Desires for participation

Relationships between autonomy, efficacy forms and desires for different organizational agents to be in control

Thomas Jønsson, Hans Jeppe Jeppesen & Maj Schøler Fausing, LINOR Research Group, Dept. Psychology, Aarhus University

Introduction

- This presentation is related to Jeppe's presentation yesterday in terms of research methods and theoretical background

- The study aims at investigating the employees' preferences for different agents to have most influence on work and organizational issues.

Background

- Prior studies have shown that employee influence is positively related to desires for influence, e.g.:

  - Hespe & Wall, 1976, IDE-studies (1981, 1993), Jeppesen et al., 2011

  - The IDE group (1993) suggests a spiral model of causality in which experiences with influence cause stronger desires for influence, which in turn cause stronger involvement efforts and use of influence

Background

- Competences and efficacy have been suggested to be related to participation in different ways (e.g. Heller, 1998; 2003, Wilpert 1998)
- Will beliefs in the capabilities of different agents also be related to the actual preference for which agent should have most influence on work and organizational issues?
  - Jønsson & Jeppesen (EAWOP, Maastrict 2011) showed that individual autonomy and self efficacy were positively related with desired degree of influence and the no. of issues, which were desired that one self should have

Background

- The present study expands this research and includes collective (team) and proxy efficacy forms (H&S, WC and management as possible proxy agents)

Methods

- Context:
  - Green tech production company
  - 170 replies from blue collar workers, 392 replies from white collar workers.
  - All participants worked in teams
  - Questionnaire data, 74 % response rate

Methods: Measurement

- Individual Autonomy
  - How much influence do you experience that <u>you have</u> on…
    - How the the daily work is performed?
    - How the daily work tasks are organized?
    - How working time is organized and scheduled?
    - The employment policies of the organization?
    - How health and safety is considered?
    - The financial decision making by the organization?
    - Plans and strategies for the development of the organization?

Methods: Measurement

- Desired issues to control: "Whom do you want to have most influence on" (the issues from before)?
  - Counts the number of issues from 0-7 that the employee desires the the following agents should have:
    - Self
    - Team
    - H&S Committee
    - Cooperation Committee
    - Management

Methods: Measurement

- Self-Efficacy: A Danish translation of Schwarzer and Jerusalem's (1995) Generalized Self Efficacy Scale

- Team Efficacy: An adaptation of the one above done by the Aarhus Group

- Proxy Efficacy (HS, WC, Management): 4 items constructed with inspiration from the above - done by the Aarhus Group

Desctriptive statistics: Means, SD's, Correlations, Cronbach's Alphas

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Age	41.51	9.16															
2 Years at the company	5.45	4.79	.39**														
3 Management fn (Low=Yes)			.01	.09													
4 Representative fn (Low=Yes)			.07	-.09*	.03												
5 Function (Low = Blue Collar)			-.24**	-.14**	-.26**	-.13**											
6 Individual Autonomy	2.90	.75	-.08	.01	-.33**	-.18**	.36**	(.84)									
7 Self Efficacy	3.85	.48	-.06	-.04	-.19**	-.11*	.29**	.36**	(.89)								
8 Team Efficacy	3.96	.54	.02	-.01	-.10*	-.04	.15**	.33**	.38**	(.93)							
9 Proxy Efficacy to WC	3.44	.63	.14**	.17**	.09*	-.15**	-.12**	.17**	.04	.31**	(.94)						
10 ProxyEfficacy to HS	3.75	.71	.19**	.12**	.07	-.06	-.20**	.18**	.03	.26**	.58**	(.94)					
11 Proxy Efficacay to Management	3.73	.69	.05	.03	-.14**	-.13**	.09*	.41**	.23**	.41**	.41**	.39**	(.90)				

No. of areas that the employee desires that the agents below should have most influence on:

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
12 One Self	1.24	1.26	-.26**	-.21**	-.10*	-.02	.34**	.23**	.16**	.01	-.15**	-.17**	.00				
13 Team	1.66	1.42	.21**	.16**	-.03	.00	-.26**	-.02	-.04	.07	.07	.07	-.03	-.50**			
14 H & S Committee	.68	.58	.03	-.04	.03	-.02	-.12**	-.05	-.12**	-.07	.08	.16**	.01	-.03	-.02		
15 Work Council	.61	.70	-.01	.04	.10*	.01	-.11**	-.02	-.08	.02	.20**	.12**	.04	-.06	-.02	.16**	
16 Management	2.20	1.21	-.02	-.08	.08	.02	-.05	-.07	.05	-.01	-.10*	-.07	.01	.06	-.12**	.01	-.17**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Results: Desired distribution of agents

Whom do you want to have most influence on (Select only **ONE** answer in each line)	Yourself	Your team	The health and safety committee	The cooperation committee/works council	The factory management/the management of your function
a. How the daily work is performed?	50,7	47,4	1,0	0,0	1,0
b. How the daily work tasks are organized?	39,7	57,8	0,6	0,0	1,9
c. How working time is organized and scheduled?	39,9	42,6	0,4	5,2	11,8
d. The employment policies of the organization?	1,4	10,0	2,8	45,8	40,1
e. How health and safety is managed?	1,4	8,2	69,7	9,0	11,7
f. The financial decision-making by the organization?	1,0	5,8	0,4	1,7	91,1
g. Plans and strategies for the development of the organization?	1,0	8,8	0,4	5,9	84,0

Results: Individual or team as agent

Dep. Variable: Number of areas one desires that the agents below should have most influence on:

	One self	Team
Age	-.21***	.20***
Years at the company	-.08	.12
Management functions	.00	-.09
Representative functions	.04	.01
Function (Blue Collar=0, White Collar=1)	.31***	-.20***
Self Efficacy	.01	
Individual Autonomy	.08	-.02
Team Efficacy		.09

Results: Differences between blue / white collars

Dep. Variable: Number of areas one desires that the agents below should have most influence on:

	Blue Collars		White Collars	
	One self	Team	One self	Team
Age	-.12	.28**	-.24***	.17**
Years at the company	.04	-.03	-.13*	.19**
Management functions	(No such)	(No such)	.03	-.11
Representative functions	-.03	.00	.05	.02
Self Efficacy	-.04	.01	.02	
Individual Autonomy	-.08	-.03	.15*	-.03
Team Efficacy				.12*

Results: Proxy agents

Number of areas one desires that the agents below should have most influence on:

	Health & Safety Committee	Work Council	Management
Age	-.03	-.08	-.01
Years at the company	-.05	.04	-.05
Management functions	-.03	.07	.05
Representative functions	-.09	.03	.02
Function (Blue Collar=0, White Collar=1)	-.03	-.08	.07
H & S Proxy Efficacy	.21***		
W.C. Proxy Efficacy		.22***	
Management Proxy Efficacy			.06
Individual Autonomy	-.12*	-.02	-.10

Discussion

- For preferences for one self or the team, the results show that blue and white collars differentiated, which suggests a contingency model

- Possible contextual factors in the production area (blue collars' workplace)
  - Traditions/institutionalization of teams as basic unit
  - Culture
  - Team structure (e.g. interdependence)

Discussion

- For the proxy agency, proxy efficacy to the committees was positively associated with the preferences for these agents

- No significant relatioships with management as preferred agent

- Can we interpret that if people believe in H&S and WC, they prefer these agents rather than management?

- Management as the "default" agent – that is if no alternative is considered viable?