

**Final Report on a Survey of Training and the Restructuring of
Work in Large Unionized Firms**

Professor Harry Katz
School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
Phone: (607) 255-3230
Fax: (607) 255-0107

and

Associate Professor Jeffrey H. Keefe
IMLR
Rutgers University
Phone: (908) 932-1749
Fax: (908) 932-5188

October 13, 1993

Working Paper # 93-19

This research was supported by the Center on the Educational Quality of the Workforce (EQW), agreement number R117Q00011-91, as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed in this report do not reflect the position or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the Department of Education. A preliminary version of the survey was developed and tested with funding support from the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies at NYSSILR, Cornell University.

Chapter 6), there exists no prior comprehensive and systematic assessment of training activities underway among unionized firms in the United States. The survey described below redresses this gap in prior research.

II. The Survey Instrument

An eleven page questionnaire was mailed to the industrial relations managers and a union officer at all firms with 1,000 or more unionized employees included in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor (BLS) contract file. Of a total population of 800 firms, 276 management and 155 union useable surveys were returned. Out of this population there are 45 cases where we have both a management and a union response covering the same bargaining unit. Appendix A is a summary survey report showing the mean management and union responses across all firms to the questions that were asked of both parties. Some questions in the survey were asked only of managers and the responses to these questions are reported in Appendix B.²

The discussion that follows does not review in detail all the survey responses. Rather, we focus on the more interesting findings and report the results of further statistical analysis with these data. The reader is encouraged to closely examine the actual survey responses reported in the Appendices.

III. The Amounts and Types of Training Provided by Firms

The level of training provided by firms to the average blue collar employee rose by one-third from 1980 to 1990, according to management's response to Question 4. At the same time, the responses to Question 1 reveal that both managers and union officers feel that substantial further increases in training are warranted.

Managers report that on average workers in 1990 received 42.5 total hours (or 2% of working time) of formal training (see Question 6). Managers also report that the cost to the company of all types of training and education provided to unionized employees in 1990 was on average \$1121 per employee (see Question 12). This amounts to 4.5% of total hourly earnings based on the average wage reported in Question 17.

It is important to note that these estimates of the amount of training provided by the firm depend heavily on the nature of the question being asked in the survey. Managers (and unionists) report twice as high an amount to a question is posed in terms of the total cost of training and education as compared to the responses to a question posed in terms of the number of hours devoted to training.

Comparisons between the median and mean sample responses to Question 12 reveal that the mean training levels are systematically higher than the median training levels.³ The median cost to the company of all types of training and education was \$501 per blue collar employee (versus mean costs of \$1121).

The much higher mean training expenditure appears because some firms are spending very large amounts on training.

This sizeable difference in mean and median training levels is an important issue that policy makers and researchers should keep in mind. These data suggest that consideration of only mean training levels is likely to provide a severe over-estimate of the level of training.

There is some controversy among researchers regarding the reliability of survey questions concerning training levels and expenditures. (Zemsky and Shapiro, forthcoming) The fact that manager and unionist responses to questions 6 and 12 (concerning total training amounts and expenditures) are so similar adds credibility to this and other survey data.

The responses from the question concerning the various types of training provided in 1990 are reported in Question 2. The largest amounts of training provided to "unskilled" blue collar employees in 1990 dealt with safety and health (9.5 hours), quality improvement (5.8 hours), and technical skills upgrading and refreshers (4.8 hours).

It is interesting to note that in 1990 the annual amounts of remedial English literacy training (.4 hour) and basic math training (.5 hour) were extremely low even in the face of the frequent claims appearing in the press concerning the alleged inadequacy of elementary and secondary education. Only 17 (out of 276) firms provided any remedial English literacy training to their unskilled workforce while only 31 firms provided any basic

math training. In those firms that provided any training on these subjects, the average levels of training for English literacy and basic math provided to unskilled workers in 1990, respectively, were .27 and .45 hours.⁴

It may be that these numbers underestimate real education deficiencies and only suggest that employers are failing to fill in for inadequate basic training. Yet, responses elsewhere in the survey suggest that employers are relatively satisfied with the skills held by blue collar workers. This satisfaction appears in employers responses to the question in the survey asking whether they expect that their company will have trouble finding qualified blue collar workers of various types over the next five years (see Question 9 and also see these responses reported in Question 31). The average response for laborers, assembly workers, production workers, and semi-skilled workers was either that they "will not hire" or that "no trouble" was expected in finding qualified hires. With regard to skilled blue collar workers, employers expected only a little bit more trouble finding hires, although even this response is far from the dire shortage of skilled employees predicted by some. Our findings are consistent with the data reported elsewhere by Cappelli and O'Shaughnessy showing that employers generally are most concerned with the social, and not the technical skills, held by their workforce. (Cappelli and O'Shaughnessy, 1993)

IV. The Providers of Training

Questions 22, 23, 25, and 26 concern the providers of blue collar worker training. The figures in Questions 22 show that nearly all training for unskilled workers is provided in-house, primarily by in-house plant staff (43.7%) or on-the-job (34.6%). (Similar responses appear for Question 23 concerning the training of skilled workers.) Firms are making very little use of either community colleges, local high schools, or vocational schools to train their unionized blue collar workforce and the responses to Questions 25 and 26 show that little changed from 1980 to 1990 in the use of these alternative training suppliers.

These figures suggest that recent efforts to provide better links between schools and firms have not met with great success. This data is consistent with the many comparisons that have been made between blue collar training in the United States and Germany which point to the heavy use of formal training (through an apprenticeship system) in Germany. Note, even unionized skilled workers in the U.S. receive very little of their training from certified apprenticeships (5.7% in Question 23).

V. Training Selection and Evaluation

Our survey results indicate that seniority, the installation of new technology or work processes, or supervisor recommendations are the three most important factors utilized to select workers for skills upgrading and training (see Questions 7 and 8). The least important factors are pencil and paper tests,

work samples or simulation, or performance appraisals. To evaluate the effectiveness of training, employers most often use a survey of the participants (36%), while supervisory evaluations (29%) and pencil and paper tests (23%) are used less frequently (See Question 30).

VI. The Demand for Training

As mentioned earlier, both managers and unionists believe that training should be increased substantially (see Question 1). The responses to this issue varied substantially with the firm's economic experiences. Our survey asked whether during the last ten years the firm had faced a severe crisis that threatened its survival. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that their companies had faced such a crisis (Question 24). Further analysis of these data reveal that managers in these crisis firms believe that their workers require considerably more training than do managers in the non-crisis firms. In crisis firms, managers thought training should be increased by 32% for unskilled workers and 35% for skilled workers. Managers in the non-crisis firms though training should be increased by 22% for unskilled workers and 25% for skilled workers and these differences are statistically significant at the 3 percent level (in a test where the firm level observations are weighted by the employment in each firm).

Yet, crisis firms provide substantially less training than non-crisis firms. Forty-six total hours of formal training was

provided to hourly employees in non-crisis firms in 1990 while hourly employees in crisis firms received only 40 total hours of training (these figures are not significantly different given the wide variation that appears across firms in the total hours of training provided). Companies spent \$1024 in crisis firms and \$1228 in non-crisis firms on all types of training and education (a statistically significant difference at the 10% level in responses to Question 2).

These comparisons indicate that firms having difficulty competing provide substantially less training although their managers perceive a greater need for more training. A public policy that provides low cost worker training could assist these crisis firms while simultaneously providing skills to workers that may not be receiving adequate employer provided training, yet may be searching for new jobs in the near future.

VII. The Extent of Work Reorganization

Our survey responses to Question 15 suggests that there has been relatively modest spread of new work organization across large unionized firms. Managers report that only 21% of blue collar employees in these firms are covered by team systems while only 10% engage in job rotation and 17% receive cross training. Participation processes have spread more widely as 31% of blue collar employees are covered by an employee involvement program, 20% are in problem solving teams, and 12% are covered by quality of work life programs. Again, it is interesting to note the high

degree of similarity that appears in mean manager and union responses to this question.

The survey does not measure the depth of employee participation in these various endeavors. Our own field work suggests that many of these participation processes are shallow. The higher percentage of workers covered by the various participation programs as compared to the percentage of workers covered by new work organization (such as teams or skill based pay) may be indicative of limited substantive change in work organization. These statistics are consistent with other data (such as the 1987 GAO study reported by Eaton and Voos, 1992) showing limited diffusion of new work organization. Although our questions are not identical to those in the Osterman (forthcoming) survey, his numbers (for a wide variety of firms) reveal somewhat larger amounts of work reorganization. At the same time, since our survey comes from large union firms (and are figures reported by managers) one might have expected to see greater reported diffusion of new work organization in this sample.

VIII. The Links Between Training and Work Reorganization

Correlation analysis reveals a strong association between levels and increase in training and the extent of work reorganization underway in the firm. To carry out this analysis we used factor analysis to simplify the responses to the training questions 2 and 6 and the work organization Question 15. The

latter broke out into one basic work organization factor which included responses to the non-pay related items in Question 15 such as the use of team systems, cross rotation, quality circles, etc. The work organization factor is strongly and positively associated with the total hours of formal training provided to blue collar workers in 1990 (Question 6), and this association is statistically significant at the 8 percent level. The work organization factor also is strongly and positively correlated with increase from 1980 to 1990 in the average level of formal training received by blue collar employees (Question 4), and this correlation is statistically significant at the two percent level. This data suggest that higher levels training and greater recent increases in training go along with more extensive changes in work organization and the introduction of features of high performance work systems (i.e., teams, employee involvement etc.). At the same time, these data and the correlations are not able to distinguish lines of causation (e.g., whether work organization causes higher training levels or vice versa).

IX. The Labor-Management Relationship and Its Association With Training

Question 20 asked union officers and managers about the labor-management relationship. The various sub-components of the question asked in a variety of about the extent to which each party respected the other side and tried to cooperatively solve problems. It is interesting to note that relations became more

trusting and cooperative between 1980 to 1990, and that the union and management responses are very similar to one another.

We used correlation analysis to test the degree to which more cooperative and respectful labor-management relations are associated with levels of training and the extent of work reorganization. In this analysis we used factor analysis on the responses to Question 20 which produced two factors, one factor included responses to Questions 20b and 20c while another factor grouped responses to the Questions 20a through 20d. The latter factor on labor-management relations correlates strongly and positively with the extent of work organization factor (derived from the non-pay items in Question 15). Furthermore, this correlation is statistically significant at the 5 percent level. This suggests that respectful and cooperative labor-management relations are associated with more extensive work reorganization. Again, these data and correlations cannot distinguish lines of causation (e.g, whether cooperative labor-management relations is causing more extensive work reorganization or vice versa).

However, contrary to our expectations, the labor-management relationship factors from Question 20 do not correlate in a statistically significant manner with training levels or change in training levels from 1980 to 1990. It may well be that it will take more time for more cooperative labor-management relations to lead to increases in training efforts.

X. Summary

A number of important findings are revealed in our survey. Survey responses reveal that in large unionized settings there is a significant amount of training provided by the firm, although the survey data shows that the amounts depend on measurement techniques. Training is twice as large in the mean versus the median firm. In addition, estimates of the amount of training provided by the firm depend heavily on the nature of the question being asked in the survey. Managers (and unionists) report twice as high an amount when the question is posed in terms of the total cost of training and education as compared to the responses to a question posed in terms of the number of hours devoted to training. Managers and unionists also believe that there is a need for even more substantial training and education efforts in their firms.

The survey data reveal relatively modest amounts of work reorganization underway in the sampled firms as of 1990. The data show that those firms that have relatively high levels of training also have more extensive work reorganization. Furthermore, more extensive work reorganization are associated with more cooperative and trusting labor-management relations although no similar association exists with respect to the amounts of training provided by the firms.

The survey reveals no evidence of a skill shortage in the perceptions of managers and unionists. Although these views may be affected by the slack labor market prevailing in the early

1990s, it does suggest that predictions of imminent recruitment difficulties are exaggerated.

It would be interesting to know how the training levels reported in this survey compare to the levels provided in countries such as Germany and Japan. Analysis of this issue is the focus of our continuing research.

Endnotes

1. A preliminary analysis of these data is provided in Katz and Keefe, 1993.
2. We did not ask union officers questions concerning corporate expenditures and matters that they would not be familiar. We used pilot tests of the survey questionnaire with managers and union officers to develop and screen the questions. A preliminary version of the survey was developed and tested with funding support from the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies at NYSSILR, Cornell University.
3. Note, the average sized firm had 6709 total employees, 3359 hourly or nonexempt employees, and 1027 employees per plant in 1990 while the median sized firm had 1800 total employees, 1200 hourly or nonexempt employees, and 550 employees per plant.
4. The respective training provided to skilled workers was .14 and 1.14 hours.

References

Bassi, Laurie. 1993. "Reorganization of Work and Education: Scope and Impact," unpublished paper, Department of Economics, Georgetown University, July.

Cappelli, Peter and K.C. O'Shaughnessy. 1993. "What's Behind the Skills Gap?," Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, (Madison, WI: IRRA):296-303.

Doeringer, Peter B. et al. 1991. Turbulence in the American Workplace (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ferman, Louis A. et al. 1991. Joint Training Programs: A Union-Management Approach to Preparing Workers for the Future, (Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press).

Katz, Harry C. and Jeffrey H. Keefe. 1993. "Report on a Study of Training, Adjustment Policies, and the Restructuring of Work in Large Unionized Firms," Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, (Madison, WI: IRRA):304-310.

Osterman, Paul. forthcoming. "How Common Is Workplace Transformation and How Can We Explain Who Adopts It?," Industrial and Labor Relations Review.

Voos, Paula B. and Adrienne Eaton. 1992. "Unions and Contemporary Innovations in Work Organization, Compensation, and Employee Participation", in L. Mishel and P. Voos, eds., Unions and Economic Competitiveness (New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.).

Zemsky, Robert and Dan Shapiro. forthcoming. "Measuring a Mirage: Why Training Numbers Don't Add Up," Working Paper 19, Center on the Educational Quality of the Workforce, University of Pennsylvania.

Appendix A

Survey Questions With Both Management and Union Responses

Part II. Human Resource Changes

The next three questions ask you to compare training activities in 1990 with those that occurred in 1980. We realize that it may be difficult to remember what training activities went on in 1980. Please do the best you can. We only want to know your sense of how 1990 activities compare to those that occurred in 1980.

4. How does the amount of formal training received by the average bargaining unit employee in 1990 compare to what those employees received in 1980 in the following topics:

| Average Training Hours | >>>>>>>>Increased by>>>>>>>> | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 1990 Compared to 1980 | Union | Management |
| Safety and Health | 33% | 37% |
| Technical Skills Upgrading | 24% | 33% |
| Training for New Technology | 27% | 33% |
| Statistical Process Control | 28% | 38% |
| Remedial English Literacy | 6% | 9% |
| Basic Math | 8% | 10% |
| Quality Improvement | 30% | 43% |
| Interpersonal Skills | 13% | 20% |
| All of the above Training | 22% | 33% |

5. How does the amount of formal training received by the average bargaining unit employee in 1990 compare to what those employees received in 1980 in the following topics:

| Average Training Hours | >>>>>>>>Increased by>>>>>>>> | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 1990 Compared to 1980 | Union | Management |
| Communication Skills | 17% | 22% |
| Time Management | 12% | 9% |
| Information Management | 13% | 16% |
| Team Building | 26% | 35% |
| Problem Solving | 22% | 30% |
| Quality Circles | 18% | 24% |
| Employee Involvement | 30% | 42% |
| Career Development | 9% | 11% |
| Finance and Cost Control | 14% | 11% |

6. Adding up all the hours of training provided in the topics in Questions 5 and 6, approximately how many hours of formal training were received by the average bargaining unit employee in 1990 and 1980?

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|
| Union | <u>35.5 hours</u> | 1990 | <u>19.5 hours</u> | 1980 |
| Management | <u>42.5 hours</u> | 1990 | <u>22.8 hours</u> | 1980 |

7. Currently, how are UNSKILLED employees usually selected for skills training and upgrading. Please rank the importance of the following factors where 1 is the most important and 6 is the least important.

| Management | Union | |
|------------|-------|--|
| 23 | 23 | Seniority |
| 4.7 | 4.3 | Pencil and paper test |
| 4.2 | 4.2 | Work sample or simulation |
| 3.9 | 3.8 | Performance appraisals |
| 2.6 | 3.4 | Supervisor recommendation or selection |
| 2.4 | 2.8 | When new technology or work processes are installed on their existing jobs |

8. Currently, how are SKILLED employees usually selected for skills training and upgrading. Please rank the importance of the following factors where 1 is the most important and 6 is the least important.

| Management | Union | |
|------------|-------|--|
| 2.7 | 2.6 | Seniority |
| 4.7 | 4.4 | Pencil and paper test |
| 4.2 | 4.0 | Work sample or simulation |
| 3.8 | 3.6 | Performance appraisals |
| 2.6 | 3.3 | Supervisor recommendation or selection |
| 2.2 | 2.5 | When new technology or work processes are installed on their existing jobs |

Part III. Hiring and Training Needs

9. Check the answer that best captures your assessment of the extent of which you expect the company will have difficulty finding qualified workers to hire of each type over the next five years.

U-UNION M-MANAGEMENT X-IDENTICAL

| | Will Not Need to Hire | No Trouble Finding Hires | Some Recruiting Problems | Severe Recruiting Difficulties |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Laborers | UM | | | |
| Assembly Workers | MU | | | |
| Production Workers | UM | | | |
| Semi-skilled Workers | | UM | | |
| Electricians | | X | | |
| Machinists | | MU | | |
| Other Skilled Trades | | X | | |
| Clerical Workers | U | M | | |
| Service Workers | MU | | | |
| Technicians | | UM | | |

Part IV. Adjustment Policies and Practices

10. Since 1980 what proportion of the bargaining unit workforce has been offered the following:

| | Union | Management |
|----------------------------|-------|------------|
| Early Retirement | 10% | 10% |
| Severance Pay | 8% | 8% |
| Job Change to avoid layoff | 8% | 8% |
| Relocation to avoid layoff | 5% | 1% |
| Retraining to avoid layoff | 4% | 2% |

11. Since 1980 what proportion of the bargaining unit workforce has accepted the following:

| | Union | Management |
|----------------------------|-------|------------|
| Early Retirement | 3% | 4% |
| Severance Pay | 1% | 4% |
| Job Change to avoid layoff | 6% | 8% |
| Relocation to avoid layoff | 3% | 1% |
| Retraining to avoid layoff | 3% | 4% |

12. Adding up all types of training and education provided by the company to skilled and unskilled employees in the bargaining unit, how much do you estimate the company spent on training and education per employee in 1990? (Please check the appropriate box).

Union \$1025

Management \$1121

13. When needed skills are not present in the existing workforce, how frequently does the company go to the external labor market to hire already trained and skilled employees rather than upgrade the skills of existing employees?

Union 24%

Management 21%

V. Work Organization and Personnel Policies

14. a. Does the company have a tuition assistance program for the bargaining unit workforce?

Union 83% Management 79%

b. What proportion of the bargaining unit workforce was reimbursed in 1990 for college, vocational education, or other continuing education?

Union 6% Management 4%

15. What percentage of the bargaining unit employees were covered by the following human resource programs and work practices in 1990:

| | Union | Management |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
| All-Salaried Pay | 4% | 7% |
| Knowledge or skill based pay | 14% | 13% |
| Profit Sharing | 36% | 20% |
| Gainsharing | 10% | 6% |
| Lump Sum or Bonus Pay | 39% | 30% |
| Incentive Pay | 9% | 15% |
| Cross Training | 13% | 17% |
| Job Rotation | 13% | 10% |
| Socio-technical systems | 4% | 3% |
| Quality Circles | 17% | 15% |
| Team Systems | 21% | 21% |
| Autonomous Work Groups | 10% | 5% |
| Union-Management Committees | 22% | 23% |
| Problem Solving Teams | 16% | 20% |
| Total Quality Teams | 14% | 16% |
| Cellular Manufacturing Groups | 7% | 4% |
| Employee Involvement Program | 26% | 31% |
| Quality of Worklife Program | 18% | 12% |

16. At a typical work site or plant in the bargaining unit how many job classifications for hourly employees were there in 1990 and 1980?

| | Union | | Management | |
|-------------------------|-------|------|------------|------|
| | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 |
| Production Workers | 42 | 67 | 54 | 75 |
| Skilled and Maintenance | 14 | 22 | 15 | 19 |
| Clerical | 6 | 5 | 10 | 12 |
| Sales and Service | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |

17. What was the average hourly wage earned by bargaining unit workers in 1990 and 1980.

| | Management | | Union | |
|-----------|------------|--------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1980 | 1990 | 1980 |
| Skilled | \$14.28 | \$9.79 | \$15.26 | \$10.85 |
| Unskilled | \$11.57 | \$8.09 | \$12.78 | \$8.61 |

18. What have been the bargaining unit's employment levels?

3091 1980 bargaining unit employment

2809 1990 bargaining unit employment

19. Check which of the following issues are addressed by some written language in your current collective bargaining agreement or letters of understanding and indicate whether these issues have been discussed in negotiations at anytime since 1980:

| Written In | | Negotiated | | Employment Security Provisions |
|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|--|
| In Contract | | Since 1980 | | |
| Union Manage | | Union Manage | | |
| 93% | 95% | 30% | 27% | Layoffs by Seniority |
| 94% | 94% | 31% | 25% | Recall rights based on seniority |
| 55% | 36% | 19% | 11% | Guaranteed minimum work week |
| 41% | 22% | 15% | 12% | Supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB) |
| 46% | 44% | 30% | 19% | Severance Pay |
| 26% | 9% | 32% | 15% | Commitment to no layoff - transfer and retraining rights |
| 62% | 46% | 28% | 23% | Interplant transfer provisions |
| 31% | 17% | 27% | 13% | Employee relocation assistance (moving expenses, etc.) |
| 5% | 0% | 5% | 1% | Spouse relocation assistance (job search, etc.) |
| 42% | 30% | 44% | 30% | Advance notice on plant closing |
| 53% | 46% | 39% | 27% | Advance notice on sub-contracting |
| 16% | 9% | 12% | 10% | Restrictions on overtime during layoffs |
| 25% | 10% | 30% | 18% | Retraining in the event of permanent layoffs |
| 13% | 7% | 24% | 15% | Outplacement assistance for workers on permanent layoff |
| 27% | 17% | 40% | 26% | Early retirement incentives to promote force reductions |

20. Indicate the extent to which the following statements characterize the day to day relationship that existed between union and management officials in 1990 and 1980.

U-UNION M-MANAGEMENT X-IDENTICAL

a) Both parties show respect for the goals and objectives of the other.

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

b) Each side suspects the intentions or honesty of the other.

U M

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

UM

c) Both union and management compete for the loyalty of the employees.

U M

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

U M

d) The union influences management decision-making.

X

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

e) When conflicts arise, negotiations between union and management take place with a spirit of cooperation.

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

f) Both sides believe that the tactics used by the other are legitimate.

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

g) Union and management officials are friendly to each other.

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

h) Each side shows understanding of the other's position.

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

21. To what extent do the following statements reflect the company's practices in 1990 and 1980 for introducing new technology?

a) Workers or their representatives discuss new technology with management before the final purchase decisions are made:

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

b) Workers or their representatives discuss with management how their jobs and duties will be changed by new technology before the final purchase and implementation decisions are made:

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

c) Workers or their representatives participate in planning the implementation of new technology and the coordination of employee training:

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

d) Workers or their representatives are informed about new technology and its impact on jobs prior to its introduction:

M U

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|------|
| 1990 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1990 |
| 1980 | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | 1980 |

M U

Thank you for your help.

Jeffrey H. Keefe
 Institute of Management and Labor Relations
 Rutgers University
 P.O. Box 231
 New Brunswick, NJ 08903
 (908) 932-1749

Harry Katz
 Collective Bargaining Institute
 ILR School
 Cornell University
 Ithaca, NY 14853

Survey Questions With ONLY Management Responses

Appendix B

