



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Articles and Chapters

ILR Collection

12-1974

Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work: The Views of Local Union Activists

Thomas A. Kochan
Cornell University

David B. Lipsky
Cornell University, dbl4@cornell.edu

Lee Dyer
Cornell University, ldd3@cornell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles>

 Part of the [Collective Bargaining Commons](#), and the [Unions Commons](#)

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the ILR Collection at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work: The Views of Local Union Activists

Abstract

[Excerpt] The purpose of the present study was to assess the views of local union officers and activists on these matters. Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Do local union leaders and members see so-called quality of work issues as equal in importance to the more traditional issues of collective bargaining? Do they tend to agree or disagree on these ratings of importance? Do they see quality of work issues as more integrative; that is, as those on which the goals of management and the union are pretty much the same?
2. Is the collective bargaining process perceived to be (a) effectively responding to the goals which are rated as being most important; (b) more effective on issues on which there is general agreement regarding their importance than on those where larger individual differences exist; and (c) more effective on issues that are perceived to be more distributive than integrative?
3. Do these individuals feel that quality of work issues should be handled through bargaining, or do they feel the need for new approaches to union-management relations? In particular, are there issues which are viewed as important, but as not being handled effectively through collective bargaining, and, thus, as holding strong potential for joint programs of organizational change?

Keywords

collective bargaining, quality of work, union officers, labor relations

Disciplines

Collective Bargaining | Labor Relations | Unions

Comments

Suggested Citation

Kochan, T. A., Lipsky, D. B., & Dyer, L. (1974). Collective bargaining and the quality of work: The views of local union activists [Electronic version]. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Winter Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association* (pp. 150-162). Champaign, IL: Labor and Employment Relations Association.

Required Publisher's Statement

© Labor and Employment Relations Association. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work: The Views of Local Union Activists*

THOMAS A. KOCHAN

DAVID B. LIPSKY

LEE DYER

Cornell University

Each decade seems to bring with it new challenges to the institution of collective bargaining in the form of social critics who argue that the process is outmoded and unresponsive to the needs of American workers.¹ This decade's challenge comes from those who express grave concern about the quality of working life in American society.

The essential argument may be paraphrased as follows:² American unions have traditionally used the process of collective bargaining to improve the wages and fringes, general working conditions, and the job security of their members. (The bargaining process has performed effectively on these issues because workers have generally shared common perceptions of their importance, and because they involve a clear-cut distinction between the interests of management and the interest of labor) (i.e., they are distributive issues in Walton and McKersie's terms³).

But now, (some critics argue, workers have rearranged their priorities and are becoming less concerned with traditional issues and more concerned with the "quality" of their work.) Union leaders, the argument continues, have been slow to deal with these new concerns. In part this is because they involve issues such as worker participation, job mobility, flexible work time, and job redesign which are unfamiliar and perhaps

* The research was supported by grants from the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations and the Ford Foundation. Points of view and opinions stated in this paper do not necessarily represent the official position of the ILR School or the Foundation. The authors are particularly indebted to the Coordinators of the ILR School's Labor Studies Program for their cooperation; they also would like to thank Robert Kahn for his research assistance.

¹ See, for example, "The Crisis in the American Trade Union Movement," a collection of papers in the November 1963 issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*.

² For more complete statements of these arguments, see *Work in America*, Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972); A. Salpukas, "Unions: A New Role?" in *The Worker and the Job: Coping with Change*, ed. J. Rosow (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974); or D. Ephlin, "The Union's Role in Job Enrichment Programs," *Proceeding of the 26th Annual Winter Meeting*, Industrial Relations Research Association (Madison: The Association, 1974).

³ R. Walton and R. McKersie, *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965).

intimidating to union leaders. Further, it is because they involve areas in which the differences between union and management interests are not always clear (integrative issues in Walton and McKersie's terms). (This may mean that they are less appropriate for handling through traditional bargaining modes and may instead require joint efforts involving mutual cooperation between management and labor in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs) involving organizational change.

(In brief, social critics who advance this point of view are suggesting that workers are developing new needs and goals to which union leaders and the process of collective bargaining have not yet responded — and in fact may not be able to respond) Trade union leaders and some intellectuals have not allowed this position to go unchallenged, of course. Some have argued that recent concerns about worker participation, autonomy, job challenge, and the like are of far greater interest to "pop sociologists" than to the rank and file.⁴ Others agree that the challenge of rising worker expectations is a real one, but feel that it is a challenge that can and will be met and overcome through the normal channels of collective bargaining.⁵

Unfortunately, to date this debate between the critics and friends of collective bargaining has been conducted almost entirely at the impressionistic level. Seldom has convincing data been introduced to support the contentions of either side. Particularly noticeable has been the absence of evidence concerning the views of local union officers and the rank and file.

This latter point is distressing since this group is probably key to determining whether or not the concerns of the quality of work advocates will be taken at all seriously by labor union leaders and, if so, how this will impact on the process of collective bargaining. This is true for several reasons. First, (union leaders are elected officials and to a large extent the issues they pursue are determined by the needs and desires of their constituents. Second, even if quality of work issues are seen as important to local leaders and the rank and file, it is still an open question whether or not these individuals feel that collective bargaining is an effective means of pursuing their goals on this front.) They themselves may feel, along with the social critics, that these are areas with which the traditional bargaining process is simply not equipped to deal.

⁴See, for example, two articles appearing in the February 1973 issues of *The Federationist*: W. Winpisinger, "Job Satisfaction: A Union Response" (pp. 8-10) and J. Kristol, "Job Satisfaction: Daydream or Alienation?" (pp. 11-12).

⁵See, for example, J. Bluestone, "Worker Participation in Decision-Making," paper delivered at the Conference on Strategy, Programs, and Problems of an Alternative Political Economy, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, March 2-4, 1973.

This may be particularly true if they disagree over the importance of these issues or if they feel that the interests of management and labor in these areas are sufficiently similar to warrant the establishment of joint union-management change programs outside the normal channels of collective bargaining.

The purpose of the present study was to assess the views of local union officers and activists on these matters. Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Do local union leaders and members see so-called quality of work issues as equal in importance to the more traditional issues of collective bargaining? Do they tend to agree or disagree on these ratings of importance? Do they see quality of work issues as more integrative; that is, as those on which the goals of management and the union are pretty much the same?

2. Is the collective bargaining process perceived to be (a) effectively responding to the goals which are rated as being most important; (b) more effective on issues on which there is general agreement regarding their importance than on those where larger individual differences exist; and (c) more effective on issues that are perceived to be more distributive than integrative?

3. Do these individuals feel that quality of work issues should be handled through bargaining, or do they feel the need for new approaches to union-management relations? In particular, are there issues which are viewed as important, but as not being handled effectively through collective bargaining, and, thus, as holding strong potential for joint programs of organizational change?

Sample and Methods

To find answers to these questions, a questionnaire was developed and administered to a sample of 221 persons enrolled in the Cornell Labor Studies Program, a noncredit, certificate program conducted in New York City, Albany, Rochester, and Buffalo. The program offers students a series of courses in labor relations, collective bargaining, and related subjects and is designed principally for local union officials and active rank and file.

Students enrolled in the program seemed a sample ideally suited to the purposes of this study. The mixture of local and district-level union leaders and active rank and file (stewards, committeemen, etc.) provides us with an excellent cross-section of the views held by committed, union activists. By virtue of their experience and their enrollment in the Labor Studies Program, these union members are knowledgeable about labor negotiations and issues of concern to local union

members. Many aspire to careers in the union movement or, at least, to move up the union hierarchy. Further, these union activists represent most major industries, occupations, and unions. If collective bargaining relationships are to be redirected in the near future, as some would advocate, the kind of people in this sample will play important roles in bringing about—or opposing—this change.

The personal characteristics of the respondents in this sample are shown in Table 1. About half the sample come from the New York City area and half from the three upstate locations. Most of the respondents are part-time, unpaid local union officials, although about 40 percent are full-time leaders. The median age of the sample is about 40. Over 80 percent are male and 27 percent are black (most of the latter are from New York City). The typical respondent is a high school graduate, holds a blue-collar job, and earns between \$200 and \$250 a week. He has been a union member most of his working life, and a union official for the last several years.

TABLE 1
Selected Personal Characteristics of the Survey Sample

Characteristic	Percentage
Location:	
Rochester	10.4
Buffalo	26.7
Albany	9.9
New York City	53.0
Age:	
Under 25	1.9
24-34	28.6
35-44	33.8
45-54	29.1
55 and above	6.6
Sex:	
Male	78.3
Female	21.7
Race:	
White	65.3
Black and other minority	34.7
Education:	
Under 12 years of school	7.9
High school graduate	45.8
More than 12 years of school	46.3
Current union position:	
National union officer	0.9
District or regional officer	8.1
Local union officer	35.8
Committeemen	29.4
Steward	35.3
Other	15.4
(Adds to more than 100% because some respondents hold more than one office).	
Full-time or part-time union position:	
Full-time	40.2
Part-time	59.8

Thirteen job-related issues were chosen in order to obtain the respondents' perceptions of (1) the importance of the issues, (2) their integrative-distributive nature, (3) the effectiveness of collective bargaining, and (4) the potential for joint union-management change programs. The items were carefully chosen from previous studies in order to be representative of (1) empirically derived dimensions of job satisfaction, (2) labor standards areas that workers have indicated are important, and (3) issues that have traditionally been handled in collective bargaining. The national survey of working conditions conducted by the University of Michigan was used as the basic source for the job satisfaction and the labor standards items.⁶ Several traditional collective bargaining issues were added to the list to make it more complete. The exact wording of the items is presented in Table 2.⁷ In the remaining tables abbreviated labels for the items (shown in parentheses in Table 2) are used to conserve space.

Results

NATURE OF ISSUES

A two-step rating and ranking procedure was used to measure the importance of the work goals. The respondents were first asked to distribute the 13 issues across four categories of importance. They were then asked to rank each of the goals they had previously placed in each of the four categories. The percentage distributions of these ratings and the average rankings obtained are shown in Table 2. Although the respondents were not told in advance of our categorization of the issues, it can be seen in Table 2 that (almost without exception the labor standards and traditional bargaining issues (earnings, fringe benefits, job security, etc.) received higher importance ratings and rankings than the quality of work issues (interesting work, supervisor relations, productivity, etc.).) One traditional issue—hours—is ranked relatively low. This may be because of the ambiguous way we phrased the issue; many union officials are not concerned with "working fewer . . . hours," but rather seek to make more hours of work available to their constituents. (Two quality of work issues are rated at or above the median rank in importance by the respondents. "Having more to say about how the work is done" is viewed as either somewhat or very important by 85 per-

⁶ R. P. Quinn, T. E. Mangione, and M. S. Baldi de Manilovitch, "Evaluating Working Conditions in America," *Monthly Labor Review* 96 (November 1963), pp. 32-41.

⁷ Unfortunately, direct comparisons of our findings with those of the Michigan study are not possible since different response formats were used to obtain the importance ranking of the labor standards items and the job satisfaction items in the Michigan study. Also, none of the numerous studies of job satisfaction has attempted to make direct comparisons of traditional bargaining issues with quality of work issues, and thus it is difficult to make direct comparisons with previous empirical research in this area.

TABLE 2
Respondents' Ratings of Importance of Job Related Issues*

Issue	Not At All Important	Not Too Im- portant	Some- what Im- portant	Very Im- portant	Mean Ratings	Standard Deviation (Ratings)	Mean Rankings	Standard Deviation (Rankings)
Earning enough money to meet my needs ("earnings")	0%	1.4%	6.8%	91.8%	3.904	0.339	12.67	2.10
Having enough of the right kind of fringe benefits ("fringe benefits")	0	1.8	18.9	79.3	3.774	0.461	10.87	2.57
Improving the safety of my workplace ("safety")	1.4	7.7	15.9	75.0	3.645	0.684	10.33	3.74
Decreasing the chance of being laid off or fired ("job security")	3.2	10.5	18.6	67.7	3.509	0.808	9.18	3.52
Increasing the way my day to day problems and grievances are settled ("grievance procedure")	3.7	9.6	33.0	53.7	3.367	0.508	7.74	3.10
Having more to say about how the work is done ("control of work")	4.1	10.1	39.4	46.3	3.280	0.809	7.86	3.44
Improving conditions that interfere with getting the work done ("adequate resources")	3.6	15.5	35.0	45.9	3.232	0.842	7.30	3.11
Getting a better job in the company ("better job")	9.1	18.3	28.3	44.3	3.078	0.995	7.27	4.18
Having more interesting work ("interesting work")	11.0	17.4	30.7	40.8	3.014	1.014	6.80	3.82
Working fewer or different hours ("hours")	6.5	26.3	41.0	26.3	2.871	0.878	6.11	3.62
Improving the productivity of the company ("productivity")	11.0	22.4	36.5	29.9	2.858	0.974	5.08	3.52
Getting along better with my supervisors ("supervisors")	13.6	27.6	35.5	23.0	2.677	0.980	4.65	3.12
Cutting down on my work load and/or work speed ("work load")	15.7	28.1	34.6	21.7	2.622	0.993	4.64	3.40

* Issues are ranked by mean.

cent of the sample. ("Improving conditions that interfere with getting the work done" is ranked important by 80 percent of the sample.) We believe the latter issue is similar to the issue, "Improving productivity of the company," yet "productivity" is ranked significantly lower. This may be because the word "productivity" suggests to these union activists problems that are wholly the concern of management or policies that run counter to union interests, such as a "speed-up." (More than any other area "improving productivity" is the one in which the respondents felt their unions should not become involved—see Table 5).

Is there agreement on what the respondents consider important? An examination of Table 2 indicates that there is a high correlation between the standard deviations of the importance ratings and their means. The rank order correlation is $+0.86$. There is little dispersion on the issues ranked "very important" and a good deal of dispersion on the issues ranked much lower. In other words, (there is a consensus among these union people concerning the importance of earnings, fringe benefits, and safety, but much disagreement concerning the importance of issues such as "interesting work" and "better jobs.") This may result in part from the limited scale we permitted the respondents to use, but we believe that a more differentiated scale would produce essentially the same result. (There appears to be general agreement about the importance of the hard-core items of bargaining, but considerable disarray on quality of work issues.)

To measure perceptions of issues as either integrative or distributive in nature, they were asked to rate on a four-point scale the extent to which their union and their employer(s) were attempting to accomplish the same or conflicting goals on each issue.

The results obtained with this measure are rather surprising (see Table 3). (Most respondents perceive the issues examined as being more distributive than integrative.) More than half checked the distributive options (completely different or somewhat different goals) on all issues except safety. Almost 70 percent checked the integrative options for the safety issue.

(More surprising still is the nature of the break that exists between quality of work issues and traditional issues.) The literature would suggest that the former would be seen as more integrative and the latter as more distributive. The data in Table 3, however, show that the modal response on all quality of work issues except adequate resources is "completely different"; conversely, except for earnings, the modal response for all traditional issues is "somewhat the same." We suspect that this breakdown must be more than accidental. Yet clearly it is opposite our expectation.

TABLE 3

Respondents' Perceptions of the Integrative-Distributive Nature of Issues^a

Issue	My Union and the Company Want To:				Mean	Standard Deviation
	Accomplish Completely the Same Thing	Accomplish Somewhat the Same Thing	Accomplish Somewhat Different Things	Accomplish Completely Different Things		
Productivity	4.8%	25.4%	30.7%	39.2%	3.042	0.916
Work load	5.8	23.2	33.3	37.6	3.026	0.919
Control of work	9.7	24.5	26.5	39.3	2.954	1.014
Better job	8.8	23.8	31.1	36.3	2.948	0.978
Supervisors	9.2	27.0	31.1	32.7	2.872	0.976
Earnings	9.3	26.5	32.8	31.4	2.863	0.968
Interesting work	9.9	28.8	30.4	30.9	2.822	0.948
Hours	12.3	30.0	28.1	29.6	2.749	1.015
Job security	13.3	30.6	26.0	30.1	2.730	1.034
Fringe benefits	10.4	37.1	22.8	29.7	2.718	1.005
Adequate resources	12.9	33.5	24.7	28.9	2.696	1.026
Grievance procedures	15.6	33.7	25.1	25.6	2.608	1.033
Safety	24.7	43.3	18.6	13.4	2.206	0.965

^a Issues are ranked by mean.

(Why are most quality of work issues perceived as "distributive" and most traditional issues as "integrative"? Many, if not most, of our respondents have had extensive experience at the bargaining table. Perhaps experience has taught them that (conflicts on traditional issues can normally be resolved peacefully and amicably.) Thus, these issues may no longer be threatening, either personally or institutionally, and the impact of their resolution may be seen as fairly predictable. On the other hand, (quality of work issues—productivity, control of work, interesting work, etc.—are topics that generally have not been handled directly at the bargaining table.) The distributive responses may reflect these individuals' lack of familiarity with these issues, uncertainty over the degree of potential conflict inherent in them, and apprehension concerning their personal and institutional impact.

Whatever the explanation for the modal responses of the respondents concerning the integrative-distributive mix, the percentage distributions shown in Table 3 suggest that there is little consensus among them on this matter. This may indicate that we have simply failed to obtain a valid measure of this complex concept. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to measure it, and certainly further testing will be needed to assure the validity and reliability of the measure used. It is also possible (perhaps even probable) that integrative and distributive issues cannot be generalized across unions and employers, but instead are specific either to a particular bargaining relationship or perhaps to the

perceptions of each individual who participates in a bargaining relationship. If the integrative-distributive concept is relationship—or respondent—specific rather than issue specific, the data in Table 3 are not very meaningful since they are aggregated across all respondents. Clearly this is an issue for further research.

Assuming valid measures, the data in Tables 2 and 3 together form a profile of how these respondents perceive this array of goals. (The traditional collective bargaining issues are rated as highly important,) there is general agreement on their importance, and they are seen as more integrative. In contrast, (the quality of work issues are viewed as less important,) there is less agreement on their relative importance, and they are seen as more distributive. With these differences in mind, we can now examine the effectiveness of collective bargaining across the same set of issues.

The Effectiveness of Collective Bargaining

In assessing the effectiveness of collective bargaining we are interested in determining whether the respondents perceive bargaining as more helpful in dealing with issues they: (1) rate as more important; (2) agree on with respect to their importance; and (3) view as more distributive. The respondents were asked to indicate on a four-point scale their views on how helpful collective bargaining is in providing desirable outcomes on the various issues in their own place of work. The answers are shown in Table 4.

(Generally, the respondents see collective bargaining as most helpful

TABLE 4
Respondents' Ratings of Effectiveness of Collective Bargaining*

Issue	Not Helpful at All	Not Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fringe benefits	3.3%	6.2%	25.7%	64.8%	3.519	0.759
Earnings	4.7	5.7	24.5	65.1	3.500	0.806
Job security	8.7	11.5	29.8	50.0	3.212	0.960
Grievance procedures	14.0	10.1	38.6	37.2	2.990	1.019
Safety	18.3	16.8	35.1	29.8	2.764	1.071
Hours	20.9	20.9	24.3	34.0	2.714	1.114
Work load	28.5	26.0	35.0	10.5	2.275	0.992
Adequate resources	36.1	21.6	30.3	12.0	2.183	1.057
Better job	39.4	23.6	23.2	13.8	2.113	1.082
Productivity	39.2	22.5	29.4	8.8	2.078	1.019
Control of work	37.5	29.8	23.6	9.1	2.043	0.989
Supervisors	45.1	23.8	24.8	6.3	1.922	0.975
Interesting work	45.1	29.4	17.2	8.3	1.887	0.974

* Issues are ranked by mean.

on issues that they rank as most important.) The five issues ranked highest on the "effectiveness" scale (Table 4) are the same five issues ranked highest on the "importance" scale (Table 2). The rank order correlation between the mean ratings of the issues on these two dimensions is +.71. Thus, these respondents see collective bargaining as responding most effectively to the job goals to which they give the highest priority.

It should also be noted that the two quality of work issues ranked relatively high on the importance scale ("adequate resources" and "control of work") are viewed as issues on which collective bargaining is *not* particularly helpful. This suggests that perhaps these issues might be suitable subjects for cooperative or joint programs with management, a subject to which we will turn later in this paper.

Clearly, since there is a close correspondence, in the sample's view, between issues ranked important and issues labeled traditional, it follows that our respondents view collective bargaining as most effective on subjects normally considered within the scope of bargaining.) In Table 4 notice the sharp break that occurs between the sixth ranked issue, hours, and the seventh ranked issue, work load. By far the largest difference between any two adjacent means in the table occurs at this point. In our view, the work load issue is one that serves as a bridge between the "old" and "new" issues. It has often been the subject of collective bargaining, but it is also very much in the center of the quality of work controversy. The six items on which bargaining is judged to be least effective are the ones most closely associated with the quality of work movement. Note that nearly 70 percent of the sample view bargaining as being not helpful or only somewhat helpful in dealing with an individual's relations with his supervisor. Similarly, 75 percent feel that collective bargaining is not very helpful in making the work more interesting.

In contrast to the above rather clear-cut findings, (our data do not provide conclusive evidence concerning whether bargaining deals more effectively with issues where there is common agreement about their importance.) Although the rank order correlation between the effectiveness rankings and the standard deviations of importance rankings tends to support this argument ($r = -.49$), this test is somewhat biased because of the restricted range on our scale and because of the high importance rankings given the traditional issues versus the quality of work issues. That is, the traditional issues were issues ranked as most important and also have the lowest standard deviations. Since we earlier found that bargaining is most effective on these highly important issues, there is a built-in correlation between the effectiveness rankings and the

standard deviation rankings. Even though we cannot conclusively answer questions relating to collective bargaining and individual differences, the data are at least consistent with the views of those who have argued that bargaining can deal more effectively with traditional issues than with quality of work issues *because* there is more general agreement on the importance of the former than the latter.⁸)

The findings concerning the relationship between the effectiveness rankings and the distributive-integrative perceptions are contrary to our expectations. (Since issues rated as more important tended to be rated as more integrative and as being handled more effectively in bargaining, it follows that bargaining is perceived to be more effective on integrative issues.) The rank order correlation between the effectiveness rankings and the integrative measure is .50. Again, although we can suggest the same post hoc explanation for this unexpected finding as we did in our previous discussion of the integrative-distributive ratings, further research on this concept is necessary before a definitive interpretation can be made.

The Potential for Joint Programs

How do the respondents feel the 13 issues considered should be handled by their unions? To determine this they were asked to indicate their opinions about the "best way" to deal with each of these issues. The options offered were: The union should (1) set up a joint program with management outside collective bargaining; (2) the union should work through collective bargaining; and (3) the union should not get involved. Table 5 shows the results of this analysis. It is clear that there is a close correspondence between the results in this table and those presented in earlier tables. For example, there is no doubt that these union officials see the greatest potential for joint programs centering around those issues most closely identified with the quality of work movement. At the same time, however, there is a strong negative relation between those issues considered best handled through joint programs and those considered most important: The rank order correlation is $-.63$. Further, there is an almost perfect inverse relation between the effectiveness rankings in Table 3 and joint program potential ($r = -.92$). Finally, our expectation that joint program strategies would more likely be endorsed for issues perceived as integrative rather than distributive is

⁸ We have used the standard deviations of the rankings here rather than the ratings because the rankings are less subject to the restriction of the range problem. If we use the standard deviations of the ratings, the rank order correlation with the effectiveness rankings is .81. While both this correlation and the one that uses the rankings are subject to the same bias, the one using the rankings is less serious. Thus, we believe it is the more appropriate statistic.

TABLE 5
 Respondents' Opinions About "Best Way" to Deal with Issues*

Issue	Set up a joint program with management outside collective bargaining	Seek improvements through formal collective bargaining	The union should not get involved in this area
Interesting work	67.8%	16.3%	15.9%
Supervisors	65.6	19.3	15.1
Adequate resources	60.6	21.2	17.8
Control of work	53.8	26.9	19.3
Productivity	51.2	25.1	23.7
Work load	43.8	42.3	13.9
Safety	41.1	56.5	2.4
Better jobs	38.4	43.6	18.0
Grievance procedures	32.7	67.3	0.0
Hours	31.1	65.6	3.3
Job security	12.2	85.9	1.9
Earnings	5.6	93.9	0.5
Fringe benefits	4.2	95.5	0.5

* Issues are ranked by the percentage indicating joint program.

not supported: The rank order correlation between integrative rankings and joint program potential is -23 .

On the basis of these findings, we can offer a few comments about the opportunity to develop cooperative union-management arrangements outside formal collective negotiations. The sample seems to see two relatively important issues—adequate resources and control of work—as offering some potential for union-management joint programs. On other issues (the views of these union activists do not provide much encouragement for quality of work or joint program advocates.) Between one-half and two-thirds of the respondents see a role for joint programs on quality of work issues. It must be remembered, however, that these issues are simply not considered very important, and they are viewed as more divisive and threatening than traditional issues. (In short, these data simply do not suggest that there is a widespread clamoring at lower union levels for bold new ventures of union-management cooperation outside the traditional bargaining process.)

Conclusions

The process of collective bargaining was judged by the respondents to be an effective instrument for dealing with the goals which were rated as relatively important to them. (The data are also consistent with the argument that collective bargaining is limited in its ability to deal with those issues where wide individual differences exist in perceptions of importance, and on those issues that relate to satisfaction with the nature of the work itself.) These findings support those who have

suggested that the bargaining process is an effective institution for dealing with a highly important but limited array of issues in industrial relations.

This, of course, does not necessarily mean that the bargaining process is responding well to the needs of *all* workers. We must remember that each of the work goals included in our list has been shown in various studies to be highly important to *some* workers and was so rated by many in the present sample as well. Thus, (while our findings are encouraging for supporters of collective bargaining, they clearly indicate that in situations where workers perceive quality of work issues as being highly important, new initiatives may receive at least some support.)

For those choosing to embark on these experiments, some lessons may be gleaned from our results. First, the issues included in these experiments should be carefully chosen. For example, (these data suggest that two issues—providing adequate resources to get the job done and increasing the individual's control over the way the work is done—may have particular potential as starting points in joint programs of organizational change.) At the same time, it seems clear that the scope of any joint program should be kept narrow so as to avoid attempting to deal with bread and butter issues of wages, fringes, and job security outside of the collective bargaining process. As a second major point, the centrality that these respondents ascribe to the formal bargaining process suggests that joint ventures must be clearly identified as attempts to supplement and not replace the traditional collective bargaining relationship. And finally, given the skepticism of these respondents concerning the goals of employers on quality of work issues, it seems likely that local union officials will be hesitant to cooperate in any joint ventures where they are not given a strong voice in shaping the program's goals.

It should be cautioned that the analysis presented here is limited to aggregate comparisons of the opinions of these respondents. No effort was made to determine which subgroups' needs are being effectively dealt with through collective bargaining. Likewise, no effort was made to isolate factors which are systematically related to differences in the perceived effectiveness of bargaining or to differences in the perceived potential for joint programs in a bargaining relationship. Clearly, further analysis is needed along these lines to obtain a more complete understanding of *why* it is that bargaining is felt to perform more effectively in some situations than in others and *why* some relationships seem to hold a high potential for joint programs between unions and employers, while others seem to hold little or no potential for this approach to improving the quality of work.