefore, that there is a relationship between his definitions of his relatively disadvantaged position in the economic order and his lack of involvement in society as measured by participation in local social relations and politics. In other words, rather than seeing himself as fortunate in escaping the deprivations of modern large scale capitalism by working for the small firm, the small firm worker may see himself as something of a 'loser' who has been less successful in some ways than many of his fellow manual workers. Such feelings may be more pronounced among workers living in an area such as that in which the present sample lived with its high levels of affluence and conspicuous material consumption. In such a locality inequalities and material deprivation are probably more apparent than in localities where the working class predominate.

In working for the small firm, which is itself often seen as inferior or old fashioned in the modern economic order, the small firm worker might perhaps also tend to define himself as inferior as a worker and as a person. This might account for his lower participation in society and politics and would also account for his consciousness of the importance of economic relations in placing people in the class order. Such a view was not consciously articulated by small firm respondents in the present study - we would not after all expect people to sell themselves short in this way - but such an overall interpretation might be held more consistent with the findings in the present study than other alternative or previous views of the small firm worker.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A number of implications for future research might be drawn from the above. It has been argued, for example, that industrial sub-culture may have more impact on workers' occupational identities and world-views than factors associated with size of firm but clearly a test of this hypothesis in terms of only two industries is insufficient. Therefore, future research should be concerned with a wider range of manufacturing industries and might also be extended into other areas where small economic units are common such as retail distribution.

It is clear that previous treatments of the 'size-effect' in terms of relatively simple relationships between small and large firm work
force attitudes and behaviour is no longer satisfactory. The present study has shown that many of these relationships have intervening variables and even that characteristics associated with size of firm may be a poor starting point in analysing the differences between small and large firm workers. For example, some of the findings on the occupational identity characteristics of small firm workers suggest that a more helpful starting point would be the family and educational experiences of workers and the early years of work experience.

A further direction in which future research might extend its coverage is on regional and locality differences. The present findings suggest, when compared with those of previous research, that certain aspects of the occupational identities and world-views of the small firm worker are related to the local socio-economic order in which they live. In the present study the latter differed greatly from the relatively traditional socio-economic order of Banbury or the low wage, economically depressed, local socio-economic order of Bradford, two areas in which previous research on the small firm worker has been carried out. Certainly, in the case of Banbury, these non-work influences appear to have had a very marked effect on worker orientations and their social relations with others. But, clearly, further research should embrace a wider range of variation in the socio-economic and political orders in which respondents live as well as replicate existing studies, in order to clarify these relationships.

The present study, like most research on manual workers, was cross-sectional yet a number of findings from the present study would require longitudinal study to adequately test their validity. Such studies might be especially connected to hypotheses on the development of small firm worker occupational identities, the effects of life-cycle influences on definitions of work and the patterns of transfer between small and large firms among manual workers over time. For example, the relative absence of workers aged over 45 in the small firms in the present study suggests that a substantial proportion of small firm workers move to jobs in large firms before reaching this age. It might be hypothesised that this is connected to their perceptions of the prospects of working in a small firm beyond this age or is the result of small firm employer personnel practices which operate to force older workers into large firm employment or some combination of such influences.

This last consideration points towards a further desirable
emphasis in future research on the small firm worker, that is, greater attention to the small firm owner-manager and his relations with workers. The present research, like previous research, gave most of its limited resources mainly to the small firm worker and other researchers have concentrated on the small firm owner-manager to the exclusion of his employees. Bringing these two groups and their relations with each other into the centre of the research focus would greatly add to the worth of previous findings from separate studies mainly devoted to one or other group. The small firm is best seen sociologically as a network of social relations surrounding economic activities and investigating only one group involved means, inevitably, an incomplete interpretation.

Overall, there is a need for research with larger samples of small firm workers than has been possible to date. As the present study has shown, much of the testing of hypotheses is in terms of sub-samples of workers which means that a relatively large total sample is required. Alternatively, some limitations might be dealt with by different research designs concentrating, for example, on younger workers or older workers. The danger here, however, is that non-representative samples of small firm workers may lead to undetected bias unless they are carefully integrated with each other to achieve a wide overall coverage.

There are a number of indications, as discussed in Chapter 1, of a marked resurgence of interest in the small firm on the part of both researchers and Government. Unfortunately, much of this discussion continues to be in terms of a romanticised view of the small firm and its internal social relations. The key contribution that sociological researchers can make here is to be sufficiently objective in their approach to the small firm, the small firm owner-manager and the small firm worker, to escape these common preconceptions and therefore provide a more adequate interpretation of this area of industrial life. The significance of the small firm as a source of employment in our society for such a large proportion of the work force at some time or other in their work experiences and as an essential part of the economic infrastructure of Britain, certainly demands that it receive more attention from industrial sociologists than it has up to now.
APPENDIX

MAIN INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

LEISURE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Main Interview Questionnaire reproduced below combines the versions used in the interviews with respondents in the main and control samples. Where a question was asked of respondents in only one sample this is indicated. The sequence of questions, Q97-097(b), is the final version asked of all respondents interviewed after the General Election in October 1974. Questions with ‘card’ above them were those where respondents were asked to give an opinion about a number of statements presented to them on a card. A set of cards was used to ensure the statements were presented randomly to the sample as a whole. The codes alongside each question are the final or main codes used in analysing answers to that question.

The Introductory Statement at the start of the interview repeated the commitments made by the researcher at the time the interview was arranged: that the interview was completely confidential and under no circumstances would the name of any respondent be divulged in any report of the research and that if the respondent did not wish to answer a particular question he need not do so. Finally, the researcher stressed that it was the respondents own personal opinions that were wanted and that if he wanted to enlarge on an answer his views would be very welcome. Respondents were also frequently encouraged by the liberal use of neutral probes, to add to their first answers.

The data from the Leisure Questionnaire, which follows the Main Interview Questionnaire, was used only to a very limited extent in the present study.

THE MAIN INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

[INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT]

Could I begin by asking you a few questions about some of the jobs you had before coming to work for:

(Name of firm at the time of interview)

Q1  How many jobs have you had since you left school – just main jobs, that is, those you stayed at for more than a year?

Code

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

More than 8
Q2 What was the very first job you had after you left school?

Present job only one since leaving school
Job in same industry as present job
Manual job
White collar
Other/DR

Q2(a) Whereabouts was this?

(Distance from present job)
Less than 10 miles
10 miles but less than 30
30 " " " 30
50 " " " 100
Over 100 miles
Other

Q2(b) Can you remember how you got the job?

Through school
Through Y.E.S.
Through father/relative
Through neighbour
Another school leaver/friend
Private employment agency
Advertisement in paper
Other/cannot remember

Q2(c) Can you remember why you chose that particular job?

Chance of learning a trade/skill
Job seemed interesting
No alternative jobs in locality
Money attractive
Because parent/relative worked in job/firm
Because neighbour worked in job/firm
Because friend worked in job/firm
Parental pressure
Other/cannot remember

Q2(d) How many people did the firm employ?

Less than 50
50 but less than 100
100 but less than 200
200 " " " 500
500 or more
Other/DR

Q2(e) How long did you stay?

Less than 6 months
6 months but less than 1 yr.
1 year " " " 2 yrs.
2 years " " " 3 yrs.
3 " " " 5 yrs.
5 " " " 10 yrs.
10 years or longer
Other/cannot remember

Q2(f) Can you remember why you left?

Firm went broke/moved
Made redundant
Did not like job for intrinsic reasons
Money reasons
Q2(f) Contd. 

No training 5
No prospects 6
Found more interesting job 7
Found better paid job 8
Parents moved 9
Entered armed forces 10
Sacked 11
Other 12
Cannot remember 13

Q3 What was the next main job you had, that is, a job you had for more than a year?

Job in same industry as present job 1
Manual 2
White collar 3
Self-employed 4
Armed forces 5
Foreman/supervisor 6
Merchant navy 7
Present job 8 —— Q5
Other 9

Q3(a) Can you remember how you got this job?

Through Y.E.S. 1
Through father/relative 2
Through neighbour 3
Through friend 4
Through advertisement 5
Private agency 6
Trade union 7
Other/DK 8

Q3(b) Why did you choose that job?

Chance of learning trade/skill 1
Interesting job 2
Money reasons 3
Alternative jobs in locality 4
Parental pressure 5
Because parent/relative worked in job/firm 6
Because friend/neighbour worked in job/firm 7
Other/DK 8

Q3(c) Whereabouts was this?

(Distance from present job)

Less than 10 miles 1
10 miles but less than 30 2
30 " " " 50 3
50 " " " 100 4
Over 100 miles 5
Other 6

Q3(d) How long did you stay?

1 year but less than 2 yrs. 1
2 " " " " 3" 2
3 " " " " 4" 3
4 " " " " 5" 4
5 " " " " 10" 5
10 years or more 6
DK 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3(a)</th>
<th>Again, how many did the firm employ? (Branch if part of a larger company)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 but less than 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 but less than 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 but less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3(f)</th>
<th>Why did you leave?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firm went broke/moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made redundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not like job for intrinsic reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No training given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Found better paid job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Found more interesting job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entered armed forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/cannot remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Can I now ask you the same questions about the last main job you had before you came to work for (Name of present company)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only had one/two jobs in work career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than two jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4(a)</th>
<th>What kind of job was it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job in same industry as present job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-skilled manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armed forces - NCO/other rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant navy - non-officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed/small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower level white collar/foreman/supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle management/semi-professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher managerial/professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armed forces - officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant navy - officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4(b)</th>
<th>Again, can you remember how you got the job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through Y.E.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through father/relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4(c)</th>
<th>And how long did you stay?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year but less than 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years but less than 3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years but less than 4 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 years but less than 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years but less than 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK/other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4(d) Why did you take the job?

- Chance of learning a trade/skill
- Interesting job
- Money reasons
- No alternative jobs in locality
- Parental pressure
- Because parent/relative worked in firm
- Because friend worked in firm
- Other/ DK

Q4(e) And why did you leave?

- Firm went broke/moved
- Made redundant/sacked
- Did not like job for intrinsic reasons
- Money reasons
- No training given
- No prospects
- Found more interesting job
- Found better paid job
- Family reasons
- Other

Q4(f) How many people did the firm employ?

- Less than 50
- 50 but less than 100
- 100 " " " 200
- 200 " " " 500
- 500 or more
- Other/ DK

Now could I ask some questions about your present job with ........................?

Q5 What is the exact title of your present job?

- Trainee/apprentice
- Unskilled
- Semi-skilled
- Skilled
- Supervisor/foreman

Q6 Have you always had the same job while you have been working with ........................?

- Yes
- No

If 'No'

Q6(a) What other job or jobs have you had?

- Trainee/apprentice
- Unskilled
- Semi-skilled
- Skilled
- Supervisor/foreman

Q6(b) Why did you change jobs?

- Management request
- Present job pays better
- Present job more interesting
- Present job has better prospects
- Present job is promotion
- Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>How long have you had your present job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months but less than 1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years or longer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7(a)</th>
<th>Have you ever worked for .......... left and come back again?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7(b)</th>
<th>How long did you work for .......... the first time you worked for them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or longer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7(c)</th>
<th>Can you tell me why you left .......... after your first period with them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money reasons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made redundant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic reasons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered armed forces</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered merchant navy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went elsewhere for experience</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement with foreman</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7(d)</th>
<th>And why did you come back?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management request</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like for the firm as a place to work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money reasons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospects of promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous foreman left</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>How did you first find out about your present job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Y.E.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through father/relative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through neighbour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through friend</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private agency</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through person who already worked for firm</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8(a)</th>
<th>Why did you choose it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance of learning trade/skill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting job</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money reasons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family reasons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative worked in firm</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend worked in firm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 How long does it take you to get to work each morning?

Less than \( \frac{1}{2} \) hour 1
\( \frac{1}{2} \) hour but less than 1 hour 2
1 hour but less than 1 \( \frac{1}{2} \) hours 3
1 \( \frac{1}{2} \) hours but less than 2 hours 4
More than 2 hours 5
Other 6

Q10 Do you find your job physically tiring?

Yes 1
No 2
Sometimes 3
DK 4

If 'Yes' or 'Sometimes'

Q10(a) Why do you say that?

Uneven work flow 1
Too few workers for amount of work 2
Poor equipment/work conditions 3
Too much skill/concentration required 4
Too much standing up 5
Very long hours 6
Too much physical labour 7
High level of noise 8
High temperature 9
Physical layout of firm 10
Respondent's age 11
Too much overtime 12
Other/DK 13

Q11 Do you find your job a nervous strain?

Yes 1
No 2
Sometimes 3
DK 4

If 'Yes' or 'Sometimes'

Q11(a) Why is that?

Uneven work flow 1
Very high level of output demanded 2
Poor equipment/conditions 3
High level of concentration/skill required 4
Production poorly organised by management 5
High noise level 6
Tight deadlines 7
Other/DK 8

Q12 Is your job boring?

Yes 1
No 2
Sometimes 3
DK 4

Q12(a) Can you tell me why?

Job is or can be repetitious 1
Job is too simple 2
Product is not interesting 3
Job has plenty of variety 4
Job requires skill and judgement 5
Product is interesting 6
Other 7
DK 8
Q13 Do you find that you think about work problems at home?

Yes 1
No 2
Sometimes 3
DK 4

Q14 (Card 1) People tend to think some things about a job are more important than others. Here is a list of some of the things that are mentioned - which would you pick out as most important?

1. Good pay
2. Good equipment to work with
3. Pleasant working conditions
4. Plenty of variety in the job
5. Responsibility
6. Full wages if sick
7. Good bonus
8. Interesting work
9. A strong and active union
10. Good pension
11. Plenty of overtime
12. A boss who takes a real interest in you
13. Security
14. Good workmates
15. Other
16. Refused to say/DK

Q14(a) What would you say was next most important?

1. Good pay
2. Good equipment to work with
3. Pleasant working conditions
4. Plenty of variety in the job
5. Responsibility
6. Full wages if sick
7. Good bonus
8. Interesting work
9. A strong and active union
10. Good pension
11. Plenty of overtime
12. A boss who takes a real interest in you
13. Security
14. Good workmates
15. Other
16. Refused to say/DK

Q14(b) How would you rate your job at for these two things?

First choice item
1. good
2. pretty good
3. about average
4. not too bad
5. bad

Second choice item
6. good
7. pretty good
8. about average
9. not too bad
10. bad

Q15 Would you call any of your workmates close friends?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 3
If 'Yes'.

Q15(a) How many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15(b) Did you know him/any of them before you came to work for .........................?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15(c) Do you see him/any of them outside working hours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'Yes':

Q15(d) About how often on average do you see him/them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First/Only Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once in 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once in 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once in 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once in 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once in 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If more than four friends frequency of meeting fifth and subsequent friends.

Q15(e) What kind of things do you do when you meet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting in home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16 How well would you say workers in your firm get on with each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16(a) Why do you say that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everybody knows/does their job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People not friendly with each other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are easy going/friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long hours leads to friction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers are always friendly to each other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors are friendly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody works as a team</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High proportion of young workers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long serving workforce</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Have you ever thought about becoming a foreman/overseer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17(a) How much would you like to become one?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at present</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17(b) Why do you say that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater satisfaction/autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More security</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More status</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough money</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have right personal characs./social skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks technical skill</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not want to be superior to workmates</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job not interesting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much responsibility/worry</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. feels he is too old</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman/overseer's job</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too demanding</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too committed to T.U activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17(c) How do you rate your chances of becoming a foreman/overseer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No chance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17(d) If you were promoted would you be upset if your workmates reacted unfavourably?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17(e) Why do you think that?
1. Workmates are friends
2. Foreman must maintain social distance
3. Personal promotion more important
4. They would accept promotion if it were their chance
5. Respondent would be 'fair' hence no unfavourable responses
6. Likes to be friendly with everybody
7. Does not care about workmates feelings
8. Other/DK

Q17(f) Would you go to another firm if the chances of promotion were good?
1. Yes
2. No
3. DK
4. Other

Q18 Can I ask you how well you get on with your present foreman/overseer?
1. Very well
2. Pretty well
3. Fairly well
4. Not very well
5. Badly

Q18(a) Why do you think that is?
1. He leaves me alone to get on with the job
2. He is friendly/helpful/looks after his workers
3. He is incompetent/lazy
4. Demands too much
5. He is too pro-management
6. He looks after his own interests only
7. I do my job well
8. He has favourites (R is not one)
9. He is unfriendly/insensitive
10. Personality clash
11. Other/DK

FOREMEN/OVERSEERS ONLY

Q19 How long have you been a foreman/overseer?
1. Less than 6 months
2. 6 months but less than 1 yr.
3. 1 year but less than 2 yrs.
4. " " " " 5 "
5. " " " " 10 "
6. 10 years or longer

Q19(a) Did you come into the firm as foreman/overseer or were you promoted?
1. Joined as foreman
2. Promoted

Non-supervisory Workers --------- Q22
Q20 How well would you say you get on with the people under you?

   Very well 1
   Pretty well 2
   Fairly well 3
   Not very well 4
   Badly 5
   Other/DK 6

Q20(a) Why do you think this is?

   Workers resent my promotion 1
   Workers resent an 'outsider' coming in as foreman 2
   I am fair 3
   I am friendly/helpful 4
   Workers respect my competence at job 5
   I am better at job than previous holder 6
   I work as hard as my workers 7
   Other/DK 8

Q21 Would you like promotion to a more senior job than the one you now have?

   Yes 1
   No 2
   DK/Other 3

Q21(a) Why do you say that?

   More money 1
   Greater interest/autonomy/satisfaction 2
   More responsibility 3
   Too much responsibility 4
   More security 5
   More status 6
   Does not think has the right personal characs./social skills 7
   Lacks technical skills/competence/qualifications 8
   Less interesting job 9
   Too much paper work 10
   Likes to be close to shopfloor 11
   Other/DK 12

Q21(b) How would you rate your chances of being promoted to a higher position?

   Very good 1
   Good 2
   Don't know 3
   Not very good 4
   No chance 5
   Other/DK 6

Q21(c) Would you move to another firm if the chances of promotion were good?

   Yes 1
   No 2
   DK 3
   Other 4

ALL RESPONDENTS

Q22 (Card 2)

   Length of time with firm 1
   Willingness to work hard 2
   Ability to do the job 3
   Ability to crawl and always put number one first 4
   Being a relative/friend of the boss 5
   Having paper qualifications 6
   Other 7
   DK 8
Q22(a)  And which would you say was the next most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length of time with firm</th>
<th>Willingness to work hard</th>
<th>Ability to do the job</th>
<th>Ability to crawl and always put number one first</th>
<th>Being a relative/friend of the boss</th>
<th>Having paper qualifications</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23  .......... is a pretty small firm compared with many firms; do you think that small firms pay better than large firms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in the control sample were asked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>In some respects but not others</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For respondents in the control sample the order of 'large' and 'small was reversed)

Q24  What about working conditions - things like welfare facilities, heating and canteens - do you think small firms are superior to large firms on these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>In some respects but not others</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For respondents in the control sample the order of 'large' and 'small was reversed)

Q25  How 'in touch' would you say management are with the way shopfloor workers in the firm feel about their jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very in touch</th>
<th>Fairly in touch</th>
<th>Not very in touch</th>
<th>Out of touch</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26  Do you think .......... is run as efficiently as it could be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'No'!

Q26(a)  What do you think are the main causes of inefficiency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervision is slack/lacks expertise</th>
<th>Management lacks ability to organise/manage</th>
<th>Wrong workers hired or kept on</th>
<th>Lack of integration between departments</th>
<th>Firm is too small</th>
<th>Shortage of capital</th>
<th>Poor management/worker relations</th>
<th>Too few managers</th>
<th>Physical layout of factory</th>
<th>Poor/insufficient equipment</th>
<th>Other/DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27 If you had a serious problem in your private life - your wife became ill or you suddenly needed money for an emergency - would you go to a manager or director of the firm for help or advice? (For respondents in the control sample the words 'or director' were omitted)

If 'No'

Q27(a) Why not?

Would become too indebted to the firm 1
Prefer to take such problems to T.U. 2
Work and home life should be completely separate 3
Personal pride 4
Management would not want to help 5
Not been with the firm long enough 6
Contract worker 7
Other/DK 8

Q28 (Card 3)

These days everybody seems to have their own ideas on industrial relations. Here are two views of industry - which is the one that comes closest to your own view?

- A firm is like a football side - it is a team and good team work means success which is to everybody's advantage. 1
- Team work in industry is impossible - because employers and men are really on opposite sides. 2

Other 3
DK 4

Q29 How would you describe worker-management relations at ...........?

Very good 1
Good 2
Fair 3
Not very good 4
Bad 5

Q29(a) Why is that do you think?

Management takes strong interest in workers 1
Everybody - management and workers - are very friendly 2
This is a small firm - leads to good worker-management relations 3
Everybody takes a pride in the work and/or the firm 4
Management gives workers autonomy 5
Management is inflexible/insensitive 6
Management demands too much work 7
Firm pays badly 8
Recent changes in firm have led to deterioration 9
Q29(a) Contd.

Firm pays well 10
Incompetent management 11
Workers do not trust management 12
Other/DK 13

Q30

How well would you say you knew the managing director?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 ** Q30b</td>
<td>4 ** Q30b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in the control sample were asked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have much contact with any of the senior managers in your firm?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'very well' or 'fairly well'

Q30(a) How did you get to know him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents in the control sample were asked:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you get to know him/them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only through normal work contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As F.O.C./shop steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD/Manager(s) makes sure he/they knows everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through out-of-work contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30(b) And how about the other directors—how well do you know them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director I</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 ** Q31</td>
<td>4 ** Q31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director II</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 ** Q31</td>
<td>8 ** Q31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director III</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 ** Q31</td>
<td>12 ** Q31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know all of them well</th>
<th>Hardly know any of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'very well' or 'fairly well'

Q30(c) How did you get to know him/them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you get to know him/them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only through normal work contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As F.O.C./shop steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director(s) make sure he/they know everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through out-of-work contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                       |                       |
|                       |                       |
|                       |                       |
Respondents in the control sample were asked:-

Q30(b) And how about top management, the directors of the company; have you ever had any contact at all with them?

If any contact at all

Q30(c) What was your impression of him/them?

(There were so few contacts that no code was needed)

Q31 How well do you think the firm is doing?

If any information given

Q33(a) How accurate do you think the information is?

Q34 What do you think is the main reason the directors have for running their own business?

Respondents in the control sample were asked:

What do you think is the main goal of management in running the company?

Q35 Has the firm changed very much since you have been there?

If 'Yes' or 'Other'

Q35(a) In what ways has it changed?
Q35(a) Contd.

Management has become
more distant/impersonal  5
Type of work or product
has changed  6
Improved technical equip­
ment/layout  7
Improved working conditions  8
Workers' attitudes have
become less favourable  9
Firm has become depart­
mentalised  10
Firm has expanded  11
Other/DK  12

Q36 Are you a member
of a union?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'Yes'

Q36(a) Which union is that?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGAT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATSOFA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTHIS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLADE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETPU</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUSMW</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUEW</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q36(b) How long have you
been a member of
a trade union?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or longer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/cannot remember</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q36(c) Why did you join
originally?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed shop or similar pressures to join</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates or friends were members</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed all workers should be in a union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed would obtain higher pay/benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q37 Have you ever been a
member of a union?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'Yes'

Q37(a) Which union was that?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGAT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETPU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUSMW</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGWU</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q38 Why did you originally join the union?
Closed shop/similar pressure to join 1
Workmates or friends were members 2
Believed all workers should belong to a union 3
Believed would obtain higher pay/benefits 4
Security 5
Other/DK 6

Q38(a) How long did you belong to the union?
Less than 6 months 1
6 months but less than 1 yr. 2
1 year 3
2 years 4
3 years 5
5 years 6
10 years or longer 7
Cannot remember 8

Q38(b) Why did you leave?
Left unionized job for non-unionized job 1
Union did not seem to serve workers' interests 2
Unions have too much power 3
Went into totally different work 4
Other 5
DK 6

UNIONIZED FIRMS ONLY
Non-union firms .......................... Q45

Q39 Are you a shop steward/F.O.C./deputy F.O.C.?
Yes 1 ---- Q61
No 2
If 'No' .................................

Q39(a) Have you ever held any position in the union?
Yes 1
No 2
Positions held: ...........................
.................................
.................................

Q40 Would you like to be a shop steward/F.O.C.?
Yes 1
No 2
DK 3

Q40(a) Why do you say that?
Too much responsibility 1
Do not want to be too closely associated with the union 2
Not interested 3
Does not have skills required 4
To help fellow workers 5
In order to progress in union 6
To improve status 7
Disapproves of unions 8
Other workers will not support you/dislike you 9
Union is too militant 10
Management would disapprove 11
To make union more effective in firm 12
Other/DK 13
**Q41** How often do you attend union meetings?

- Attend every meeting
- Attend most meetings
- Rarely attend
- Never attend
- Other

If 'rarely' or 'never attend'...

**Q41(a)** Why don't you go more often?

- Not interested in union
- Home/family demands
- Relations with union should be through shop steward
- Too much overtime
- Union does well - no need to attend
- Supervisors/foremen do not attend meetings
- Meetings held too far away
- Other/DK

**Q42** Do you always vote in any union ballot or election?

- Always
- Most occasions
- Not very often
- Never

If 'not very often' or 'never'...

**Q42(a)** Why do you not vote more often?

- Not interested
- My vote makes no difference
- Prefers minimum involvement with union
- Other/DK

**Q43** Do you talk about union affairs with your workmates very much?

- Very often
- Quite a lot
- Now and then
- Hardly ever
- Never

**Q44** How effective would you say the union is in ...............?

- Very effective
- Fairly effective
- Not very effective
- Ineffective

**Q44(a)** Why do you say that?

- F.O.C./shop steward(s) effective at their job
- F.O.C./shop steward(s) ineffective
- Management behaviour promotes strong T.U.
- New/young workers are union-minded
- Workers too pro-management/apathetic
- Union has too few members in firm
- Good management, therefore no need of active T.U.
- Other
- DK
**NON-UNION FIRMS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unionized Firms</th>
<th>Q46</th>
<th>Q47(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>Do you think it would be a good thing if ... became unionized?</td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45(a)</td>
<td>Why do you say that?</td>
<td>Does not believe in unions/unionism 1</td>
<td>Would improve pay and conditions 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>If a union tried to organize ....... would you join?</td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>Would you allow your name to be put forward as a shop steward/F.O.C.?</td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47(a)</td>
<td>Why not?</td>
<td>Too much responsibility 1</td>
<td>Does not have necessary skills 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q48(a)</th>
<th>Q48(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>As you know the last Conservative Government brought in the Industrial Relations Act - what was your opinion of the Act?</td>
<td>Approve 1</td>
<td>Disapprove 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48(a)</td>
<td>Do you think that on the whole the Act benefited workers like yourself?</td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48(b)</td>
<td>Do you think that a person like yourself had a good knowledge of how the Act worked?</td>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q49 (Card 4) There are different opinions about the amount of influence unions have in our society. Which of the statements on this card would you most agree with?

- Unions are not strong enough in Britain and cannot ensure that their members' standard of living keep up with those of other groups in society. 1
- Unions represent their members' interests fairly and strongly to ensure workers have as much influence in Britain as other groups. 2
- Unions have become too powerful in Britain and this may result in permanent harm to the national economic interest. 3

Other/DK 4

Q50 In general what do you think are the main reasons why workers go on strike?

- Unions have become too powerful in Britain and this may result in permanent harm to the national economic interest. 1
- Other/DK

Money/fringe benefits 1
Better work conditions 2
Bad management 3
Because they feel they have no alternative 4
Militants in the firm 5
Boredom/monotony 6
Frustration 7
Militant leaders in the firm 8
Poor management-worker communications 9
Other 10
DK 11

Q51 Would you say that you could work for?

- Better
- About the same
- Worse
- Other

Better 1
About the same 2
Worse 3
Other 4
DK 5

Q51(a) Do you think your wages should be higher than they are at present?

Yes 1
No 2
Other 3
DK 4

Q51(b) Do you think that you could afford to pay you more without the risk of going broke?

Yes 1
No 2
Other 3
DK 4

Q52 How secure do you think your job is?

- Very secure
- Fairly secure
- Not very secure
- Insecure
- Other

Very secure 1
Fairly secure 2
Not very secure 3
Insecure 4
Other 5
DK 6

Q52(a) Why do you say that?

- Firm is expanding
- Firm could go broke

Firm is expanding 1
Firm could go broke 2
Q52(a) Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not get on well with foreman/manager/director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union member</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job is secure in Britain today</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of labour for my kind of work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job is secure in this industry</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm is very profitable</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. is very good at his job</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been at firm a long time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked by management</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm hires and fires frequently</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice/formal training</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management reducing labour force</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q53 (Card 5)

People have different views about going on strike - which of the statements on this card comes closest to your opinion?

- I don't believe going on strike will benefit me and I would not do so under any circumstances. 1
- I would be prepared to go on strike if I were a member of a union and the strike was officially called by the union. 2
- I would be prepared to strike if necessary to get a fair deal if my mates also agreed, even if we didn't belong to a union. 3
- I would be prepared to strike at any time if it was necessary to support the interests of workers and help the working class movement, anywhere in the country. 4

Q54 Do you work overtime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'No'

Q54(a) Why not?

(Few respondents said they never did overtime and therefore no code required)

Q55 Is there too much or too little overtime in your present firm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much/too little sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overtime</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q56** What is your main reason for working overtime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management insists</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because other workers do it</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get the job out</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear backlog of work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/DK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q56(a)** How many hours a week do you work overtime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours but less than 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours but less than 15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 hours but less than 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hours or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot state an average</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q57** How many hours a week do you work excluding overtime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours but less than 35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 hours but less than 40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours but less than 45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 hours but less than 50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 hours and over</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q58** Have you ever thought of leaving your present job?

- Yes: 1
- No: 2
- Sometimes: 3

If 'Yes' or 'Sometimes':

**Q59** Are you seriously looking for another job at the moment?

- Yes: 1
- No: 2

**Q60** What would your main reason for leaving be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To get more money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start own business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of prospects in present firm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get more interesting job</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To travel/emigrate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration in present job</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get more experience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q61** Have you ever had your own business or been self-employed?

- Yes: 1
- No: 2

**Q61(a)** What kind of business/self-employment was it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated to present job or industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to present job or industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract worker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q61(b)** How long were you in business/self-employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yr. but less than 2 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and over</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q61(c) Why did you give up your business/self-employment?

Lack of financial skills 1
Found better paid job 2
Lack of technical skills 3
Disagreed with partner(s) 4
Difficult trading conditions/went broke 5
Not enough capital 6
Too demanding physically/mentally 7
Insufficient profits 8
Other 9

Q62 Would you like to have your own business or to become self-employed(again)?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 3

Q62(a) Why?

For autonomy 1
Too much responsibility 2
Lack of personal/social skills 3
Lack of business skills 4
No capital 5
Cannot find suitable partner 6
Cannot find suitable labour 7
Age 8
To make money 9
Personal achievement 10
Security 11
Other/DK 12

If 'Yes' to Q62

Q63 What kind of business would it be?

Unrelated to present job/industry 1
Related to present job/industry 2
DK 3

Q64 Have you begun to make any serious preparations to realise your ambition?

Yes 1
No 2

If 'Yes'

Q64(a) What kind of preparation?

Getting capital/saving 1
Looking for premises 2
Looking for partner 3
Training for extra skills 4
Other 5

Q65 If somebody showed the ability and worked hard, how far do you think he could get in ...........

Director 1
Supervisor/head of department/middle management 2
Not beyond present job 3
Promotion depends on firm growing 4
Promotion depends on investing capital in firm 5
Promotion depends on bringing in new business 6
Not very far beyond present job 7
Firm too small to provide promotion opportunities 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q66 | Full approval 1  
|     | Full disapproval 2  
|     | Qualified approval or disapproval 3  
|     | Other 4  
|     | DK 5  
| Q67 | Same job as now 1  
|     | Different manual job in same industry 2  
|     | Manual job in unrelated industry 3  
|     | Professional/managerial 4  
|     | Lower level white collar 5  
|     | Open air manual 6  
|     | Own business 7  
|     | Other/DK 8  
| Q68 | Unskilled manual 1  
|     | Semi-skilled manual 2  
|     | Skilled manual 3  
|     | Armed forces - NCO/other rank 4  
|     | Merchant navy - non-officer 5  
|     | Self-employed/own business 6  
|     | Lower level white collar 7  
|     | Supervisor or foreman 8  
|     | Middle management/semi-professional 9  
|     | Higher managerial/professional 10  
|     | Armed forces officer 11  
|     | Merchant navy officer 12  
|     | DK 13  
| Q68(a) | Yes 1  
|       | No 2  
|       | DK 3  
| Q68(b) | Unskilled manual 1  
|       | Semi-skilled manual 2  
|       | Skilled manual 3  
|       | Armed forces - NCO/other rank 4  
|       | Merchant navy - non-officer 5  
|       | Self-employed/own business 6  
|       | Lower level white collar 7  
|       | Supervisor or foreman 8  
|       | Middle management/semi-professional 9  
|       | Higher managerial/professional 10  
|       | Armed forces officer 11  
|       | Merchant navy officer 12  
|       | DK 13  

Respondents in the control sample were asked:

How would you feel if (this branch of) became larger than it is now?

If 'No'

If you were leaving school again next week what kind of job would you choose?

I wonder if I could now ask you some questions about your family and life in general.
**C68(b) Contd.**

| Armed forces officer | 11 | C69 |
| Merchant navy officer | 12 | C69 |

**C68(c)**

Was his job in same industry as the one you are now working in?

| Yes | 1 |
| No  | 2 |

**C69**

Can I ask what kind of accommodation this is?

| Own house/on mortgage | 1 |
| Rented furnished flat/house | 2 |
| Rented unfurnished house | 3 |
| Rented unfurnished flat | 4 |
| Council house/flat | 5 |
| Parental home | 6 |
| Other | 7 |

**C70**

Have you always lived in this district?

| Yes | 1 | C73 |
| No  | 2 |

**C71**

Where were you born?

| Up to 20 miles from present home | 1 |
| 20 miles but less than 50 | 2 |
| 50 " " " " 100 | 3 |
| Over 100 miles | 4 |
| Abroad | 5 |

**C72**

What were the main places you have lived in since then?

**Place I**

| Up to 20 miles from present home | 1 |
| 20 miles but less than 50 | 2 |
| 50 " " " " 100 | 3 |
| Over 100 miles | 4 |
| Abroad | 5 |

**Place II**

| Up to 20 miles from present home | 6 |
| 20 miles but less than 50 | 7 |
| 50 " " " " 100 | 8 |
| Over 100 miles | 9 |
| Abroad | 10 |

**Place III**

| Up to 20 miles from present home | 11 |
| 20 miles but less than 50 | 12 |
| 50 " " " " 100 | 13 |
| Over 100 miles | 14 |
| Abroad | 15 |

**Place IV**

| Up to 20 miles from present home | 16 |
| 20 miles but less than 50 | 17 |
| 50 " " " " 100 | 18 |
| Over 100 miles | 19 |
| Abroad | 20 |

Details of any further main places lived in:
Q73 (Card 6)
Do you belong to any clubs or associations? Here is a list of the kind of thing we mean?

- Working men's club
- Political party
- Parent/teacher assoc.
- Tenants' assoc.
- Church/church group
- Sports club
- WEA/class/evening class
- Brit. Legion/Servicemen's club
- Social club
- Residents' Assoc.
- None
- Other

Q73(a) Are you an ordinary member or do you hold an official position?

If 'holds an official position'

Q73(b) What position do you hold? (Name of organisation(s) and position(s) held)

(So few respondents held such positions that no code was required)

Q74 About how often do you attend?

Name of organisation:

Name of organisation:

Name of organisation:

Frequency of attendance at any further organisations;

Q75 Are you married?

If 'yes' or have been married

Q76 How long have you been/were you married?
### Question 76
Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 yrs but less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 77
Does your wife go out to work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 77(a)
What kind of work is it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled manual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/own business</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level white collar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management/semi-professional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher managerial/professional</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 77(b)
Is her job full-time or part-time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 78
Are you engaged or going steady?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 79
When do you plan to be married?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK/No definite plans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In less than 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less than 1 yr</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year but less than 2 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 80
Do you know what your fiancé's/girlfriend's father does for a living or what he did if he no longer works?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled manual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces - NCO/other rank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant navy - non-officer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/small business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level white collar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/foreman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management/semi-prof.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher managerial/professional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces-officer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant navy - officer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 81
Do you know what your father-in-law does for a living or what he did if he no longer works?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled manual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces - NCO/other rank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant navy - non-officer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/small business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level white collar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/foreman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management/semi-prof.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher managerial/professional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces-officer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant navy - officer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q82: Do you have any children?

**Yes**

**No**

---

### Q83: Are they boys or girls and how old are they?

**For each child**

**First Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr. but less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 yrs. and over</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr. but less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 yrs. and over</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr. but less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 20 yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fourth Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr. but less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 yrs.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 20 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Q84: What kind of secondary school does your child go to?

**For each child of Secondary School age**

**First Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**If more than 4 children sex and age of remaining children:**

**IF ANY CHILDREN OF SECONDARY SCHOOL AGE**

**If none** --- **Q87**
If more than 3 secondary school age children, type of school attended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q84</th>
<th>Contd.</th>
<th>Third Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If more than 3 secondary school age children, type of school attended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q85</th>
<th>Do you think he/she/they is/are getting the education he/she/they need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some are some not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'No' or 'Some are some not':

Q86 | What is wrong with the education he/she/they is/are getting? |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------|

(Data from this question not analysed in the present study and a full code was not developed)

Q86(a) | Would you like him/her/them to go on to full-time further or higher education? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'Yes':

Q86(b) | What kind would you prefer him/her/them to go on to? |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------|

|       | First Child                                     |
|       | University                                     | 1 |
|       | Polytechnic                                    | 2 |
|       | Teacher Training                               | 3 |
|       | College of FE/Tech. College                    | 4 |
|       | Other                                          | 5 |
|       | DK                                             | 6 |

|       | Second Child                                   |
|       | University                                     | 7 |
|       | Polytechnic                                    | 8 |
|       | Teacher Training                               | 9 |
|       | College of FE/Tech. College                    | 10 |
|       | Other                                          | 11 |
|       | DK                                             | 12 |

|       | Third Child                                    |
|       | University                                     | 13 |
|       | Polytechnic                                    | 14 |
|       | Teacher Training                               | 15 |
|       | College of FE/Tech. College                    | 16 |
|       | Other                                          | 17 |
|       | DK                                             | 18 |

If more than 3 children preferences for any remaining children:

Q86(c) | Why would you like him/her/them to go on to further or higher education? |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|

For each child:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enable child to get better job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enable child to extend education even further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child is bright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q86(c) Contd.

Child is good with hands 4
Other/DK 5

Second Child
Enable child to get better job 6
Enable child to extend education even further 7
Child is bright 8
Child is good with hands 9
Other/DK 10

Third Child
Enable child to get better job 11
Enable child to extend education even further 12
Child is bright 13
Child is good with hands 14
Other/DK 15

If 'No' to Q86(a)

Q86(a) Why wouldn't you like him/her/them to go on to further or higher education?

(Only one respondent answered 'No' to Q86(a).)

FOR ANY CHILDREN WHO HAVE COMPLETED SECONDARY SCHOOLING

Q87 What kind of secondary school did your .......... go to?

For each child who has completed secondary schooling

First Child
Grammar 1
Secondary Modern 2
Comprehensive 3
Other 4
DK 5

Second Child
Grammar 6
Secondary Modern 7
Comprehensive 8
Other 9
DK 10

Third Child
Grammar 11
Secondary Modern 12
Comprehensive 13
Other 14
DK 15

If more than 3 children completed secondary schooling type of school attended for additional children:

Q88 Did .......... go on to any full-time higher education?

Yes 1
No 2 ---- Q91
DK 3 ---- Q91
If 'Yes'

Q89  What kind was it?

For each child who received full-time higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Child</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of FE/Tech. College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Child</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of FE/Tech. College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If more than two children received full-time higher education, type of education received:

Q90  Do you think they have had the education they deserved?

| Yes | 1 |
| No  | 2 |
| DK  | 3 |

ALL RESPONDENTS

Q91  (Card 7)

Here is a list of some of the things which are said to help a person get on in the world. Which would you pick out as most important?

| Ambition | 1 |
| Character | 2 |
| Intelligence | 3 |
| Being born in the right family | 4 |
| Hard work | 5 |
| Knowing the right people | 6 |
| Luck | 7 |
| Education | 8 |
| Other | 9 |
| DK | 10 |

Q91(a)  What kind of secondary school did you yourself attend?

| Grammar | 1 |
| Comprehensive | 2 |
| Secondary Modern/Elementary | 3 |
| Secondary Technical | 4 |
| Other | 5 |

Q91(b)  At what age did you leave?

| Under 14 | 1 |
| 14 | 2 |
| 15 | 3 |
| 16 | 4 |
| 17 | 5 |
| 18 | 6 |
| 19 and over | 7 |

Q92  Did you have any further education, part-time or full-time, after you left?

<p>| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q92(a)</strong></td>
<td>What kind was it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q92(b)</strong></td>
<td>Did you gain any qualifications and what were they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q93</strong></td>
<td>Did you do an apprenticeship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q93(a)</strong></td>
<td>What kind was it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q93(b)</strong></td>
<td>Did you finish it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARRIED RESPONDENTS ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q94</strong></td>
<td>Do you know what kind of secondary school your wife attended?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q94(a)</strong></td>
<td>Do you know at what age she left?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q94(b)</strong></td>
<td>Did she, do you know, go on to any form of further education, full-time or part-time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q94(c)</strong></td>
<td>Do you know what kind it was?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q94(d) Did she obtain any qualifications? University/professional qualification 1
Teacher Training Certificate 2
Secretarial qualification 3
G.C.E. 'O' or 'A' 4
Nursing qualification 5
Trade qualification, e.g. 6
City and Guilds 7
Other 8
DK 9

Q95 Outside your families do you and your wife know another couple who you regard as especially close friends? Yes 1
No 2

Q95(a) Can you tell me what he does for a living? Unskilled manual 1
Semi-skilled manual 2
Skilled manual 3
Armed forces - NCO/other rank 4
Merchant navy - non-officer 5
Self-employed/small business 6
Lower level white collar 7
Supervisor/foreman 8
Middle management/semi prof. 9
Higher managerial/professional 10
Armed forces officer 11
Merchant navy officer 12
DK 13

Q96 Do you get a daily newspaper regularly? Yes 1
No 2

Q96(a) Which one? Daily Mirror 1
Guardian 2
Daily Mail 3
Daily Express 4
Times 5
Daily Telegraph 6
Sun 7
Financial Times 8
Morning Star 9
Sporting Life 10
Other 11

Q96(b) Do you regularly get a local newspaper? Yes 1
No 2

Q96(c) What is your main reason for getting it? Obtain news about local community 1
Entertainment information 2
Local sports information/results 3
Job information 4
Parents buy it 5
Other 6
DK 7

Q96(d) Do you have a second paid job of any kind? Yes 1
No 2
### Q96(e) What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid youth work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual printing on national newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/T barman in pub/club</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance printing/graphics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/T garage work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance electrical rewiring</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance electronics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q96(f) How many hours a week do you spend doing this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours but less than 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &quot; &quot; &quot; 15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 hours or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q97 Do you mind telling me which party you voted for at the last General Election in October?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to state</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q97(a) And which party did you vote for at the Election in February 1974?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to state</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q97(b) Can I also ask you how you voted in the 1970 General Election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to state</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q97(c) Why do you always vote for the Party/did you change from one Party to another/did you not vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in politics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to give other party a chance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to give Liberals a chance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents voted this way</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour is the 'only' or best party</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatives are the 'only' or best party</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberals are the 'only' or best party</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q97(d) Do you think it makes a lot of difference whether Labour or Conservatives win the Election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q097(a) Why do you think that?</td>
<td>Both parties are the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better off economically under Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better off economically under Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour is the party for workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservatives is the party for business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q098 Who would you say has had the most influence on your political views? | Parents                                                                   | 1    |
|                                                                          | Brother/sister                                                            | 2    |
|                                                                          | National politician/T.U. leader                                          | 3    |
|                                                                          | Local councillor/politician                                               | 4    |
|                                                                          | Workmate or friend                                                        | 5    |
|                                                                          | Newspapers/televison                                                     | 6    |
|                                                                          | Other                                                                    | 7    |
|                                                                          | Nobody                                                                   | 8    |
|                                                                          | DK                                                                       | 9    |

| Q099 Do you think people like yourself have enough say in the way the country is run? | Yes | 1 |
|                                                                                   | No  | 2 |
|                                                                                   | DK  | 3 |
|                                                                                   | Other | 4 |

| Q100 Which group in our society has the most say in your opinion, on how the country is run? | Trade unions | 1 |
|                                                                                           | Big business/capitalists/Employers/CBI | 2 |
|                                                                                           | The rich/those with money              | 3 |
|                                                                                           | Ruling class/upper class               | 4 |
|                                                                                           | Working class                          | 5 |
|                                                                                           | Parliament/MP's                        | 6 |
|                                                                                           | Government                             | 7 |
|                                                                                           | Politicians, Political parties         | 8 |
|                                                                                           | Civil servants                          | 9 |
|                                                                                           | The young                               | 10 |
|                                                                                           | A mixture of the above                 | 11 |
|                                                                                           | Other                                   | 12 |
|                                                                                           | None/DK                                 | 13 |

| Q101 Did you vote in the last local elections? | No vote | 1 |
|                                                | Yes     | 2 |
|                                                | No      | 3 |
|                                                | Cannot remember | 4 |

| Q102 Which social class would you say you belong to? | None | 1 |
|                                                     | Working class | 2 |
|                                                     | Middle class  | 3 |
|                                                     | Other         | 4 |
|                                                     | No classes    | 5 |
|                                                     | DK            | 6 |

| Q102(a) How many social classes would you say there are? | None | 1 |
|                                                         | 1    | 2 |
|                                                         | 2    | 3 |
|                                                         | 3    | 4 |
|                                                         | 4    | 5 |
|                                                         | 5    | 6 |
|                                                         | 6 or more | 7 |
Q102(b) How would you name them? 

- Aristocracy/royalty
- Wealthy/rich/those with money
- Ruling class/elite
- Upper class/top class
- Businessmen/management
- Middle class
- Upper middle class
- Lower middle class
- Working class
- Lower class
- Upper working class
- Middle " "
- Lower " "
- The poor/unemployed
- Other/DK

Q102(c) What kind of people belong to .................? Repeat for each class named in answer to Q102(b).

Name of Class: ................. Kind of people: .................

- Name of Class: ................. Kind of people: .................
- Name of Class: ................. Kind of people: .................
- Name of Class: ................. Kind of people: .................

If more than 4 classes, same details for remaining classes:

Highest strata defined in:  
- Power terms
- Econ./occupational 1
- Prestige/lifestyle 2
- Educational terms 3

Middle strata defined in:  
- Econ./occupational 4
- Educational terms 5
- Prestige/lifestyle 6

Lower strata defined in:  
- Econ./occupational 7
- Educational terms 8
- Prestige/lifestyle 9

Sub-lower strata defined in:  
- Econ./occupational 10
- Educational terms 11
- Prestige/lifestyle 12

All strata defined in:  
- Econ./occupational 13
- Educational terms 14
- Prestige/lifestyle 15

Highest strata defined in prestige terms others in econ. 16
- Other/DK 17

18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q103</th>
<th>What would you say are the most important influences which put people into different classes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth/income 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family of origin 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q104</th>
<th>How easy do you think it is for people to move up from one class to another?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very easy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly easy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very easy 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very difficult 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impossible 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q105</th>
<th>(Card B) Which of the statements on this card would you say come closest to your opinion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class is a thing of the past - we are all equal now in Britain. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are classes in Britain but they are not important and people can move easily from one to another. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are two main classes in Britain - those who work and those who get others to work for them. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/DK 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q106</th>
<th>Can I ask you what your basic pay is - before tax and without any overtime or bonuses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than £20 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£20 but less than £25 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£25 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£30 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£35 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£40 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£45 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£50 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£55 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£60 and over 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused to state 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q106(a)</th>
<th>And how much, on average, is your weekly pay with overtime but again before any deductions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than £20 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£20 but less than £25 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£25 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£30 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£35 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£40 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£45 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£50 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£55 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£60 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£65 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£70 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£75 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£75 and over 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused to state 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q106(b)</th>
<th>So what would you say is your average take home pay - after all deductions - a lot?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than £20 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£20 but less than £25 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£25 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£30 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q106(b) Contd.

£35 but less than £40  5
£40 =  £45  6
£45 =  £50  7
£50 =  £55  8
£55 =  £60  9
£60 and over  10
Refused to state  11

Q107 And one final question: can I ask you how old you are?

Under 21  1
21 but under 25  2
25 but under 30  3
30 =  35  4
35 =  40  5
40 =  45  6
45 =  50  7
50 =  55  8
55 =  60  9
60 or over  10
Refused to state  11

THANKYOU STATEMENT

At the end of the Main Interview all respondents were asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire on their activities over the week-end immediately after the interview.

LEISURE QUESTIONNAIRE

On the opposite page is a list of leisure time activities. The time periods refer to next week-end. Please put a tick ✓ in the box alongside the statement which most closely describes what you were doing in each of the time periods. If none of the statements describes what you were doing write the activity in the space at the bottom of the list.

The codes for Questions 1, 2, 5 and 6 are as printed alongside the questions. (Code 3 in Questions 2 and 5 are Other/No Response). The code for Question 3 was:

Inside the U.K.  1
Southern Ireland  2
Western Europe  3
Elsewhere  4
No Response  5

The code for Question 4 was:

7 days or less  1
8 days and up to 14 days  2
15 days and up to 21 days  3
22 days or more  4
No response  5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Friday Evening</th>
<th>Saturday Morning</th>
<th>Saturday Afternoon</th>
<th>Saturday Evening</th>
<th>Sunday Morning</th>
<th>Sunday Afternoon</th>
<th>Sunday Evening</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked Overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do It Yourself (Painting, Decorating etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched television at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives came to visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to the cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited by workmate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to visit friends at their home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in sport (football, fishing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to visit relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went drinking at Pub/Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator at sports event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took children out for walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to a political meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited by friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went out to a restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went dancing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went for drive in car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to the Theatre/Concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went for walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Did you have a holiday away from home last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you did, where did you go?

4. How long were you away for?

5. Did you take a car?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What kind of accommodation did you stay in?

Please tick the correct box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stayed with Relatives</th>
<th>Stayed with Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caravan</td>
<td>Camping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-catering chalet/flat</td>
<td>Hired boat/own boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday camp</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding house</td>
<td>Other (Please state)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you again for allowing me to interview you and also for answering the questions on this Questionnaire.

Place the completed Questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope and drop it into a post box. Thanks again.
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