

1.

ATTITUDES OF FOREMEN IN THE
AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

by

ROMAN J. KRYGIER, JR.

B.S., Purdue University
(1964)

and

KENNETH J. BARKER

B.S., University of Detroit
(1964)

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF

SCIENCE

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF

TECHNOLOGY

June, 1974

Signature of Author..

Alfred P. Sloan School of Management

Certified by.....

.....
Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by.....

Chairman, Departmental Committee on
Graduate Students



ATTITUDES OF FOREMEN IN THE
AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

by

Roman J. Krygier, Jr.

and

Kenneth J. Barker

Submitted to the Alfred P. Sloan School
of Management on May 10, 1974 in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science.

Abstract

The industrial foreman's job has become increasingly complex and difficult in the past twenty years. Considerable time and money have been expended by industrial concerns to improve the position of the foreman. Some attention has been given to foremen's problems in professional journals, but in few instances has the information been obtained from foremen directly. In this study we have sought to identify the problems faced by the foreman as he perceives them.

We surveyed the opinions of foremen in nine automotive manufacturing plants. The survey tool was a Likert-type questionnaire sent to all production foremen (730) in the nine selected plants. Results of the questionnaires were key punched and tabulated for processing on the MIT computer facilities, utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences System. This provided detailed analysis of demographic data and questionnaire answers. Written comments were handled individually for use in comparing questionnaire answers with freely expressed concerns of the respondents.

The questionnaire was designed to answer questions in these areas:

- 1) How does the foreman see his job?
- 2) How does he feel others see his job?

- 3) What satisfaction does he derive from his job?
- 4) What motivates him?
- 5) How well does management support him in performance of his job?
- 6) What does he dislike most about his job?
- 7) How can his job be improved?
- 8) What does the future hold for the job of foreman?

We felt these areas would provide sufficient information on the attitudes held by the respondents.

Of the conclusions reached, the following list comprises the most significant:

- 1) The respondents had a positive attitude about their job and about management generally, but 58% felt that management was not consulting them about decisions affecting their areas and 60% felt they had little voice in the management decision process.
- 2) Positive feelings about job security led to positive feelings on other important issues; negative feelings on security do not bias feelings negatively on other issues.
- 3) Eighty-two percent of the foremen responding had ten or less years as foremen and 52% had been foremen for five or less years.
- 4) Eleven percent of the respondents had less than a high school education; a greater percentage of non-high school graduates was found in the older age groups.
- 5) The older a foreman is, the more positively he feels that hourly personnel see the foreman's job decreasing in importance.
- 6) Sixty-four percent of the respondents felt their plant management saw the foreman's job as important as they saw it.
- 7) Seventy-one percent of the respondents felt the job of foreman has decreased in prestige over the past ten years.
- 8) Respect for help from supervisors was less among the younger, more educated respondents.

- 9) Forty-nine percent of the 20-30 age group felt that the training provided them has not significantly affected the way they perform their job.
- 10) Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt they perform well because of promotional possibilities.
- 11) Seventy-two percent of the respondents felt they were free to discipline.
- 12) There are discrepancies between what the respondents see themselves doing and what their supervisors want them to do.
- 13) Forty-three percent of the respondents feel closer affiliation with their crew than with other foremen or their supervisors.

Chapter III utilizes the aforementioned results to construct meaningful conclusions concerning the role of the modern foreman in the automotive industry.

Thesis Adviser: Charles A. Myers
Title: Sloan Fellows Professor of Management

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our sincere thanks to Charles A. Myers, Sloan Fellow Professor of Management, for his guidance and editorial work during the preparation of this study. His contributions from the inception of the questionnaire through this final form have helped make this effort meaningful and memorable.

We want to express our appreciation to Maison Haire, Sloan Fellows Professor of Management, for his timely and useful suggestions concerning the statistical analyses and procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction:	
Participants	7
Development of Questionnaire	9
Methodology	10
II. Results:	
Demographics	26
Prestige	29
Problems	31
Communications	33
Cross Reference of Key Questions	35
Expectations	36
Discipline	38
Duties	40
III. Conclusions:	
Communications Gap	45
New Foremen	51
Worker's Perception of Foremen	55
IV. Tables:	
I. Questionnaire	71
II. Percentage Results	79
III. Key Questions	81
IV. Breakdown by Company	84
V. Cross-Reference of Positive Replies	86
VI. Cross-Reference of Negative Replies	87
VII. Ranking of Job Duties	88
V. Bibliography	89

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The foreman in American industry has not suffered lack of attention from those writing in Personnel and Psychology publications. Articles have been written describing his plight, exploring his feelings and recommending how to improve his lot. He is recognized as a man in a difficult position, having been referred to as "Master and Victim of Double Talk," "Man in the Middle," "Victimized Middleman," "Forgotten Man," "Marginal Man," and "Most Misused, Accused, and Abused Man in Industry." His role in industry seems to be accepted as being very important, at least in the literature. If this is so and if these learned articles do give insight into his problems and guidance toward solutions, why is the foreman still in trouble? One would have to believe that he is and that his problems have not been solved since there does not appear to be a slackening in the number of articles being published about him. A comprehensive survey conducted in 1970 by Opinion Research Corporation for the Foremanship Foundation compared to a similar survey conducted in 1952 showed that foremen were "less rather than more effective, less rather than more secure, less rather than more important, and received less rather than more recognition." ¹

¹ Patton, John A., "The Foreman - Most Misused, Accused and Abused Man in Industry." Speech given before the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, October 11, 1973.

To test this hypothesis - that the foreman is still a misunderstood victim of management policies - we have undertaken a study of one type of foreman in one industry - the line foreman in several automotive manufacturing facilities. This foreman is a problem solver type supervising a relatively varied crew size of men performing manual operations to men responsible for operating complex manufacturing equipment. It was our object to examine the attitude of these foremen. Do they feel they are being treated fairly by management and are they able to represent management fairly to their subordinates? Also, what factors distinguish satisfied from dissatisfied foremen? To this end we asked foremen to answer questions in these areas:

- 1) How does the foreman see his job?
- 2) How does he feel others see his job?
- 3) What satisfaction does he derive from his job?
- 4) What motivates him?
- 5) How well does management support him in performance of his job?
- 6) What does he dislike most about his job?
- 7) How can his job be improved?
- 8) What does he feel the future holds for the foreman job?

Two automobile companies participated in the study. Each company was requested to supply the home addresses of production foremen in several of their manufacturing facilities. The companies did cooperate and sent the requested information; as was learned later, many of these addresses (96) were not up to date

and as a consequence many questionnaires never reached the intended foremen. In the package sent to the foremen's homes a letter was included explaining the reason for the study and promising that the contents of each questionnaire would be kept confidential. On completion, the foremen were requested to return the questionnaire to MIT in the pre-stamped envelope. Questionnaires were mailed to 730 production foremen in nine automobile manufacturing plants.

A large quantity of literature has been written about production foremen. Some of the material we reviewed for this paper was inadequate and did not illustrate what an actual production foreman faces. Foremen working in an automobile plant are expected to manage the areas assigned to them. (That is the view many managers have of the foreman's prime responsibility.) Whether the foremen are adequately equipped to meet that objective has been discussed many times. It was our desire to study this problem from the aspects of our personal experience, the foremen's point of view, and the meaningful literature available.

The foremen in this study are responsible for safety, timekeeping, quality, production performance, planning, discipline, overtime, grievances, and a multitude of other responsibilities.

Questionnaire Development and Methodology

Since a large amount of data would have to be analyzed,

catalogued and stored for statistical analysis during the course of this study, we decided to utilize the computer facilities at MIT: particularly, we chose the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences System. This system provides a comprehensive set of procedures for data transformations and file manipulations, plus a large number of statistical routines and is capable of generating variable transformations, recording variables, selecting specific samples and/or answers to questions. The system is an ideal medium in which to carry out the repeated, routine application of a number of statistical procedures.

We decided on a three part questionnaire (See Sample as listed in Table I in the Appendix):

- 1) Demographic Data.
- 2) Statements requiring respondents to indicate their feelings on a Likert type scale.
- 3) A series of questions requiring essay type answers.

The demographic questions were constructed so that data would be grouped; that is, we wished to have ages, seniority, job years and schooling in groups large enough to have statistical meaning. Low numbers in individual cells when conducting CHI-X², F tests and other statistical analysis makes meaningful interpretation questionable.

The main body of the questionnaire employed a Likert scale of seven for the responses. The answers ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The essay type questions were inserted for two reasons. First, we felt the foremen should have an opportunity to express their feelings without being restricted to canned questions. Second, by mechanically reviewing the essay responses we hoped to categorize them by subject and weigh each by importance as expressed by the foremen. We then anticipated using this weighted categorized essay response to check against the results obtained in the main body of the questionnaire concerning major areas of the study, such as satisfaction and motivation.

Data were keypunched as they arrived and preliminary data were used to determine keypunching inaccuracy (which was less than .01%). The SPSS system provided histograms, tables, means, modes and standard deviations as well as other statistical measurements (See Table II).

The next step was to determine the interrelationship of questions and demographic data of one question vs. another. To accomplish this we used the "Crosstabs Procedure" which permitted compilation of a 2-way to n-way cross-tabulation of the selected variables and related statistical measurements. Table III shows the crosstab tables providing frequency count, row percent, column percent and cell percent.

Initial tabular form matched a demographic question such as age against each of the main text responses using the full seven space Likert scale. Initial runs included a cross-tabulation of each demographic question against each of the

Likert scale questions; CHI-Square tests were run on the tabular data to determine whether there were any readily visible interdependencies between demographics and question responses. Crosstabulation was also utilized to determine whether there were groups giving all negative or positive answers; runs were conducted after reducing the Likert scale from 7 to 3 points. Output from this was presented in tabular form and histograms. Crosstabs were run on demographic variables to determine relationships between such factors as age and years on the job, age and company seniority, etc.

This same questionnaire and methodology are being used by another group writing a companion thesis on oil refinery operations foremen.

In preparing the questionnaire, we used a combination of personal experience and data found in reviewing the literature. Our experience includes work in this particular foreman's job as well as supervising this type foreman.

As mentioned earlier, the literature indicates the foreman's problem still has not been solved. If so, what can be the explanation for it?

We do not feel there is a serious lack of management response in dealing with this problem. The importance of the foreman's job is generally recognized in management circles. He is the man closest to the work force. He works with them. In most cases he was one of them and unless he has lost their respect, they trust him. The hourly employees seldom see

anyone above the foreman level. Consequently he is management to them. What he says and how he says it is company policy. He does, depending on his satisfaction and motivation, influence the morale and performance of his subordinates.

An improper response can occur by assuming that all foremen are alike or by misinterpreting factors affecting their job. The term foreman encompasses supervisors in a wide variety of jobs. A foreman in one department might be primarily a pusher whose responsibility is to see that men stay on the job for a certain period of time and that they stay busy; another might be a problem solver concerned with operation of a multi-million transfer line run by highly experienced personnel; and a third might be a clerical type concerned with scheduling and expediting. Some are a combination of all the above. They may all be called foremen but obviously one policy will not satisfy all. The one thing they have in common is that they deal directly with the work force and are first-line representatives of management. This function is important, but what satisfies these different types will usually be different and requires different company policies. Key personnel such as foremen should be considered as individuals. This is necessary to provide an environment in which satisfaction and motivation can be attained.

It is difficult to set forth a policy which will satisfy a group of people if their job function is changing. This is certainly true of the foreman. Forty years ago the foreman was the almighty boss. He could hire, fire, plan, buy, expedite, etc.

With the advent of the staff specialist, the union contract and government regulations, he finds his authority restricted. The Personnel Department has taken over the recruiting, screening and hiring and in many cases the discharge of employees. The Engineering Department now sets standards and determines how and when the equipment is to be maintained. Union contracts reduce his flexibility for getting work done and in disciplining. The nature of the job is changing and company response to the needs of the foreman must be flexible enough to recognize this change and make necessary adjustments to insure continued satisfaction and motivation.

Earlier we specified questions for which the survey was designed to provide answers. Examination of available literature provided information pertinent to that effort; review of the literature was a useful measure of our results and in the formulation of our conclusions.

One of our primary purposes was to determine how the foremen perceived their role; i.e., was it an important job now and/or was it declining in importance and prestige. Additionally, we wanted their perceptions on how other groups saw the foreman's role. A description of the foreman's role depends on the relationship a describer has with the foreman. According to Kay,² an evaluator tends to see the foreman's role more critically in those aspects of it that concern his area. This means that a

² Kay, Brian R., "The Foreman's Role: Theme with Variations," Personnel, November-December 1963, Vol.40, No.6, pp.32-37.

production foreman's superiors will consider cost and productivity as significant, whereas Manufacturing Engineering personnel would be critical in areas of preventive maintenance and knowledge of tools. It is not incorrect to conclude that he must fill different roles depending on other peoples' interests. Wikstrom³ concluded that "...in a sense he does a part of everyone's job with no real job of his own, at least no managerial job of his own."

Another of our principal objectives was determination of the level of satisfaction and motivation among the respondents. We were interested in ascertaining which factors affect these feelings. To this end we included questions in the survey covering areas of security, wages, communications, authority, workload distribution, advancement, attitudes, and fringe benefits. Management considers performance to be the most important quality when gauging personnel activity. Specific information concerning a respondent's performance can only be obtained through an evaluation made by his supervisors. However, we feel that inferences concerning knowledge of his satisfaction level may accurately describe his performance. Thus the survey results concerning degree of satisfaction may indicate performance level. We do recognize that our literature search indicated the relationship of satisfaction to performance has not been

³ Wikstrom, Walter S., Managing at the Foremen's Level, National Industrial Conference Board, Personnel Policy Study No. 25.

proven. Kavanaugh's article ⁴ concerning satisfaction, morale and performance begins by stating:

"There is still the intuitive feeling that employees who derive satisfaction from their jobs do better work than those who do not. Research up to this time has shown there is no simple relationship between job satisfaction and job performance."

He found that individual environment interaction determines satisfaction and particularly important is the performance of the employee's supervisor in the personnel area.

If a simple correlation between performance and general satisfaction does not exist, is there any relationship? Our search of the literature has led to a conclusion that a negative relationship between these factors is recognizable. Iris⁵ found that an individual dissatisfied with his job can cope with life and his job by downgrading the importance of the various aspects of his job.

What constitutes being satisfied or not satisfied with a job? Boyd⁶ sums up the available opinions:

"Poor working conditions, bad company policies and administration, and bad supervisors will lead to job

⁴ Kavanaugh, Michael J., McKinney, Arthur C., Wohns, LeRoy, "Satisfaction and Morale of Foremen as a Function of Middle Managers' Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, April 1970, Vol.54, No.2, pp.145-156.

⁵ Iris, Benjamin, Barrett, Gerald V., "Some Relations between Job and Life Satisfaction and Job Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, August 1972, Vol.56, No.4, pp.301-304.

⁶ Boyd, Bradford B., "Worker to Supervisor - Problem of Transition," Personnel Journal, Sept. 1964, Vol.43, No.8, pp.421-426.

dissatisfaction. Good company policies, good administration, will not lead to positive attitudes. In opposition to this as far as the data has gone, recognition, achievement, interesting work, responsibility and advancement all lead to positive job attitudes."

This may appear paradoxical, but suffice it to say that specific policies lead to a better job attitude. Carrington⁷ points out that as needs become satisfied, other needs take their place; furthermore, security and adequate remuneration are two factors predominant in motivating. Once these needs are satisfied, others become important, such as participation in planning. Management should develop an atmosphere which presents "these individuals with new sources of satisfaction and new opportunities to achieve, thereby revitalizing their interest in goals of the organization and their role in achieving them."⁸

Support of the notion that security and wages are important basic needs is obtained from an extensive survey conducted by Schappe.⁹ Security may be a perceptual view that salaried personnel are more secure than non-salaried in times of personnel cutbacks. Inadequate pay will often lead to dissatisfaction and defection. There is evidence that what may be considered adequate pay will not necessarily lead to a positive or satisfactory feeling. Generally, management has a lower

⁷Carrington, James H., "Does Management Owe the Supervisor Promotional Opportunity?," Personnel Journal, June 1969, Vol.48, No.6, pp.423-427.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Schappe, Robert H., "The Production Foreman Today: His Needs and His Difficulty," Personnel Journal, July 1972, Vol.51, No.7, pp.489-494.

esteem for the production foreman than for staff specialists; i.e., industrial engineers, personnel, budget analysts, etc. This has led to an unproven hypothesis that foreman have a lower relationship to their salary midpoints than staff specialists.¹⁰ Whether we like to admit this fact or not will not deter the information from getting to the foreman if true; once known, the results can be catastrophically devastating.

One of the major problems a foreman is confronted with involves communications. There are two aspects to this problem: communications from management and staff functions to the foreman; then there are the communications from the foreman to management. MacNaughton¹¹ describes the foreman's job as being primarily communicative. Communication from management and/or staff services to the foreman are important to his level of job satisfaction. In many management circles foremen are tagged as key communicators; yet, those he reports to often find it unnecessary to communicate adequately with him. Patton's article¹² mentions a 1970 foreman attitude survey which found that foremen are less satisfied now (38%) than they were in 1952

¹⁰ Patton, Thomas H., "Revitalizing the Role of the Foreman," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Summer 1966, Vol.5, No.2, pp.34-43.

¹¹ MacNaughton, J.D., "A Study of Foremen's Communication," Personnel Practice Bulletin, March 1963, Vol.19, No.1, pp.10-19.

¹² Patton, John A., op.cit.

with the way their company keeps them informed on company policy. Further examination of the Opinion Research survey indicates a decline in satisfaction concerning all areas of communication from levels above the foreman. A recent BNA survey¹³ confirmed that management appeared more concerned in 1958 than in 1971 with supervisory communications. Not only are foremen dissatisfied with communications concerning company policy, they apparently desire more communications relative to how they are doing. Bonham¹⁴ hypothesized that a deficiency in this area may effect a decline in motivation and performance. Information on company policy and feedback relative to performance is important - the foreman must have the information to perform effectively in his job and secondly it is the underpinning of his authority. Too often the line foreman is placed in embarrassing situations with his subordinates when more information has been available to the steward or his men through the "grapevine." At that point the foreman's authority declines in the eyes of his subordinates. George¹⁵ states that:

"A foreman's effectiveness in directing the men under him depends to a great extent on his status. His workers are aware of his connections with the higher-ups. When they feel he carries little weight with his supervisors, this is discovered

¹³ MacNaughton, J.D., "A Study of Foremen's Communication," Personnel Practice Bulletin, March 1963, Vol.19, No.1, pp.10-19.

¹⁴ Bonham, T.W., "The Foreman in an Ambiguous Environment," Personnel Journal, Nov. 1971, Vol.50, No.11, pp.85-88.

¹⁵ George, Norman, "Training Won't Solve These Supervisor Problems," Mill and Factory, Sept. 1960, Vol.67, No.3, pp.85-88.

quickly. The foreman's role is greatly undermined. Workers in any group will not feel secure and happy when they know their foreman wields little real authority."

Foreman training is a much discussed topic among managers responsible for line operations. There are endless schemes and varieties of programs concocted to get the foreman enlightened to carry out his job responsibilities. However, Boyd¹⁶ found that the greatest difficulty encountered by new foremen was the lack of understanding of the responsibilities they had assumed; this transition difficulty resulted in 25% of the group to consider giving up their jobs. Too often, canned programs are applied in all cases of foreman induction programs. As in most beneficial educational programs, a degree of tailoring to particular audiences is necessary to achieve success. Many foremen programs simply do not feel any need adequately and can be described as giving only empty words to the needs. Patton¹⁷ estimates that one-half billion dollars will be put into foremen training programs this year and most of that money will be wasted for lack of proper methods and materials. One of our objectives became the determination of how our survey respondents perceived their company's training programs - were these programs successful in meeting their needs?

We felt that advancement or at least the opportunity for it

¹⁶ Boyd, Bradford B., op.cit.

¹⁷ Patton, Thomas B., op.cit.

was an important factor in men assuming a foreman's job. Consequently, we placed questions on this subject in our survey questionnaire. Our intention was to determine its effect on other factors such as the foreman's perception of management's understanding their problems. Carrington¹⁸ states, "It is management's responsibility not only to provide the up-through-the-ranks foreman with security in what he is now doing, but with security for the future through opportunities for promotion."

As mentioned previously, Kavanaugh¹⁹ found satisfaction is related to performance of superiors in personnel matters. Our survey included questions which would enable us to examine how the respondents view their subordinates with respect to adequacy of quality, quantity, and lastly, his relationship to each. We should be able to infer from the results whether these foremen feel closer to their supervisors, crew, or other foremen. Answers to this will assist in determination of their level of satisfaction and motivation.

Our experience in manufacturing showed that there is a wide variability in the workloads given various foremen. We set out to determine whether there are similar conditions in the plants we surveyed. By experience we were also aware that conflicts between the foremen and management often arise out of what the foremen spend their time doing and what management feels

¹⁸ Carrington, James H., op.cit.

¹⁹ Kavanaugh, Michael, J., op.cit.

they should be doing. Is there a difference in what the respondents thought was important and their supervisors thought important? Conflicts in this area result in inefficient and costly misuse of the foreman's time. Kahn²⁰ points out that workload is a major factor in role conflict, especially the conflict between routine and non-routine work. He follows up, stating:

"Most of the role conflict in industry takes the form of overload especially in managerial positions...he may shut off communication from others in the work situation...reducing the effectiveness of the organization..."

It is not our purpose to draw concrete conclusions from the survey but rather to determine whether there may be workload conflicts.

To that degree do foremen have authority to complete their assignments? Often there are disparities between upper management's assigned tasks and the authority that the foreman has to execute them. Bennett²¹ concludes, most foremen feel they lack sufficient authority. Yet, in the workplace we observe foremen not fully utilizing the full authority delegated them. Why? At the turn of the century the foreman had absolute monopoly of power and authority over his subordinates. The modern foreman has inherited greatly reduced power and authority; he is daily

²⁰ Kahn, Robert L., "Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Organizations," The Personnel Administrator, March 1964, Vol.9, No.2, pp.8-13.

²¹ Bennett, Willard E., "Why Don't They Give Us More Authority?," Supervisory Management, Jan. 1961, Vol.6, No.1, pp.2-8.

receiving further restrictions. Although the foreman no longer has a monopoly of power, he does have manifestations of authority by which he can manage his subordinates. Homans²² states:

"Some of the most important kinds of rewards and punishments that might affect production are no longer the foreman's to bestow...he can praise, he can take a personal interest... protect them from abrupt and arbitrary changes made by higher management. It is no accident that these things - the democratic or employee centered form of supervision - are precisely the things that the foremen of high-producing groups are seen as providing."

There were two factors relative to authority we wished to examine: first, how does the foreman perceive his authority; second, does he feel free to exercise his authority? Bennett²³ phrases the question properly: "The key question for any manager is not how to get more authority, but how to use fully and constructively the authority he has."

Management support of the foreman is an absolute requisite for him to be successful at his job. It is also necessary for his subordinates to recognize him as the authority in the workplace. Through the use of the survey questions and the written comments of the foremen, we hoped to establish whether there were supportive management environments in the plants surveyed. The lack of supportive management will result in lost production

²² In Dubin, R., et al., Leadership and Productivity, Chandler 1965, pp.62-63.

²³ Bennett, Willard E., op.cit.

and, if too bad, lost foremen.

Factors discussed in this chapter and those found in Chapter III by way of the questionnaire analysis form a framework by which we can build a picture of the respondent's satisfaction, motivation and performance levels. Management, despite its contrary rhetoric, pays only for performance! It is therefore crucial that the foreman have all the tools necessary to perform at expected levels. As mentioned previously, there is no good way to have foremen evaluate their performance through the use of a questionnaire. The universal factor which winds its way through most of the literature is that of human relations. There does appear to be general agreement that this is a common denominator in all definitions of successful foremen. Cummins²⁴ found, "There is some indication that the first line industrial supervisor who is able to remain involved in the face of apathy and who does not attempt to coerce or direct uncooperative workers is more likely to be successful." This aspect of the job is important, but we feel a foreman must be satisfied in his job and sufficiently motivated before he will undertake extension of himself in the area of human relations.

24

Cummins, Robert C., "Leader-Member Relations As A Moderator of the Effects of Leader Behavior and Attitude," Personnel Psychology, Winter 1972, Vol.25, No.4, pp.655-660.

CHAPTER II

Discussion of Results

Results from the survey will be discussed in four distinct sections and where necessary be cross-referenced. These sections will be:

- 1) A discussion of the returns in relation to quantity sent out versus those returned.
- 2) A brief discussion of the demographics will be presented.
- 3) Manual and computer analysis of the responses to the Likert scale questions.
- 4) Commentary on the written comments as provided by 90% of the respondents.

Where necessary we have placed pertinent information in either tabular or chart form for the reader's ready reference. For all questions, histograms have been provided and in all cases these are based on frequency of responses. We have also provided cross-tabulations of questions against other questions; moreover the reader will also find in the Appendix a list of responses to specific questions and how those persons responded to other key questions.

The survey was intended to be completed independent of the companies' personnel departments or help they might wish to provide. As such the companies were asked only to supply a listing of the names and home addresses of foremen in the selected plants to be surveyed. Of the nine plants surveyed a total of 730 questionnaires probably reached the foremen intended.

Our initial response was quite gratifying in that we received 130 returns within the initial two weeks after mailing. However, as time progressed, the responses were drastically reduced and our final tally was 197 responses of which 189 were processed for this report. This amounts to approximately 25.9% of the total sample. Returns from each plant were in the same ratio as the number of questionnaires issued by plant and were in the range of 25% for each plant. The number of returns was disappointing to us, but was undoubtedly affected by the turmoil presently being encountered in the automobile industry. Many of the plants surveyed had experienced schedule reductions, layoffs and large uncertainty as to future operations during the period prior to and just after the questionnaires were sent out. We are confident that the returns do represent an approximation of the foreman population in the surveyed plants in demographic factors of age and seniority. Questionnaire data on these factors were compared to overall plant data, supplied by the personnel departments, and the sample falls within the actual population averages.

Demographic data as requested in this survey were not for specific values of age or seniority but rather the respondent had to place himself within a range of values. This was done so that the resultant data groups would have samples large enough to be meaningful in statistical analyses (see Table I - Questionnaire).

The largest age group within our sample was comprised of individuals 31-40 years old - 38.6% fell in this age group (refer to Table I). The next largest group was found to be in the 20-30 year olds with 27% of the population sampled. Information supplied by the surveyed plants indicated that this age grouping was in line with their figures; i.e., the actual populations were heaviest in the 31-40 group and the second highest group were those in the 20-30 class. There were few respondents in the 51-60 year old group, which may have been the result of newly effected retirement policies; there were 11.1% in this age group.

Seniority the foreman has with the company is important when considering the degree of loyalty or general feelings he has concerning management policies. Of the 189 respondents in our sample, 105 had ten or less years with the company, or slightly more than 55% of the sampled population. About 30% of the respondents had been 11 and 20 years with the company. The cross-tabulation of age with seniority showed that nearly 100% of those in the 20-30 age group had ten or less years with the company. Personnel departments should examine the turnover rate among foremen and its effect in light of the retirement of experienced foremen.

The age at which a person becomes a foreman and the number of years he has been a foreman were examined. To our surprise, 82% had been foremen for ten or less years and 51.9% had been

foremen for five or less years. These results were somewhat of a shock to us in light of the increasing need for qualified supervisors. While the majority with five or less years fell in the 20-30 age group (42.9%), substantial numbers appeared in each of the age groups. Almost 28% of those in the 41-50 age group have five or less years seniority as a foreman. Chi-Squared tests of contingency tables between age, job years and/or seniority show a degree of relationship with a significance level of better than .01%. Computer printouts of cross-tabulations of these variables can be found in the Appendix.

Educational level attained by the respondents provided some noteworthy facts. One of the interesting things learned was that 10.6% of all the respondents had less than a high school education. There was a larger percentage of non-high school graduates as the age of the respondent increases; i.e., the highest percentage of non-high school graduates fell into the 31-40 group. Nearly 6% of the 20-30 group lacked a high school education. However, we found that 30% of the respondents reported an educational level between that of high school and a college degree. Exactly four persons reported having a college level education, which represented 2.1% of the sample population. It would not be out of order to examine the educational requirements being exercised by the plants when interviewing foreman candidates today.

Of the demographic data which were unanticipated, perhaps the number of employees the respondents reported having to

supervise is noteworthy. No less than 43.9% report that they supervise 21 to 30 employees. This is a very large number, particularly where the process is continuous and the people are spread out in a large area. Thirty-eight of the persons indicated they were supervising over 30 but less than 40 persons, which represents over 20% of those responding to the questionnaire. We found that 47 of the respondents indicated they were supervising between 11 and 20 employees.

Two questions were asked regarding the presence of the union in the areas supervised by the respondents. In all cases the employees they supervised were members of an international union. The respondents themselves indicated that in their own careers 87.8% had been members of a union at some time, and 12.2% had never belonged to a union.

The primary set of questions have been divided into groups of three or four in which the questions all seem related to one topic of discussion (see Table III). The initial topic of interest was how the foreman saw his present prestige (see Table V). This question was answered by the respondents from various points of view. For example, question 1 asks it from the foreman's perception of the viewpoint of the hourly work force in the respondent's plant. In this case, 141 of the respondents, or 75%, agreed the hourly work force feel that the first line supervisor is an important part of the plant operation. The respondents by age groups were fairly much in agreement on this question. However, it is worth noting that

the lowest percentage came from those respondents in the 20-30 age group! There did not seem to be any deviation from agreement on this question when reviewed in relation to company seniority or years on the job as a foreman.

As to whether the hourly work force sees the job of foreman decreasing in importance (question 5), 46% agreed the statement was true. However, 37.6% of the respondents rejected the notion outright. The cross-tabulation of this question against age would indicate that the older foremen (those in the 41-50 and 51-60 groups) were more positive on this issue. Of the age group 51-60 some 61.9% agreed that this was a true statement. The respondents in the 20-30 group felt it was true in 49% of the responses. However, Chi-Squared and hypothesis tests did not indicate that age groups, job years or company years are in any way related to the positive or negative responses.

The third question in this series asked whether the foreman saw his plant management feeling that his job was as important as he saw it. The overall response to this question was 64% in agreement. Slightly over 25% definitely disagree. Although we were unable to find any agreement between age, job years or company years in relation to this question, some differences did exist by age groups. The strongest positive response came from persons in the 51-60 group. The strongest negative response came from those in the 20-30 group, where 33.3% felt their plant management did not regard the foreman's job as important as they thought it was.

The response to question 9, similar to that in 10, showed considerable more positiveness; i.e., 74.6% of the respondents agreed that the company needs them as an important link in the organization. In the last question of this series, 71% of the respondents agreed that the job of foreman has decreased in prestige over the past ten years. While there was positive response from all the age groups, the strongest agreement came from those in the age groups 41-50, at 76.7%, and 51-60 at 90.5%. There did not appear to be any significant difference on this question by breakdowns along company seniority or job years.

Our second group of questions dealt with the way the foreman perceives his problems being recognized and/or worked on in his plant (see Table IV). Question 3 was the first in this series and asked the respondent whether his problems were both recognized and being worked on by his management. In only 48.1% of the cases did we find the respondents agreeing with this statement, while 32.8% disagreed with it. The strongest disagreement came from those in the 20-30 age group, where over 41% disagreed that their management had recognized or was working on their problems. Within the age group 31-40 the percentage was slightly lower, but still 31.5% were in disagreement. The second question (15) in this series involved the respondents' supervisor; i.e., did their supervisor have a real understanding of their problem? To this question those in the 20-30 group answered 61% in the affirmative. The other age groups' responses

did not differ too much from those they gave in question 3. Their supervisors received a better vote on this matter than did the group "plant management." We found a strong relationship between a foreman's perception of general management's help and his positive feelings toward his supervisor's level of understanding and help; conversely, negative feelings about his immediate supervisor did not negatively influence the respondent's feelings about management. The question concerning their supervisors was followed up with question 19 - help from your immediate supervisor definitely assists you in your work. As we found in question 15, the response from the 20-30 group was more positive (55%) in their agreement than they were in question 3. It is worth noting that 31.7% of the respondents disagreed with the notion that help from their supervisors assists them in their work. It was evident that as the educational level of the respondents went up, so did the disagreement with the notion that their supervisors' help aided in their work. Respect for help from supervisors was less among the younger, more educated members of the sampled population. We inserted the question concerning training in an attempt to determine whether the foremen's perception of the company's program was satisfactorily recognizing their needs and meeting them adequately. While overall response to this question was 53.4% in agreement, there were again variances by age groups. In the 20-30 group, 49% disagreed that their plant's or company's training program has had a significant effect on the way they perform their job.

There were 41.2% who agreed that the programs did affect their job. We noted that there was a marked increase in the percent agreement on the question as the age of the respondent increased. There was a slight increase in disagreement on this issue as the respondents' educational level increased, but this was not found significant using Chi-Square or hypothesis tests.

One of the most important areas we covered in our investigation was that of the two-way communication between the foreman and his plant management. Although more than three questions appear in the questionnaire on this subject, we feel that questions 6, 7 and 12 best exemplify what we were looking to investigate. In question 6 we asked whether the respondent is generally able to defend management's position when he is talking with hourly employees. The response to this was an overwhelming agreement; in fact, 87.8% agreed they could. The favorable response was across the board, in that it was not limited to one age group, seniority group or job years group. Following this, we asked the foreman whether their management consulted them prior to making decisions affecting their areas (see question 7). This question brought a completely different response. We found that 33.3% agreed management consulted them prior to making decisions affecting their area. Conversely, there were 57.7% who disagreed on this matter. The disagreement among the 51-60 group was 61.9% and in the 31-40 group it was 65.8%. The lowest percentage disagreement on this matter was found among those who had less than a twelfth grade education. Statistical

tests did not confirm a relevant degree of significance on this question for age, seniority, schooling, etc. But it is clear that nearly three-fifths of the respondents felt they had little voice in the management decision process. We designed question 12 to indicate the degree of management communication to the first level supervisor. We were interested in determining whether the foreman perceived his management either consulting with him or instructing him on operating decisions prior to implementation so that to some extent his position as authority in operating questions is not compromised. While 50.8% agreed with the statement, a surprising 36.5% disagreed with the statement. The greatest percentage of agreement was found among the 20-30 group (58.8%). In the 51-60 group, 47.6% were in agreement, but 42.6% were in disagreement. Further analysis of this series of questions led us to a number of interrelationships. At one point it was thought that there may be one group of people who consistently answer questions in either a positive or negative manner, depending on some fixed attitude or other reason. To determine whether this was a factor, we revised the computer program so that we could examine the people who gave specific answers to key questions and then compared their answers to other questions deemed to be in the category or simply important to this study.

This analysis led to results which were considered important enough to warrant discussion. Immediately obvious was that agreement on a question within the key groups led to an agreement

on question 6 (80%) of the time or better. In no way did disagreement on the key questions cause a significant number of people to say they could not defend management's position to hourly workers. We also found that if the foreman felt the organization regarded him as an important link in the organization (question 9) he was more apt to answer the key questions in a positive manner.

Perhaps one of the things thought to be self-evident but which showed itself clearly in this analysis, was the security question's impact on other key questions. Question 18 asked whether the respondent felt secure as a foreman. If answered positively this led to agreement in over 80% of cases on questions 6, 9, 14 and 16. Of those indicating they feel secure as foremen, 91% are able to defend management. Yet, only 60% felt that management recognized and worked on their problems. Again, we found that the immediate supervisors received better marks on problem recognition and help (74%). Our results show that positive feelings on security lead to positive feelings on other important issues; negative feelings on security do not bias feelings negatively on other issues.

By the same token, if the respondent felt he was not secure he answered questions 7, 12 and 20 negatively in 50% of the cases. We have concluded that answers to questions 7 and 12, related to the communications between foremen and their management, have not been biased by one particular group with either positive or negative feelings. The large negative response to

question 7 represents a cross-section of people who could be classified as satisfied on many other questions and some who could be classified as dissatisfied. The converse of the situation is also worth mentioning at this time. That is the fact that of those who answered question 7 positively 50% or more of the time, also answered other key questions positively. The suggestion here is that the perception of input by the foreman may have a bearing on how he feels toward his job, security, and related factors. We did find some evidence that the lack of input may be localized to certain plants or locals.

The least negative response on this series of questions came from the rural Indiana plants. We concluded this was significant based on the hypothesis tests: these tests showed significance at the 5% level. However, the reader should keep in mind that the sample being discussed represents 26% of the plants surveyed and perhaps less than 1% of the production foremen within the entire industry.

What might the foreman's expectations be? To find out we constructed a question series built around security and advancement. The questions placed in this group were 14, 16 and 18. The expectation of promotion is often a strong motivator, so we wanted to know what the respondents had in the way of promotion expectations. More than 67% felt that they perform well because of the promotional possibilities. This feeling was considerably stronger among the younger men; over 80% of the 20-30 group agreed, whereas only 43% of the 51-60

agreed. We found that 80% of those agreeing on question 7 - consideration of their opinions - also answered that they perform well due to the expectation of promotion. It also held true that nearly 80% of those feeling that management knew and was working on their problems agreed on the relation of performance and promotion possibilities. Question 16 concerns whether the respondents see men in their positions expecting to be promoted. In this case 66.5% of the respondents agreed. However, the strongest feeling (81%) was held by the 51-60 group. The 21-30 group agreed in 60% of the cases. There was some degree of significance to this question because a positive answer led to positive answers on many other questions. Over 90% in agreement on this question said they could defend management's position to hourly workers. Over 80% felt the company needs them as an important link in the organization. In general, agreement on this question led to higher percentage agreement on other questions. Hypothesis testing of the age variation showed that there was a relationship of age to the way the respondent answered the question. The last question in this group was 18 and involved the degree to which the respondent felt secure in the job of foreman. A total of 51.9% of the respondents agreed that they felt secure. Slightly over 30% replied that they disagreed about the sense of security in the foreman's job. It is interesting as well as statistically significant that the older men felt more secure in the job. As was mentioned before, this question would appear to be one

which can be used to gauge a general attitude of the respondents. This we feel confident is due to the fact that if the respondent answered positively he did so on other key questions 80 to 90% of the time. Those feeling secure also indicated 80% of the time that the promotional expectation was high. They were also the strongest defenders of management position in discussions with hourly personnel. Of those indicating a less than secure feeling in their job, only 10% said they couldn't defend management in discussions with hourly personnel. It might prove beneficial to explore the reasons why a man feeling insecure in his job is still willing to defend the system that appears to be a threat to his job. Slightly more than 56% of those not feeling secure also indicated that the training provided them is of no real help in their job. To an extent, the feelings of security were found to be localized. However, in the plants where the expected feeling of security would be low were not far off the mean value for the entire sample. Overall, the results indicate that feelings about security did influence answers to other questions.

The area most likely to be a source of complaint by foremen is that of discipline. It might be expected that questions related to perceptions of authority in matters of discipline would help to establish perceptions of their authority, in general. Question 8 asks the respondent directly whether he enjoys the amount of authority his job provides. We found

that slightly more than 52% agreed they enjoy the authority provided by the job. Nearly 27% said they were indifferent to it and 21% indicated they were not happy with it. On this question, 60% of the younger men (20-30) were stronger in their agreement than were the older men, 51-60 years (42.9%). There is evidence that this is significant based on hypothesis testing of the population means. Further investigation showed that this question was one of those in which a positive answer seemed to have a bearing on the answers to other questions. For instance, of those agreeing on the authority question somewhat over 76% agreed that the hourly personnel see the foreman as an important function. Of those agreeing on this question, 93% also agreed that they are able to defend management's position. However, less than half of those answering positively to this question also answered positively to that of management decisions not being made without considering their opinion - again leading us to conclude that question 7 has been answered to a large extent independently. Slightly more than 43% saw the role of the foreman decreasing in the eyes of the hourly work force. This group tended to answer the questions very close to the norm in most cases.

As to whether the respondents are free to undertake disciplinary action, question 17 was intended to address this problem. Discipline was felt to be a kind of measure of the authority the respondents have, since it represents one of the few remaining areas of sanction left to the foreman. Slightly

over 72% indicated that they had the freedom to initiate discipline whereas less than 20% indicated they were not free to do so. The response was uniform by all age groups, seniority and/or company years. We also asked the respondents whether they were apt to be supported in their use of discipline (question 21). More than 68% said they were likely to be supported by management in their use of discipline.

The importance of fringe benefits to the foreman was inquired about. Nearly 88% said that fringe benefits are important to them. This area of compensation should not be overlooked. This support was found among all age groups. By the same token, in question 22 we asked how they felt about pay being the most important factor in taking the job and continuing on it. Approximately 64% felt it was the most important factor and only 26% said it was not. A related question to this area of compensation was that of the review given him by his supervisor. We asked the respondents to tell us whether they were being reviewed fairly. To this, slightly more than 57% indicated they were being fairly reviewed by their supervisor. Only 27% disagreed.

A subject of interest to us was how the foreman's job duties were distributed. We wished to find out what he was actually doing, what his supervisor thought he should be doing, and finally what he considered important as job duties. Table VIII gives the responses to each of the categories. Not unexpectedly we found that technical problem solving was chosen as

the duty actually requiring most of their time. Coordination (20.6%) and paperwork (14.6%) were second and third, respectively, in the order of duties taking up most of their time. What really surprised us was that safety occupied just 4% of their time. Remember, this is in response to what actually they spend their time on!

In response to our query on what their supervisors feel foremen should be spending their time on, we found that their supervisors thought safety was the most important duty they had in 29.6% of the cases. Problem solving, coordination and other duties followed in that order of importance. There is an apparent discrepancy between what the respondents see themselves doing and what their supervisors want them to do.

The third part of this question concerned what the respondents felt was important. More than 40% felt that matters dealing with safety were the most important (safety messages are believed?) Problem solving was seen as the second most important function they had to perform (22.9% consider themselves trouble-shooters or managers?) Coordination followed closely in third place, with 22.9% indicating it was the most important. As to why there is a large division between these answers, we have attempted to answer in our conclusions.

To some degree we were interested in determining whether the respondent felt he was a member of management (question 31). Whether the question provides a true measure of their affiliation with management can probably be questioned. Nevertheless,

we found that 49.2% of those responding to the question were closest to their crew, 40.7% said they were closest to other foremen, and a low 10.1% indicated they were closest to their supervisors. Most second place votes were for the crew and other foremen.

Early in the discussion stage of constructing the questionnaire we decided to include an area for the foreman to write comments on topics concerning improvements and dislikes about his job. As matters turned out, this section proved to be quite valuable in the analysis for this study. Corroboration of the results found in the questionnaire proper have been obtained from this section.

Only ten of the 730 respondents failed to take advantage of this opportunity to express themselves. Although we asked whether the foremen saw management recognizing and working on their problems, and received affirmative answers in 48% of the cases, there appeared to be widespread criticism of the maintenance function. About 14% of the respondents felt that maintenance of their equipment was less than was needed to allow them to perform properly. Some of the comments were vitriolic in content, implying that management knew of the problem but was doing nothing about it. The fewest complaints on this issue were received from a car assembly plant. This is not surprising because management fully understands the need for immediate maintenance reaction to down equipment on the assembly line.

While management communications appear as one of the more

frequent complaints, we found that most of it was localized to one or two plants. However, it should be noted that every location had several written complaints in this area. Recognition and understanding by management were among the more frequent complaints. Recognition of jobs well done versus only being told about jobs that do not go well received a lot of comment at all locations. Along the same lines, many expressed a desire for management to try understanding that the problems on the floor are not as easily solved as they are in the conference rooms.

Perhaps the single item which appeared most in all locations was that of authority. Men from every location complained of their inability to do the things that needed to be done. This complaint does not seem out of place if we compare it to the results we observed in question 30 where the foremen placed importance on duties somewhat differently than their supervisors and also in relation to what they were actually doing. Many of the complaints along the line of authority dealt with their freedom in dealing with employees. This does not seem to fit the results we observed earlier in questions 17 and 21. In those questions we noted that the respondents felt they were free to initiate discipline and that management was likely to support them in it. Although questions 17 and 21 deal primarily with discipline, we rather expected to find that term covering the subject in general, but apparently it doesn't. There seemed to be considerably more emphasis on the quality

of employees in the assembly plant than in the other locations. Yet the matter of authority was least criticized in this plant.

General comments were found at all the locations dealing with the question about their security. In some cases it was unclear as to whether this implied security from physical harm or job security. Many of the respondents complained that people were not treated as people but rather as units of production.

A large number of comments were made about the quality of new employees and their inability and/or desire to work. Some of the respondents expressed a desire to assist in the hiring process so that qualified employees might be hired. Many of the comments expressed the need for better communications from management to the employees (apparently these respondents didn't consider themselves as filling this role.) A few of the respondents indicated that a training program for the employees would be beneficial.

An attempt to reconcile the comments with the questionnaire results has been made in the final chapter and, therefore, further comment on this will be deferred.

CHAPTER III

ConclusionsIntroduction:

One of the most discussed problems in industry deals with the role of the foreman, his attitudes and relationships within the organizational structure. There have been numerous articles and books written to evaluate his status in the organization, the amount of prestige in the job, the authority he has, his loyalty, and how other characteristics such as pay, fringe benefits, the sense of security, and the importance of recognition affect the role or position of the foreman within the organization. It might seem that with all the research and analysis given to the foreman's role, companies would have made more significant changes to strengthen and reinforce it. But the problems of foreman communication with upper management, authority within the job, and recognition from upper management still continue to be the prime source of dissatisfaction among foremen. Many companies have initiated and are pursuing extensive foreman training programs, and other seminar or meeting type get-togethers in an effort to open the channels of communication in both directions. This in itself will not solve the problem unless in the reality of the shop floor situation, the foreman can see his suggestions, his requests being put into effect, and his problems being worked on by top management. A top management commitment to an effort to improve the position of foreman is not easy. Many interrelationships among

departments are present, and careful review must be given to the methods applied so that more harm instead of good doesn't take place within the organization.

The position of foreman is characterized by a set of complex human relationships. A man in this position is interacting with people from every part of the organization. Whenever something goes wrong, invariably it is the person at this focal point position who takes the blunt of the criticism and at the same time is expected to get things turned around. Upper management under these circumstances expects immediate results and improvements, but when the problem originates with the foreman, the response time and action is both slow and many times ignored. We believe it is this communication gap and fault attitude created on the part of upper management that leads to a considerable amount of discontent and has effects on the role of the foreman toward upper management and has an impact on those he supervises. When a foreman feels he is being ignored and his suggestions are not given consideration and his problems are not being worked on, it is inevitable that he sees his position as less important, with less authority and less influence within the organization. If he is not kept informed and able to transmit information accurately and clearly to his crew, his authority and status become even more critical. Now it is his crew who perceives him as being less important, having less authority, less influence. This can be very damaging to the success of the management team directing the operation. Many of our questions have been directed to these points, which we feel are important to the role of the foreman.

Conclusions:

We believe the questions relating to job perception, communications, expectations and authority to be the focal point for our discussion and conclusions. As mentioned in Chapter II, we have grouped questions that relate to the above characteristics. The conclusions will be based partly on our past job experience as a foreman, the data as represented in the Appendix, and the literature we read pertaining to the grouped questions. Although our sample of returned questionnaires was small (25%), we are reasonably confident that the results are not biased as to age, seniority or job years. This was verified by getting the average age, seniority and job years of the total population from each plant involved in the total sample. Also, when we use the term foreman, it will apply only to production foremen - those supervising the direct labor portion of the hourly work force.

When reviewing our initial computer results, the question arose as to whether or not we had a group or sample of foremen who tended to disagree in general with a number of questions regardless of the contents of the question. If this were so, then we had a group of truly dissatisfied people, and this would lead us to some different conclusions. In order to determine if this bias was present in the results, we took all those who disagreed with a question and found out how many of that sample also disagreed with other key questions. The results of this cross-reference is shown in the Appendix. We came to two

unique conclusions:

- 1) There was no group of foremen that continually disagreed with the majority of questions. The disagreeers on certain questions did not always disagree on other questions.
- 2) When doing the same test for those who agreed, there was a strong tendency for agreeers on a particular question to also agree on other key questions. For example, of those who agreed on question 18 relating to job security, there was significant agreement toward nearly all the other key questions (1, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20). On all these questions, 60% and higher were agreeers from question 18.

Positiveness is Bias:

This conclusion is meaningful in that no negative bias is evident: there is a group of foremen who responded positively to most questions. This is significant because the questions weren't phrased to get a biased or forced answer from the respondent. We are reasonably sure the foreman's true attitude was expressed in the replies to the questions.

It is not uncommon to think of young foremen and old foremen, those with few years' experience and those with many years' experience. One's first assumption would be that foremen differ in attitude toward their jobs according to age and experience, since usually longevity on the job breeds familiarity and this in turn creates more confidence and positiveness on the part of the older foreman. On every question asked with the exception of 18 and 20, there was no significant difference as to age, job years, and company years among the respondents' replies. This is both interesting and meaningful in that the

characteristics of the foreman's role or position that we examined are nearly independent of the age level, time on the job, and company seniority. This has significance when training programs are initiated and directed to those factors such as communication with management, authority of the job, recognition and expectations from the job, uniform information and instruction can be given to foremen as a group without concern that the training initiated is not applicable to some ages and experience of foremen. It is evident that the characteristics of good communication with management, prestige, recognition and authority necessary to the foreman's role are primary traits to his position and not distinguishable by age or any other demographic variable.

A comparative analysis on disagreement and agreement to questions by company was performed. There was no significant bias by either company to swing the results. The percentage agreement and disagreement to questions was very close, and further supported our conclusion about the commonality of the attitudes and role of the foreman in the industry. A further breakdown by plants within a company was performed and replies analyzed. This analysis yielded that there was a difference of replies for one plant from each group within each company. This difference could not be related to urban or rural location. These plants tended to be more negative on replies to key questions pertaining to management communication, recognition and promotability. Although not a startling result, this information can be useful

when comparing the effectiveness of a plant management against others within a division. We had expected this occurrence, and we now conclude it is one of those situations where no two plant managements implement and perform their managerial functions in exactly the same manner. Each plant has its particular atmosphere or style of management even though the organizational structure is the same. Plant autonomy is very necessary for successful operations, but it is important that the human resources, in our case, the foreman, be given periodic review to assure that his position with management and subordinates is not slowly being eroded through lack of communication with upper management at the local level. If norms of communication had been established and applied, the role of the foreman would not have been reduced to its present condition. So, in our case where one or two plants are out of line with the norm or average, it is important for upper management to further investigate and hopefully reduce or eliminate the condition causing the problem.

Despite the general conclusion that age was not a significant factor, there were two questions where age difference was thought to be significant - nos. 18 and 20. Question 18 related to security and no. 20 to training. There was more agreement from the older respondents that training provided by the company helped them in performing their job. This is an indication that the current training does not adequately meet the needs of the new and younger foreman, since only 41% of the 20-30 age group agree with this question. With the changing technology and the

and the complexity of dealing with a changing work force that is highly unionized, it is suspected that foreman training has not kept up with the changing times. To a certain degree, foreman training must be an ongoing program. Indoctrination prior to starting as a foreman is not adequate alone. There must be follow-up and involvement to keep the foreman abreast of management-union agreements and commitments, as well as to short and long-term management objectives.

We feel this question of adequate training is important since the 20-30 year olds were 27% of our sample, and nearly half of them believe that training efforts should be reviewed, giving consideration to suggestions by the foremen on what aspects of the program need strengthening. Of the total sample, 34% of the respondents disagreed that training was adequate.

It has been our experience that the foreman wants training and looks at it as a method of communication from top management. It shows upper management's concern for some of the needs of the foreman on his job. So in this respect it's just one more means that the communication between the foreman and the other management members can be improved.

One other aspect possibly accounting for the age difference is that a younger foreman, new on the job, is just trying to survive so that the usually brief training period is of little consequence. Once established and over the initial difficulties of the job, any training provided then becomes more useful and is viewed as more applicable to the job. From our experience,

the initial training provided new foremen is useful in getting them acquainted with the various functions of the organization, but little emphasis is placed on addressing the problems dealing with the human interaction the foreman will face with his crew, his peers, and his superiors and upper management. Also, the feedback obtained from a foreman through training sessions can be extremely useful to upper management to see how goals and objectives are being viewed by the hourly work force. In this manner, training can serve as a two-way communication as well as a means to improve the capabilities of the foreman and his role on the job.

In reply to question 18 - being a foreman gives you a sense of security - the 20-30 and 31-40 age groups had the largest percent disagreement, 35%. Referring back to Chapter II, our analysis indicates these groups to also have less time on the job. It is reasonable to conclude that with less years on the job and at a younger age, the sense of security is not as strong as with the older, more experienced foreman. When a man takes a foreman's job usually there is some allowance for his starting inefficiency in the eyes of his immediate supervisor, but it is not long before the pressures come to bear relating to efficiency and performance. Although the man may have viewed it from the hourly ranks prior to his being selected as a foreman, the new foreman faces daily pressures and criticisms which make him feel uncomfortable and uncertain on the job, so that his sense of security is weakened. Also, the relation of the foreman with his

supervisor is important to his sense of security, probably the most influential. How his supervisor assists him and works to help him solve his daily problems, plays an important part toward his feeling secure in the job. The supervisor's initial performance rating of him also affects the foreman's sense of security. Once he has established himself as a good performer and has gotten over the initial difficulties the job presents, his sense of security is reinforced and strengthened.

Despite these age group differences, there were still 47% in the 20-30 age group and 44% in the 31-40 age group who agreed that being a foreman gives them a sense of security. This led us to an examination of how the agreeers to the security question 18 responded to the other key questions. We concluded that when a respondent answered positively to the security question, he was highly inclined to be in agreement with other key questions between 70 and 85% of the time. A foreman being secure in his job is linked to management's perception of that job, his perception of the job, and the relation to his immediate supervisor. It appears that a foreman who has a feeling of security is more positive in his attitude toward his job and generally satisfied with his management organization and his position within it. It is suspected from our experience that the disagreeers to this question are predominantly new on the job and undoubtedly have communication difficulties with their supervisor and other members of management; also, if a man has not been performing well in his position and his supervisor has made it known to him, he would

obviously have answered in disagreement to this question. Performance appraisal is important to feeling secure on the job. The foreman must know where he stands, how he is doing, and what areas he must improve upon. It has been our experience that the position of foreman in our industry does give one a sense of security and good livelihood, and the insecurity we have discussed here is inherent at the beginning of any new situation and will always be present to a certain degree. Although this exists, management has much to gain if it can change the conditions mentioned above which contribute to the insecurity of the younger and less experienced foremen, or new management members.

How the foreman perceives his job within the organization and how he feels others see his job is very important to his position of authority. If he perceives his job as less influential and not having importance to the extent that many decisions are being made without his input, he undoubtedly will lack motivation and desire to get the job done, and feel he lacks authority. One group of questions - 1, 5, 9, 10, and 27 - addressed this question of the foreman's perception of his job. If he thinks his job is important and has recognition in the organization, he probably will act accordingly and establish himself in a position of authority with his crew. In addition, if his crew feels his position is important then the foreman has established himself as an important link in the organization, simply because he must be meeting the various needs of his crew members. If members of his crew are able to get assistance or help, or even answers to

their questions from other than their foreman, then to the foreman's crew his position is one of somewhat less authority and decreasing in importance.

The first question of this group was a perception of his job from the hourly work force view. The agreement was 75% that the foreman has an important function in the operation of the plant. When asked if the work force sees the role of the foreman decreasing, there was a more even distribution on replies - 47% agreement and 38% disagreement. It is interesting that the work force's perception of the job is one of an important function decreasing in importance. This indicates that the role of the foreman has changed. In many respects, the foreman is the key communication link to his crew but there are other places in the organization where the worker can now seek assistance and help beyond the foreman. The role has shifted from one where the foreman was the man who did it all, to one where other support functions are now needed within the organization to assist and offer guidance pertaining to employees. There are many other inputs besides the foreman's in dealing with the current work force, but the foreman is still the person in the organization with whom the work force has the most contact. If the foreman can provide the assistance a worker needs, or even at best direct the employee to someone who can, then the importance of his function is still evident; but if he can provide little help to members of his crew, the foreman's role obviously has decreased in importance. It was our expectation to get a somewhat even

distribution to question 5, since the importance of the foreman to his crew depends so much on how well he communicates with his crew and how effective he has been in helping and assisting when needed. Since nearly all the foremen were selected from the hourly work force, many of them most recently (the last ten years), their view as to how the hourly work force perceives the role of the foreman is accurate.

Question 9 asked the foreman his perception of the job and surprisingly a strong positive reply was given. Nearly 75% believe he is performing an important function within the organization. This attitude is certainly critical to the foreman's job performance. Communication and support from upper management buttresses the feeling of the foreman's perception of his job importance.

The support of upper management was brought out by question 10. Here 64% of the respondents were in agreement that management feels his job is important. There was a slightly higher negative response from the 20-30 age group (33%), but taking into consideration that this group of foremen is new to the job, so probably more supervisory intervention was required in assisting them to carry out their functions with the work force. With this intervention, it is likely some respondents were somewhat more negative to management's view on the importance of their job. In some respects, more guidance and assistance is imparted to the new, less experienced foreman and occasionally the course of action

to pursue becomes a conflict between the foreman and his supervisor on, for example, labor relations. If not overcome by the new foreman this conflict can lead to some dissatisfaction and the feeling of not being an important link within the organization. With this fact in mind, it is not unreasonable that the 20-30 age group was slightly more negative in their responses.

We conclude that the foremen, even though differing in their replies that the role is decreasing in importance, have a strong positive attitude toward the importance of their role within the organization. This positiveness towards fulfilling an important function took three points of view: how the work force perceives his job, how he perceives it, and how upper management perceives it. All three points of view yielded a strong positive attitude, 75, 74.6 and 64% respectively. Although they believe that their position has decreased in prestige, 71% of the foremen still feel they are performing an important function, are an important link in the organization, and are supported in this view by plant management.

Questions 3, 15, 19 and 20 were grouped to determine whether or not the foreman perceives his problems are recognized and worked on by his supervisor and upper management. Only 48% agreed that plant management recognized and was working on problems confronted by the foreman. But nearly 33% disagreed and the 20-30 age group was slightly higher at 41%. In the total group there was 58.2% agreement that the supervisor has an understanding of the foreman's problems and 58.2% agreement that the help

received from his supervisor assists him in his work.

The immediate supervisor got more recognition from the foreman than did upper management on problem recognition, but the immediate supervisor was not thought of as being highly effective in assisting the foreman. This result almost leads one to the conclusion that both the supervisor and upper management don't care to get involved in the foreman's daily problems. The response to this question indicates a breakdown in communications between the foreman, supervisor and above. If the foreman has done all in his power to handle his problems and then gets no recognition or adequate assistance in further help from the hierarchy, foreman dissatisfaction and lack of enthusiasm will grow. Also, if his crew sees the requests for help and assistance being disregarded or shunned, the role of the foreman becomes less influential and some prestige is lost. It is important that upper management be responsive to the foreman and take an "open door" policy for the recognition of the problems he encounters. This is not to say that each and every problem must get the attention of upper management and that action is warranted on all situations, but the system of communication must be present so that legitimate and genuine problems not solely solvable by the foreman receive management assistance and resolution.

This series of questions exemplifies the communication gap that exists between the foreman and his management, and it is possible that a similar gap exists between the foreman and his crew when the need exists for assistance and direction. When we

analyzed how the agreeers to one question of this group - problems you are confronted with are recognized and being worked on by plant management - also responded to other key questions, we concluded that they tended to be more positive toward most of the others. The analysis indicates that when the foreman perceives management as having an understanding and recognition of his problems, and is attempting to assist him in some manner, the foreman's attitude toward his role is more positive and generally he is more satisfied with his position in the organization. This recognition by upper management is reassuring to the foreman that he is part of management and what he confronts in his job is important to other members of management, as shown by their participation to assist and resolve some of the problems encountered.

Three questions were designed to look at two-way communication between the foreman and plant management. As mentioned previously, we believe the communication process between foreman and plant management is the essential ingredient to a successful relationship and that it established to a degree the role the foreman assumes in his job. If the foreman has input into the decision-making process, if he is consulted about decisions affecting his area, if the communication process is such that his opinions are listened to and considered, his role will be reinforced and his position of authority enhanced. If, on the other hand, his involvement is limited and not influential to changes taking place in his area of responsibility, his role is

nothing more than that of a funnel between upper management and the work force. When this situation is prevalent, the job of the foreman is seen as lacking prestige. If the channels of communication are evident and the foreman has the feeling of confidence that he is supported by management, it is understandable that his attitude will be positive toward his job and organization. Also, with this positive attitude toward his job and his position seen by management as important, the foreman is likely to defend management's position to his crew as if it were his own.

Question 6 dealing with the issue just raised received the highest percent agreement of any question, 87.8%. We concluded that regardless of the agreement or disagreement with other key questions, the foreman is able and willing to defend management's position with the hourly work force. This indicates a high degree of loyalty to management and to the company. We feel that the question, at least, suggests that the foreman considers himself a member of management and takes pride in it. Also, when asked, if you would encourage a friend to accept a foreman's job, 59% agreed and only 18% disagreed. This reinforces the satisfaction of the job to the foreman.

Questions 7 and 12 from this group represent communications between the foreman and management. After careful analysis of the interrelationships with other key questions, we feel that there is no single group of foremen that answers to other questions in a consistent way, either positively or negatively.

For question 7 there was only 33% agreement and 58% disagreement. This indicates a dissatisfaction by the foremen to the extent they are not involved in expressing opinions affecting their operations. We concluded that the foremen feel they should be consulted and have an opportunity to make suggestions before decisions affecting them are made. The sample of respondents who agreed with this question was found to have a more positive response to all other key questions. Question 12 - management decisions are discussed with you prior to being put into effect - was a similar communication question. The percentage of respondents agreeing that decisions are discussed with them before being instituted was 50.8. The replies indicate a deficiency on the part of management to involve the foreman more in the implementation process. We again emphasize that communication is important to the role of the foreman, his level of authority and his image with his crew. Concluding from our analysis and prior experience, this lack of involvement or input to the decision process is most dissatisfying to the foreman and is perhaps one of the factors influencing his general attitude toward his job. Although we don't have substantial proof of this, the comparison of agreeers from this related set of questions indicates a relationship to all the other key questions. The agreeers tended to be more positive to all other questions. In other words, the foreman's need for input to the decision process (or at least expression of opinion), his perception of the importance of his job, the recognition by

management to assist and understand his problems, and his feeling of security are interdependent and have a significant effect on how he feels about his job and his role in the organization.

Three questions relate to advancement and security. The availability of promotions is usually an important help to motivate improved performance. There was strong agreement (67%) that foremen continue to perform well because there is opportunity for advancement. The expectations of foremen were rather high: 66.5% expected to be promoted to better positions. Apparently, regardless of the respondents' age or seniority, they feel opportunity for advancement is present as a reward for good performance. Question 16 - most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions - had some significance in that those who agreed with it also were more positive on many other questions. It has been characteristic of our industry for men who were foremen to advance to higher levels of management within the plants. The foreman still feels this mobility to advance is present in the system and he is motivated by this to perform well.

We asked two questions in an effort to get a feel for the level of authority the job holds. We were of the opinion that there would be much more disagreement to the question relating to discipline, but there was 72.5% agreement that the respondents are free to initiate discipline on their own, and 68.1% agreement that management was likely to support them. The

respondents were 52.1% in agreement that they enjoy the amount of authority the job provides, and only 21.2% disagreed. Surprising to us, the foreman does feel he has the authority to discipline and isn't handicapped to do so if necessary. This indicates that the foreman still has a certain amount of authority and degree of control within his area of responsibility. Although it is difficult for a foreman to fire a man outright, he does have the authority to operate within the context of the management-union contract and, with care, he can initiate discipline to get rid of the poor performers or troublemakers in his crew. When used properly and in fairness, this authority to initiate disciplinary action is a valuable control mechanism to the foreman. It is one of the key elements in describing his level of authority and if administered fairly and properly gives him considerable leverage in performing his job. Where foremen are really dissatisfied, it is because disciplinary action they take is reversed without consulting or involving them in the decision process. This type of action undermines the authority of the foreman and further complicates the relationship with his crew. If disciplinary action was unjustified in a particular situation, then the foreman should be the one to reverse the decision after consultation with the labor relations people and with his immediate supervisor, but the actual talking with the disciplined individual should be done by the foreman. Too many times, information on changes of a foreman's action bypasses the foreman and as a consequence erodes his position

of authority with his crew. If service and support functions would adopt a policy of working through the foreman instead of around him, his position and role would be considerably reinforced instead of eroded.

Another aspect reflecting the foreman's attitude toward his job is that of compensation. Three questions - 4, 11 and 22 - were asked to determine if pay (including fringe benefits) was a dissatisfying element for the foreman. When asked whether the added fringe benefits you gain as a member of management are important, 87.8% replied positively. Also, 78% replied positively that they were fairly compensated for hours worked in excess of those considered normal for their position. Question 22 highlighted the importance of pay by emphasizing pay as the most important factor in taking a position as a foreman and continuing at that level. There was 64% agreement to this question and only 26.5% disagreed. We believe that pay and fringe benefits are strong motivators and important to the foreman continuing to perform well at his job. Whether he feels his pay and benefits are adequate for assuming the responsibilities of his job will influence his overall performance on the job. Our experience is that foremen feel pay is a very essential and important factor and must be given consideration when analyzing the attitude of men in in these positions. If a foreman feels he is adequately compensated, his outlook and attitude toward other elements of his job will be more positive and his role within the organization will be more satisfying to him. A

foreman who believes he is not adequately compensated for his performance is certain to be dissatisfied and his future performance will decline. Adequate compensation linked with appropriate and timely merit increases is a primary rather than secondary characteristic affecting the attitude of the foreman and his perception of the job. Interestingly, in the comments portion of the questionnaire very little was mentioned about pay. Most of the comments were complaints that merit increases based on good performance were not on a timely basis. This complaint should not be overlooked. If this practice becomes habit, the foreman's attitude toward his position within the organization will appear less important and one not having much recognition. Generally, the foremen are satisfied with the level of their pay and continue to perform well because their pay is considered important.

Question 30 was designed to see how foremen actually spend their time, whether communication about the job duties between foreman and supervisor is adequate. There was a discrepancy between what the respondents are doing, what they consider important and what their supervisors consider important (see Table VII). This question points out whether or not there is congruence of thinking with his supervisor. Parts B and C indicate very close agreement between foremen and supervisors on what they think is important, but the foremen are actually doing other things. Although safety is rated most important by the foreman and supervisor, only 4.3% time allocation is

is actually given to it (approximately 32 minutes per day). Based on our experience and survey results, it indicates that the production foreman is highly production-output oriented in his daily activities. Although he feels safety is most important, the amount of time he gives to it is relatively small. Under pressure for high output with good efficiency, it is understandable that the foreman will devote his time to those duties which help him most in the accomplishment of those goals. Once the foreman has communicated with his crew as to what he expects in terms of safety performance and use of proper wearing apparel (gloves, glasses or tools), it becomes a matter of policing to assure conformance. This approach is not very time consuming but rather visual attention with positive corrective action if necessary, whether it be to discipline employees or maintenance action to correct a faulty piece of equipment. So although only 4.3% time is allocated to safety, it doesn't follow that this is an error in the foreman's actions. Criticism can be voiced that not enough time is applied to safety problems and communication, or other problems, and that less time be applied to paperwork in preference to other problems. To clearly understand this issue, many other points relating to safety would have to be clarified, and this is not the intent of this discussion.

The significance of question 30 is that the foreman and supervisor are in agreement and indicates a positive communication process. As far as the actual time allocation of duties,

the foreman appears to have to allocate his time in the manner the situation demands for accomplishing his tasks. His allocation time to duties is in response to the immediate task, but problem solving and coordination would still account for better than 50% of his time related to the production output task. Our experience is that foremen are very responsive to management's requests and are able to efficiently accomplish tasks not related to the primary function of production output.

The final portion of our questionnaire was the comments section. Most of the comments related to communication with upper management, lack of recognition for a job well done, and the lack of adequate maintenance to keep equipment operating. There were plants within each company that had more complaints directed to the above topics, but generally all plants reflected similar complaints. The comments closely support the main body of Likert-type questions and reflect a lack of communication on the part of upper management to the foreman. Many of the respondents found it difficult to understand why upper management keeps pressuring them but does little to remedy situations they have been pointing out and not controllable by them. This is evidenced by the maintenance problems encountered over which the production foreman has relatively little control but often held responsible for when his area isn't performing to standard. There exists a dual standard between maintenance and production whereby the production foreman usually is held accountable in that he is criticized for not being effective

enough with the maintenance people to get his problems resolved earlier and more rapidly. The real problem - the lack of maintenance and effective corrections - is never attacked and the production foreman becomes paranoid about problems of this nature. Continual pressures of this type lead to dissatisfaction with the job. This management attitude is unjust in that the maintenance problem is not only the foreman's, it is the general foreman's, the superintendent's, etc. There must be understanding by management of the problems encountered and creation of an atmosphere demanding team work. The maintenance complaint is a good example of the communication gap existing between the foreman and those above him.

In summary, we have discussed those elements of the foreman's position that lead to dissatisfaction and influence his attitude toward his job. Generally, there was positiveness by the respondents to many of the questions and this indicates overall satisfaction toward their jobs. The most dissatisfying aspect of their job was the lack of input in the decision-making process and the inability of management to recognize and understand the problems encountered in their daily activities. The foreman continues to feel he is an important link in the organization, recognized by both his crew and upper management and able to defend management's position even if different from his own. He has expectations of being promoted to better positions and views good performance as a means for future advancement. The compensation he receives for performing his job is adequate

but the unpredictable nature of merit increases creates dissatisfaction. His position of authority on discipline is recognized and supported by upper management. However, he is dissatisfied that incidents occur behind his back usually involving decisions he should have been a part of.

The respondents feel that hourly workers are less willing to work and cooperate with management today than they were ten years ago. They feel the position of foreman has decreased in prestige over the last ten years due primarily to support functions assuming responsibilities the foreman once carried out. Primarily due to this change of role, the hourly work force sees the role of the foreman decreasing in importance. He also feels there is a sense of security in being a foreman, but our analysis indicates this to be dependent on his relationship with the organization, his perception of the job, how others view his job, and in part his working relationship with his supervisors. The factors contributing to a foreman being satisfied with his role or position within the organization are dependent on many variables which must be considered separately as well as their dependency on each other.

Throughout our discussion we emphasized the importance of the communication process. Communications are very essential and foremost in establishing a positive attitude among foremen toward their job and reinforcing their authority. We feel that the results along with our experience support our notion

that the communication process is important in strengthening and defining the role of the foreman in the automotive industry.

THE ROLE OF THE FOREMAN IN INDUSTRY

TABLE I

Personal Data

1. Age	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70
2. Number of years in current job	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	more than 20
3. Number of years with the company	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	more than 40
4. Number of years of schooling completed	less than 12	12	13-15	16	more than 16
5. Number of employees in your crew	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	more than 40
6. Are members of your crew unionized?					
	International Union				
	Independent Union				
	Company Association				
	Not Unionized				
7. Were you a union member?	Yes	No			
If yes, were you an officer or elected representative	Yes	No			

TABLE I (con.)

(Circle number which best describes extent of your agreement)

1. The hourly work force sees the first line supervisor or foreman as an important function in the operation of your plant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent	Strongly Disagree		

2. The employees and materials under your supervision are adequate to meet your goals.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent	Strongly Disagree		

3. Problems you are confronted with are recognized and are being worked on by your plant management.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent	Strongly Disagree		

4. Aside from wages or salary, the added fringe benefits you gain as a member of management are important.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent	Strongly Disagree		

5. The hourly work force sees the role of the foreman decreasing in importance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent	Strongly Disagree		

TABLE I (con.)

6. You are generally able to defend management's position when talking with hourly employees.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

7. Management decisions which affect your operations are not made without considering your opinions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

8. You enjoy the amount of authority your job provides.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

9. You continue to perform your daily work because you feel the company needs you as an important link in the organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

10. Your plant management sees the foreman's job as important as you feel it really is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

11. You are fairly compensated for hours worked in excess of those considered normal for your position.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

TABLE I (con.)

17. Generally, you perceive the need for disciplinary action and are free to initiate discipline on your own.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

18. Being a foreman gives you a sense of security.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

19. The help you receive from your immediate supervisor definitely assists you in your work.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

20. Foreman training, provided by your company, has had a significant effect on the way you perform your job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

21. If disciplinary action is initiated by you, management is likely to support you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

TABLE I (con.)

12. Management decisions are discussed with you prior to being instituted, so that you can clearly transmit them to your crew.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

13. You originally became a foreman because of the status and prestige gained.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

14. You continue to perform well because there is opportunity for further advancement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

15. Your immediate supervisor has a real understanding of your problems.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

16. Most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

TABLE I (con.)

22. The most important factor in taking a position as a foreman, and continuing at this level, is the amount of pay received.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

23. Your performance is being reviewed fairly by your supervisors.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

24. Hourly employees are worse today than they were 10 years ago in willingness to work and cooperation with management.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

25. The plant manager and his staff have more influence on your job than do the members of your crew.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

26. You would encourage a friend to accept a foreman's job.

1	2	3	4	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent				Strongly Disagree

TABLE I (con.)

27. The job of foreman in your company has decreased in prestige over the last 10 years.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

28. A change in your general plant management, i.e., a new plant manager or general superintendent, does not affect your job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

29. Seniority played no part in your becoming a foreman.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Indifferent			Strongly Disagree

30. If your job duties were divided up in the following way:

- a) Paperwork, b) Training, c) Problem Solving,
 d) Coordination, e) Assisting Subordinates, f) Safety,
 g) Other

- 1) Which one takes up the most time? _____
 2) Which one does your immediate supervisor emphasize as most important? _____
 3) Which one do you feel is most important? _____

31. With which group do you have the closest relationship?
 (1-closest, 2-next closest, etc.)

Your supervisors

Other foremen

Your crew

TABLE I (con.)

Comment on and rate in order of importance (1-highest, 2-next highest, etc.) the improvements that could be made to make your job more satisfactory.

- 1. _____

- 2. _____

- 3. _____

Comment on and rate in order of importance (1-most dissatisfying, 2-next most dissatisfying, etc.) what you do not like about your job.

- 1. _____

- 2. _____

- 3. _____

How do you think the foreman's role will change in the next few years?

TABLE II

(Demographics)

\bar{X} & σ are based on each question's (x) or number of answer divisions.

<u>X₁</u>	<u>Age of Respondent</u>	<u>Number in this group</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Respondents</u>
1	20-30 years	51	27.0%
2	31-40 "	73	38.6
3	41-50 "	43	22.8
4	51-60 "	21	11.1
5	61-70 "	1	.5

Total 189 100.0

$$\bar{X} = 2.2, \sigma_1 = 1.0$$

<u>X₂</u>	<u>Number of years as a Foreman</u>		
1	0-5 years	98	51.9%
2	6-10 "	57	30.2
3	11-15 "	8	4.2
4	16-20 "	15	7.9
5	21- "	11	5.8

Total 189 100.0

$$\bar{X}_2 = 1.9, \sigma_2 = 1.2$$

<u>X₃</u>	<u>Company Seniority</u>		
1	0-10	105	55.6%
2	11-20	57	30.2
3	21-30	19	10.1
4	31-40	8	4.2

Total 189 100.0

$$\bar{X}_3 = 1.6, \sigma = .8$$

<u>X₄</u>	<u>School Years Completed</u>		
1	0-12 years	20	10.6%
2	12	104	55.0
3	13-15	56	29.6
4	16	4	2.1
5	More than 16	5	2.6

Total 189 100.0

$$\bar{X}_4 = 2.3, \sigma_4 = .8$$

TABLE II (con.)

<u>X</u>	<u>Number of crew members</u>	<u>Number in this group</u>	<u>Percentage of Total respondents</u>
1	1-10	3	1.6%
2	11-20	47	24.9
3	21-30	83	43.9
4	31-40	38	20.1
5	More than 40	18	9.5
	Total	189	100.0

$\bar{X}_5 = 3.1, s_5 = .9$

In all cases the crew members of the foremen were unionized. In all cases the men belong to an international union, namely the United Automobile Workers.

The respondents were asked whether they had personally belonged to a union prior to becoming a foreman. To this question 87.8% replied that they had belonged to a union, the number of respondents in this case came to 166. A total of 23 men had not belonged to a union (or 12.2% of the sample.)

TABLE III

OVERVIEW OF LIKERT SCALE
Question Answers

All data presented is based on 189 individual replies: \bar{x} & σ is based on the Likert scale of 7 pts. where 1 = strong agreement and 7 = strong disagreement.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Indif- ferent</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>σ</u>
1) The hourly work force sees the first line supervisor or foreman as an important function in the operation of your plant.	75.0%	12.2%	12.8%	2.7	1.6
2) The employees and materials under your supervision are adequate to meet your goals.	58.7	10.6	30.7	3.5	1.8
3) Problems you are confronted with are recognized and being worked on by your plant management.	48.1	19.0	32.8	3.7	1.9
4) Aside from wages or salary the added fringe benefits you gain as a member of management are important.	87.8	6.3	5.8	1.9	1.4
5) The hourly work force sees the role of the foreman decreasing in importance.	46.6	15.9	37.6	3.9	2.1
6) You are generally able to defend management's position when talking with hourly employees.	87.8	6.4	5.9	2.1	1.3
7) Management decisions which affect your operations are not made without considering your opinion.	33.3	9.0	57.7	4.7	2.1
8) You enjoy the amount of authority your job provides.	52.4	26.5	21.2	3.4	1.7
9) You continue to perform your daily work because you feel the company needs you as an important link in the organization.	74.6	8.5	16.9	2.6	1.8

TABLE III (con.)

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Indif- ferent</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>6</u>
10) Your plant management sees the foreman's job as important as you feel it really is.	64.0	10.6	25.4	3.0	1.9
11) You are fairly compensated for hours worked in excess of those considered normal for your position.	77.8	4.8	17.5	2.5	2.0
12) Management decisions are discussed with you prior to being instituted, so that you can clearly transmit them to your crew.	50.8	12.7	36.5	3.8	2.1
13) You originally became a foreman because of the status and prestige gained	48.7	13.8	37.6	3.9	2.2
14) You continue to perform well because there is opportunity for further advancement.	67.2	12.2	20.6	3.0	2.0
15) Your immediate supervisor has a real understanding of your problems.	58.2	13.2	28.6	3.3	2.0
16) Most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions.	66.5	14.9	18.6	2.9	1.8
17) Generally, you perceive the need for disciplinary action and are free to initiate discipline on your own.	72.5	7.9	19.6	2.8	2.0
18) Being a foreman gives you a sense of security.	51.9	18.0	30.2	3.7	2.1
19) The help you receive from your immediate supervisor definitely assists you in your work.	58.2	10.1	31.7	3.4	2.1
20) Foreman training provided by your company has had a significant effect on the way you perform your job.	53.4	12.2	34.4	3.7	2.2

TABLE III (con.)

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Indif- ferent</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>- X</u>	<u>6</u>
21) If disciplinary action is initiated by you, management is likely to support you.	68.1	8.5	23.4	2.9	2.1
22) The most important factor in taking a position as a foreman, and continuing at this level, is the amount of pay received.	64.0	9.5	26.5	3.3	2.0
23) Your performance is being fairly reviewed by your supervisor.	57.1	15.9	27.0	3.4	1.9
24) Hourly employees are worse today than they were 10 years ago in willingness to work and cooperate with management.	73.1	9.17	17.7	2.6	1.9
25) The plant manager and his staff have more influence on your job than do the members of your crew.	50.8	19.5	29.7	3.5	2.1
26) You would encourage a friend to accept a foreman's job.	59.0	22.9	18.1	2.6	1.8
27) The job of foreman in your company has decreased in prestige over the last 10 years.	71.7	14.4	13.9	2.6	1.8
28) A change in your general plant management, i.e., a new plant manager or general superintendent, does not affect your job.	45.7	15.4	38.8	3.8	2.2
29) Seniority played no part in your becoming a foreman.	94.2	3.7	2.1	1.4	1.0

TABLE IV

Breakdown of Answers to Key Questions by Company
Data is Related to 189 Analyzed Questionnaires

<u>Question</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>%</u>	
	<u>Agreement</u>		<u>Disagreement</u>	
	Co I	Co II	Co I	Co II
1)The hourly work force sees the first line supervisor or foreman as an important function in the operation of your plant	81.5	71.5	9.2	14.4
3)Problems you are confronted with are recognized and are being worked on by your plant management	53.8	45.2	27.7	35.5
5)The hourly work force sees the role of the foreman decreasing in importance	49.2	45.2	36.9	37.9
6)You are generally able to defend management's position when talking with hourly employees	89.2	87.0	6.1	5.6
7)Management decisions which affect your operations are not made without considering your opinion	32.3	33.9	56.9	58.9
9)You continue to perform your daily work because you feel the company needs you as an important link in the organization	78.5	72.6	16.0	15.8
10)Your plant management sees the foreman's job as important as you feel it really is	64.6	63.7	19.9	28.2
12)Management decisions are discussed with you prior to being instituted, so that you can clearly transmit them to your crew	60.0	46.0	29.3	40.3
14)You continue to perform well because there is opportunity for advancement	67.7	66.5	21.6	20.2

TABLE IV (con.)

<u>Question</u>	<u>% Agreement</u>		<u>% Disagreement</u>	
	Co I	Co II	Co I	Co II
15) Your immediate supervisor has a real understanding of your problems	58.5	58.1	32.6	26.7
16) Most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions	66.2	66.7	18.4	18.6
18) Being a foreman gives you a sense of security	53.8	50.8	26.2	32.3
19) The help you receive from your immediate supervisor definitely assists you in your work	63.1	55.6	24.7	33.9
20) Foreman training, provided by your company, has had a significant effect on the way you perform your job	66.2	46.8	23.1	40.3

TABLE V

Tabulation of how respondents, answering key questions positively, answered other selected questions, i.e., those answering 1,2, or 3 on questions 3,5,7,16 and 18.

Key Question	Total Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
3)Problems you are confronted with are recognized and are being worked on by your plant management	91	85	3.8	95	37	86	85	65	79	76	76	65	77	62	88	80	80	80	80	80	80
5)The hourly work force sees the role of foreman decreasing in importance	88	64	100	84	33	67	57	44	60	55	67	49	56	53	88	80	80	80	80	80	80
7)Management decisions which affect your operations are not made without considering your opinion	63	78	46	92	100	79	75	64	79	65	62	54	60	56	88	80	80	80	80	80	80
16)Most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions	98	74	47	90	31	81	70	54	73	62	100	64	62	58	88	80	80	80	80	80	80
18)Being a foreman gives you a sense of security	125	78	44	91	35	85	76	60	80	74	82	100	73	67	88	80	80	80	80	80	80

TABLE VI

Tabulation of how respondents, answering key questions negatively, answered other selected questions, i.e., those answering 5,6, or 7 on questions 3,5,7,16 and 18.

Key Question	Total Dis-agree	1	5	6	7	9	10	12	14	15	16	18	19	20
3) Problems you are confronted with are recognized and are being worked on by your plant management	62	18	31	15	77	23	42	56	31	47	26	40	48	47
5) The hourly work force sees the role of foreman decreasing in importance	71	3	100	3	61	8	10	18	30	15	28	18	27	39
7) Management decisions which affect your operations are not made without considering your opinion	109	14	39	8	100	19	33	50	28	35	20	36	33	34
16) Most men in your position expect to be promoted to better positions	35	17	37	11	63	31	51	54	43	37	100	49	40	51
18) Being a foreman gives you a sense of security	57	16	33	11	68	39	37	47	40	46	30	100	46	56

TABLE VII

Tabulation of how respondents ranked their job duties

<u>A) Those taking up most of your time</u>	<u>B) Those your supervisor emphasizes as most important</u>	<u>C) Which ones do you feel most important</u>
1) problem solving - 38.1%	1) safety - 29.6%	1) safety - 40.4%
2) coordination with other functions - 20.6	2) problem solving - 18.3	2) problem solving - 22.9
3) paperwork - 14.8	3) other - 17.2	3) coordination with other functions - 20.7
4) training - 10.6	4) coordination with other functions - 16.1	4) training - 8.0
5) assisting subordinates - 9.0	5) paperwork - 10.8	5) assisting subordinates - 4.3
6) safety - 4.2	6) training - 4.3	6) other - 3.7
7) other - 2.6	7) assisting subordinates - 3.8	7) paperwork - 0.0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, John W., "The Use of Union Officers As A Source Of Management Personnel," MIT Sloan Management Thesis, 1967.
- Beech, Dale S., "An Organizational Problem-Subordinate-Superior Relations," Advanced Management, December 1960, Vol.25, No.12, pp.12-15
- Bennett, Willard E., "Why Don't They Give Us More Authority?" Supervisory Management, January 1961, Vol.6, No.1, pp.2-8.
- Bonham, T.W., "The Foreman In An Ambiguous Environment," Personnel Journal, November 1971, Vol.50, No.11, pp.841-845.
- Boyd, Bradford B., "Worker to Supervisor-Problems of Transition," Personnel Journal, September 1964, Vol.43, No.8, pp.421-426.
- Bureau of National Affairs, Status of First-Level Supervisors, Washington Bureau, November 1971, Personnel Policies Forum Survey No.25, 23 pages.
- Business Management, "The First-Line Supervisor: Industry's Number One Problem," September 1971, Vol.40, No.6, pp.18-19.
- Busse, Frank A., Three Dimensional Foremanship, American Management Association, 1969.
- Carrington, James H., "Does Management Owe the Supervisor Promotional Opportunity," Personnel Journal, June 1969, Vol.48, No.6, pp.423-427.
- Cummings, Paul W., "Measuring Supervisors Responsibilities," Training and Development Journal, July 1972, Vol.26, No.7, pp.24-27.
- Cummings, Robert C., "Leader-Member Relations As A Moderator of the Effects of Leader Behavior and Attitude," Personnel Psychology, Winter 1972, Vol.25, No.4, pp. 655-660.
- Dale, Leon A., "The Foreman As A Manager," Personnel, July-August 1971, Vol.48, No.4., pp.61-64.
- Dubin, Robert, et al, Leadership and Productivity, Chandler, 1965.
- Factory, "The Lonely Supervisors," August 1961, Vol.119, No.8, pp.88-89.
- Faller, Ray R., "An Analysis of the Foreman's Job," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, February 1962, Vol.16, No.2, pp.47-50.

- Frank, George, "12 Ways to Ruin a Good Foreman," Factory, February 1964, Vol.122, No.2, pp.69-70.
- George, Norman, "Training Won't Solve These Supervisor Problems," Mill & Factory, September 1960, Vol.67, No.3, pp.85-88.
- Goodacre, Daniel M., "Do Foreman Pass Along Economic Information," Personnel, January-February 1962, Vol.39, No.1, pp.73-77.
- Gust, Gerry M., "Discovering Management's Forgotten Man - The Foreman," Personnel Administrator, September-October 1971, Vol.16, No.5., pp.34-36.
- Halpern, Richard S., "Employee Unionization and Foremen's Attitude," Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1961, Vol.6, No.1, pp.73-88.
- Harris, Phillip, "Affirmation of the Foreman's Role," Business Topics, Michigan State University, Winter 1965, Vol.13, No.1, pp.42-50.
- Heyel, Carl, "The Supervisor and the Big Picture," Supervisory Management, November 1962, Vol.7, No.11, pp.12-15
- Hopper, Kenneth, "The Growing Use of College Graduates as Foremen," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Summer 1967, Vol.6, No.2, pp.2-12.
- Iris, Benjamin, Barrett, Gerald V., "Some Relations Between Job and Life Satisfaction and Job Importance," Journal of Applied Psychology, August 1972, Vol.56, No.4, pp.301-311
- Johnson, Alton C., Peterson, Richard B., Kahler, Gerald, "Historical Changes in Characteristics of Foremen," Personnel Journal, July 1968, Vol.47, No.7, pp.475-481.
- Kavanaugh, Michael J., McKinney, Arthur C., Wohns, Leroy, "Satisfaction of Morale of Foremen as a Function of Middle Management Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, April 1970, Vol.54, No.2, pp.145-156.
- Kay, Brian R., "The Foreman's Role: Theme With Variations," Personnel, November-December 1963, Vol.40, No.6, pp.32-37.
- Kelly, Charles M., "The Myth of the Key Communicator," Personnel Journal, January 1966, Vol.45, No.1, pp.32-42.
- Kleiler, Frank M., "Getting Along With Your Supervisor," Supervision, August 1960, Vol.22, No.8, pp.22-23.

- Kakoske, Theodor J., "Initial Impact of Work Measurement on Office Supervisors: A Case Study," MIT School of Industrial Management Thesis, 1966.
- Luscomb, Robert C., "The Effect of Management Information Systems On First Line Supervision," MIT Sloan Management Thesis, 1970.
- Mann, C., et al, "Toward an Understanding of the Leadership Role in Formal Organization," Leadership & Productivity, Chandler Publishing Co., 1964, pp.68-102.
- MacNaughton, J.D., "A Study of Foremen's Communication," Personnel Practice Bulletin, March 1963, Vol.19, No.1, pp.10-19.
- Obrochta, Richard J., "Soremen and Workers Speak Out: Anyone Listening," Personnel Administration, January-February 1962, Vol.25, No.1, pp.24-27.
- Olsen, Charles S., "Supervising Not a Lazy Man's Job," AM-OE, March 1963, Vol.2, No.3, pp.9-13.
- Packard, Russell, L., "How Budget Conscious are Supervisors," Personnel Journal, November 1960, Vol.39, No.6, pp.229-230.
- Patten, Thomas H., "Revitalizing the Role of the Foreman," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Summer 1966, Vol.5, No.2, pp.34-43.
- Patton, John A., "The Foreman - Most Mis-Used, Accused and Abused Man in Industry," Speech for the National Machine Tool Builder's Association, October 11, 1973.
- Pemberton, Robert C., "The Authority, Accountability and Responsibility of the Foreman: A Case Study," MIT Master of Science Thesis, 1961.
- Prien, Erich P., "Development of a Supervisor Position Description Questionnaire," Journal of Applied Psychology, February 1963, Vol.47, No.1, pp.10-14.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., "The Foremen: Master and Victims of Double Talk," Harvard Business Review, September-October 1965, Vol.43, No.5, pp.22-26.
- Rosen, R., Hudson, A., "Foreman Role Conflict: An Expression of Contradictions in Organizational Goals," Industrial & Labor Relation Review, July 1970, Vol.23, No.4, pp.541-552.

- Schappe, Robert H., "The Production Foreman Today: His Needs and His Difficulty," Personnel Journal, July 1972, Vol.51, No.7, pp.489-494.
- Schleh, Edward C., "Six Management Pitfalls for a Growing Company," Management Review, September 1973.
- Schoderbek, Peter P., "The Changing Role of the Foreman," Personnel Journal, August 1970, Vol. 49, No. 8, pp.680-687.
- Simmons, Roberta G., "The Role Conflict of the First Line Supervisor: An Experimental Study," The American Journal of Sociology, January 1968, Vol.73, No.4, pp.482-495.
- Slocum, John W., Hand, Herbert H., "Prediction of Job Success and Employee Satisfaction for Executives and Foremen," Training & Development Journal, October 1971, Vol.25, No.10, pp. 28-36.
- Stanton, Erwin S., "Company Policies and Supervisors Towards Supervision," Journal of Applied Psychology, February 1960, Vol.44, No.1, pp.22-26.
- Tarnowieski, Dale, "The Changing Success Ethic," American Management Association Survey Report, 3118-6.
- Warr, Pete B., Bud, Michael, Hadfield, Raymond W., "Some Characteristics of Foremen in the Iron and Steel Industry," Occupational Psychology, October 1966, Vol.40, No.4, pp.203-211.
- Yanouzas, John, "The Victimized Middleman of Industry Re-examined," Personnel Administration, November-December 1965, Vol.28, No.6, pp.18-24.
- Youngdahl, Russell C., "An Observational Study of First Line Supervisory Behavior," MIT Master of Science Industrial Management Thesis, 1963.