

Division of Professional Relations  
1155 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

DENNIS CHAMOT, *Editor*



No. 29  
May, 1982

## FROM THE EDITOR . . .

### Election Results

The following are the official results of the last DPR election (\*elected):

#### Chairman-elect

Mark Cohen*	102
Mordecai Treblow	73

#### Treasurer (1982-83)

Valerie Kuck*	161
---------------	-----

#### Member-at-Large (1982-84)

Attila Pavlath*	125
Fred Owens*	102
Alan McClelland	55
Lou Pollack	52

Ballots sent: 524

Ballots returned: 176

### National ACS Meetings, and Other Thoughts

No great excitement at the Las Vegas meeting in March. The Economic Status Committee is now a joint Board-Council committee, giving it greater stature and visibility. Under the chairmanship of Gerry Meisels of the University of Nebraska, CES has been completely reorganized. Even so, I would caution you not to expect too much, simply because no committee of the ACS can change the world. It can do a great deal to determine what problems exist, to gather data, to do analyses, to confer with other groups, etc. But what can it affect? Probably very little, directly.

Does this mean that such a committee has little value? By no means! Its output and discussions can be extremely valuable. Just don't expect it, all by itself, to set salaries for chemists at Dow or Dupont; or to set output quotas for graduate schools; or to effect licensing statutes throughout the country; or to act as a collective bargaining agent for chemists in particular locations. Any or all of the

above could have an impact on chemists' salaries, but to expect such actions from the ACS is illusory. There's a role for ACS activities, and they are quite valuable. But there are also limits, and these must be kept in mind so that we don't allow wheel spinning to blunt additional efforts, supplementary and complementary efforts outside of ACS, to effect the improvements we seek.

Many of the same comments would also apply to the Council Committee on Professional Relations. Actually, they have had some real successes in helping individual chemists through the Member Assistance Program, although the goals and the accomplishments of that program are necessarily limited. But there are times when even that committee must be frustrated when mild suggestions are shot down from above.

This happened recently with a statement that originated in the Civil Service Subcommittee of CCPR. The statement dealt with the very real and immediate issue of loss of technical competence on the part of Federal agencies. The causes included continued salary ceilings and below average salary increases; reduced personnel ceilings; and excessive "contracting out". The problem has been recognized in many quarters, and has been mentioned in the press. Even so, the ACS Board would not permit the statement to issue without time wasting, unnecessary further study to gather additional data. What could they possibly be afraid of? Do the "powers that be", many themselves in industrial management, actually *want* reduced competence on the part of Federal regulators?

The statement underwent extensive study and review by both the Civil Service Subcommittee as well as the full Committee on Professional Relations before it went to the Board. Quite a long time has passed since action was begun on this issue, and the various committees are rather frustrated by the current situation. Just another example of how difficult it is

to get things through the ACS maze on occasion.

Having gone through all this apparent negativism, it's time for

### A Commercial

To dispel the notion that we should give up on the ACS, I here state that the profession needs it, and the Society needs the Division of Professional Relations. ACS will never be the sole answer for all the problems plaguing employed chemists, but it is essential for protecting educational standards and providing avenues for dissemination of new knowledge. The Society needs the DPR to constantly remind it that its responsibilities go beyond the science to include the chemist. Whatever the limitations on its actions, ACS does have a role to play in the professional life of the chemist, and this Division has an important role in helping to keep the ACS aware of its broader responsibilities.

The DPR functions in several ways. Most visible are our symposia at national meetings and our publications. Less visible, but just as valuable, are our activities within the governance structure of the Society. Our members are on Council and Board committees, we serve on task forces, we speak out at meetings of the Council. As to the latter, we are still a relatively small division, and as such we have two Councilors. If our membership drops a bit, we can lose one. On the other hand, a growing membership can get us up to a total of four Councilors. The extra Councilors, as well as the prestige large numbers would convey, would greatly enhance our effectiveness.

How about signing up some friends? Have them join you and the many other chemists and chemical engineers who want to support the belief that the responsibilities of the ACS include not only chemistry, but also chemists!

—Dennis Chamot

# RESULTS OF DPR MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

Dennis Chamot, DPR Chairman  
815 16th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

The last issue of the *Professional Relations Bulletin* contained a questionnaire for the Division's membership. This article gives the results of the survey, with commentary. As of this writing, 71 forms were returned. Three were from retirees, and were not included in the tabulations which follow, as the questions deal with current work experience.

As far as possible, the data are broken down by type of employer — industrial (25 managers or supervisors; 19 non-supervisory), academic (9), or government (9). The total figures include an additional six industrial employees who did not indicate whether they were managerial or not.

The first question asked for a general rating about your present job. Almost three quarters of the responses were favorable, putting to rest once and for all the belief in some quarters that the membership of the DPR are only a bunch of malcontents.

## 1. How would you rate your overall feeling about your present job:

	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government
a. Very Satisfied	25, 36.8%	10	5	6	1
b. Somewhat Satisfied	24, 35.3%	8	8	2	3
c. Take it or leave it	2, 2.9%	0	1	0	1
d. Somewhat dissatisfied	8, 11.8%	4	1	1	2
e. Very dissatisfied	6, 8.8%	1	4	0	1

Questions 2 asked about specific aspects of your job. Note that the totals don't always add to 100% because everyone did not check each line. Those who did not were presumably neutral on that particular item. A "like" vote of 60% or better was indicated for technical content or challenge; physical facilities and surroundings; human support; personal relationships with supervisors; working hours; and

individual job security. There was some disappointment with the technical competence of supervisors, and a great deal of discontent with promotional opportunities, except among the academic chemists. It is interesting to note that managers felt greater job security (19 out of 22 "like" votes) than did non-supervisory industrial chemists (only 11 out of 19).

Most respondents were reasonably well

## 2. Below are listed several aspects of a typical job. Check as many as apply:

	LIKE					DISLIKE				
	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government
a. Technical content and challenge	56, 82.4%	22	15	6	7	10, 14.7%	3	3	3	1
b. Physical facilities and surroundings	49, 72.1%	23	12	7	2	18, 26.5%	2	7	2	6
c. Human support (technician, secretary, etc.)	42, 61.8%	19	12	5	3	18, 26.5%	3	5	3	5
d. Technical competence of supervisors	38, 55.9%	17	11	5	2	23, 33.8%	5	7	3	6
e. Personal relationships with supervisors	46, 67.6%	14	11	8	8	15, 22.1%	9	4	1	1
f. Working hours	56, 82.4%	18	17	7	9	8, 11.8%	5	1	2	0
g. Individual job security	50, 73.5%	19	11	9	6	14, 20.6%	3	8	0	3
h. Promotional opportunities	22, 32.4%	10	3	7	0	36, 52.9%	11	13	1	9

satisfied with their employer's activities in health and safety, and even more thought their own efforts in this area were satisfactory (question 3).

Question 4 is a complex one. It asked whether or not you thought you had sufficient individual control over several areas related to your professional employment. Salaries are always of interest, and it was in this area that the bulk of you felt there was little you could do. There was a fairly even split among the academic ranks, but every other category was overwhelmingly negative.

As for work schedules, industrial managers and academic chemists felt they had the greatest control, but the managers had much less control over choice of project. Choice of location was the only category besides salary where a majority of managers indicated an inability to effectively influence the decision.

Only the government employees indicated an overall dissatisfaction with continuing education availability, while non-supervisory industrial chemists, academics and government employees all had problems with technical support.

Both industrial managers and academic chemists are satisfied with the opportunity to publish, while non-supervisory industrial chemists and government employees have more trouble.

### 3a. Are you satisfied with your employer's activities in protecting your health and safety on the job?

	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government
Yes	53, 77.9%	20	14	9	4
No	15, 22.1%	5	5	0	5

### 3b. Are you satisfied with your own efforts to keep informed about safety and health matters related to your job?

	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government
Yes	59, 86.8%	20	16	8	9
No	9, 13.2%	5	3	1	0

In many ways, question 4 demonstrates the difference between self-employment and employee status. Most of us (and all those represented in these tables) are employees. As such, our individual bargaining power in the non-technical aspects of our work is somewhat limited. It was in-

teresting to see that even industrial managers (level unspecified) had problems negotiating over salary, choice of assignment, and location.

I hope you found this survey as interesting as I did. Any additional comments or suggestions would be welcome.

### 4. Do you feel that you have sufficient bargaining power to effectively negotiate with your employer over:

	YES					NO				
	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government	Total	Industry, Mgr. or Supr.	Industry, Non-Supr.	Academic	Government
a. Salary	12, 17.6%	6	0	4	0	55, 80.9%	19	19	5	8
b. Work schedules	41, 60.3%	18	8	7	4	26, 38.2%	7	10	2	5
c. Choice of project	36, 52.9%	13	8	8	3	26, 38.2%	12	10	1	1
d. Location	32, 47.1%	11	9	7	2	31, 45.6%	14	8	0	6
e. Continuing education	46, 67.6%	18	13	6	3	20, 29.4%	7	6	2	5
f. Technical support	35, 51.5%	17	8	4	2	31, 45.6%	8	10	5	6
g. Opportunity to publish	40, 58.8%	18	9	7	1	23, 33.8%	5	10	2	5