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ABSTRACT

The Metropolitan Fire Brigade (MFB) Melbourne, is at the crossroads. Change is sweeping the economic and political environment within which international fire services operate. The MFB is not insulated from this change. Unless alternative productivity strategies can be achieved, the emergency response sector of the Brigade will suffer the same fate as the corporate sector of the MFB and other statutory authorities. Downsizing within this sector has been occurring in response to the above conditions over the past four years.

This study investigates the impact of change upon public safety agencies in general, then compares data gathered on the MFB against this to:

- Identify the level of organisational commitment that currently exists,
- Develop an understanding of the impact of downsizing upon public sector employees.

This study reviews the body of literature concerned with culture and change, downsizing and outsourcing and examines and builds upon the framework of previous research, particularly in the area of downsizing and its impact upon survivors.
The study was designed as a one shot correlational study. A questionnaire was designed and administered to the population. Responses were analysed and discussed in context with the referenced literature.

This study extends previous research in that it compares those findings with current findings. Low morale, job insecurity, poor communication and negativity have been identified as consistent with that of previous research (Brockner 1992; Brockner, Grover and Blonder 1988; Cascio 1993). In other areas the findings vary from previous research, in that organisational commitment remains high, contrary to the literature.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The impact of change as a paradigm is an issue that organisations need to consider within the context of their employees, welfare, level of commitment, satisfaction and overall performance. Change occurs generally in response to both internal and external environmental factors. For an organisation, and its employees, change may be considered either positive or negative depending upon their perspective. This study examines the impact of change upon Corporate Service staff within the Metropolitan Fire Brigade (MFB), a public safety agency.

 Downsizing of and outsourcing within organisations has steadily increased since these new management initiatives were introduced into the United States of America (USA) in the early 1980's. Takeovers, mergers and government reform have created the platform for economic and organisational realignment. This has generally resulted in flatter, leaner and at times totally dysfunctional work forces (Cameron, Freeman and Mishra 1991; Cascio 1993; DeLacy 1993; Feldman 1989; Greenberg 1988; Greenhalgh, Lawrence & Sutton 1988; Grosman 1989; Imberman 1989; Jacobs 1988; Murray 1989; Overman 1991; Roach 1996). Impacts upon the work force such as burnout, stress, low morale and lack of commitment create interesting challenges for organisations which primarily rely upon the survivors of change programs for organisational performance.

 This study focused on an emergency service (public safety agency) and expands upon previous studies of this nature. Although this study was conducted in only one organisation, the findings will articulate into other organisations with similar problems.
Especially those within the public service where such massive change has not previously been experienced.

This study explores the impact that downsizing has had upon the MFB’s corporate work-force with respect to satisfaction/morale, productivity and organisational commitment.

This chapter will review the background of the MFB relative to its history, mission, funding, management structure, environmental influences and staffing.

1.2 ORGANISATIONAL HISTORY

The MFB is an organisation which is formalised by tradition and established values, particularly in the uniformed, emergency response sector of the Brigade, not unlike that of other emergency services.

The Metropolitan Fire Brigade’s Board (MFBB) was established as a result of a parliamentary review in December 1890, which saw the introduction and establishment of a full time fire fighting service in Victoria. Prior to 1890, volunteer brigades operated in the suburbs, whilst insurance company-financed brigades operated in the city.

The MFBB operates as a statutory body within the responsibility of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to provide a service throughout the Metropolitan Fire District.
Historically the MFB focused upon fire suppression as its core activity, though it has since evolved into an integrated emergency service. Today the MFB provides extensive service to the community of Melbourne, including fire safety, public education, rescue and suppression activities. The Brigade also ensures safety both for life and the environment through its role in the development and planning stage of building and dangerous goods proposals. A proposal for the future involves incorporating emergency medical services into the existing infrastructure.

The Metropolitan Fire District comprises an area of approximately 1200 square kilometres including the central business district of Melbourne. Service delivery is achieved through 46 strategically located fire stations.

The organisation is characterised by the corporate mission adopted at the MFBB planning conference in 1992.

1.3 MISSION

The mission of the MFBB is:

To meet the community’s need in an economic, efficient and effective manner;

for continuous protection of life, property and the environment, from the effects of fire, accidents and other hazards;

for appropriate standards for protection of life, property and the environment from fire;

and for increased community involvement and awareness in hazard prevention.

(MFBB Annual Report, 1995, p.4)
1.4 FUNDING

The MFB is funded from a number of sources. Fire service levies placed upon property and contents insurance comprise seventy five per cent of the Brigade’s budget. That level of fire service levy is determined by the State Government. The remaining twenty five per cent is made up of contributions from the State and Local Governments.

The Brigade’s current budget is approximately $160 million. Of this, eighty five per cent is expended recurrently on salaries and costs.

1.5 EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

The MFBB comprises a President (Mr Brian Parry) and eight board members. The President is the Chief Executive Office of the Brigade and is a non-uniformed staff member (Corporate Service staff).

The Brigade has a philosophy of corporate management centred on an executive committee which consists of: the Chief Fire Officer, and the Directors of Emergency Response, Fire and Hazard Safety, Finance, Technical Services and Human Resources (See Appendix I). The Executive Committee is responsible for the development and implementation of overall policy for the Brigade following approval by the Board. Directors are also responsible for specific corporate functions within their respective Directorates. (See Appendix II).
1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCE

A Government investigation into Fire Service management resulted in closer financial control being exercised by Government from 1986 onwards. In 1988, the Board decided to close its vehicle assembly plant for financial reasons, which saw twelve Corporate Service staff made redundant. As a result, other corporate staff were alienated.

The major environmental influence which determined a marked change in strategic direction was the election of the Liberal Government in 1992. In order to achieve State debt reduction, the Government dramatically reduced public sector budget allocations. In real terms the Brigade's budget was reduced by four per cent which in 1992/93 amounted to $6 million. In response to this, the Brigade's business plan was critically re-assessed and a Human Resources strategy became vital. Organisational structure was crucial and the Emergency Response sector of the organisation was restructured. In 1993 the Board initiated a "rightsourcing" project which resulted in the work-force being downsized through strategic redundancies and voluntary departures within the uniformed and non-uniformed sectors. This resulted in 125 positions being retired, predominantly from the Corporate Service sector. Later that year, 95 operational positions were made redundant which by fire service standards was unprecedented in this country.

On the 3rd of February 1993 the Public Bodies Review Committee was requested by the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Hon P. J. McNamara, MP, to review the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board, Melbourne.
The terms of reference related to:

- The strategic location of Brigade resources.
- The effectiveness of its current computer aided dispatching system.
- The potential for sharing of support facilities.

The Parliamentary Committee Act 1968 also requires the Committee to:

- Report to Parliament whether or not the body (MFBB) should cease to exist.

Following months of submissions from the Brigade and other interested parties, a final report was tabled in 1994. The following is an extract from the executive summary and some of the recommendations made by the committee:

**Executive Summary**

- "Emergency services must be provided effectively and fairly.
- The community is not concerned about the basis of the organisation or the structure of the organisation and, consequently, historical arrangements should not be allowed to impede changes which offer improved service delivery and lower costs".

**Recommendations extract**

- "The Committee recommends that the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board continue to exist.
- It is inappropriate for an emergency service provider to develop its own standards, core objectives and functions. These should be the responsibility of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.
- Performance monitoring standards should be established.
- The Board extend its role to include emergency medical services."
• The Government act urgently to make the existing system of funding the fire service fair and equitable.
• The Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board remain a statutory authority, and
• The Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board be reviewed in five years time".

(Public Bodies Review Committee, Parliament of Victoria, 1994, pp. IV-V)

These and other recommendations of the committee have resulted in significant changes to the work environment of all employees both uniformed and non-uniformed. Downsizing and outsourcing have continued following the above report.

1.7 STAFFING

The following table and figure identifies the total number of staff including Corporate Service staff employed by the Brigade from 1980 to 1996. Corporate Service staffing levels are also independently provided. The changes in the staffing levels are indicative of management and technology initiatives.

Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td>2317</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSS = Corporate Service staff, not including Fire Equipment Service personnel

Total includes any temporary staff

As can be seen from Table 1.1 and Figure 1.1, Corporate Service staff as a percentage of total staff rose steadily from 11 per cent in the early 1980’s to 15.8 per cent by 1991. Over the past 5 years total staffing levels have been significantly reduced by some 523 personnel. The Corporate Service staffing levels have reduced to a level similar to that of the 1980’s; approximately 11.9 per cent.

To date downsizing has occurred within every department of the Brigade. In 1994, the Fire Equipment Services section of the Brigade was corporatised. This department was responsible for fire fighting equipment maintenance within buildings under contract.

The department also provided fire patrols at public and theatre venues as legislated. Corporatisation resulted in opportunities for some of the eighty former employees of this department to partake in a contracted venture, whereas others were made redundant. More recently the printing, tailoring and stationery functions of the Brigade have been outsourced.
Table 1.2

Staffing as of 30th June 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Hazard Safety</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Secretariat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1785</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures represent 1551 operational (uniformed) staff, 214 Corporate Service (non-uniformed) staff and 20 temporary staff (Source: MFB Personnel Department).

Corporate Service staff are distributed throughout the organisation though they are predominantly employed within the Technical Services, Human Resources and Finance Directorates, and include: secretarial, clerical, storeman, fleet manager, radio technician, computer programmer, occupational therapist, social worker, mechanic, librarian, accountant, financial, clerical, property manager, occupational health and safety and a variety of other skilled occupations. These staff are considered specialists within their respective departments and form an interesting mixture of white and blue collar workers. The blue collar workers are assigned to the Technical Services Directorate.
1.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter has outlined the MFB's organisational history, mission, funding, staffing arrangements and executive management structure, all of which are influenced by environmental pressures.

The following briefly outlines the thesis format.

In Chapter 2 the literature relative to Government reform, culture and change, outsourcing and downsizing will be reviewed. Chapter 3 will outline the purpose of the research. Problem definition, generation of the theoretical framework and hypothesis development are discussed in this section.

The methodology and study design used in this research will be described in Chapter 4. The procedure, sample population and questionnaire design are discussed and data analysis methods explained. This will be followed in Chapter 5 by a summary of the results of the survey questionnaire.

In Chapter 6 the results, as they relate to the independent variables, will be discussed in detail and then used to tests the hypotheses.

In the final Chapter - Chapter 7 - the conclusion summarises the results in terms of the value of the research, limitations and future research possibilities.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the body of literature reviewed as it relates to Public Sector reform, culture, change, outsourcing and downsizing. From this, several research questions will be identified.

Organisations invariably go about their business in their own peculiar way often referred to as "the way of doing things around here", (Deal & Kennedy 1982, p.59). However there have been some significant impacts and opportunities for the private and public sectors more recently, particularly in light of the Federal and State Governments’ reform agendas. The following literature review draws upon the views of some well known authors on the subject of change, the influence that culture plays within organisations and the impacts of downsizing and outsourcing strategies within organisations.

2.2 PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Following the departure of the Labour Government in 1992, the Liberal National Party Coalition set about to reduce Victoria’s debt problems. The April mini budget of 1993 set the regime for a smaller public sector that was to outsource where possible (O’Sullivan, Ed 1993).

The public sector debt containment strategy included:-

- Public sector superannuation costs.
- Review of non-essential government activities.
• Improved return from government trading enterprises.
• Contracting out or privatisation (O’Sullivan Ed, 1993; Kennett 1994).

Approximately 70 per cent of public sector departmental operating costs are direct labour costs, and therefore continuing reduction in outlays required major downsizing of the budget sector work-force through voluntary and targeted redundancy programs through 1993 - 94.

The adoption of outsourcing strategies in order for the MFB to become more cost effective and improve productivity were also implemented.

The long run strategy of these reforms is to restore Victoria’s AAA credit rating to ensure the State is in the best position to take advantage of opportunities for joint ventures, and infrastructure improvements with increases in business activity and employment growth (Kennett 1994).

From a Federal perspective, Beazley (1995) highlights the reforms within the Federal arena which have also included the corporatisation and privatisation of publicly owned assets, to improve competition. The key goal was to “break down monopolies”. In some cases the Government opened its activities to business and in others the Government divested itself of business. It was simply a matter of determining which activities were core to the Government’s role.
Other Federal and State reform initiatives include:-

- Accountability.
- Resource management.
- Financial management.
- Empowerment.
- Career development.
- Service delivery.


2.3 CULTURE

2.3.1 IN SEARCH OF A DEFINITION OF CULTURE

Opinions on what constitutes culture are mixed. Some authors see culture as intangible shared meanings and basic assumptions, others as tangible forms, and others again as a mixture of observable and non-observable meanings and assumptions (Lewis 1994).

Culture at its lower level, as defined by Rubin (1996, p.253), is the result of a series of often "semiconscious agreements" about how people agree with one another. Any organisational culture profile, therefore, is nothing more than the cumulative effects of how people choose to behave toward one another and the emotions which are evoked as a consequence.

This view is shared by Kotter (1994) who adds that culture represents an independent set of values and ways of behaving that are common in a community, that tend to
perpetuate themselves, sometimes over long periods of time. This continuity is the product of a variety of social forces that are frequently subtle, bordering on invisible, through which people learn a group's norms and values. Individuals are rewarded when they embrace them, and are banished and excluded when they do not.

Organisational culture is considered as having two levels, which differ in terms of their "visibility and their resistance to change" (Kotter 1994, p.19). At the deeper and less visible level, culture refers to values that are shared by people in a group and that tend to persist over time even when the group members change. At this level culture can be difficult to change. At the more visible level, culture represents a behaviour model that new employees are automatically encouraged to follow by their fellow employees. This view is supported by Lahiry (1994) Shafritz and Ott (1987) and Thomson (1991).

Tosti and Jackson (1994, p.59) identified that culture is not just about tasks performed or what people do, but also about "the way they do it and how they behave as they perform it". Culture refers primarily to behaviour patterns that people tend to bring to any assignment or decision. Changing an organisation's culture then would seem to have the potential for long term sustained benefits compared with changing its products, services or delivery methods.

Although there is no common thread amongst all theorists, the views espoused by Edward Schein are widely referenced.
An organisation's culture is a pattern of basic assumptions "invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration" (Schein 1983, p.14) which, to be considered valid, will therefore be taught to new members of the community as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

Schein's (1986) book "Organisational Culture and Leadership" provides a framework of aspects of organisational culture:

- Observed behavioural regularities, such as when and how people interact within organisations, the language used and the rituals.
- The group norms that evolve in working groups, such as what is a fair day's work.
- The dominant values espoused, such as service quality, response times or leadership.
- The organisational rules of the game, such as the ropes a newcomer must learn in order to be accepted.

Hence the culture of an organisation is comprised of many tangible things such as values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, behavioural norms, and patterns of behaviour (Shafritz & Ott 1987; Robbins & Barnwell 1989; Deal & Kennedy 1982; Kotter 1994).

"It is the social energy that moves people to act" (Shafritz & Ott, 1987, p.373; Britton 1992). Lahiry (1994, p.50) strikes an interesting analogy in stating, "Culture is to organisations what personality is to the individual - a hidden yet unifying theme that provides direction, meaning and mobilisation", shaping people's behaviours. Kleiner and Corrigan (1989, p.27) describe the culture of an organisation as a prism through
which its management views the world. Vielba (1995) however claims managers do not have a full understanding of cultural concepts and found managers have difficulty discussing the underpinning’s of their own organisational culture.

In a 1983 journal article, Wilkins and Ouchi (p.469) take a pragmatic view of culture and refer to it as a “clan” and argue that an organisation which develops a distinct local culture or clan will have significant performance efficiencies. “Functional groups or small organisations will develop thick social understandings that are specific to the organisation”. Schein (1983) states that a reasonably long history and stable relationship is required to produce organisations or units within which complex social understandings will develop. This would therefore see the emergence of subcultures.

It would therefore seem that the longer the history of a unit with a stable membership, the more likely that one generation of members would pass on knowledge to successive generations. This is the beginning of the institutionalisation of social knowledge. (Wilkins & Ouchi 1983; Robbins & Barnwell 1989).

2.3.2 PUBLIC SECTOR

The difference between public and private organisations has been widely documented. The political nature of public administration and resulting accountability to an amorphous and complex client group (Painter 1988) and the importance of equity, as well as efficiency in the delivery of services, highlight these differences (Sinclair 1991).
In the public sector culture, the management area is the centre of all undertakings, which themselves are combined, hierarchical and structured. "The new culture of development should seek to recognise, from a more fragmented, systematic perspective, the democratic supremacy of the population area, and place it at the centre of all undertakings" (DeCelles 1995, p.31). This type of culture is only possible if managers themselves find the courage to shift development back in the right direction. To do this, they must take up the challenge of interactive learning.

Whilst it can be recognised that both the public and private sectors cater to the specific needs of their client base, the Public Sector is becoming increasingly aware of the important role culture plays in performance. This has influenced the content and strength of existing cultures and sub-cultures in Public Sector organisations, and is particularly evident in departments which are service orientated and now client focused. The present culture of the fire service supports this view as there has been a dramatic shift or realignment of values and beliefs that have surfaced following a bitter industrial dispute evolving from increased community service provisions.

2.3.3 SUB CULTURES

Organisations as a rule also have sub cultures which are usually associated with different functional groupings or geographic locations (Kotter & Heskett 1992). There is a potential for conflict when these groups combine because, whilst possibly sharing a generic organisational culture, a divisional culture may vary to some degree depending upon the behaviour in the group (Harvey & Brown 1992; Robbins & Barnwell 1989).
The fire service has numerous sub cultures throughout the organisation, all of which are unique.

2.3.4 CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Groups do not form accidentally or spontaneously. During the infancy stage of organisational development, "its founder or leader creates a group and by force of his/her personality, begins to shape the group’s culture", however, not until it has experienced growth and survival (Schein 1983, p.13).

Schein (1983, p. 17) proposes four stages of Cultural Development

1. An idea by the founder.
2. Consensus by the group that the idea is of worth.
3. The raising of funds, obtaining patents, etc.
4. An influx of expertise depending upon what is needed.

The basic model of culture formulation is that someone must propose a solution to a problem that a group faces. When the solution works, it will be accepted as a cultural element. There are numerous processes in the fire service that are carried out in this manner, whereas some processes have not altered since inception of the resolution. Efficiency is not part of the system when a method or workable solution is adopted.

The ultimate organisational culture, according to Schein (1983, p.14), will always reflect the complex interaction between:-

1. “The assumptions and theories the founder brings to a group, and
2. What the group learns subsequently from its own experiences".
Organisational culture is about developing shared assumptions between groups and individuals about the world in which they live. The organisation must face internal and external environments and associated problems based on the following:

**External Adoption**

1. Consensus on tasks.
2. Consensus on goals.
3. Consensus on means to accomplish goals.
4. Consensus on measurement.
5. Consensus on remedial strategies.

**Internal Integration**

1. Language.
2. Consensus on boundaries “who is who”.
3. Power and status.
4. Intimacy and friendship.
5. Rewards and punishment.
6. Ideology.

(Schein 1983; Kotter 1994).

If an individual wants to identify an element of a given culture, one needs only to ask how a group views “...its core mission, its goals, the way it accomplishes those goals, the measurement system and procedures it uses, the way it remedies actions, the jargon and measuring system, reward system and ideology” (Robbins & Barnwell 1989, p.316).
The fire service is no exception to this rule of thumb. Much could be learned by asking these simple questions and drawing a conclusion from the responses. This is a typical framework by which most organisations function.

A model of organisational culture that emerges is one of shared solutions which work well enough to be taken for granted, become intrusive, and are taught to new members as the way to view things. This is the beginning of cultural training (Shader & Fox 1992).

Schein (1983) and Robbins and Barnwell (1989) have identified a basis upon which new members learn and develop.

- stories
- rituals
- logos
- material symbols
- language

In mature cultures, understanding how group members view the world and understanding the basic underlying assumptions, lies within the following: "The groups relationship to the environment, nature of reality, nature of human nature, the nature of human capacity, and nature of human relations" (Robbins & Barnwell 1989, p.320).
Organisational culture, then, is the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problem of external adoption and internal integration. Patterns of assumptions that have worked well and are considered sound are therefore taught to new members as the correct way to perceive them and feel in relation to those problems.

2.4 CHANGE

Whilst a culture within a system/organisation may remain functional and static for long periods, an organisation may need to make adjustments in response to the pressures imposed by the external environment in which it operates. The challenge is deciding how to make the transition in such a manner that the organisation remains adaptive to its changing external environment without destroying cultural elements that have given it its personality and that have made life fulfilling in the internal environment.

The existing culture of an organisation must be analysed, and an understanding of the role culture plays in an organisation is essential to the successful implementation of any change (Robbins & Barnwell 1989; Kleiner & Corrigan 1989; Cook 1990; Smeltzer 1995).

The search for, and choice of, alternative practices that are consistent with values and the effort to preserve an organisation's particular competence is not always an easy task, and will almost certainly result in realignment (Gagliardi 1986).
Kotter (1994, p. 19) claims, “cultures that are not adaptive take many forms. In large organisations they are often characterised by some arrogance, insularity and bureaucratic centralisation, all supported by a value system that cares more about self-interest than its customers, stakeholders, employees or good leadership”. In such cultures, managers tend to ignore relevant contextual changes and cling to dated strategies and rigid practices. They make it difficult for anyone else, especially those below them in the hierarchy, to implement new and better strategies and practices. This practice in the past has stifled innovation and creativity in the fire service.

A new workplace culture rests upon three fundamental factors:

- “Trust, and a faith in the power of people to perform.
- A joint commitment to firm realistic goals and standards to perform to, and
- Leadership which drives vision” (Warburton 1990, p. 38).

This establishes a framework for change which focuses on the positive aspects of organisational development.

2.4.1 PUBLIC SECTOR CHANGE

Political and economic pressures have produced dramatic change in the way Government policy is administered and managed. With increasing attention on how to deliver more with less, and the impact of outsourcing, the usual administrative reforms are being implemented. Restructuring and rationalisation, financial accountability and management information systems, human resource management techniques such as
contract management, performance appraisal, and codes of ethics (Stewart & Clarke 1987).

The fire service is not insulated from these processes, and has had to react to the changing internal and external environment. This has included cultural adjustment and re-evaluation which has been short on success. The organisation has been confronted with resistance by industrial intervention.

This issue is identified by Warburton (1990) who states that just as the world in general has had to change and restructure, so must our industrial relations system, and employer/employee attitudes. “The fact that you must force things to a dispute to achieve conciliation or arbitration is in itself adversarial and over the years has helped perpetuate the unhealthy them versus us attitude that abounds in Australia” (p.35). Hence industrial relations plays a key role in any change process within the enterprise through negotiations between managers and work-force representatives as well as possibly in the wider sphere of organised unionism and employer associations (Patrickson, Bamber & Bamber 1995).

DeCelles (1995, pp. 24-28) states, “public organisations must reinvent, rediscover and redefine the underlying precepts, as far as actual values and attitudes are concerned, to enable them to deal with the problems of adaptation and internalization in adjusting to today's issues”. These rules are radically different from those that, until recently, were the basis of previous successes.
Ongoing adaptation with periodic stability is necessary, but often unnatural to public organisations. In day-to-day practice, there is the primacy of the management area over all others. Acceptance of change can be improved, where conditions which minimise potential threats or discomfort of a proposed change are implemented. These include careful planning and thorough communication of the change to the target individual, group or system. A climate where people are involved in the change rather than coerced will further improve the probability of success (Patrickson, Bamber & Bamber 1995; Kotter & Heskett 1992; Harvey & Brown 1992).

2.4.2 CHANGE FACTORS

There are a number of factors which impact upon internal and external environments which may result in some realignment, they include:

- moves toward more international trade, competition and globalisation of economic units;
- increasing technological change in processes and products;
- demands for more widespread participation in decision-making by various stakeholders;
- the move toward deregulation, tariff reduction, privatisation and micro economic reform;
- progressively severe economic recessions in the early 1980s and the early 1990s;
- calls for greater gender equality in employment opportunities and career development;
- growth in the number and power of non-traditional organisational stakeholders, eg. women, ethnic minorities, governments, consumers, conservationists, and
increases in the cost of capital, adding further to the increasing pressures for higher returns investment and cost reduction (Patrickson, Bamber & Bamber 1995, p.1).

Evidence clearly shows that major cultural change does not happen easily or quickly, especially in large organisations. Kotter (1994) and Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) claim few organisational change efforts tend to be complete failures, however, few tend to be entirely successful.

2.4.3 LEADERSHIP

"The single most visible factor that distinguishes major cultural changes that succeed from those that fail is competent leadership at the top" (Kotter & Heskett 1992, p.84).

Kotter claims that the very best management cannot produce major change by itself. Only with leadership does one get the boldness, the vision and the energy needed to create large and difficult changes, and cultural change certainly tends to be large and difficult (Kotter 1994).

In cases studied, major change began after an individual who already had a track record for leadership was appointed to head an organisation. Each of these individuals had previously shown the capacity to do more than manage well. They knew how to produce change and were willing to do just that (Kotter 1994). Without leadership, purposeful change of any magnitude is almost impossible.

This is not an isolated view, Kleiner and Corrigan (1989) espouse the opinion that the hallmark of successful firms is that their executive leadership is pro-active in
recognising the need for change as a necessity for survival and processes the vision and
courage to take required action. “Any implementation of a new strategic direction has
cultural implications,” (Roberts 1996).

2.4.4 CHANGE STRATEGY

There are many strategies for implementing change, however, as Kotter and Heskett
(1992) pointed out, one of the most widely publicised strategies involves support and
empowerment. “A manager or new leader creating a team that would establish a new
vision and set of strategies for achieving that vision. The leader would succeed in
gaining support and influencing groups to commit themselves to the new direction and
energise and empower people to make it happen” (p.84). Using this approach hundreds
could be involved to make the changes in strategies, policies, personnel, and eventually
culture (Crofts & Onsman 1996).

Others claim that by “changing the rituals, stories, material symbols and language we
ought to also be able to change the culture” (Robbins & Barnwell 1989, p.323).

Change may also begin with the perception or experience of some environmental threat,
loss of opportunity or the establishment of a crisis. This places the organisation in a
state of uncertainty about the future, be the threat true or false, potentially the desired
result is the same (Kleiner & Corrigan 1989; Kotter 1994).
There are three basic types of change:

*Developmental change:* an improvement on the old way of doing things, with the aim of doing more or doing things better, eg: refining policies, methods and procedures.

*Transitional change:* an implementation of a known new state which requires rearranging or dismantling old operating methods. It is generally planned, the desired outcome is known and the change occurs within a set time frame, eg: new product line, new technology, automation.

*Transformational change:* the most profound and traumatic, and the least understood. Such change is typically initiated when an organisation is reaching a plateau and is driven by shifts of strategy. Change is revolutionary and is implemented rapidly in bursts and will result in the following:

- Reformed mission and core values.
- Altered power and status.
- Reorganisation.
- Revised interaction patterns.
- New executives.

(Kleiner & Corrigan 1989 p.27).

An acceleration of change will result in an increased need for reorganisation.

Reorganisation is usually feared by members of a group because it means disturbance
of the status quo, a threat to people's vested interest in their jobs and a potential to upset the established ways of doing things (Kotter & Schlesinger 1979).

The most common mistake made by managers is the use of only one change strategy approach (Harvey & Brown 1992).

2.4.5 EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT COERCION.

Managers may force people to accept change by explicitly or implicitly threatening them (with loss of jobs, promotional opportunities and so forth) or by actually firing or transferring them.

Using coercion is a risky business as people strongly resent forced change. However, where speed is essential and change will not be popular, regardless of how it is introduced, coercion may be the manager's only option (Harvey & Brown 1992).

Given the events that have taken place in the last 12 months where the MFB has attempted to introduce new activities and services, the above strategy has been clearly identified on a number of occasions. The ramifications have also been considered.

2.4.6 RESISTANCE

"From the frying pan into the fire", "Let sleeping dogs lie", and "You can't teach an old dog new tricks", are all well known sayings borne out of the fear of change (Kotter & Schlesinger 1979, p.106). These are the words of people who are usually ingrained within an existing culture who will undoubtedly resist or reject change. From a Public Sector perspective, a resistance to change is considered by many to be a "hallmark of
bureaucratic organisations, which stems from their formalisation, budgetary and personnel processes which favour inertia and immortality rather than adaptability" (Sinclair 1991).

2.4.7 DIAGNOSIS OF RESISTANCE

Managers need to assess systematically who might resist the change effort and for what reason, to accurately predict what form of resistance may take place. Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) and Harvey and Brown (1992) identify several reasons for resistance.

- a desire not to lose something of value;
- a misunderstanding of the change and its implications;
- a belief that the change does not make any sense for the organisation;
- a low tolerance for change;
- fear of the unknown;
- lack of potential benefits;
- loss of status and security;
- disruption of routine;
- conformity to norms and culture.

Resistance to change is a complex rather than simple problem.

When people believe that they will be treated fairly and honestly, they will be quite willing to experience and trial new ideas. However, on the other hand when the paradigm doesn’t change but people begin to believe that others will attempt to take advantage of them, they seem quite resistant. Such situations occur when trust is lacking.
between the person making the change and the employees (Wilkins & Ouchi 1983).

Rubin (1996, p.248) warns that too often the focus is on “changing attitudes, not
behaviour”, without instructions or suggestions on how to gauge that change.

Resistance to change is usually “a reaction to methods employed in implementing
People tend to resist changes that do not make sense to them or that are forced upon
them against their will.

Quillen (1995) has another view and suggests people within an organisation who foster
change are frequently rule-breakers. Employees should be encouraged to speak out and
share concepts. It is also critical to remember that while rule breakers may reside within
the management team, they may also be a lot further down in the hierarchy. Effective
rule breakers may initiate resistance by stealth.

Where an organisation's culture is totally dysfunctional, it may be necessary to destroy
the culture completely and replace it with a new functional culture. It may be a last
resort. Cook (1990) and Robbins and Barnwell (1989) agree, and claim top
management may even resort to demoting or dismissing individuals who are rigidly
locked into the current culture and replacing them with individuals who accept and
promote the values that are sought. Yet change only occurs when the new membership
embraces the new values and ideas.
If an organisation changes to the extent that it imports new personnel and symbols, Gagliardi (1986) suggest that this strategy constitutes the death of the old firm and the birth of a new one, rather than a transformation of the old firm. "When a value postulated by a new strategy is antagonistic towards an older one, a real cultural revolution is needed" (p.129). This is always extremely costly and necessitates the large-scale defection of old and an influx of new, including the destruction of old symbols and the creation of new ones.

Change as a paradigm is a difficult process and requires a broader range of skills than may be apportioned to the generalist manager, particularly where trust is lacking. Resistance can take many forms and may result in a total realignment of the organisation's internal environment.

2.5 OUTSOURCING

The strategy of outsourcing for structural realignment is not new. Throughout the course of business history, corporations have wisely relied upon outside organisations to perform legal, advertising, accounting, construction, recruiting and a host of other tasks. The purposes of which include: cost cutting, convenience, minimising or avoiding problems and acquiring skills for a special problem (Jacobs 1994; Forshaw 1991).

Contracting out, or outsourcing as it is more widely known, is on the increase. This phenomenon is not limited to the Public Sector. Increasingly "private sector firms are outsourcing" (Domberger 1994) for the supply of goods and services from the market.
For the Public Sector the choice to outsource is somewhat complex. Decisions are based upon “cost and quality, accountability of the service provider and whether contractual or bureaucratic processes are more effective in meeting policy goals” (Houghton 1991; Lyon 1994; Rimmer 1994).

Whilst the above conditions may also prevail within the Private Sector, competition within the market provides the incentive for firms to choose the “least cost” option, a view supported by Prager (1994) and Jacobs (1994).

In 1993 a survey of all New South Wales (NSW) Government agencies reported savings as a result of outsourcing of approximately 23 per cent compared to previous expenditures according to Domberger (1994). Critics have acknowledged and argued that savings may be obtained, albeit at the expense of quality and service. However, it was identified in the NSW study that “more agencies reported a higher level of satisfaction with contractor effectiveness” (Domberger 1994). Thus service appeared not to be traded for savings.

Jacobs (1994) expresses a view that efficiencies have not been made because of the need for high level monitoring. This is seen as one of the negative aspects of outsourcing.

The impact of contracting out is ambiguous. Domberger (1994) claims that on one hand contracting out results in job losses, as contractors economise on the use of labour. However, on the other hand it is now common for the successful tenderer to provide job opportunities for the casualties of the process.
Prager, in his 1994 article, "Lessons from the private sector", highlights the following examples of corporate giants who have outsourced activities.

Boeing considered itself as a design and assembly outfit and therefore most of the company’s components requirements are contracted out, even Boeing’s parts contractors subcontract further. In another example, following the 1991 restructure, General Motors sought outside contractors to produce many of the parts previously produced internally.

Outsourcing in the private sector however is not limited to parts or products; services too are actively sought. McDonald Douglas contracted out all of its information services to IBM and Businessland, British Petroleum outsources a sector of its finance division to Arthur Andersen (Prager 1994).

Organisations in both the private and public sectors are realigning their work-force to reflect core competencies; it is, therefore, evident that a decision to outsource major inputs to service delivery or major elements of service delivery is a strategic one (Lyon 1994; Fryklund 1994; Jacobs 1994; Houghton 1991).

Jacobs (1994) believes once the strategic decision has been made the next step is identification of the current activities for contracting and the evaluation process starts with clerical, maintenance and other support activities. Yet, despite outsourcing’s growth and popularity, it is frequently poorly controlled, high in cost and a drain on quality and service performance (Jacobs 1994; Bing 1995; Falconi 1995; Houghton 1991; Russell & Stevenson 1995; Strassmann 1995).
Even these considerable problems do not address the traumatic impact on the displaced employee, a victim of the outsourcing decision. Outsourcing brings with it a period of adjustment in the economy. The traditional work security of a large corporation may become a fond memory as the growth of the job market is with contracting companies and ventures in service activities.

2.6 DOWNSIZING

Downsizing, as defined by Cascio (1993, p. 95) refers to “the planned elimination of positions or jobs”. Downsizing may occur by reducing work (not just the employees) as well as by eliminating functions, hierarchical levels or units. It may also occur by implementing cost containment strategies that streamline activities such as transaction processing, information systems or sign off policies (McDowell 1995).

During the past decade, organisations in the USA have gone about the business of restructuring and downsizing with increased regularity. Downsizing as a concept was to be the first in a number of strategic decisions made by corporate USA in order to boost productivity and competitiveness, and to develop long term visions within the organisational markets (Maiden 1996; Roach 1996).

Mergers and acquisitions resulting from restructuring and tight economic conditions of 1982 had resulted in approximately two million USA workers being layed off between the early 1980’s and 1991 (Overman 1991). This has seen entire layers of management eliminated to streamline organisations. The hierarchical pyramid has been flattened in an attempt to make organisations more effective. “Career hopes and individual
aspirations were likewise flattened” in this process of continual change (McClelland & Wilmont 1990).

Australia is following the trend of the USA, in that many of the nation’s major corporations commenced their restructuring programs as early as 1989. The four major banks, in the past five years, have reduced their corporate size by some 25,000 positions. The Public Sector is embracing this notion of a leaner and meaner work-force, particularly Victoria, and the Federal Government has announced its intention to eliminate some 30,000 positions (Lateline, ABC, 1996).

There are however some success stories, such as the Newport Power Station which went through a massive restructure and corporatisation which saw a reduction in staff from 1,300 in 1980, to 150 in 1992, and a present day staffing of forty five. Mr Charles Harvey, Manager Newport Power, claimed that this facility is globally competitive and is seen as a leader internationally in its business (Lateline, ABC, 1996).

In terms of organisational benefit, proponents of downsizing cite six expected outcomes

• Lower overheads.
• Less bureaucracy.
• Faster decision making.
• Smoother communications.
• Greater entrepreneurship.
• Increased productivity.
However, DeLacy (1993) believes that downsizing has failed to produce the expected outcomes and cites examples of Eastman Kodak, Westinghouse and Sears, all of whom have undergone severe restructuring only to see continuing earnings problems through increases in overtime and staffing levels, which are returning to pre-downsizing figures. Organisations are starting to come to grips with the reality that downsizing is not only bad for the individual, but may be very harmful for the corporation as well. This view is also shared by Pond (1995).

Professor Nitin Nohria of Harvard University compiled a study of one hundred major USA corporations and found that 86 per cent had downsized their operations and subsequently their work-force. It was identified that when organisations downsize across the board as a cost cutting strategy for purely financial reasons, these corporations were not well received by the stock market, nor did they, in the long run benefit in terms of improved productivity or performance (Late Line, ABC, 1996).

"There is not one shred of evidence that downsizing has anything whatsoever to do with productivity" (Littler 1996).

Further studies have concluded that little more than 30 per cent of organisations achieve their goals of increased productivity through downsizing. Firms such as A T & T, General Electric and Ford Motor Company have succeeded in alienating many of their staff and employee morale and loyalty were among the long term problems of post downsizing (Cameron, Freeman & Mishra 1991; Cascio 1993; Clark & Koonce 1995; De Lacy 1993; Feldman 1989; Greenberg 1988; Greenhalgh, Lawrence & Sutton 1988;
One of the major issues confronting the new managerialists of today is the impact of downsizing upon the survivors. Organisational scholars and practitioners have devoted considerable attention to the topic with theoretical and applied importance (Brockner 1992; Greenhalgh 1983; McClelland & Wilmont 1990) the relevance of which is testimony of the impact downsizing can have upon current and future organisational performance. After all, “it is the reactions of the employees who remain, that will dictate the organisation’s effectiveness” (Brockner 1992; Feldman 1989).

Voluntary severance and early retirement packages are commonly used to reduce the size of the work-force, especially among firms with traditional “no-lay off ” policies. Whether the targeted workers are called “redundant”, “excessed” or “transitioned”, the result is the same: employees are shown the door, it’s just called something else.

Work-force reduction is a common strategic response to organisational decline. For example, Zammuto and Cameron (1985) recommended that organisations facing sudden resource scarcity should use a strategy of domain consolidation reducing the scale of operations to protect their core markets, technologies and services (Brockner, Grover & Blonder 1988). In essence organisations, and in particular the survivors, invariably find that the workload is the same and in most instances greater (Imberman 1989; McClelland & Wilmont 1990; Lynn 1989).
These writers all agree that this rationale of more with less presents certain dangers. While some organisations prepare for the needs of the employees being released (through outplacement counselling, career counselling and job placement), many are unprepared for the strong emotions, lengthy adjustment time, diminished morale and lower productivity experienced by the survivors of massive restructuring.

In an article titled “Downsizing: Survivors Assessment”, Lynn (1989) identified that there are dangers in not realising or dealing with the needs of survivors. These needs depend upon the individual perceptions of the survivors to the downsize process. i.e., whether it provides “opportunities” and is therefore considered positive, or a “threatening” process filled with uncertainty.

There are a number of factors which affect survivors’ reactions to and perceptions of downsizing and layoffs which include: fairness, justification, the existing culture, communication channels, implementation, cutbacks across the entire organisation at all levels, and conciliation. Failure to respond adequately to employees’ assessment of the situation may result in:

1. Loss of the best people.
2. Burnout/stress-related illness.
3. Dysfunctional, manipulative, or bizarre behaviour.
4. Psychological withdrawal/ Lack of commitment.
Additional emotional fallout stems from the employees wanting to keep on working yet knowing that they are “powerless” to control their own “job security” (Greenhalgh 1983). Friends of those that may have been forced to leave the organisation increase their sense of loss. In a quote from a survey undertaken in a Fortune 500 service company, one employee stated: “Nothing ever happened around here” now becomes “I wonder what will happen to me” (Jacobs 1988).

An employee’s assessment of the fairness of the organisation’s work-force procedure is complicated by the underlying dynamics of attitude formation. Equity Theory, (Adams 1965) predicts that employees who believe that they have made a high contribution to the organisation would believe that they deserve high job security as an outcome (Greenhalgh 1983).

*High seniority, low productivity* workers see their primary contribution as “years of loyal service and believe in a seniority system for choosing which employees to retain is equitable” (Greenhalgh 1983, p.434).

*Low seniority, high productivity* workers see their primary contribution in terms of “current levels of effort and performance and believe a merit system should be used.

The anger of those who feel they have been treated unfairly by the organisation adds to the job security crisis”. “The net effect is a change in employees’ work attitudes, which affect the productivity, stability and adaptability of the work-force” (Greenhalgh 1983
This phenomenon is partly the result of the incapacitating effect of high anxiety levels that has been established in laboratory experiments.

More than half of the 1,468 restructured companies surveyed by the Society of Human Resource Management (Cascio 1993) reported that employee productivity either stayed the same or deteriorated after the layoffs. Very few implemented downsizing in a way that improved their effectiveness.

In a poll conducted of 1,142 companies by the AMA (Brockner 1992; Cascio 1993) it was revealed that nearly half were badly or not well prepared for restructuring, with no policies for job retraining or redeployment. Many middle managers and lower level employees were alienated. The managers who remain after a downsizing often find themselves working in new, and not necessarily, friendly environments.

In a further study by the Rights Association in Philadelphia 74 per cent of workers were found to have low morale and a fear of future cut backs combined with a total distrust of management. One observer noted “people used to be able to count on the organisation and its stability, but the myth that institutions will take care of us has been shattered” (Cascio 1993; Jacobs 1988).

These studies and others, eg; Greenhalgh (1983) and Imberman (1989) reveal that surviving employees become narrow minded, self absorbed and risk averse. In many organisations which downsized in the late eighties and early nineties, managers are now shouldering the burden that two, three or even four managers carried in the past. There
are a number of major impasses of downsizing among the survivors: morale sinks, productivity drops and survivors distrust management. Generally, this is known as "survivor syndrome" (Littler 1996; Rice & Dreilinger 1991). Astute top management are belatedly coming to realise that one of their key tasks today is to re-establish high morale and improve motivation among the survivors burdened with extra duties in an uncertain environment.

In a teleconference interview (Lateline, ABC; 1996) Mr Steve Roach, a leading USA economist, investment banker and former supporter of downsizing claimed that the USA is stuck in the downsizing cycle of restructuring and has not embraced the rebuilding phase. This view was also supported by professor Craig Littler, of Queensland University. However, Mr Eric Greenberg management expert of the AMA who was also being interviewed believed that the cycle has finished and USA corporations are responding to the needs of the market by removing staff who do not fit the vision of the corporation, that being, consumer focused and quality oriented. However corporations are employing people who fit the vision on a one for one basis (Late line, ABC; 1996).

The 1995 AMA survey results identified that downsizing tended to be repetitive in that 72 per cent of companies surveyed have repeated the downsizing process (Pond 1995).
The following strategies have been identified as contributing to the successful implementation of downsizing strategies.

- Implementation by command from the top with recommendations from lower levels.
- Use of short term and long term strategies.
- Paying special attention to both those employees who lost their jobs and those who did not.
- Identification of excessive costs and inefficiencies.
- Reorganisation.
- Downsizing is viewed as a means to an end as well as a targeted end.
- Evaluation of relationships.
- Providing ample advance notice.
- Communication.
- Providing assistance.
- Empowerment.

(Cascio 1993; Brockner 1992; Silverthorne 1987)

Research conducted by Cameron, Freeman and Mishra (1991) identified that the most effective firms engaged in surgical procedures when downsizing. They identify exactly where redundancy, excess costs and inefficiencies existed, and targeted those areas specifically and they made available to any employees any associated data.
Downsizing must be planned and communicated and morale must be monitored before, during and after any downsizing. Open discussion, an opportunity to grieve and discuss the issues using clear and open communication lines, is vital. Improved communications and transition planning are the key. Survivor productivity and morale will be greater if the lay offs are viewed as fair (Brockner 1992; Wallfesh 1991; Wood 1990).

Loyalty is a concept that is ambiguous, according to Grosman (1989). It is very much in the eye of the beholder. An employee believes that loyalty on the part of the corporate employer means that he/she will be looked after. It means a long-term commitment by the employer. It means that as long as he/she does their job they will receive a decent wage, will work in a decent environment and will work for a decent employer. On the other hand, the corporate employer believes that the loyal employee puts a corporate interest above personal interests, is a team player, is trustworthy, is discrete and behaves in a way which is predictable - he or she is reliable.

Until recently, the implicit contract between a company and its management personnel was a simple one: work in exchange for job security (Lynn 1989; Grosman 1989). In other words, if a manager or other professional performed his or her job responsibilities at least to a minimal agreed standard, continued employment could be expected. We are entering a future that will encourage corporate disruption. Lifetime employment is dead. Short term and contract based employment represents the future. Overman (1991) suggests that companies will have to think more in terms of a divided work-force ie: core workers who are really part of the family and contingency workers who are not.
Terms, such as the use of “employer” and “employee”, implies an adversarial, subservient relationship. It conjures up a picture of the employer/boss and the subordinate /employee. In an era of participative management, such language becomes less acceptable. Instead of the “employee”, the term associate, team member or colleague softens the nature of the relationship.

In a corporate world that softens every blow with positive rhetoric about employees being members of the family, both employer and employee feel abject failure and guilt when they need to make decisions in a corporate interest contrary to the employee’s interest. Traditional concepts of loyalty will not survive (Grosman 1989).

2.7 CONCLUSION

This Chapter reviewed the literature which provides an understanding and background knowledge of reform, culture, change, downsizing and outsourcing strategies. The next Chapter, “Purpose of the Research”, outlines the problem definition as it relates to the MFBB. A theoretical framework is developed and explained and the generation of the hypotheses is undertaken.
CHAPTER 3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The image drawn by the community of its emergency service organisations is one which includes well drilled professionals in uniform arriving at a scene with 'high tech' equipment, lights flashing and sirens alerting surrounding traffic, all premised by the urgency of the situation. This of course is the image portrayed by the media and the perception espoused at times by emergency services themselves. Yet there is an entire infrastructure behind the facade of each service which is just as integral to the overall corporate objectives of the organisation as are the uniformed members, the Corporate Service staff.

Whilst there have been studies conducted directly relating to the uniformed sectors of emergency services, little if any previous research has been conducted within the corporate sectors of these organisations.

The aim of this research is to understand the impact of change, downsizing and outsourcing on Corporate Service staff within the MFB through:

- Examination of the underlying principles of culture and change.
- Developing an understanding of the impact that change, downsizing and outsourcing has upon organisations, and
- Identifying the existing levels of job satisfaction.
This study will build upon previous research which has identified changes in organisational commitment and satisfaction levels of individuals and groups following the implementation of downsizing and outsourcing strategies.

The 1987 studies of Brockner, Grover, Reed, Dewitt and O’Malley are of particular relevance, as their studies focused upon the impact of the survivors who remained following lay offs. Factors identified as being of particular interest included reduced levels of commitment, negativity and a sense of injustice.

3.2 MIND MAP

From the author’s review of the literature, a mind map (model of the current environment, effects of downsizing and outsourcing) was developed that would assist in developing a conceptual and theoretical framework.

The mind map identified:

- The survivors as the focal point following downsizing or outsourcing strategies.
- The intervening ability of the State and Federal Governments and their respective reform agendas.
- The casualties and various stakeholders.

The mind map provided the framework for a research proposal to investigate and identify the impact of change upon Corporate Service staff within public safety agencies, specifically the MFB.
It was upon the completion of this mind map that the research began to take shape. A copy of the mind map is provided in Appendix III.

From a personal perspective, this research has enhanced my knowledge of the behavioural factors which underpin an organisation such as the MFB and the potential impact upon its infrastructure.

It is envisaged that upon completion of this study, a framework through which the MFB may identify and formally recognise the impact of change upon employees, will have emerged. This is expected to assist in any future cultural realignment.

3.3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

From the literature review and general discussion with Corporate Service staff the following research problem was identified:

What has been the impact of downsizing and outsourcing upon the Corporate Service staff?

From this overall research question come the sub-questions:

- What is the current level of job satisfaction amongst Corporate Service staff within the MFB?
- What level of commitment currently exists?
- Is the current situation supported by the available literature?
A conceptual model of the problem is detailed below:

**Problem**

The MFB needs to identify the impact that downsizing and outsourcing has had upon its corporate work-force.

**Need**

This will require an understanding of culture, downsizing, outsourcing, Government reform and change strategy mechanisms.

**Innovation**

A pilot study of the impact of change upon Corporate Service staff.

**Outcome**

Awareness of the impact and issues which have affected Corporate Service staff and awareness of the impact of change. Identification and recognition of the current levels of satisfaction.

3.4 **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

From the literature, an image of the potential impacts of change through downsizing and outsourcing has emerged.

The most significant factor identified following downsizing and outsourcing was the impact upon the survivors and the systemic effects upon their welfare and job satisfaction.
Job satisfaction (the dependent variable) as it currently exists is the main focus of this study. Factors which have the potential to positively or negatively influence levels of job satisfaction have been identified as the independent variables (Sekaran 1992).

It can be expected that the higher the level of job satisfaction amongst employees, the more productive and successful the overall organisation will be. Success in many organisations can be measured by the level of employee commitment and willingness espoused by the collective individuals within a clan or team. Factors relating to this include: remuneration; security; perceived contribution value; relationships amongst peers, superiors and subordinates as the case may be; opportunities for advancement through training; perceptions of impending change and its impact (Robbins 1993).

The independent variables studied are:

- **Training and career opportunities.**
  
  The ability to attend training courses, which in essence provides future promotion opportunities, has been recognised as a major satisfier of career orientated personnel (Morton 1988; Shonk 1992)

- **Organisational Commitment.**
  

- **Reward.**
  
  May be financial or otherwise and identified by Maslow (1970), Herzberg et al (1959) and Adams (1965) as a contributor to motivation and satisfaction and a dis-satisfier.
• Willingness.

Defined as the ability to give voluntarily, and inclined to portray a positive outlook. (Barnhart & Barnhart 1982)

• Contribution Value.

Described as a person's sense of worth when applied to the ability to provide or supply for a common purpose and identified by Herzberg et al (1959).

• Security.

Identified by Maslow (1970) as one of the basic needs and by Lynn (1989) and Grosman (1989) as a potential demotivating factor where security cannot be guaranteed.

• Survivor impacts / psychological disorders


• Relationships.

Described as a sense of belongingness by Maslow (1970) and Kable (1988).

• Change.

Leading authors such as Schein (1983) describe change as a tool to be used for cultural realignment in response to the changes in the internal and external environment. It can have a positive or negative outcome.

Demographics 'the moderating variable' are a contributing factor to whether individuals and work groups are positively or negatively motivated (Brockner 1992; Cascio 1993; Greenhalgh 1983; Wellins, Byham and Wilson 1991).
Figure 3.1 Theoretical Framework Model
3.5 HYPOTHESIS

Hypotheses were generated following discussions with a number of Corporate Service staff who are currently assigned to the Training and Fire and Hazard Safety Directorates in Abbotsford, review of the current literature and/or previous studies.

It is hypothesised that:

1. The level of organisational commitment of Corporate Service staff will be high/positive.

   *This hypothesis will be tested through data analysis and focus group discussion.*

From my own perspective and experience within the MFB, on the surface all staff tend to share a common norm, (that being) that all staff, "uniformed and non-uniformed" are providing a valuable service to the community.

2. Satisfaction levels will be lower for those departments where downsizing and outsourcing has occurred and where a perceived lack of career advancement exists.

   *An ANOVA (analysis of variation) test will be used to test this hypothesis.*

Downsizing and outsourcing has predominantly occurred within the Technical Services Directorate. It is expected that job satisfaction levels within this department will be low.
Staff cutbacks will have led to increased workloads for Corporate Service staff.

This hypothesis will be tested through data analysis and focus group discussion.

This hypothesis has been identified as being a significant factor in previous research eg: Greenhalgh, Lawrence & Sutton (1988) and Imberman (1989).

3.6 CONCLUSION

Chapter 3 has defined the problem and established a theoretical framework.

The next chapter will outline the methodology utilised in this study. Questionnaire design, population sample and data analysis techniques will also be examined.
4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter information about the study design, procedure, sample population and data analysis methods is presented. The development and design of the questionnaire used to measure levels of job satisfaction are also described.

This study was conducted in order to identify the current levels of job satisfaction amongst Corporate Service staff following downsizing within the MFB.

4.2 STUDY DESIGN

The study was designed as a one shot correlational “non contrived” field study in which job satisfaction (the dependent variable) and training and career development, organisational commitment, remuneration, willingness, contribution value, job security, survivor impacts, relationships and change mechanisms (the independent variables) and general demographics (the moderating variable) were studied. The units of analysis for this study comprised individuals, dyads and groups. Sekaran (1992) outlines three main methods of data collection: observation, questionnaires and interviews. For the purposes of this study questionnaires and interviews (focus groups) were utilised. The latter was used to verify concepts identified following analysis of the questionnaire.
4.3 PROCEDURE

Steps undertaken in the procedure were:

• Informal discussion with university colleagues, university staff and general
discussion with peers within the MFB on the feasibility of a study.

• A mind map of the research proposal was developed. This was of great
assistance in defining the reference material to study, research questions, survey
group, qualitative and quantitative analysis, and theoretical framework. (See
Appendix III)

• Identification of the sample population from the MFB. Issues for consideration
included whether to study uniformed and or non-uniformed personnel.

• Questionnaire research and design.

• The Chief Fire Officer of the MFB, Mr Geoff Godfredson, was advised of the
proposal and gave his support to the project.

• The Ethics Committee of Victoria University examined the questionnaire and
passed it for general distribution.

• The questionnaire was reviewed by Mr Michael Gielewski of the mathematical
modeling department, Victorian University Footscray campus for content,
relevance and data computing capabilities.

• Consultation took place with Mr Keith Adamson (Director of Human Resources,
MFB) relative to survey sensitivity, and Mr Reg Myers of the Australian
Services Union (ASU) regarding industrial considerations.

Note: Mr Reg Myers (ASU) supported the project and requested a copy of the
survey upon distribution and access to the finalised results.
• A data base listing of all Corporate Service personnel was obtained from the personnel department of the MFB.

• The questionnaire was pilot tested by a small number of Corporate Service associates.

• The questionnaire was reviewed and altered.

• A letter of support was requested from Mr Adamson to advise MFB Corporate Service personnel on the organisation wide Email, that an academic study was being undertaken and that participation would be on a purely voluntary basis. (See Appendix IV)

• The questionnaire was distributed to a sample population and included an introductory letter outlining the survey purpose, support from executive management and anonymity and confidentiality provisions of the survey. (See Appendix V & VI)

• Distribution and return of the questionnaire was conducted through the internal mail system, using sealed envelopes. Two weeks were allowed for return.

• The majority of the responses were received within the time-frame deadline.

• Data was entered into Microsoft Excel for analysis.

• A “feel for the data” was obtained and two focus groups were held, each lasting approximately 1.5 hours with 5 - 8 participants per group. The groups were assembled from all departments.

• Advice was sought from Mr Michael Gielewski on using SPSS for data analysis.

• Results were analysed and the final report compiled.

• A thank-you message was provided via the internal E-mail to all Corporate Service staff who took the time to participate. (See Appendix VII)
The sample population, questionnaire design and data analysis techniques are now described.

4.4 SAMPLE POPULATION

It was decided to sample the entire Corporate Services population of the organisation, all 214 permanent and contract personnel as downsizing and rationalisation of the MFB had involved every department within the Brigade. Sekaran (1992, p. 253) states a sample population of approximately 136 would have been acceptable for this group. However, a high level of reliability was required, and therefore it was decided that every individual would be afforded the opportunity to participate. Temporary staff (20) were not included in this survey because of their limited exposure to the organisation and any changes that had taken place.

The MFBB, Board members (elected representatives of the Municipal Councils and Insurance companies) were also not afforded the opportunity to participate. The majority had only recently taken up their part time positions on the Board and had not been sufficiently exposed to the organisation for their comments to be of value to the study.

The sample population was dispersed throughout the five organisational Directorates: Operations/Emergency Response, Fire Safety, Human Resources, Finance and Technical Services. Representatives of the Office of the President of the Board were also invited to participate. (See Appendix II). The sample population comprised female and male employees.
4.5 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The questionnaire, (See Appendix VI), was designed on the basis of the following:

1. Discussion with a small group of Corporate Service staff on issues of change, downsizing and outsourcing.

2. Information supplied by personnel who were survivors of previous downsizing processes.

3. Results of previous research identified in the literature review and other academic papers.

4. Pilot study. The pilot study involved a small group of Corporate Services staff within my own directorate, (Fire Safety), where comments and opinions were solicited.

General demographics of the organisation and participants were sought. This first page of the questionnaire was a “tick the box” response. The benefit of such information is to compare the respective Directorates against representative levels of satisfaction through the variables, as some Directorates have experienced downsizing and outsourcing to a greater degree than others. This information would provide valuable feedback for the Directors.
The second section of the survey was designed to obtain information and data on the independent variables, a 5 point Likert scale was used. Using this scale, "respondents indicate the extent to which they either agree or disagree with a variety of statements" (Sekaran 1992, p.170).

Forty one questions relative to job satisfaction were structured based on previous academic studies, for eg: Brockner, Grover, Reed, Dewitt and O’Malley (1987), to obtain individual perceptions concerning:

- Opportunities for career advancement.
- Improvements or otherwise in existing levels of commitment.
- Equality among employees.
- Remuneration and incentives.
- Job security and expectations.
- Communication between organisational levels.
- Change and its impacts.
- Contribution value.
- Performance appraisal.
- Workload demands.
- Perceptions of management and relationships.
- Organisational relationships.
- Organisational feedback.
- Empowerment.
- Stress and guilt.
These issues were broadly categorised into the nine variables for analysis:

- Training and Career.
- Commitment.
- Remuneration.
- Willingness.
- Contribution value.
- Job Security.
- Survivor Impacts.
- Relationships.
- Change.

(Refer to Theoretical Framework Model, page 51).

Following approval from the University Ethics Committee and pilot testing, the final questionnaire was prepared for distribution.

There were twelve negatively worded (reverse scored) questions structured into the questionnaire, these were reverse scored. These questions remove the mechanical influences of questionnaire participation and encouraged participants to consider their responses. Negatively reversed questions also detect biases (Sekaran 1992, p.204).
4.6 DATA ANALYSIS

Two specific sets of data were collated from the sample population:

1. General demographics,
2. Perceptions about issues affecting current levels of job satisfaction.

The tools for analysis comprised Microsoft Excel and SPSS. General demographics were recorded using Microsoft Excel and graphs produced to show the variance between the groups and individuals.

Frequency distribution was used to summarise the responses to each question. The data were also analysed within the respective variables. The ratings scores for negatively worded questions were reversed. For all graphs (figures) the range 1-2 is considered low / negative and 4-5 considered high / positive (See Appendix VIII). This provided consistency for analysis and reader interpretation.

For the first hypothesis, organisational commitment, descriptive analysis is employed. The second hypothesis, variations of satisfaction amongst departments was obtained using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) through SPSS software to cross tabulate any significance between departments and specific responses (See Appendix IX). The third hypothesis, workload requirement, was tested through descriptive analysis and focus group discussion.
4.7 CONCLUSION

In this Chapter, the study design, sample population and data analysis techniques were identified. The next chapter will introduce the results of the study. Response rate, and gender will be discussed. The findings of the study will be introduced within the respective variable groupings.
CHAPTER 5 RESULTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present results of the study. The Chapter will begin with the analysis of the survey population. Several figures are then presented highlighting a strong preference for a particular response to the questionnaire within variable groupings. Limited discussion on these results occurs in this chapter. Following these figures, the remaining findings of question seven through to forty seven will be summarised, once again within the respective variable groupings. Full discussion of these findings will be undertaken in Chapter 6.

5.2 RESPONSE RATE

The entire population of the Corporate Service staff comprised a total of 214 personnel. Prior to the distribution of the survey, I was advised that four personnel were away on extended sick leave and would not participate in the study. Therefore a total of 210 questionnaires were distributed to the population. The personnel department of the Brigade have since advised that 16 additional personnel were on annual leave during the survey period.

In total 126 responses were received from an available population of 194 Corporate Service staff. This equates to a 65 per cent return. This exceeds the 50 per cent minimum response rate required of mail surveys for reliability (Zikmund 1994).
Figure 5.1  Response rate by department

Note: Human Resources and office of the President combined

Responses from Human Resources and the Office of the President were combined because of the low staffing numbers, (five) within the Office of the President. It was identified that this low figure may skew the ANOVA analysis.

Table 5.1  Response rate by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Return</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The department response on two surveys could not be identified.
Technical Services whilst being the largest work group recorded the second lowest response. This group has in the past been subjected to downsizing and outsourcing strategies. A large number of staff had indicated that they were not going to participate in any management survey and the response rate results demonstrate this negative attitude. Operations on the other hand was expected to provide a high response. This group is distributed across four independent work locations and only one response was received from each location.

The willingness of staff to respond has also been identified as a reflection of profession / occupation, as white collar staff provided a higher response rate overall than did blue collar staff. This issue requires further investigation though is beyond the scope of this study.

5.3 GENDER

The work force is unevenly distributed and is dominated by traditional male roles and male staffing within the largest work group, Technical Services. Human Resources, however, is predominantly staffed by females. The Corporate Service staff current gender ratio is 1.7:1 in favour of males.

The male population comprised 63 per cent of the corporate work-force. A 53 per cent response was received from this group. The female population comprised 37 per cent of the corporate work-force from which a 68 per cent response was received (See Figure 5.2). The number of additional comments provided on the questionnaire as well as the response rate would suggest that female staff welcomed the opportunity to participate and contribute to the study. These comments will be discussed later in Chapter 6.
The variation in gender response rate is attributed to the response of male staff within the Fire and Hazard Safety Directorate.

![Gender response graph](image)

**Figure 5.2 Gender response graph**

Whereas the average age group of respondents was between 31 and 35 years, the majority of respondents were from the 20-30 and 41+ age groups. These two groups alone account for 51 per cent of the respondents.

With respect to years of service, 62 per cent of respondents had been employed by the MFBB for less than 10 years, and 22 per cent of respondents had previously changed departments.

| Age Mean | 31-35 years |
| Years of Service Mean | 6-10 years |
The following is a brief presentation of responses to questions seven through forty-seven. These results have been arranged in the respective variable categories (See Theoretical Framework Model page 51).

**Note:** Scores for negatively worded questions were reversed. For all figures, the range 1-2 is considered low or a negative response, and 4-5 is considered high or a positive response (See Appendix VIII for all result figures).
5.4 TRAINING AND CAREER

Q7

![Graph showing frequency and cumulative percentage for responses to Q7]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.48

Q7 There is an opportunity for career advancement for me within the MFB

"Opportunities for career advancement", was considered by most (56 per cent) to be very low and is a negative result for the Brigade. However, 27 per cent of respondents did feel that the MFB offered them a career path. These responses were from the Finance, Human Resources and Technical Services Directorates. The Directors of Technical Services and Finance are career staff members, appointed internally. Corporate Service staff, to an extent, have acknowledged these appointments.
Figure 5.4 

**Opportunity to increase skill level (through training and development)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>87.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23: There is ample opportunity for me to increase my skill level through Training and Development courses.

Responses to question 23 demonstrated that “Training and Development courses” are seen as a Brigade strength. As will be discussed further in the next chapter, the Brigade is committed to educating and upgrading existing skill levels of all staff. Training and Development is resourced at a current cost of 3 per cent of budget. It is therefore not surprising that a positive response to this question was recorded. Although previously, as discussed in Question 7, the majority of staff perceived there were limited career opportunities.
5.5 COMMITMENT

Reductions in levels of commitment may result where individual needs are not identified (Lynn 1989). Literature eg: (Imberman 1989) also suggests that survivors will be expected to do more with less following downsizing and outsourcing. It was essential to this study to obtain the staff's current perceptions on productivity and performance.

Q 15

Figure 5.5  Productivity changes 1990-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.67

As shown in figure 5.5, 67 per cent of respondents indicated their individual productivity had increased since 1990. Responses to this question support the focus group discussions in that they perceive they are doing more with less assistance.
With 74 per cent of respondents strongly or very strongly disagreeing with the statement (I do just enough to achieve my performance objectives), the results of question 38 clearly demonstrate that Corporate Service Staff perceive that they were achieving much more than their performance objective requirements. This level of commitment is contrary to the previous studies of Greenhalgh (1983) and Imberman (1989).
5.6 RELATIONSHIPS

Figure 5.7 Importance of staff to organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35 The most important thing to this organisation is its staff.

Mean 3.68

It is maintained that as a consequence of having experienced a major restructuring or downsizing, employees will consider management no longer values them (Greenhalgh 1983; Jacobs 1988). This study found, however, that 68 per cent of respondents felt that staff were the most important thing to the Brigade. This view is also espoused by management.
5.7 WILLINGNESS

Brigade staff had previously been afforded the opportunity to apply for a voluntary departure during downsizing and outsourcing. However the possibility of having more requests for voluntary departure than are required has the potential to destabilise and demotivate the entire work-force (Brockner 1992; Cascio 1993; Grosman 1989; Jacobs 1988; Lynn 1989).

Q 19

![Graph showing willingness to accept a voluntary departure package](image)
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Figure 5.8 Willingness to accept a voluntary departure package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19 If given the opportunity, I would accept a Voluntary Departure Package (VDP).

Mean 3.45

If the MFB offered voluntary departure packages, currently, it could expect 20 per cent of respondents to apply as shown by figure 5.8. However, 50 per cent of respondents state that they would not apply, indicating a willingness to remain with the MFB. A further 30 per cent were undecided.
Q 41

![Bar chart showing frequency and cumulative percentage for responses to question 41.]
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Note: Reverse scored question.

Figure 5.9 Willingness to remain with the MFB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41 I am working for the MFB because I am unable to obtain employment elsewhere.

It was previously identified, on page 69, that the MFB prepares its staff for the future through development training, and possibly for employment opportunities external to the MFB. The suggestion that staff may be working for the MFB as they may be unable to obtain employment elsewhere was refuted by 85 per cent of respondents. This response clearly indicates staff are working for the MFB because they choose to be and not because of a lack of skill or employment opportunities elsewhere. Again a willingness to remain with the organisation is being demonstrated.
Maslow argued that organisations are not very good at satisfying growth or higher needs: (esteem and self actualisation) recognition, achievement, responsibility and the work itself (Hearn, Southey & Vecchio 1992).

Figure 5.10 Value of individual contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.93

Individual contribution is seen as a major factor in levels of satisfaction where people form part of a team (Robbins, 1993). The MFB espouses and operates as a system within itself where each component is reliant upon the next. Eighty three per cent of respondents to this question felt that their contribution to the organisation was important.
5.9 JOB SECURITY

It could be expected that if a person had secure employment, job satisfaction and motivation would increase.

Q 21

![Fear of future cutbacks graph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.59

Figure 5.11 shows that the potential impact of future cutbacks is causing concern for the majority of staff with 50 per cent of respondents very strongly or strongly agreeing, they and their associates fear future cutbacks. When considering the relationship between security, motivation and satisfaction in the above, a perceived fear of future cutbacks has the potential to destabilise morale.

Q21 Myself and a number of my associates are fearful of future cutbacks.
5.10 SURVIVOR IMPACTS

One of the recognised impacts of downsizing (Brockner, Grover & Blonder 1988; Greenhalgh 1983; Imberman 1989; McClelland & Wilmont 1990; Lynn 1989) is the increase in work load for the survivors.

Figure 5.12 Increase in individual work load following staff cuts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q44 My individual work load has increased following staff cuts.

Mean 3.65

When asked about individual work load, 60 per cent of the respondents perceived that their work load commitment had increased. DeLacy (1993) suggests that downsizing has failed to produce the expected outcomes, and that organisations are increasing staffing figures to pre downsized levels.
The likelihood of a successful change management strategy is increased where open communication between individuals and management levels is achieved.

Figure 5.13  Information regarding the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14  I am informed of what will happen in the future.

Information on what may transpire in the future produced a negative response as 59 per cent of the respondents perceived that they were uninformed of what will happen in the future, and only 18.6 per cent strongly or very strongly agreed that they were being kept informed of future developments.
Australia is not insulated from the pace of change. Advanced information and communications technologies, industrial reform, the composition of the work force, the nature of work in Australia and globalisation are issues which will continue to affect the nation and its work force.

Figure 5.14 Change as a personal challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.81

More than 76 per cent of Corporate staff saw change in response to the above conditions as a personal challenge. The technology revolution has completely altered the methods by which the corporate sector analyses its own performance. Data analysis techniques provide senior management with up-to-date information at the touch of a button. Technology and other change mechanisms will continue to challenge the work force.
5.12 OTHER RESULTS

The results of other questions did not record a response as significant as the findings already reviewed. However these results add to the study and are therefore included in the summary as follows. Once again responses have been presented according to variable groupings.

TRAINING AND CAREER

Question 37. Fourty six per cent of respondents believed the uniformed members of the Brigade were afforded greater opportunities than other staff were to attend Training and Development courses. However, thirty eight per cent were non committal. Most respondents perceive there is a clear distinction between the uniformed and Corporate Staff regarding training opportunities (See Appendix VIII Q 37).

COMMITMENT

Question 8. The level of commitment and morale within the respective Directorates was found to have not improved since 1990. However there were no additional comments to indicate that morale and commitment had decreased (See Appendix VIII Q 8).
Question 18. Respondents believed that their department had increased productivity since 1990 (See Appendix VIII Q18). This is consistent with the findings of question 15, where staff considered they were doing more with less.

Question 32. Productivity across the Brigade was found not to have reduced, according to 47 per cent of the respondents. Thirty five per cent were non committal. (See Appendix VIII Q 32).

RELATIONSHIPS

Question 9. The MFBB, particularly within the uniformed sector, is considered culturally to be a family (this organisational theory begins in recruitment). Respondents were asked if they felt as though they were treated as an equal. The data provided a slightly negative result though 20 per cent remained undecided. (See Appendix VIII Q 9).

Question 24. Corporate staff perceive generally that the uniformed sector of the organisation are aware of their role within the Brigade (See Appendix VIII Q24).
Question 30. Feelings of uncertainty were expressed in relation to the performance development plan and supervisor relationships, however 39 per cent of respondents perceived that their relationship with their supervisor had not improved. (See Appendix VIII Q 30).

Question 39. As stated in question 9 the MFBB particularly within the uniformed sector is considered culturally to be a family, Respondents to question 39 were asked if they felt as though they were part of the family. A negative response was recorded. (See Appendix VIII Q 39).

Question 45 In relation to management’s “open door philosophy”, a slightly positive response was recorded (See Appendix VIII Q 45).

REMUNERATION

Question 10. No perceived significant differences were identified between remuneration packages available within the private sector or other Government agencies as compared to the Brigade currently (See Appendix VIII Q 10).
Question 25. No significant response was recorded in relation to satisfactory levels of remuneration. (See Appendix VIII Q 25). This is consistent with question 10.

Question 40. Corporate Service staff responses showed their preferences were divided between recognition and monetary reward; no significant difference was observed (See Appendix VIII Q 40).

WILLINGNESS

Question 11. Fifty three per cent of respondents were undecided on whether they would prefer employment within the private sector as opposed to public sector employment. However, the majority of the remainder indicated a preference for the private sector (See Appendix VIII Q 11).

Question 16. No significant differences were identified between those who would recommend the organisation and those who would not (See Appendix VIII Q 16).
Question 26. Given the opportunity a majority of respondents (55 per cent) would leave the organisation, however this is not consistent with question 19 regarding VDP’s, and requires further investigation (See Appendix VIII Q 26).

Question 33. Only 19 per cent of respondents indicated they would transfer if given the opportunity. A further 40 per cent were undecided. There are a number of Corporate positions that require specific skills and knowledge. Therefore not all skills are portable between departments (See Appendix VIII Q 33).

CONTRIBUTION VALUE

Question 12. Sixty four per cent of the respondents agreed management’s recognition of the Corporate employees contribution to the organisation was positive (See Appendix VIII Q 12).

Question 20. Respondents demonstrated it is believed that Corporate Service staff’s contribution is valued by the organisation (See Appendix VIII Q 20).
Question 42. A majority of respondents felt that open communication was taking place during meetings and that Corporate Service staff contribution was valued by management. Reductions in staffing have resulted in a flatter organisational structure which has effectively opened the communication lines (See Appendix VIII Q 42).

JOB SECURITY

Question 13. With 43 per cent of respondents disagreeing to feeling secure in their positions and 39 per cent feeling secure, no clear indication of an overall level of security for the respondent group was identified (See Appendix VIII Q 13).

Question 28. Most respondents were either unsure of whether they would be, or did not expect to be, employed by the Brigade beyond the year 2000 (See Appendix VIII Q 28). This response is consistent with that of question 21.

Question 43. Corporate Service staff are divided by 1 per cent on the potential impact that the Fire Fighters industrial dispute may have upon their futures (See Appendix VIII Q 43).
SURVIVOR IMPACTS

Question 29. With a mean of 3, it was perceived that there had been an increase in individual levels and feelings of stress following staff cutbacks. A slightly positive response was recorded (See Appendix VIII Q 29).

Question 34. When asked directly about individual levels of satisfaction, 42 per cent responded positively, as opposed to 34 per cent who did not (See Appendix VIII Q 34).

Question 47. A majority of Corporate staff, (63 per cent) had not suffered feelings of guilt (Greenhalgh 1983; Greenhalgh Lawrence & Sutton 1988) following the staff cuts (See Appendix VIII Q 47).

CHANGE

Question 17. Respondents demonstrated that they were not threatened by change (See Appendix VIII Q 17).
Question 22. Just over 50 per cent of respondents indicated that feelings of empowerment are obtained through consultation during times of change (See Appendix VIII Q 22).

Question 31. Communication with the informal network is undertaken during periods of change (See Appendix VIII Q 31).

Question 46. Eighty nine per cent of respondents strongly / very strongly agreed and not one respondent disagreed that they attempt to understand the value of change (See Appendix VIII Q 46).

5.13 CONCLUSION

This Chapter has briefly outlined the results of the study. The next Chapter, Chapter 6, will discuss the findings of the study in detail and test hypotheses. The findings of the ANOVA test will also be discussed.
CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss the results of the study and draw comparisons with the literature. Referenced figures are located in Appendix VIII. Hypotheses will be tested and results discussed.

6.2 HYPOTHESIS REVIEW

6.2.1 HYPOTHESIS 1

The level of organisational commitment of Corporate Service staff will be high/positive.

The data supports this hypothesis.

Commitment is a strong indicator of job satisfaction (Robbins 1993). The response rate of 65 per cent for this study is an excellent result considering the recent history of the organisation as discussed in Chapter One. This in itself is a measure of commitment as staff have taken the time to contribute voluntarily.

With no formal measures of former organisational commitment available, respondents perceptions of their former level of organisational commitment were measured. No increase in pre-existing levels of commitment were found. However, productivity as an indicator of levels of commitment was perceived to have increased significantly for individuals according to 64 per cent of respondents (See Appendix VIII Q 8, 15 & 38).
These findings are not supported by the literature, Brockner, Grover, Reed, Dewitt and O’Malley (1987) Greenhalgh (1983) Imberman (1989) Lynn (1989) and McClelland and Wilmont (1990) state reduced levels of commitment and productivity are a side effect of downsizing. The focus group discussions have supported the data. Throughout the sessions participants demonstrated high levels of organisational commitment, and sighted examples of improved productivity. The fact that financial reward for two productivity increases has been achieved supports the argument. However, overall organisational productivity increases could not be demonstrated. Issues such as improved work practices through added skills acquisition, technology and quality were portrayed.

One participant revealed that they and others felt good about working for an organisation like the MFB. This statement was generally supported within both focus groups and within the additional comments section of the survey. For instance one respondent stated “I think of my job as a contribution to the people of Melbourne”. Being employed by a public safety agency is unlike being employed by a private company, in that the community receives the benefits, not the company.

The statement quoted and others like it, provide some explanation for the variance between the results of this study and the literature. The MFB and other public safety agencies are seen as servants of the community where the objective and mission of the organisation are to assist the community when they need help or when there is an emergency.
6.2.2 HYPOTHESIS 2

Levels of satisfaction will vary between departments.

The data confirms this hypothesis. Using a one way ANOVA, the student Newman Keuls range test identified the differences between responses from the six Departments surveyed (See Appendix IX). Within the respective variable groupings, significant differences were found in Job Security and Contribution Value responses between the Technical Services and Human Resources Directorates (See Appendix IX pp.2-3). As detailed in Chapter Five, the Human Resource Directorate, Operations Directorate and the Office of the President were combined to provide a more reliable reading. Once again the test was performed on the combined group and significant difference at the .05 level was found between Group 5, Technical Services, and Group 3, Human Resources (See Appendix IX pp.7-8).

These significant differences may be explained by the fact that Technical Services have been impacted by outsourcing and downsizing strategies more than any other Directorate as discussed in Chapter One.

Job security, as identified, is a major concern to this department. Focus group discussion has confirmed this result. An extract of additional comments within the survey claims a distrust of management, "who will be next to leave?" and "we are just numbers on a card". These comments fit with the findings of Greenhalgh (1983) and Jacobs (1988) who identified "emotional fallout" as a factor of downsizing with "Staff
being aware that they are powerless to control their own job security, and wondering who will be next and when it will happen”. The Technical Services directorate staff are clearly emotional about the past, present and future.

The difference in perceived contribution value, or “sense of worth”, invokes negative attitudes (Brockner 1992) and is consistent with the literature on downsized departments. Contribution value, as perceived by Technical Services, is a factor of job security, and morale is identified as being extremely low. These issues present a major challenge for the organisation as fifty three per cent of the Corporate Service staff are assigned to this Directorate.

6.2.3 HYPOTHESIS 3

Workload requirements of the Corporate Service staff will have increased significantly following staff cutbacks.

This was confirmed by both the data and the focus group discussions.

Sixty per cent of respondents perceived that their workload commitments had increased following staff cutbacks. (See Appendix VIII Q 44)

This finding is supported by the literature, where survivor workloads have increased initiating the “do more with less” philosophy identified by Imberman (1989) and McClelland and Wilmont (1990) and the potential impact of doing more with less can lead to stress related disorders and burnout (Lynn 1989). The MFB, like other
organisations, can ill afford to lose valued members of its staff because of prolonged under resourcing, as identified in the focus group discussions.

Staff are seen as the most important resource to the Brigade. This is supported by the commitment of the organisation to welfare and Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) policies. These policies and facilities are specifically designed to cater for the workforce and are communicated and encouraged widely.

6.3 TRAINING AND CAREER

The respondents generally agreed that the MFB provided skills maintenance and development opportunities. Currently the Brigade is resourcing development and skills training at 3 per cent of its total budget. Courses such as software training, conflict resolution, speed reading and academic courses are resourced. This figure does not include the organisation's operational training commitment. Yet no link could be identified between training and development and career prospects.

Corporate Service staff perceived opportunities for career advancement to be less than satisfactory. Flatter structures and outsourcing of activities are major contributors. Impacts upon career-plateaued employees (Ference et al 1977; Stevens 1994) are relevant. This is defined as the point at which the likelihood of promotion is low. There can only be a limited number of opportunities available for people to climb the corporate ladder, failing designed turnover of employees or expanded operations. This point was discussed during the focus group discussions with little consensus.
The potential impact for the Brigade is the loss of skilled staff who joined the Brigade with career hopes and aspirations (McClelland & Wilmont 1990). A number of employees have left this organisation for this very reason. Although there are numerous benefits of increased training to both the organisation and the individual, it also provides career opportunities external to the MFB for some individuals, possibly resulting in employee turnover, though at a high cost. From the findings the Brigade may be overcapitalising on some training where newly developed skills are not utilised. Funds associated with this capital commitment may be better utilised elsewhere. The organisation may need to reassess its development policies in view of the current Human Resource strategy of not turning over staff to create opportunities.

6.4 RELATIONSHIPS

The MFB would consider itself as a big family, or at least would like to. But Corporate Service staff do not consider themselves to be a part of this family. This was reflected in the findings and espoused vigorously within each focus group. There is however a variance on this perception, that being within respective Directorates. The analogy being drawn is that within a Directorate like eg: Fire Safety, staff are treated in the same way, uniformed or not, however, outside that department, Corporate Fire Safety staff perceive they are treated differently, with a “who are you?” attitude. The analogy drawn from the focus group and additional comments section of the survey suggests that if you haven’t risen up from within the ranks of the uniformed, then you can never understand or know everything about the organisation, or where the uniformed staff are coming from. This view was also critical of the senior ranks.
An "open door philosophy" by management would perhaps assist in breaking down this apparent invisible barrier. Perceptions of attitude, contribution value (worth) and self esteem could all be affected.

6.5 REMUNERATION

The respondents did not perceive remuneration currently to be a major area of concern. Generally, it was considered that the current levels of remuneration were consistent with the private sector. Successful enterprise bargaining negotiations between the MFBB and the ASU have resulted in productive outcomes for both parties. Reward, therefore, has not been a major contributing factor to levels of satisfaction following the change process and is consistent with Herzberg's (Stoner et al 1985) theory of short term motivators and hygiene factors. However, it was acknowledged during focus group discussions that two further pay increases had occurred since the adoption of an enterprise agreement.

A number of comments were made in relation to the performance management development plan. Comments of concern were: "equity", "encourages mediocrity", "no incentive" and "managers must be able to differentiate the performers from the non-performers". Obviously there are a number of outstanding issues to be resolved if performance appraisal is to be embraced as a professional management tool of benefit to the employee and employer.
6.6 WILLINGNESS

It is apparent that a large number of Corporate Service staff are disgruntled with the events that have taken place in recent times. Although there was no specific preference for the private sector as opposed to public sector employment, given the opportunity, 55 per cent of respondents would consider leaving the organisation. However, only 19 per cent espoused a desire to transfer.

When the survey population was asked if they would consider taking a VDP, 50 per cent of all respondents would decline and a further 30 per cent were undecided, indicating a strong willingness to remain with the MFB. The decision to leave must be instigated by the respondents and not the organisation. Respondents are becoming risk averse (Greenhalgh 1983; Imberman 1989). The majority, 85 per cent, are working for the MFB because they choose to. Today’s employment opportunity market could not be considered plentiful as was the case in the seventies. The key phrase is the opportunity, being the availability of or offer of employment. This would dramatically influence a decision to leave. The implications for the organisation are apparent. Previously some staff chose to take VDP’s and unfortunately as is often the case, the organisation lost people they would otherwise like to retain. Any future downsizing will almost certainly be selective.

These questions measuring willingness have demonstrated a strong desire by the Workforce to be a part of any future decisions. If VDP’s are to be offered again in the future, it is likely to bring about a reduction in motivation and increase job insecurity.
6.7 CONTRIBUTION VALUE

The majority of responses to all questions concerning contribution value were positive. It is clear that Corporate Service staff are well aware of their importance to the overall corporate objectives of the organisation. As stated in chapter one, the activities and performance of the Corporate Service staff are as vital to the organisational objectives as is the performance of the uniformed sector. These views are also reinforced to the Corporate Service staff by management. Increased workload and productivity, and positive reinforcement have created a powerful corporate identity. Downsizing has reinforced this image of a highly dedicated and productive work group.

Adams (1965) “Equity Theory” predicts that employees who believe that they have made a high contribution to the organisation will believe they deserve high job security. Whereas almost all respondents returned a positive response to contribution value, images of potential and possible competition for future survival begin to emerge. This being the case, questioning the level of employer loyalty to employees may produce high negativity. As Grosman (1989) states “loyalty is in the eye of the beholder and is ambiguous”.

6.8 JOB SECURITY

Job security, as previously stated in hypothesis three, within the Technical Service Directorate varies significantly as opposed to the other Directorates as identified in the ANOVA tests (See Appendix IX). The Government's increasing pressure through tight economic policy and further restructuring is a major concern for the Corporate Service staff according to 50 per cent of the respondents. Such is the issue that a majority of
respondents considered that they do not either expect to be employed by the MFBB beyond the year 2000, or were uncertain of their futures.

The impacts which could stem from this insecurity could become untenable for the organisation and certainly the Corporate Service staff where reduced performance, negative attitudes, psychological withdrawal and lack of commitment as predicted by Brockner (1992) were to occur. Alternative employment may be an option for some who are unable to cope with the pressures of insecurity. Whether there is a high level or moderate level of job insecurity is beyond the scope of this study, however, Brockner (1992) claims that other studies have shown evidence that a moderate amount of job insecurity actually leads to greater productivity. These studies may support the perceived improvements in productivity espoused by the respondents.

The literature relating to job security suggests that the adage of a fair day's work in exchange for a fair day's pay and security is gone (Lynn 1989). During the focus group discussion a number of participants stated that their current level of job security is no different to that of anyone else in any other organisation. Basically, job security and "lifetime employment is dead" (Lynn 1989; Grosman 1989).

In relation to the firefighters dispute, the respondents were unsure of the potential impacts. This issue was raised during focus group discussion. Most participants had not considered the long term effect of unsuccessful negotiations between the UFU and the MFBB. To this end, the uniformed and non-uniformed staff are both integral to the
efficiency of the Brigade and one group can ill afford not to consider the potential of extended industrial disputation in the current environment.

6.9 SURVIVOR IMPACT

The issue of job security, as previously described, has been a significant factor in staff having recorded a slightly positive response to feelings of stress following cutbacks and supports the literature (Brockner, Grover & Blonder 1988; Cascio 1993). However feelings of guilt were not considered as an outcome of downsizing. Some staff left the organisation after VDP’s were offered, whereas others were employed by outsourced contractors. The works of Greenhalgh (1983) and Adams (1965) are of relevance in this situation with respect to the perceived fairness of the downsizing and outsourcing processes. Individuals compare their job inputs and outcomes with those of others.

Where employees perceive inequity (Robbins & Barnwell 1989) there is a strong possibility that one or more of the following will eventuate: change in inputs, change in outcomes, distorted perceptions of one’s self and others or leaving the organisation. It is clear that some or all of the above have occurred following downsizing and outsourcing within the organisation studied. The MFB Corporate staff have experienced increased workloads, low morale, anger and staff turnover.

6.10 CHANGE

The future of the organisation, and that of the employees that make the organisation what it is today, is cloudy. Respondents throughout the focus group discussion criticised management’s lack of communication about the future. As a result feelings of
insecurity, stress and the potential of mass employee turnover have been reported.

Change is being directed by decisions at the strategic level with little involvement or
communication with staff. The literature warns that this type of strategy increases the
risk of failure (Harvey & Brown 1992). Strong leadership and communication (Kotter
1994) are seen as key success factors in change strategies. The Corporate Service staff
have stated that they see change as a personal challenge and try to understand the true
value of change. However where communication is lacking, views of distrust and
resistance are emerging (Kotter & Schlesinger 1979; Harvey & Brown 1992).

The informal network is alive and well in the MFB. According to most personnel, there
is no better source of information. Whilst the informal network, sometimes known as
the grape vine does not always tell it like it is, generally the information forms the basis
of, or a slightly distorted view of the facts. Unfortunately the rumour file can become a
self fulfilling prophesy, leading to a, “I told you so” negativity that spreads like a
tumour, increasing the levels of uncertainty and scepticism.

6.11 FOCUS GROUPS

Participants were asked to provide any other comments that they thought were relevant
and the additional comments section of the survey was also discussed during the focus
groups. Many of the issues raised related to a commitment to the organisation and what
it stood for. There were some extremely negative comments, particularly from staff of
the Technical Services Directorate. These attitudes support the literature and theories
relative to dis-satisfiers.
Gender bias was another issue raised. Although not identified within the literature review as a by product of downsizing and outsourcing strategies, some female participants of the focus groups and others within the survey raised the point as a measure of their dissatisfaction with the issue. The MFB is dominated by the male gender, particularly within the operational sector of the organisation. Fewer opportunities for promotion, communication in “man speak”, lack of willingness to take seriously female members of the staff and contempt themes were raised. These gender issues are cause for concern, though they are beyond the scope of this study.

6.12 CONCLUSION

Chapter six discussed the findings of the study in detail. The next chapter will summarise this research and will discuss the value of the results, identify the limitations of the study and discuss the possibilities of future research.
CHAPTER 7  CONCLUSION

7.1  SUMMARY

The findings of the research support the hypothesis. Varying levels of satisfaction have been identified within the variables. The MFB Corporate Services staff can be presently characterised as highly committed individuals.

The effects of downsizing the Corporate Services staff have, in some instances, provided a valuable insight into current levels of satisfaction. However, as there is no base data available to compare past and present levels of satisfaction, it cannot be categorically stated that there has been a positive or negative impact upon existing levels of satisfaction.

Perceptions of increased workload, negative attitudes and increases in stress as a result of job insecurity, poor communication and gender biases were highlighted in the findings. These issues in most instances are consistent with the literature. Expected and contrary to the literature, high levels of commitment were espoused during focus groups and in questionnaire responses.

Individuals are choosing to remain with the MFB for personal reasons that not only relate to the individual needs, but it has also been identified that those of the community are being considered.

Change appears not to have been discussed adequately with staff and perceptions of distrust have emerged.
The negative influences on satisfaction that have been identified and discussed require further investigation. Executive management must consider the responses of participants and act accordingly.

7.2 VALUE (IN TERMS) OF THE RESULTS

The significance of the study is that it has identified current levels of satisfaction and dis-satisfaction through the respective variables and identified variances between the departments, specifically Technical Services.

The study has also confirmed the expectations of some focus group members and other interested parties (Executive Management) within the MFB. The results provide a basis to compare Corporate Service staff within other public safety agencies. The data supports the literature. The major sources of dis-satisfaction were found to be communication, job security, career opportunities and organisational relationships.

Positive contributors to employee satisfaction and morale were: contribution value, willingness, development, increased productivity, albeit through increased workload. Remuneration is not considered a factor which is consistent with Herzberg’s theory of satisfiers and dis-satisfiers (Robbins 1993).

For the MFB, the significance of the study will be the ability to now continue to monitor the impact of change on individual perceptions of fairness, justification, existing culture barriers and communication channels.
By monitoring these impacts, morale improvements may be expected. This research alone may in fact contribute to improved morale as evidenced in the Hawthorne studies of the 1920's and 30's by Mayo (Stoner et al 1985).

7.3 LIMITATIONS

The Corporate Service staff may well consider themselves as a family in their own right. Non-uniformed staff though are surrounded by a hierarchical structure which is characterised, historically, by para-military attitudes and behaviours. Yet the results tend to be generic across other industries as identified in the literature. Corporate findings in terms of impacts upon absenteeism, casualty impact statements and organisational performance analysis may have been of benefit in terms of the results, though were beyond the scope of this study. The availability of time and access to one public safety agency with no base data was also a limiting factor.

7.4 FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on the findings of this study future longitudinal research could be undertaken into Corporate Sectors of public safety agencies.

The focus within the industry has traditionally been upon the coalface, or operational sectors of these agencies. Studies to provide comparative data from other fire services within Australia and other public safety agencies could be undertaken. Comparison of results could provide even better information for decision makers and planners in public safety agencies.
The analysis of questionnaire response by gender and or occupation (blue or white collar workers), and the reasons for variances in response levels requires further study.

Expansion of the study into the casualties of downsizing and its impact upon the Government's reform agenda may provide social environmentalists with valuable data on the impact of reform.

A review and possible reintroduction of the study within three years to enable comparison and to monitor the impact of any impending change would prove a valuable resource for management.

This study has focused upon change and change impacts to a community service organisation. The recent industrial dispute between the Public Transport Corporation (a community service organisation) and the Victorian State Government is likely to see the Government's privatisation reforms for this sector accelerated.

Issues of job security following media reports and comments made by Government and Unions can expect to have a significant impact upon the employees of the Public Transport Corporation. Change factors identified in the literature review and similar experiences examined in this study will be of relevance.
REFERENCES


DeCelles, P. 1995, “Managing change; Going around in circles ... but in the right direction,” *Optimum*, Vol: 26 Iss: 1 Summer, pp. 28-34.


Rubin, I. M. 1996, Transforming organisational cultures, Pfeiffer and Company, San Diego, CA.


Stevens, J. 1994, Determinants of Motivation of positively and Negatively Career Plateaued Personnel In Emergency Services, Unpublished


APPENDICES

I   Executive Committee

II  Organisational Chart

III Mind Map

IV  E Mail To Staff Regarding Survey

V   Introduction Letter

VI  Questionnaire

VII Thank You Note To Staff For Participation

VIII Questionnaire Result Figures

IX  ANOVA Test
THE IMPACT OF CHANGE ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS WITHIN A PUBLIC SAFETY ORGANISATION

**STAKEHOLDERS**

Support Staff (all)
Questionnaire
Focus Groups

Q What are they
V What are they

**FACTORS V?**

Culture/Change
Downsizing/Outsourcing
Knowledge of Government Reform
Knowledge of Org. - Size

History
Business Policy
Knowledge of Business (Core Activities)
Survivors & Casualties of Change

Federal Government Reform?

State Government Reform Agenda

S.S. Support Staff
• Remains
• Survivors

Packages
Targeted 90-95 Voluntary

Survey & Focus Groups

| (Culture) |
| Motivation |
| Impact of Change |
| SUB Cultures |

| Privatisation |
| Contract |

Case Study?
Future Research

Intro
History & Background
Lit. Review
Method
Results
Conclusion

APPENDIX III
E MAIL TO STAFF REGARDING SURVEY

As you may be aware, Inspector Shane Wright is currently completing a Masters of Business, the final component of which is a 20,000 word thesis. The topic of his thesis is "THE IMPACT OF CHANGE UPON CORPORATE SERVICE STAFF WITHIN PUBLIC SAFETY AGENCIES".

Within the following weeks, a survey will be distributed to all non-uniformed personnel. The survey is designed to identify levels of satisfaction, employee commitment, and the personal and organisational impacts of change.

I have liaised with Inspector Wright regarding his thesis and have reviewed the survey and encourage all recipients to respond. Internal projects of this nature can only be of benefit to the future of the Brigade.

This project also has the support of the Chief Fire Officer.

If you require any further information regarding the survey, please contact Inspector Wright at Community Safety on 3874.

KEITH ADAMSON
Director Human Resources
Dear Colleague

As part of my Masters of Business course at Victoria University of Technology I am writing a thesis on the impact of change on corporate service staff in Public Safety agencies. The past five years has seen an enormous amount of change take place within the Brigade, such as the decentralisation of Human Resources, restructuring of business demographics and rationalisation of department activities in response to the economic and political environment. The Fire Service is only one of a number of Public Safety agencies that operate under the Public Safety Agency umbrella.

A little about myself. I have been employed by the MFBB since 1980 and have been at my present rank of Inspector, "formally District Officer" since 1989. During this time I have worked in various departments including Training, Policy and Planning and Operations. Currently I'm assigned to Fire Safety and have been for the past 3.5 years. Many of you, I will have met either formally or informally through the functional aspects of the Brigade.

I am conducting a survey of all corporate services personnel (non uniformed) in the MFB. The purpose of which is to gather information on your perceptions of your job, the organisation and the personal effects of change. It is envisaged that the changes that have occurred have impacted upon each and every member of the MFB in one way or another.

The information you provide is confidential and will not be available to anyone other than myself. A summary of the research findings will be made available to the organisation and any other interested party. These findings will not identify any individual respondent.

I invite you to participate as this will give you an opportunity to have input into an academic paper which may lead to positive changes being made in your situation.

Please complete the attached survey and return it to me in a sealed envelope by the 7th August 1996.

Thank you for your participation.

Shane Wright
Inspector
Community Safety
QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

GENERAL & DEMOGRAPHICS

1 Age

20-30
31-35
36-40
41-45
46 +

2 Gender

M
F

3 Department

Operations
Fire Safety
Human Resources
Finance
Technical Services
Office of the President

4 Years of Service

0-5
6-10
11-15
16-20
21 +

5 Have you previously changed departments

Yes
No

6 Which of the following organisational levels best describes your current position?

Supervisor
Management
Senior Management

Other position please specify ..............................................................
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is an opportunity for career advancement for me within the M.F.B.B.
- The level of commitment/morale within my Department has improved over the past 5 years.
- I am treated as an equal by all members of the M.F.B.B.
- I believe my remuneration package is similar to that offered by other employers.
- I would prefer to work in the private sector.
- My immediate supervisor / manager recognises my contribution to the organisation.
- I feel secure in my present position.
- I am informed of what will happen in the future.
- I am more productive today than I was in 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I would recommend this organisation to a close friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I feel threatened when change is introduced.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Department and my colleagues are more productive than they were in 1990.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>If given the opportunity, I would accept a Voluntary Departure Package.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The organisation values my contribution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Myself and a number of my associates are fearful of future cutbacks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I feel empowered when consulted about change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There is ample opportunity for me to increase my skill level through Training and Development courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Operational personnel (uniformed staff) are aware of my role within the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I am happy with my current level of remuneration.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I would consider leaving this organisation if an opportunity arose.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel that my contribution to the organisation is important.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I expect to be employed by the M.F.B.B. beyond the Year 2000.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have suffered stress following staff cuts.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The performance development plan has improved my relationship with my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>When change is introduced, I talk to the informal network.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Productivity in this organisation is lower than it used to be.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>If given the opportunity to transfer, I would.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My current level of satisfaction is high.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The most important thing to this organisation is its staff.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. I see change as a personal challenge.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

37. The uniformed members of the Brigade are afforded a greater opportunity to attend training and development courses.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

38. I do just enough to achieve my performance objectives.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

39. My co-workers and I feel very much a part of the M.F.B.B. family.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

40. I prefer recognition rather than monetary reward.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

41. I am working for the M.F.B.B. because I am unable to obtain employment elsewhere.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

42. My contribution is valued during team meetings/discussions.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

43. I am concerned about the impact the firefighters dispute will have upon my future.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5

44. My individual work load has increased following staff cuts.  
   Disagree Strongly: 1  
   Disagree: 2  
   Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3  
   Agree: 4  
   Strongly Agree: 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Our managers practice the open door philosophy to a high degree.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I try to understand the value of change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I have suffered guilt following staff cuts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any additional comments you would like to make:-

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey.
THANKYOU NOTE TO CORPORATE STAFF

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the Corporate Service staff who completed the survey questionnaire and actively sought the opportunity to participate. I also extend my thanks to those who participated in the focus groups.

The thesis is nearing completion, and the findings of the study will be made available to the library in the new year. A copy will also be made available to executive management.

Any person wishing to discuss any matters raised within my thesis may do so through the normal channels.

I once again extend my thanks

Shane Wright
Inspector
Community Safety
**Question 7**

There is an opportunity for career advancement for me within the M.F.B.B.

Mean - 2.48

**Question 8**

The level of commitment / morale within my Department has improved over the past 5 years.

Mean - 2.48
Question 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9 I am treated as a equal by a members of the M.F.B.B.

Mean - 2.82

Question 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>96.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10 I believe my remuneration package is similar to that offered by other employers.

Mean - 2.93
**Question 11**

I would prefer to work in the private sector.

**Mean - 3.36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12**

My immediate supervisor / manager recognises my contribution to the organisation.

**Mean - 3.50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 13

**I feel secure in my present position.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>95.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean - 2.84**

### Question 14

**I am informed of what will happen in the future.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean - 2.34**
**Question 15**

I am more productive today than I was in 1990.

**Mean - 3.66**

**Question 16**

I would recommend this organisation to a close friend.

**Mean - 3.02**
**Question 17**

I feel threatened when change is introduced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean - 2.54

**Question 18**

The Department and my colleagues are more productive than they were in 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>87.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean - 3.46
Question 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Reverse scored question

Q19 If given the opportunity, I would accept a Voluntary Departure Package.

Mean - 3.45

Question 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20 The organisation values my contribution.

Mean - 3.15
Agree

Disagree

NOTE: Reverse scored question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Myself and a number of my associates are fearful of future cutbacks.

Mean - 2.59

Disagree

Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel empowered when consulted about change.

Mean - 3.38
**Question 23**

There is ample opportunity for me to increase my skill level through Training and Development courses.

**Mean - 3.45**

**Question 24**

Operational personnel (uniformed staff) are aware of my role within the organisation.

**Mean - 3.32**
Question 25

I am happy with my current level of remuneration.

Mean - 3.87

Question 26

I would consider leaving this organisation if an opportunity arose.

Mean - 2.57
Question 27

I feel that my contribution to the organisation is important.

Mean - 3.93

Question 28

I expect to be employed by the M.F.B.B beyond the Year 2000.

Mean - 2.78
**Question 29**

I have suffered stress following staff cuts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean - 3.08

**Question 30**

The performance development plan has improved my relationship with my immediate supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean - 2.65
Question 31

When change is introduced, I talk to the informal network.

Mean - 3.41

Question 32

Productivity in this organisation is lower than it used to be.

Mean - 3.35

NOTE: Reverse scored question
Question 33

If given the opportunity to transfer, I would.

Mean - 3.31

Question 34

My current level of satisfaction is high.

Mean - 3.07
**Question 35**

The most important thing to this organisation is its staff.

**Mean** - 3.68

---

**Question 36**

I see change as a personal challenge.

**Mean** - 3.81
Question 37

The uniformed members of the Brigade are afforded a greater opportunity to attend training and development courses.

\[ \text{Mean} - 2.60 \]

Question 38

I do just enough to achieve my performance objectives.

\[ \text{Mean} - 3.81 \]
Question 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q39  My co-workers and I feel very much a part of the M.F.B.B family.

Mean - 2.73

Question 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q40  I prefer recognition rather than monetary reward.

Mean - 2.96
Question 41

I am working for the M.F.B.B because I am unable to obtain employment elsewhere.

Mean - 4.30

Question 42

My contribution is valued during team meetings/discussions

Mean - 3.44
Question 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Reverse scored question

Q43 I am concerned about the impact the firefighters dispute will have upon my future.

Mean - 2.94

Question 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Reverse scored question

Q44 My individual work load has increased following staff cuts.

Mean - 3.65
Question 45

Our managers practice the open door philosophy to a high degree.

Mean - 3.08

Question 46

I try to understand the value of change.

Mean - 4.03
Question 47

Q47  I have suffered guilt following staff cuts.

Mean - 3.77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree  Disagree  NOTE: Reverse scored question

•nan Frequency  • Cumulative %

Range
APPENDIX IX

Variable CHANGE COMPUTE Change = q14+q17+q22+q31+q36+q4

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.6818</td>
<td>11.3364</td>
<td>1.8270</td>
<td>.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>713.5661</td>
<td>6.2049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>770.2479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) >= 1.7614 * RANGE * SQRT(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

Step  2  3  4  5  6
RANGE 2.82 3.36 3.69 3.92 4.10

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

Variable COMMIT Commitment

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115.2704</td>
<td>23.0541</td>
<td>1.8866</td>
<td>.1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1393.0963</td>
<td>12.2201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1508.3667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
MEAN(J) - MEAN(I) >= 2.4719 * RANGE * SQRT(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

Step  2  3  4  5  6
RANGE 2.82 3.36 3.69 3.92 4.10

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

Variable CONTRIB

By Variable DEPARTME Department
Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73.9511</td>
<td>14.7902</td>
<td>2.1826</td>
<td>.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>792.8457</td>
<td>6.7765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>866.7967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONE WAY ---

Variable CONTRIB
By Variable DEPARTME Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.8407 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean DEPARTME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.4603 Grp 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8571 Grp 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2381 Grp 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2500 Grp 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3684 Grp 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5000 Grp 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONE WAY ---

Variable JOB Job Security
By Variable DEPARTME Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130.1149</td>
<td>26.0230</td>
<td>3.9144</td>
<td>.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>771.1638</td>
<td>6.6480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>901.2787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONE WAY ---

Variable JOB Job Security
By Variable DEPARTME Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.8232 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle
Mean | DEPARTMENT
---|---
10.4603 | Grp 5
11.2632 | Grp 3
11.7619 | Grp 4
12.3077 | Grp 2
13.2500 | Grp 1
16.5000 | Grp 6

---
**ONE WAY**
---

Variable RELATION Relationships
By Variable DEPARTMENT Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.4818</td>
<td>17.2964</td>
<td>1.2131</td>
<td>.3076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1596.8403</td>
<td>14.2575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1683.3220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
**ONE WAY**
---

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 2.6700 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}
\]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

---
**ONE WAY**
---

Variable REMUN Remuneration
By Variable DEPARTMENT Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.9664</td>
<td>2.9933</td>
<td>.6309</td>
<td>.6765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>540.9003</td>
<td>4.7447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>555.8667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
**ONE WAY**
---

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.5402 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)}
\]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:
### Variable SURVIVE Survivor Impact by Variable DEPARTMENT Department

#### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4749</td>
<td>2.0950</td>
<td>.4853</td>
<td>.7866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>509.3638</td>
<td>4.3166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>519.8387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) > - 1.4691 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

---

### Variable TRAIN Training and Career by Variable DEPARTMENT Department

#### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2721</td>
<td>6.2544</td>
<td>1.1167</td>
<td>.3554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>655.3133</td>
<td>5.6010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>686.5854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) > - 1.6735 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

---
Variable WILL Willingness
By Variable DEPARTMENT Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.8172</td>
<td>4.9634</td>
<td>.4953</td>
<td>.7792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1152.3233</td>
<td>10.0202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1177.1405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONEWAY ---

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[ \text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 2.2383 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}} \]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level
OneWay

Variable CHANGE
By Variable RECODEDE

Compute Change = ql4+ql7+q22+q31+q36+q4

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.9429</td>
<td>16.9810</td>
<td>2.7621</td>
<td>.0452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>719.3050</td>
<td>6.1479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>770.2479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Variable COMMIT
By Variable RECODEDE

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113.9217</td>
<td>37.9739</td>
<td>3.1589</td>
<td>.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1394.4550</td>
<td>12.0211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1508.3667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Variable CONTRIB
By Variable RECODEDE

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113.9217</td>
<td>37.9739</td>
<td>3.1589</td>
<td>.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1394.4550</td>
<td>12.0211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1508.3667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[ \text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.7533 \times \text{RANGE} \times SQRT\left(\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}\right) \]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.4621</td>
<td>23.8207</td>
<td>3.5641</td>
<td>.0163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>795.3346</td>
<td>6.6835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>866.7967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- O N E W A Y ---

Variable CONTRIB  
By Variable RECODEDE  Grouped Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[ \text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.8280 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)} \]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>RECODEDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.4603</td>
<td>Grp 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8571</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2381</td>
<td>Grp 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4400</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- O N E W A Y ---

Variable JOB  Job Security  
By Variable RECODEDE  Grouped Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73.0491</td>
<td>24.3497</td>
<td>3.4692</td>
<td>.0184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>828.2295</td>
<td>7.0189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>901.2787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- O N E W A Y ---

Variable JOB  Job Security  
By Variable RECODEDE  Grouped Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if
\[ \text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.8734 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{1/N(I) + 1/N(J)} \]
with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Indicates significant differences which are shown in the lower triangle

\[ G G G G \]
\[ r r r r \]
\[ P P P P \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean RECODEDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.4603 Grp 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7619 Grp 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0000 Grp 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3077 Grp 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONEWAY ---

Variable RELATION Relationships
By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86.2260</td>
<td>28.7420</td>
<td>2.0516</td>
<td>.1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1597.0961</td>
<td>14.0096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1683.3220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONEWAY ---

Variable RELATION Relationships
By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if

\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 2.6467 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

--- ONEWAY ---

Variable REMUN Remuneration
By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3831</td>
<td>.7944</td>
<td>.1665</td>
<td>.9188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>553.4836</td>
<td>4.7714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>555.8667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONEWAY ---

Variable REMUN Remuneration
By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if

\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.5446 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level
## ONEWAY Variable SURVIVE Survivor Impact By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2117</td>
<td>2.0706</td>
<td>.4838</td>
<td>.6942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>513.6270</td>
<td>4.2802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>519.8387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if

\[
\text{MEAN}(J)-\text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.4629 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

## ONEWAY Variable TRAIN Training and Career By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department

### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.4016</td>
<td>6.4672</td>
<td>1.1535</td>
<td>.3306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>667.1838</td>
<td>5.6066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>686.5854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if

\[
\text{MEAN}(J)-\text{MEAN}(I) \geq 1.6743 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level

## ONEWAY Variable WILL Willingness By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3088</td>
<td>.4363</td>
<td>.0434</td>
<td>.9879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1175.8317</td>
<td>10.0498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1177.1405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- ONEWAY ---

Variable WILL  Willingness
By Variable RECODEDE Grouped Deptartment

Multiple Range Tests: Student-Newman-Keuls test with significance level .050

The difference between two means is significant if

\[
\text{MEAN}(J) - \text{MEAN}(I) \geq 2.2416 \times \text{RANGE} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(I)} + \frac{1}{N(J)}}
\]

with the following value(s) for RANGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level