

**Union Attitudes Towards Significant Aspects of Job Training Programs
for the Disadvantaged**

John E. Drotning
State University of New York at Buffalo

David B. Lipsky
Cornell University

Myron D. Fottler
State University of New York at Buffalo

Complementing their earlier study of employer non-participation in manpower programs for the disadvantaged, the authors now turn their attention to the union aspect of non-participation. The present survey extensively explores the attitudes of union rank and file as well as those of local and regional union leaders in an effort to determine exactly where unions stand on this issue. John E. Drotning is a Professor of Industrial Relations at the State University of New York at Buffalo. David B. Lipsky is an Assistant Professor of Industrial Relations at Cornell University. Myron D. Fottler is an Assistant Professor of Industrial Relations and of Environmental Analysis and Policy at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

How do local and regional union leaders feel about critical aspects of manpower programs to employ the disadvantaged? How do they perceive the rank-and-files' attitudes about such programs? Do unions block the implementation of job programs? Or contrary to general opinion, do they support such activity? Moreover, how do union leaders view specific questions on special treatment, double work standards, and the like for disadvantaged workers? What role if any, does the size of the bargaining unit and the position of the union leader play in the identification of job training supporters? How difficult do union leaders feel it will be for the hard-core unemployed to achieve the educational standards set by the firms where they have collective bargaining contracts? These basic questions are examined in this study in an effort to provide some empirical basis for generalizing about union attitudes towards job training programs.¹

NATURE OF THE SAMPLE

This study involves intensive interviews with fifty-one (51) local union leaders in Western New York.² These 51 local leaders were selected from 1) the unionized portion of 115 firms (48/ 115) participating in a coupled on-the job training program for the disadvantaged called Project JET

¹ There have been very few empirical studies of the union role in training the disadvantaged. An exception is Chapter VI of Louis A. Ferman, *The Negro and Equal Employment Opportunities: A Review of Management Experiences in Twenty Companies* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), pp. 122-130. Ferman's study is based on interviews with 14 union officers.

² The interviews were administered by the Survey Research Center of the State University of New York at Buffalo.

(Jobs, Education and Training), and 2) the unionized portion of 115 firms (37/115) not involved with JET, matched in terms of size and industry with the JET firms. Project JET is designed principally for black workers and is very similar to the national NAB-JOBS Program.³ Fourteen unions were selected from the 48 unionized firms in the JET population and 37 unions (all the unions represented) were taken from the non-JET population. The unions from the JET universe comprised all unions in firms with more than 500 employees; all unions in firms in the service sector; and all unions in firms which had taken on 5 or more trainees.⁴ The unions were selected in order to cover what we thought were crucial subsets of the JET population viz. large firms, and/or those with at least 5 trainees, and the service sector. In addition, all the unions in the non-JET population were included simply because we wanted to get as much information as possible from union leaders associated with firms not participating in manpower programs.

It must be noted that many unions in the non-JET set represented workers in firms which had participated in job training programs at other times. Specifically, thirty-six (36) union respondents had experience with on-the-job training for the disadvantaged either in JET or in some other program at another time and fifteen (15) had no prior involvement in any such employment program.

³ David B. Lipsky, John E. Drotning, and Myron D. Fottler, "Some Correlates of Trainee Success in a Coupled On-the-Job Training Program," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, Summer 1971, pp. 41-61. For description of the development of "coupled—OJT" programs, see Garth L. Mangum, MDTA: *Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), pp. 92-93. For an account of the origin and operation of the NAB-JOBS program see, Sar A. Levitan, Garth L. Mangum, and Robert Taggart, III, *Economic Opportunity in the Ghetto: The Partnership of Government and Business* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), pp. 17-45.

⁴ A union leader representing workers in either JET or non-JET firms may also represent workers in locals outside both groups. For example, the President of the Buffalo AFL-CIO Council represents about 70,000 workers.

The average membership of the unions represented by the union leaders interviewed was 3,157. The median size range was 501-1,000.⁵ Machinists, fabrication workers, and chemical and petroleum workers comprised forty-one (41) per cent of the union sample. The rest of the unions were made up of workers in various occupations as shown in Appendix—Table L In addition, forty (40) unions were affiliated with the AFL-CIO, while eleven (11) were not (see Table 2). The union leaders interviewed represented 161,018 workers or about 33 per cent of the employed civilian work force in Western New York (Erie and Niagara Counties) in 1968.⁶

Appendix—Table 2 shows the position of the respondents, whether or not they were elected or appointed, and whether their jobs are part or full-time. In addition, the same table identifies the unions represented in the sample, their size, and divides them into two categories on the basis of whether or not they have had experience in job training programs, either through JET or another program.

Since JET trainees were heavily concentrated in large manufacturing units, as well as the service sector, most of the surveyed union leaders headed industrial- type unions. The few

⁵ Size Range	Frequency	Per Cent
10-25	1	2.0
26-50	1	2.0
51-100	1	2.0
101-250	8	15.6
251-500	8	15.6
501-1,000	10	19.6
1,001-5,000	18	35.3
5,000+	3	5.9
Don't Know	1	2.0
	-----	-----
	51	100.0%

⁶ There is some double counting, since the President of the Buffalo AFL-CIO rep represents many of the same workers as do local union presidents.

nominal craft leaders included in the sample (Teamsters, IAM, Iron Workers, etc.) are there because some—if not most— of their constituents are actually employed in semi-skilled jobs and are included in industrial-type bargaining units. Therefore, the question of the attitudes of craft union leaders is outside the scope of this study. The attitudes of craft leaders are indisputably important, but doubtless more job opportunities exist for the disadvantaged in that portion of the labor force organized along "industrial" lines.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Does experience in programs for the disadvantaged affect the attitudes of the union leaders? In the analysis which follows, we will be interested in comparing the attitudes of the 36 union leaders who have represented workers in firms participating in such programs with the 15 leaders who have had no such experience. We will expect experienced leaders to be favorably disposed to such programs.

Along another dimension, we also investigated the relation between certain generalized attitudes held by the union leaders and their specific attitudes toward hard-core training programs. Table 1 shows the answers given by union leaders to three questions about broader social issues. It can be seen that the sample of leaders displayed divergent attitudes on these issues. However, individual union leaders were strongly consistent in their opinions. For example, a union leader who believed laziness was a very important cause of black poverty, also tended to believe that poor education in urban schools was not an important cause of poverty, and that efforts to integrate public schools should be decreased. We expected this consistency to carry over to their attitudes about manpower programs for the disadvantaged.

Accordingly, we divided the union leaders into two "attitudinal groups" on the basis of the answers given in Table 1. One attitudinal group we label "pro". In this group we placed those leaders who tended to discount laziness as a cause of black poverty, thought poor urban education an important cause of poverty, and felt school integration efforts should be increased. This group is labeled "pro" because we expected the leaders in it to have positive attitudes toward manpower programs for the disadvantaged. Those leaders who had opposite opinions we labeled "con", since we expected these "There is some double counting, since the President of the Buffalo AFL-CIO rep leaders to have negative attitudes towards programs to train the disadvantaged. For some leaders who had mixed opinions, we had to make a judgment as to whether, on balance, they leaned one way or another. Therefore, the division of the leaders into two groups is somewhat arbitrary. Nevertheless, the division permits a judgment to be made on the relation between a leader's general social disposition and his view of special efforts to aid the hardcore trainee. In sum, then, we hypothesized that leaders most favorably disposed to training programs for the disadvantaged would have had past experience with such programs and would fall into the group we label "pro".⁷

⁷ The respondents also can be sorted in the following way:

Distribution of Trade Union Officials by Attitudinal Group and Experience

	<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>	<i>Total</i>
Experienced	21	15	36
No Experience	6	9	15
---	---	---	
$X^2 = 0.8$	27	24	51

There is no relationship between experience and attitude based on the chi-square.

Insert Table 1 Here

Social Attitude vs. Selected Characteristics

Table 2 shows various characteristics of union leaders and their unions by experience and attitudinal group. What is expected is that "con" union leaders are those elected to office in relatively small unions and who work only part time in this capacity. The point is that the further removed the union leader is from the rank-and-file, the more likely he is to be classified in the "pro" group. Table 2 shows that this distance between the official and his constituents is related to size. Moreover, officials serving large bodies of workers are probably less sensitive to the rank-and-file than are elected leaders.

Insert Table 2 Here

To a certain extent, this is borne out by an examination of Table 2. Three out of nine inexperienced "con" union leaders work part-time at union business; none of them are appointed. In addition, the mean size of the unions represented by this subgroup is 743—the smallest of the four major subgroups. Perhaps this can be seen more clearly if this group is compared with experienced "pro" union leaders. In the latter, only four of 21 officials worked part-time at union business and six of 21 were appointed to office. The mean membership of this group is 5,380. Moreover, 92 per cent of the con group were elected to their jobs compared to a 74 per cent figure for the pro group.

Experienced union leaders, regardless of attitudes, represent larger constituencies than their inexperienced counterparts. There is not much doubt that leaders of larger unions exhibit a more tolerant social attitude than union leaders in smaller units. However, it is also true that experienced union leaders represent larger locals because it is large employers who are likely to participate in training programs for the disadvantaged. Leaders of large unions, even though elected, may be further removed from the day-to-day administration of collective bargaining contracts, and therefore exhibit somewhat more liberal values than those officers closer to the rank-and-file.

In addition, the officials of larger units may be more heavily influenced by top AFL-CIO executives, who tend to support job training, than are union officials of smaller units.⁸ For example, 76 per cent (16/21) of the experienced, pro-union leaders are full time, compared to a 60 per cent (9/15) figure for experienced, con union leaders. Full-time status reflects union size since the approximate mean membership of fulltime, experienced leaders is 5,620 compared to 593 for the part-time, experienced union officials.

A significant point that must be made is that con union leaders are not necessarily anti-job training oriented. However, they tend to advocate traditional work values, that is, the idea that effort and hard work will pay off and that one can rise above his environment no matter how bad it is. These traditionally oriented unions are, perhaps, somewhat less tolerant of

⁸ Derek C. Bok and John T. Dunlop, *Labor and the American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), pp. 116-136. AFLCIO support of job training programs for the disadvantaged is clearly enunciated in a policy statement issued by the Executive Council in September, 1967.

individual differences than are pro respondents. Moreover, the tolerance level seems to vary directly with the size of the union.⁹

Rank-and-File Attitudes Towards Working with the Hard-Core Disadvantaged

What are the union leaders' impressions of their memberships' feelings about working with hard-core disadvantaged job trainees? Table 3 indicates that 71 per cent of the experienced pro union officials think the rank-and-file support working with the hard-core.

Insert Table 3 Here

Moreover, especially among con union leaders, experience with manpower programs appears to have an impact on their perceptions of their constituents' support of working with the hard-core. For example, 22 per cent of the inexperienced leaders in the con group think the rank-and-file support the idea of working with the hard-core, compared to a 40 per cent figure for experienced leaders in the con group. Even if respondents are simply projecting their own feelings, it is not unlikely that some of this positive attitudinal drift reflects real changes in the attitudes of the rank-and-file as a result of their firms' involvement in JET and similar programs. An interesting comparison can be made with the interview responses of 115 employers in the JET program and 115 employers, matched in size and industry with JET firms, but who were not participating in JET. About 53 per cent (61/115) of the experienced (JET) employers felt that their employees supported working with the hard-core, compared to 24 per cent (28/115) for

⁹ Cited at footnote 8.

the nonparticipating (non- JET) firms. The analogous figures for the experienced and inexperienced union respondents are, respectively, 58 per cent and 33 per cent. The similarities are significant; both employers and union leaders appear to view their constituents in similar fashion.

But what about the negative answers of experienced union leaders? Is there something unique about their experiences which led to this response? An examination of the interviews suggests that the main concern of these union officials is job security.¹⁰ For example, one respondent said, "At first the workers disliked the idea—they expressed fear of job loss and loss of overtime." Another replied, "We have more people than jobs now." Still another commented on the nature of the production process in saying, "There are so many people to a machine, and when they are absent and tardy it is hard for efficiency— people didn't complain, but supervision had a lot of trouble." What he meant was that management had difficulty in adapting to the interruptions in the production process created by the poor work habits (absenteeism) of some trainees.

Only two of the fifteen inexperienced union leaders said that their rank-and-file would oppose working with the hard-core. (The proportion among experienced leaders is almost identical. Neither of these union officers fully supported on-the-job training programs. One said, "We're not completely for either JET or NAB 100 per cent because we feel all training

¹⁰ Also see Bok and Dunlop, cited at footnote 8. "Some labor officials have actually blocked efforts to place the graduates of government training programs because of fear that jobs and wages of union members would somehow be impaired."

should be outside of the industry grounds." The other noted that, "Our union has never been involved, but from what I understand, it (JET) hasn't proven itself to me."

***Union Official's' Attitudes On: Supervision, Promotions, Exceptions to Seniority Rules and
Work Standards***

(1)—Supervision

How do union leaders feel about supervision for the job trainees? In their eyes, is it necessary to provide closer supervision for disadvantaged trainees than for other new hires?

Insert Table 4 Here

From Table 4, it is obvious that inexperienced, pro-union leaders are the only group that strongly advocates closer supervision for trainees. This is expected since their values have not been tempered by reality. The rest apparently do not feel this extra guidance is necessary. However, it should be noted that about 43 per cent (9/21) of the pro, experienced respondents felt there should be some extra help given trainees in their first three or four weeks on the job. Surprisingly enough, an even higher percentage of con leaders (47 per cent) advocate closer supervision in the initial phases of the job. It may be that leaders in the pro group favor closer supervision for trainees because of their desire to ensure success. On the other hand, perhaps those in the con group advocate closer supervision because they view trainees as poor risks, and so feel that closer supervision is necessary to minimize these risks. In other words, leaders in both attitudinal groups advocate closer supervision, but possibly for different reasons.

(2)—Promotion and Exceptions to Normal Seniority Rules

How should people in entry level jobs be promoted? Do union leaders believe the criterion should be "seniority", "merit", or "seniority when merit is equal"? Ninety per cent [18/20 (one no answer)] of the experienced, pro group and 80 per cent of the experience, con group said, "seniority where merit is equal," as shown in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 Here

Perhaps a more important question is the union leaders' feelings on whether or not there should be any exceptions to established seniority rules on promotion, job bidding and/or layoffs.

The only group that shows any support for exceptions are three out of 15 experienced, con union leaders. Seniority is, in the words of one official, "the guts of the union contract" and most union leaders are not ready to alter this rule either for promotion, job bidding, or layoffs.

(3)—Work Standards

A common problem indicated by many employers in Project JET is late reporting and undue absenteeism by disadvantaged trainees. With this in mind, it is interesting to see how union leaders feel about the work place standards that should apply to job trainees.

Insert Table 6 Here

Table 6 shows that a significant minority of experienced leaders in the pro group support the notion of easier work standards for the hard-core. Three of six inexperienced leaders in the pro group also favor easier standards. But the overwhelming majority of "con" leaders reject the idea of different treatment.

Differential treatment of individuals in a particular bargaining unit goes against the grain of these unionists. For example, one respondent said the reason the rank-and-file opposed working with the hard-core was because, "They get away with things like tardiness and absenteeism." However, the union officials' support of single work standards cannot be construed to mean they are against job training programs. Sixteen out of 36 experienced union leaders pointed out the need for special supervision for the disadvantaged during the initial week of work. What these respondents seem to be saying is that, given some initial help, there eventually is no need for dual standards. Moreover, it also suggests that double standards can be employed where necessary, if they are limited to some specific time period. It seems reasonable to think that the rank-and-file would buy such a policy if it were well explained by their union officers and if it were clearly pointed out that the dual standards were only temporary.

Educational Standards of the Firm

One of the significant aspects of Project JET was the literacy training that accompanied on-the-job training. Usually two hours per day during normal working time was devoted to this. The objective was to bring the trainee up to the equivalent of an eighth grade education. Some JET trainees were well past this level and the degree of difficulty in achieving this goal is directly related to the starting level of the trainee. How did the union leaders view this task? How many felt it could be attained?

Insert Table 7 Here

Somewhere between 60 and 67 per cent of the union respondents in the four categories felt that the hard-core can be brought up to the educational standards required by the firm for entry level jobs. However, in contrast to this, only 39 per cent (45/115) of the JET employers felt this to be an attainable goal (compared to 72 per cent (83/115) of the non-JET employers). The figure for JET employers is surprisingly low relative to the union leaders' response. Perhaps employers project higher job requirements than is necessary; or it may be that this response reflects some greater pessimism by employers about the literacy aspect of the training. The two hours per day allocated to the three R's might have interfered with production schedules and antagonized employers. Some employers discovered that their regular employees generally resented this arrangement. Why shouldn't they also get time off for schooling? After three

years of experience JET administrators concluded that the literacy component of training could better be done at sites other than the work place.

Also interesting are the union leaders' comments on this question. For example, one union leader's pessimistic response is based on the company's effort to hire only workers with at least a high school degree. This kind of hiring requirement is one that would create nearly unattainable goals for any coupled-job training program. Another dubious trade union official pointed out that workers in his union were required to have, "The ability to converse with the public and to be able to read and write," talents presumably difficult for the disadvantaged to attain. And still another said, "It's just impossible for them to learn, otherwise they would already have done it." The union leaders, at times, found it difficult to distinguish between the employer's hiring standards (which might be arbitrary) and functional job requirements.

However, the majority of the responses are positive. Some unionists felt this goal was easily reached. One man commenting on the ability of the hard-core to learn said, "No question about it, we have some darn good examples here." Another said, "The need for skills is not that high here. Mostly what is needed is good sense." In the eyes of some respondents, job standards are, at times, unrealistically high as indicated by a union leader saying, "One of our best men cannot read or write, but he has good sense and is smart in other ways." And still another said, "You don't need much education to do this work—so long as you can read and write a little."

CONCLUSION

This study has analyzed the attitudes of a small sample of union leaders in Western New York. Obviously, this sample may not be representative and generalizations based on the findings reported here must be used cautiously. Nevertheless responses of the interviewed union officials indicate that unions generally support, rather than block, the significant aspects of on-the-job training programs for the disadvantaged. The results show that union leaders representing larger units are generally more sympathetic towards job training programs than officers of smaller unions. Moreover, a good majority of union respondents felt that the rank-and-file would work cooperatively with the disadvantaged, especially if the regular employees' fears of job insecurity are allayed. Very few union leaders support the idea of dual work place standards, although many advocate extra supervision for the trainees in the early weeks of work. Special treatment and separate standards for the hard-core seem to be an anathema to most union people.¹¹ In addition, a policy of dual standards may violate bargaining contracts and stimulate untold grievances. Another significant point is that most union leaders, regardless of experience and social disposition, felt that the hard-core could achieve the educational requirements set by the firms they dealt with. The union officers generally do not seem to feel that lack of education is a barrier to success. What they emphasize are good work habits and basic common sense.

¹¹ Ferman concluded, ". . . union leaders give relatively little opposition to equal employment practices unless these come into direct opposition to the job rights of white workers." Unions were unwilling "to compromise with long-established sets of institutional values—seniority and apprenticeship." See Ferman, cited at footnote 1.

Basically, it is the employer who decides to participate in job training programs. But clearly the quality of the responses of the interviewed union officials does not allow the inference that unions are likely to set up insurmountable roadblocks to progress in the implementation of public or private employment policies for the disadvantaged. This appears true even though local union officials have not led the way in manpower training.¹²

What does this mean for public policy? It may be that it would be more fruitful to foster training plans in large plants with relatively large bargaining units. In addition, it also may be sensible to emphasize the development of good work habits, even at the expense of classroom education. There are many jobs in industry which do not require much formal education. Moreover, the hardcore who show interest in such programs are likely to have had a reasonably good "out of school" education simply to have survived.

¹² Bok and Dunlop, cited at footnote 8, pp. 440-441.

TABLE 1

Attitudes of Union Leader Sample on Three Social Issues

<i>Question</i>	<i>No. %</i>		<i>No. %</i>		<i>No. %</i>	
	<i>Very Important</i>		<i>Important</i>		<i>Not Important</i>	
How important a cause of poverty is black laziness?	28	54.9	17	33.3	6	11.8
How important a cause of poverty is poor education in urban schools?	20	38.8	16	31.4	15	29.8
	<i>Increase</i>		<i>Maintain</i>		<i>Decrease</i>	
Should the Federal, State, and local government increase, maintain, or decrease their efforts to integrate public schools?*	20	41.7	11	22.9	17	35.4

* Three no answers or no opinion.

TABLE 2
***Selected Characteristics of Union Leaders and Their Unions
 by Experience and Social Attitude***

	PRO					CON				
	Elec	App	FT	PT	Mean Size	Elec	App	FT	PT	Mean Size
Experience	15	6	17	4	5,380	13	2	9	6	2,250
No Experience	5	1	2	4	1,470	9	0	6	3	743
TOTALS	20	7	19	8		22	2	15	9	

TABLE 3

*Percentage of Union Leaders Who Believe Rank-and-File Support Working
 With the Hard-Core by Attitudinal Group and Experience*

	PRO		CON		Total	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Experienced	71	(15/21)	40	(6/15)	58.5	(21/36)
No Experience	50	(3/ 6)	22	(2/ 9)	33	(5 /15)

TABLE 4
***Proportion of Union Leaders Feeling that Closer Supervision
of Trainees Is Necessary***

	PRO		CON	
	%	No.	%	No.
Experienced	14.3	3/21	0.0	0/15
No Experience	66.7	4/6	11.2	1/9

TABLE 5
Union Leader Attitudes Toward Promotions—Per Cent Advocating
“Seniority Where Merit Is Equal”

	PRO		CON	
	%	No.	%	No.
Experienced	90	18/20	80	12/15
No Experience	50	3/6	88	7/8
				(1 no answer)

TABLE 6

***Union Leader Attitudes Towards Work Standards: Per Cent Advocating
Easier Standards for Trainees Than for Regular Work Force***

	PRO		CON	
	%	No.	%	No.
Experienced	24	5/12	7	1/15
No Experience	50	3/6	11	1/9

TABLE 7

***Union Leader Attitudes Towards Education—Per Cent Feeling That Hard-
Core Trainees Could Be Brought Up To Educational Standards
Required by the Firm Literacy Training***

	PRO		CON	
	%	No.	%	No.
Experienced	62	13/21	60	9/15
No Experience	67	4/6	67	6/9

Appendix Table 1

Occupational Distribution of Unions Represented by Union Leaders
 Interviewed

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Machinists	4	7.8
Fabricators	10	19.6
Tool & Die Makers	1	2.0
Chemical, Petroleum Workers	7	13.7
Papers Makers	2	3.9
Civil Service Workers	2	3.9
Service Employees	4	7.8
Clerks	1	2.0
Grain Millers	2	3.9
Clothing Workers	1	2.0
Wood & Allied Product Workers	3	5.9
Construction Workers	2	3.9
Printers	3	5.9
Laundry Workers	1	2.0
Automotive Repair Workers	1	2.0
Textile Workers	1	2.0
Electrical Workers	1	2.0
Operating Engineers	1	2.0
Other	2	3.9
Unable to classify	2	3.9
	<u>51</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Appendix

Appendix Table 2

Selected Characteristics of Union Respondents*

I. Union Leaders with Prior Experience in Job Training Programs

No.	Title	Union	Size (-X)	Elected	App.	PT.	FT.	AFL-CIO Affil.
1.	President	Retail Clerks	3408	X			X	yes
2.	President	Civil Service Employee Assoc.	300	X		X		no
3.	Sec.-Treas.	Bartenders	640	X			X	yes
4.	President	I.A.M.	162	X		X		yes
5.	Vice President	Grain Millers	1000	X			X	yes
6.	President	Int. OCAW	800	X			X	yes
7.	Staff Rep.	USW	2000		X		X	yes
8.	Exec. Sec.	Western New York Hospital	1500	X			X	yes
9.	President	Amalgamated Meat Cutters	6000	X			X	yes
10.	President	Intl. Longshoreman	270	X			X	yes
11.	Asst. Mgr.	Textile Workers	2000		X		X	yes
12.	President	Hotel, Motel, Rest. & Cafe. Wkrs.	2200	X			X	yes
13.	President	Intl. Union of Oper. Engineer	500	X			X	yes
14.	Bus. Rep.	I.A.M.	8200	X			X	yes
15.	President	Niagara-Hooker Chem.	1270	X		X		no
16.	Director	UMWA - District 50	8000		X		X	no
17.	Intl. Rep.	U.A.W.	2500		X	X		no
18.	President	AFL-CIO Bflo. Coun.	70,000	X			X	yes
19.	Staff Rep.	U.S.W.	1300		X		X	yes
20.	Intl. Rep.	United Hat, Cap & Millinery Workers	350		X		X	no
21.	General Rep.	Dist. Painters	850		X		X	yes
22.	President	Intl. Union of Elec., Radio & Machine Workers	118	X		X		yes
23.	President	U.S.W.	250	X		X		yes
24.	Bus. Rep.	I.A.M.	700	X			X	yes
25.	Bus. Mgr.	IBEW	1750	X			X	yes
26.	President	U.S.W.	484	X		X		yes
27.	President	U.S.W.	220	X		X		yes
28.	President	AFL-CIO Combined Laundry & Service Workers	1300	X			X	yes
29.	Sec. - Treas.	Intl. Printers & Pressman	700	X			X	yes
30.	President	Building Service Empl.	2600	X			X	yes
31.	Regional Dir.	U.H.W.	19,000		X		X	no
32.	President	U.S.W.	930	X		X		yes
33.	Vice Pres.	Intl. Longshoreman	270	X		X		yes
34.	President	U.S.W.	2200	X			X	yes
35.	President	Independent Union	3000	X			X	no
36.	Shop Steward	Protection Association	15	X		X		no

n = 36; \bar{X} = 4077

146,787 28 8 11 25 28 yes

* It should be noted that where the same international union is listed more than once, different local leaders have been interviewed.

II. Union Leaders with NO Prior Experience in Job Training Programs

No.	Title	Union	Size	Elected	App.	PT.	FT.	AFL-CIO Affil.
1.	President	OCAW	147	X		X		yes
2.	Bus. Rep.	Office & Profess. Employees	1200		X		X	yes
3.	President	Civil Service Employ. Assoc.	4500	X		X		no
4.	President	Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers	139	X		X		yes
5.	President	United Paper Makers	87	X		X		yes
6.	Bus. Mgr.	IBEW	1470	X			X	yes
7.	President	I.A.M.	128	X		X		yes
8.	President	United Paper Makers	110	X		X		yes
9.	Bus. Mgr.	Operating Engineers	2000	X			X	yes
10.	President	Intl. Molders & Allied Wkrs.	50	X		X		yes
11.	Sec. - Treas.	Teamsters	1700	X			X	no
12.	Sec. - Treas.	Teamsters	500	X			X	no
13.	Bus. Rep.	Waitresses Alliance	600	X			X	yes
14.	Bus. Rep.	Intl. Bridge, Structural & Ornamental Iron Workers	1000	X			X	yes
15.	President	Lithographers, Photo Engrav.	600	X			X	yes

\bar{X} = 949

14,231 14 1 7 8 12 yes