

QUELQUES REFLEXIONS SUR LA METHODE ET LES TECHNIQUES DE PLANIFICATION DANS LES ECONOMIES ATTARDEES

*par Dr. Aziz Katifi**

On constate depuis quelques années, que les forces spontanées de l'économie attardée ne sont pas suffisantes pour assurer un progrès rapide, et qu'il faut planifier pour activer et accélérer le progrès économique et social.¹

Cependant le rapport entre développement et planification n'est pas direct; l'analyse économique montre, que le problème du ralentissement et de la stagnation du développement, est un problème structurel avant d'être instrumental.² Le plan n'est qu'un instrument, et la planification en elle-même n'est pas remède au retard économique. C'est pourquoi elle est efficace dans certains pays et inefficace dans d'autres.

En effet, le plan en soi n'anime pas les forces spontanées de l'économie stagnante, il n'est efficace qu'en fonction de son adaptation au système économique que l'on désire appliquer. Cela dépend dans une large mesure de la conception théorique de la planification ainsi que de ses techniques quantitatives. Cette étude a pour but de donner quelques observations sur ces deux questions dans les pays sous-développés. Elle abordera ainsi les problèmes suivants :

1. Charles Bettelheim, *Sous-Développement et Planification, Politique Etrangère*, No. 3, 1957, P. 287 - Guy Caire, *Méthodes et Aléas technique de la planification, Développement et Civilisations*, No. 11, 1962, P. 20. Oskar Lange, *Problems of Political Economy of Socialism*, Peoples Publishing House, 1962, P. 17.

2. Gabriel Turin, *Planification et Développement, Développement et Civilisations*, No. 8 Octobre 1961, P. 57.

* Chargé de cours à la Faculté de Commerce et de Sciences Economiques de L'Université Libyenne à Benghazi.

On the other hand, a critical attitude by the employees toward factors not directly related to their work (ventilation, rest rooms, etc.) was not found to be associated with a prounionization attitude to a statistically significant extent.

It would seem, then, that knowledge of the employees' attitude toward their management, their job incentives, and their working conditions is most valuable for the purpose of predicting union sentiment. Less valuable is a knowledge of their attitude toward factory conditions not directly related to the work.

It may well be, therefore, that the unsatisfactory nature of the job incentives, the working conditions, and the management-labor relations are factors which contribute to the desire to join a union.



attitude toward unionization. There is a tendency, however, for those who prefer the "grapevine" (a personal, non-company source of information) to be more favorably disposed toward unionization than those preferring other sources of information about company affairs.

Table 8

SOURCES OF INFORMATION RELATED TO UNION ATTITUDE

Source of information for employee:*	Employee said union would change things for :				
	Better	Little difference	Worse	No answer	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Foreman	39.9	19.8	19.2	21.1	100
Personnel office	41.2	23.3	18.8	16.7	100
Company magazine	46.0	22.3	15.8	16.0	100
Bulletin boards	41.5	23.5	20.7	14.3	100
Grapevine	51.0	20.1	15.4	13.5	100
Company meetings	39.9	24.4	23.8	11.9	100

*The chief sources of information were weighted for the first, second, and third choices by values of five, four, and three respectively; then the results were combined and converted into percentages to construct this composite table. (For the percentage breakdowns of first, second, and third choices by employees, see Table 7.)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A survey was made of all four hundred and ten production employees of an American manufacturing company for the purpose of discovering what employee attitudes are associated with a desire to join a union. Since the employees of this company were actively considering unionization, an excellent opportunity existed for such a study.

The results of the survey indicate that a prounionization attitude on the part of the employees was associated with a critical attitude toward work conditions, job incentives (wages, promotion), and management.

Table 7

EMPLOYEES' CHIEF SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Source of information for employee :	Ranked by employees in order of importance:		
	First	Second	Third
	%	%	%
Foreman	32.5	8.3	9.3
Bulletin boards	21.7	22.7	16.6
Grapevine	12.4	7.8	11.7
Company magazine	6.4	13.2	9.0
Personnel office	5.6	15.4	5.1
Company meetings	2.4	1.7	7.3
Newspapers	0.2	0.2	2.7
Others	1.0	0.4	3.9
No answer	17.8	30.3	34.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

There was a separate but related question asked concerning the foreman as a source of information. To the question "How well does your foreman keep you informed about what is going on in the plant?" the employees' responses were : "very well"—19.3 per cent; "fairly well"—33.7 per cent; "poorly"—19.3 per cent; "He's not in a position to know himself"—11.9 per cent; and 15.8 per cent failed to answer. One out of two appears satisfied, while two out of five are critical either of the foreman or perhaps of management's failure to inform the foreman so he can properly communicate such information downward to his men.

One test of the expectation that employees' attitudes have a relationship to the sources of information would be an appraisal of how the chief sources of information may vary according to the employees' attitude toward unionization. (See Table 8.)

Contrary to expectations, the results of Table 8 do not indicate any statistically significant relationship between sources of information and

It is seen that the more employees like their job, the more apt they are to think a union will make a change for the worse. Conversely, the less they like their job, the more apt they are to think a union would make a change for the better. This relationship was found to be statistically significant (P less than .01).⁴

To a significant extent, an unfavorable attitude toward either the individual foreman or management in general is accompanied by a desire to join a union.

Employees' Chief Sources of Information

The study of the communications process within the company is valuable to management in determining how well its policies are understood and what attitudes are generated toward these policies. It should be expected that the employees' sources of information about the company would have a substantial effect on the way in which information is "slanted" and on the degree of its acceptance because of employees' attitudes toward the source.

The employees were asked to indicate their chief sources of information about the company's affairs, and the results are presented in Table 7.

One out of three of the employees stated his foreman was his chief source of information about the company, while one out of five indicated the bulletin boards. Because of the great number of second and third choice responses for the "bulletin boards" category, it rivaled the "foreman" as a source of information.

While the "grapevine" had as many first choices as did the "company magazine" and "personnel office" categories put together, it had only half as many seconds as either of them. It would therefore not be so far ahead of them in a weighting of first, second, and third choices for a composite valuation of importance of sources of information.

"Newspapers" ranked very low as a source of information about the company.

4. Because of the small number who dislike their job, the "dislike" and "just another job" categories were combined in the statistical analysis, using the chi square method.

Summarizing the results of Table 5, those employees who rate their company's chances for steady employment high are less likely to be prounion than are those who rate it low.

Rating of Present Job Related to Union Attitude

In Table 6 is presented the employees' attitude toward unionization in relation to their indications of how they like their present job.

Only 31 per cent of those who like their job very much think a union would make a change for the better, whereas 85 per cent of those who dislike it or dislike it very much think a union would be better. Similarly, only 8 per cent who dislike their job think a union would make a change for the worse, whereas 25 per cent of those who like it very much think a union would be worse.

Table 6

FEELING ABOUT JOB RELATED TO UNION ATTITUDE

Feelings about present job :	Employees said union would change things for :				
	Better	Little difference	Worse	No answer	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Like it very much	31.2	24.0	35.3	19.5	100
Like it	43.2	20.8	12.6	23.5	100
Just another job	70.2	14.9	10.6	4.3	100
Dislike*	84.6	0.0	7.7	7.7	100
No answer	30.8	7.7	30.8	30.8	100

*Includes the two persons who indicated "dislike it very much."

Steadiness of Employment Related to Union Attitude

The employees' rating of their chances for steady employment in terms of whether the employees think an affiliated, an independent, or no union would be best is presented in Table 5.

Table 5
STEADINESS OF EMPLOYMENT RELATED TO UNION ATTITUDE

Compared to other plants in area, chances for steady employment here are :	Organization preferred by employees :					Total
	Affiliated union	Independent union	No union	No answer		
	%	%	%	%	%	No.
Better	23.7	32.2	23.0	21.0	100	152
Same	30.9	33.8	13.0	22.3	100	139
Not as good	71.4	0.0	14.3	14.3	100	7
No answer	25.0	15.2	17.0	42.9	100	112

It is seen that 23 per cent of the employees rating steady employment as "better" prefer no union, while only 13 per cent of those rating steady employment as the "same" prefer no union. Conversely, only 24 per cent of those who rate it as better prefer an affiliated union, whereas 31 per cent of those who rate it as the same prefer an affiliated union. About the same proportion of those indicating "better" and "same" choose an independent union as being best.

Statistical analysis indicates that those employees who rate steady employment as being better are more likely to prefer no union to an affiliated union than are those who rate it as the same or worse; this is statistically significant (P less than .02). Furthermore, those who rate steady employment as better seems more likely to prefer no union to an independent union than are those who rate it as the same or not as good. This, however, is not statistically significant (P equals .07).

the wages not as good think a union would be better, but only 38 per cent of those who rate wages as being better think a union would improve conditions.

Those who rate wages as better or the same are found to be more likely to consider a union would change things for the worse than are those who rate wages as not as good. This is statistically significant (P less than .02).

Foreman's Ability to Handle People Related to Union Attitude

The employees' rating along the dimensions of how good they think their foreman is at handling people and what their attitude is toward unionization is presented in Table 4.

A greater proportion of those employees who consider their foreman "good" at handling people are more likely than those who consider him "poor" to prefer no union to either an affiliated or independent union (P less than .01).

Table 4

FOREMAN'S ABILITY TO HANDLE PEOPLE RELATED TO UNION ATTITUDE

Foreman's ability to handle people :	Organization preferred by employees :					Total
	Affiliated union	Inde- pendent union	No union	No answer		
	%	%	%	%	%	No.
Good	26.3	26.3	21.5	25.9	100	312
Poor	34.7	38.7	5.3	21.3	100	75
No answer	17.4	8.7	8.7	65.2	100	23

In summary, the data presented in Table 4 show that those employees who rate their foreman as good in his ability to handle people are more likely to be antiunionization than are those rating him as poor.

expected that these two areas would be most strongly related to union attitude. The relationship between the employees' attitude toward employee-management interaction and their attitude toward unionization may also be expected to be strong if the current contention is correct—that labor unrest is usually related to some personal difficulties. Finally, there seems to be little reason to expect that company affairs which are only indirectly or not at all related to the job should be related to union attitude. A general hostility toward the company, however, might manifest itself in a critical attitude toward all aspects of the company and, therefore, might be accompanied by a pronunionization attitude³.

Wages Related to Union Attitude

How the employees related their company's wages in terms of whether they thought a union would make a change for the better or worse is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
WAGES RELATED TO UNION ATTITUDE

Compared to other plants in area, wages here are :	Employees said union would change things for :					Total
	Better	Little difference	Worse	No answer		
	%	%	%	%	%	No.
Better	38.1	15.9	22.2	23.8	100	63
Same	30.1	32.5	26.5	10.9	100	83
Not as good	57.2	16.5	11.2	15.1	100	152
No answer	34.8	18.7	17.0	29.5	100	112

We see that of those employees who rate wages "better," 22 per cent think a union would make a change for the "worse," whereas only 11 per cent of those who rate wages as "not as good" think it would make a change for the "worse." Also, 57 per cent of those who consider

3. It must be remembered that no causal relations can be established in this type of investigation. However, knowledge of statistically significant relationships should be useful in guiding research to establish causal principles and, ultimately, scientific laws explaining these phenomena.

In Table 2, for example, it is apparent that, while 80 (or about one out of five) employees did not indicate the effect they felt a union would have and while 112 (or about one out of four) did not indicate their organizational preference, only 56 (or a little less than one out of seven) failed to answer both union attitude questions. Some inferences are thus still possible if a preference has been indicated on one of a related pair of questions on attitudes. Thus one might conjecture that the twenty persons who neglected to indicate organizational preference but did indicate a union would change things for the better are probably pronunion, without being able to say whether they prefer an affiliated or nonaffiliated union. (Perhaps that indecision was a factor in some of them not expressing a choice.) The twenty-four who indicated a union would make little difference are possibly indifferent or undecided, while the twelve who indicated a union would make things worse probably are antiunion. One should be cautious in such conjecturing, however, because these two attitudes, though correlating highly, do not correlate completely : seven employees who preferred no union believed a union would change things for the better ; of those who indicated a preference for an independent union over the no union category they were free to choose, eighteen believed a union would change things for the worse.

Hypotheses Relating Union Attitude to Job Aspects

Five types of events (several questions included for each) are used to analyze the employees' attitudes toward various aspects of their company. These five aspects, previously mentioned, are those areas that are : (a) directly job related, (b) indirectly job related, (c) nonessential facilities, (d) job incentives, and (e) employee-management relations. By relating the employee's attitude toward unionization to each of these aspects of his job, it should be possible to determine which of them are strongly related to union attitude and which of them are not.

Since a union would be expected to strive primarily to improve job incentives (wages, steady employment, and chances for promotion) and conditions directly related to job (safety, cleanliness, etc.), it might be

Table 2
UNION PREFERENCE RELATED TO CHANGE UNION
WOULD MAKE

Organization preferred by employees :	Employees said union would change things for :					Total
	Better	Little difference	Worse	No answer		
	%	%	%	%	%	No.
Affiliated union	86.6	8.0	0.0	5.4	100	112
Independent union	45.1	28.3	15.9	10.6	100	113
No union	9.6	24.7	57.5	8.2	100	73
No answer	17.9	21.4	10.7	50.0	100	112
Total number	175	83	72	80		410

Close analysis of Table 2 reveals an interesting fact. Those employees who prefer an affiliated union are more strongly in favor of unionization than those who prefer an independent union.

Since there is this difference between those who select an independent and those who select an affiliated union, these two groups will be treated separately in the following analyses.

Evaluation of "No Answer" Groupings

An important aspect of the study is its unique treatment of questions to which no answer was given. A "no answer" has not been treated as simply a case in which no data is available, but efforts have been made to find the significance of the "no answer" group on a particular question by the answer commitments made on other related questions. This procedure has given insights into certain attitude relationships. Since a higher percentage of noncommitments on a survey occurs for questions perceived as having important repercussions on policy formation, it is important to sub-divide this "no answer" category in terms of expressed attitudes on related questions. This type of analysis, therefore, makes possible a more nearly complete utilization of survey data, which should result in additional knowledge of the attitudes investigated.

c. How good is he at handling people?

Very good	Usually good	Sometimes poor	Always poor	No answer
41.5	34.6	15.1	3.2	5.6

d. In giving out jobs, does he make it clear what you are to do?

Always clear	Usually clear	Sometimes confused	Always confused	No answer
35.9	38.0	16.6	4.1	5.4

e. Is he fair and impartial to all?

Always fair	Usually fair	Sometimes plays favorites	Always plays favorites	No answer
38.8	31.4	17.8	3.9	8.1

f. When you have a problem, how easy is it to talk to him?

Always ready to listen	Usually will listen	Usually too busy to listen	Will never listen	No answer
50.7	30.2	11.0	2.0	6.1

g. Does he give credit for work well done?

Always gives credit	Usually gives credit	Seldom gives credit	Never gives credit	No answer
34.4	24.9	21.9	6.6	12.2

Consistency of The Two Union Attitude Questions

In investigating the relationship between attitude towards unionization and other attitudes, both questions concerning unions are used. The first question concerns the change employees think a union would make in the plant; and the second, the type of organization they think would be best. All data are presented in terms of percentages of the 410 respondents. Furthermore, all statistical tests of significance have been performed with the chi square test.

In order to determine the consistency of the employees' responses to the two union attitude questions, the responses to the two questions are related. (See Table 2.) In general, there is excellent consistency of response, thereby justifying the use of both questions as a measure of union attitude.

Evaluation of Working Conditions

8. How do you rate your working conditions as to the following things :

Item :	Our company is :				
	Very good	Good enough	Poor	Very poor	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
a. Lighting	53.7	32.4	3.9	1.5	8.5
b. Heating	40.2	37.1	10.7	2.7	9.3
c. Ventilation	12.7	23.9	29.0	20.2	14.2
d. Cleanliness (considering type of work)	20.0	35.6	16.1	10.5	17.8
e. Machines and equipment	9.0	26.8	26.4	16.6	21.2
f. Safety	19.5	38.0	15.4	7.3	19.8
g. First aid setup	33.2	38.0	7.8	5.4	15.6
h. Locker rooms	43.7	37.8	2.9	1.5	14.1
i. Rest rooms	42.9	37.3	4.6	2.0	13.2
j. Parking area	22.2	30.2	18.1	14.4	15.1
k. Lunchroom & snack bar	28.3	33.1	17.8	9.3	11.5

Attitude Toward Foreman

9. This question is about your foreman or supervisor. (Figures are percentages of the total number of respondents)

a. Does he know the work in his department?

Very well	Fairly well	Not too well	Not at all well	No answer
61.9	27.3	5.4	2.0	3.4

b. How good is he at training new people?

Very good	Fairly good	Not too good	Poor	No answer
44.4	33.7	13.4	4.4	4.1

Attitude Toward Company

7. From what you know about other places to work in this area, how do you think our company compares with them in the following things :

Item :	Our company is :				
	Better	About the same	Not as good	Don't know	No answer
	%	%	%	%	%
a. Working conditions	24.6	30.7	11.5	17.8	15.4
b. Steady employment	37.1	33.9	1.7	11.5	15.8
c. Chances for promotion	11.5	20.2	19.7	22.7	25.8
d. Wages	15.4	20.2	27.2	8.5	18.8
e. Safety record	20.0	25.6	8.5	17.6	28.3
f. Desire to do right thing by all employees	15.9	29.0	13.4	14.4	27.3
g. General reputation around town	12.2	26.8	19.3	16.8	24.9
h. All in all, as a place to work	23.7	38.0	7.8	7.6	22.9

4. Leaving out individuals, do you have confidence in the ability of the plant foremen? Is your impression of them as a group favorable or not?

Favorable	57.1%
In between	21.7
Unfavorable	6.6
No opinion	8.8
No answer	5.8
	100.0%

Action on Complaints

5. Suppose you have a gripe about something. What is the best thing for you to do?

a. Just keep quiet about it	20.0%
b. Tell somebody else in my department	1.7
c. Tell my foreman or supervisor	59.3
d. Tell the personnel department	6.5
e. Do something else (explain)	1.4
No answer	11.0
	100.0%

Seniority Status Awareness

6. Do you know where you stand on the seniority list?

Yes	35.4%
Not sure	26.3
No	31.2
No answer	7.1
	100.0%

Table 1**EMPLOYEE RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS****Job Attitude**

1. In general, how do you feel about your present job?	
a. Like it very much	37.5%
b. Like it	44.6
c. Just another job	11.5
d. Dislike it	2.7
e. Dislike it very much	0.5
f. Don't know	0.5
No answer	2.7
100.0%	

Attitude Toward Supervisors

2. Do you have confidence in the ability of the top executives from the home office who visit this plant from time to time? Is your impression of them as a group favorable or not?

Favorable	40.7%
In between	15.6
Unfavorable	2.2
No opinion	30.3
No answer	11.2
100.0%	

3. Do you have confidence in the ability of your executives here? Is your impression of them as a group favorable or not?

Favorable	51.7%
In between	23.1
Unfavorable	5.6
No opinion	9.8
No answer	9.8
100.0%	

GENERAL RESULTS AND METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

Responses to the Individual Questions

Although this study is designed primarily for the investigation of the relationship *between* attitudes, a presentation of a percentage breakdown of the employees' responses to each question should serve as a simple description of employee attitudes. The employees' responses to the individual questions of the survey are presented in Table 1.

Some General Observations

The employees indicate strong prounionization feelings, as originally thought by management. When asked what changes a union would make, over 40 per cent thought a union would make conditions better; and when asked what would be best for them, over 50 per cent selected some type of union rather than no union. (See Table 2.)

The employees' attitudes range from quite favorable to extremely critical in their evaluation of the company. Over 80 per cent like their present job, but on specific comparisons with other companies the employees are quite critical. This is especially true of wages and promotion possibilities and of the ventilation, machines, and parking area.

With respect to the foremen, the employees rate them favorably in general, but again some of the specific ratings are quite critical. This is true especially of the foremen's willingness to give credit and of their ability to handle people.

It seems, then, that a large number of the employees expressed severe criticism of some aspects of the company.

and labor-management relations. Several questions included in the survey were not obviously related to union attitudes. These questions aided management in its use of the survey as an important tool to supplement upward communications. They gave valuable information about the employees' attitudes toward the company, toward working conditions, and toward their supervisors. They also aided the corollary use of the survey as an internal public relations medium in reassuring the employees of management's interest in their views and feelings. Furthermore, having a broadly based questionnaire probably induced many employees to answer the "touchier" questions such as those pertaining to unionization when they came to them among the others.

The questionnaire method was used to obtain information about the employees' attitudes towards unionization and other topics. Attitude towards unionization was measured by the employees' responses to two questions. The first of these was a general question asking the employees what type of change they believed a union would make in their company. The second question was also general, but required the employees to state a preference for either an affiliated union, an independent union, or no union. The employees' responses to these two questions constitute the measure of their attitude toward unionization.

In order to relate the attitude toward unionization to other attitudes, the production employees were questioned concerning their attitudes towards various company conditions. The conditions selected for this purpose were : (1) job incentives (wages, promotion, steady employment) ; (2) conditions on the job (safety, cleanliness, machines) ; (3) conditions related to the job (ventilation, lighting, etc.) ; (4) non-job related conditions (parking, snack bar, etc.) ; and (5) management and employee relations. By relating an employee's attitude toward unionization to his attitude toward each of the conditions, it should be possible to determine which aspects of his work are related to his attitude toward unionization and which are not.

eighteen per firm. 10,218 or 92% were paid employees, while the remaining 888 were working proprietors or unpaid family workers. While 8,410 of the paid employees were actual operatives, the remaining 1,808 were managerial, supervisory, administrative, service and other such occupations.

The trend in Libya is thus obviously away from family production units to more complex, impersonal employment relations. It becomes increasingly important, therefore, to ask, what are the significant factors in labor-management relations in Libya? Knowledge of these factors is of great importance to management and to social scientists in the field of industrial relations. When considerations of unionization arise, such information is especially relevant, since it may be used to create a better understanding of why many employees prefer a union.

Employee attitude surveys can be used effectively by social scientists and by employers to get useful, supplementary information on pertinent factors in labor-management relations. A case study of such a survey will now be presented to illustrate why and how it can be used as a valuable scientific tool or technique.

The Administration and Research Design of the Survey

A printed attitude survey questionnaire was administered in one day to the four hundred and ten production employees working in a manufacturing plant located in a small American town. No foremen or executives were included in the study, and complete anonymity was guaranteed the interviewees.

The survey was conducted under the direction of the personnel manager of the company's home office (whose production workers were unionized). This was at a time unionization was being considered seriously by the production employees of the branch plant. Management planned to re-examine its labor policies with employee attitudes as an important consideration.

The prominence of unionization attitudes provides an excellent opportunity for investigating the factors associated with union attitudes