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ABSTRACT

Understanding the factors associated with workers' inclination to participate in employee involvement programs is critical to developing successful programs. This study examines whether previous experience, beliefs about EI programs, perceptions of support for the program by peers and management, and job attitudes influence unionized workers support of employee involvement programs. Respondents were 452 union workers in five mid-sized manufacturing plants in the mid-west. As predicted, previous experience, workers beliefs about EI programs, workers perception of their peers' support, and organizational commitment were positively correlated with support for employee involvement. Contrary to expectations, trust and worker perception of management support were not positively correlated with support for employee involvement. Similarly job satisfaction did not have the anticipated negative correlation predicted.
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Over the past 15 years a competitive, quality-oriented, international market place has precipitated keen interest in flat organizational structures, shared goals and enabling workers to have more influence in the workplace. These practices are categorized as Employee Involvement (EI). It has been suggested that labor and management leaders tend to support such programs only when faced with environmental pressures (Ichniowski & Shaw, 1995). Since historically few of these programs have survived beyond their immediate objective (Jacoby, 1995), each new effort tends to be greeted with skepticism. Government, labor and management leaders agree that Employee Involvement (EI) is vital to global competitiveness, but the critical observer must ask “what will make this period of cooperation more enduring than those which have come and gone before? An examination of the literature shows pointed attention to outcomes of program participation as described by singular stakeholder groups, typically
union and management leaders. Not enough is known about the attitudinal variables that influence stakeholders' support for EI programs, or the relationships among those variables. Attitudes have not been adequately examined as predictors of support for EI. Although they have surveyed line workers, researchers have largely ignored how workers perceive other groups to view EI and how those various groups may influence workers attitudes and support.

Employee Involvement (EI), which will be described in detail later, can be traced to Sidney and Beatrice Webb's writings about industrial democracy in the nineteenth century and Mary Parker Follett's notion of shared power in the early 1900's. It is broadly used to describe a number of different programs, such as Quality Circles (QCs), self-managed work groups (SMGs), Quality of Work Life (QWL), and other types of joint process. The literature yields a fairly consistent set of conclusions regarding programs like EI: participation usually has a positive, small, effect on productivity, sometimes a zero or statistically insignificant effect, and almost never a negative effect (Levine & D'Andrea Tyson, 1990). Osterman (Osterman, 1994) finds that about 35% of private sector firms with 50 or more workers make substantial use of flexible work organization. A large majority of the Fortune 1000 companies now employ some type of employee involvement program which when successful, can provide desirable outcomes in quality, productivity, and commitment (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1992).
Despite widespread agreement about its potential, many organizations still report difficulties in making participative efforts like EI work over significant periods of time (Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector, 1990); (Pasmore & Fagans, 1992). The financial risks are high because time devoted to changing job roles, norms, and values ((Katz, 1978; Schein, 1992) slows productivity. Costs of EI programs can mean added expenses for reorientation and training of managers, workers, and union representatives (Jick, McKersie, & Greenblough, 1982), perceived loss of authority and status, and displacement for middle-managers and supervisors (Schlesinger & Walton, 1977). Additionally systems based on the involvement and development of employees meet resistance because they change the established roles of managers and workers (Deming, 1986); (Lawler, 1992) from adversarial to cooperative. Although the more traditional adversarial roles are certainly not ideal, they are familiar and labor relations practices have been tailored to operate within that framework (Hammer, 1986).

Top management is often reluctant to relinquish power and control since ultimately they must answer to stockholders for the company's profitability. Unions are concerned about being co-opted or having loyalties divided among membership (Cooke, 1990a; Eaton, 1990; (Eaton & Voos, 1992), and front line managers may feel threatened because they are less essential when EI works (Klein, 1985). Since negative outcomes are possible for all parties, some degree of job satisfaction, trust, and organizational commitment must be present to warrant the risk (Jacobs & Jones, 1990; Beer & Walton, 1990). EI may
increase job satisfaction, trust, and organizational commitment (Cooke, 1992), but the process can also be undermined if these factors are not present before the program begins.

The objective of this study is to identify predictors of support for EI in unionized organizations by defining the variables, establishing their importance and clarifying the relationships between those variables. This will be accomplished by examining the beliefs and attitudes among unionized workers towards EI. Much of the research on participation has centered on the actual program-participation-to-individual-outcomes relationship with little attention given to the participation process itself.

One determining factor in participation decisions has been previous experience with participation and/or EI programs. Union leaders sometimes fear that such participation will attract workers who are less committed to the union and divide the membership, a selection effect. Secondly, EI could increase worker confidence and loyalty towards management, a program effect (Verma & McKersie, 1987). Third, workers could start to look to such programs to solve work-related problems rather than the union, a displacement effect (Leana, Ahlbrandt & Murrell, 1992). Because of these concerns union leaders tend to favor participation to be voluntary while management prefers more broad implementation. What is overlooked here is whether participation in EI programs increases the likelihood that workers will support such programs in the future. A
closer look at the impact of previous experience with EI on the decision-making process is warranted.

Fucini and Fucini (Fucini & Fucini, 1990) note that very little work has been done to examine workers views about the effects of team programs. Dachler and Wilpert (Dachler & Wilpert, 1978) refer to the values, assumptions, and goals of those who are implementing the participative scheme as the "social theories" underlying participation. These are among the contextual elements that increase or decrease the likelihood of success. It is likely that willingness to participate will increase if participating fulfills, but does not conflict with, other social roles and needs (Neumann, 1989).

It is reasonable to expect that worker decisions about participation will be influenced by their beliefs and attitudes. An attitude is a predisposition to respond favorably or unfavorably toward something (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). Research has examined the relationship between attitudes like satisfaction and behaviors like hard work with varying conclusions. Fishbein's (Fishbein, 1967) theory of reasoned action focuses on three related parts of job attitudes: beliefs about the job, the attitude itself, and the behavioral intentions that result from the attitude. The pressure of subjective norms and social pressures influence the beliefs and formation of attitudes, and transforms those attitudes into behavioral intentions and actual behavior. This study will examine workers' decision-making with respect to EI and the factors that influence that process.
Outside of frequent mention of the importance of management support, the impact of worker's perception of management support is another factor that has received little attention. The results of EI studies are not adequately placed in context because frequently the results are based on responses from one stakeholder group. Management attitudes and behaviors toward EI and participative climate have been suggested as important factors that influence attitudes and behaviors of workers (Lawler & Mohrman, 1985).

Eaton (Eaton, 1994) and Juravich (Juravich, Harris, & Brooks, 1993) have demonstrated that managers and union leaders, whose roles change dramatically in EI programs, can view success of participation in significantly different ways. They may have different views about the threats and opportunities it presents, or have different goals for EI programs altogether. These divergent views and goals affect their commitment to the process, and without some shared commitment any change effort is likely to be unsuccessful (Lawler, 1992). Organization change research has demonstrated that the reticence of plant managers for example, is likely to influence the attitudes of lower level managers and line workers. More specifically, Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, and Vance (Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, & Vance, 1995) found that if workers perceive that management is not supportive of EI or distrust management's motives they are less likely to transfer EI training to the job.

There are instances where change programs are ultimately successful despite initial skepticism, but means of establishing tolerance for change
enhances the chance of success. Organizational commitment and trust exist at some level before change is implemented and, because they appear to be related to employee support for the plan, it is good to assess these attitudes early to identify potential problem areas. Many failures in OD interventions may be attributable to a failure to understand what conditions are required to sustain effective participation in organizational change (Pasmore & Fagans, 1992).

Understanding how the organizational climate, and job attitudes of stakeholders interact provide the most clear basis for designing employee participation programs that are well-received and effective. Thereby decision makers are better able to predict under what circumstances stakeholders are likely to participate, and under which circumstances EI initiatives are likely to succeed, and work to create a conducive environment prior to undertaking change. Given the varied experience and muted success of EI efforts to date (Lawler et al., 1992), an examination of the precursors of support and efficacy is warranted.

After providing background on EI and participation, with which it is closely aligned in the literature, the relationships of the key variables will be modeled, hypotheses presented and results given. Finally there will be discussion of the results and implications for further study and practice of EI. Three general questions will be addressed:
1. What impact, if any, does previous experience with EI programs have on workers' support for EI?

2. What beliefs and job attitudes influence support for EI among unionized workers?

3. To what degree are workers' perceptions about peers and managers associated with worker support for EI?
CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

Employee Involvement (EI) is a fairly broad term that has come to refer to any number of programs and structures that may be seen in organizations today. Terms like EI, participation, empowerment and self-management are ubiquitous in today's workplace. Yet as stated by Lawler (Lawler, 1986) "it is practically impossible to say anything about the potential effectiveness of a program or about its nature from merely knowing that it is called an employee participation program." One of the challenges for those who examine participation is to more clearly specify how workers react to the various types of programs.

The vast majority of Fortune 1000 firms indicate that they use some form of employee involvement programs with some workers (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1992). Yet there is little agreement among researchers as to what constitutes participation or EI or even the relationship between the two terms. The purpose of the following conceptualization is to provide definition, background, and categorization of the programs and thus clarify the terminology.
Much of the research completed to date focuses on Quality Circles which is an EI program, and it is important to note how QCs compare to other types of EI programs for purposes of generalization. For example, it may be that Self-Managed Work Teams (SMWTs) and QC's, require more commitment from management, and are more popular with workers who disdain suggestion systems like Quality Circles, in which case a distinction is necessary.

The long history of union-management attempts at cooperation in the United States started with the practices of the Knights of Labor in the latter half of the nineteenth century but became more common in the early twentieth century. The 1928 Monthly Labor Review cites examples of union-management cooperation in railroads, printing trades, upholstery, carpet weaving, glass, clothing, street railways, textiles, and construction (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987). Even so, during this era most participation programs were heavily controlled by management. For example, the popular American Plan was comprised of limited participation strategies executed through informal committees or employer-dominated company unions.

With passage of the Wagner Act in 1933, collective bargaining became the primary tool by which workers could enhance their economic security and influence at work. Writings about democratic supervision and participative management started appearing with some regularity in the 1930's, highlighted by the famous Lewin, Lippit & White (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939) study extolling the virtues of democratic leadership. During WWII the War Production Board
promoted the development of labor-management committees leading to the formation of approximately 5,000 production committees covering more than seven million workers (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987). These early attempts at participation and cooperation between labor and management were the precursor for the types of efforts that are called EI today.

During the latter half of this century three writers were among the foremost champions of participative processes: Chris Argyris, Douglas McGregor, and Rensis Likert. All wrote books on participative management that proposed greater participation and cooperation instead of the traditional control-oriented approach. The most contemporary contributions in this area have come from Lawler (1992) and his associates who, with the concept of high involvement organizations, have charted the territory and done much to identify and describe the use of EI in the United States. In the present era, the key area of change has been from the control-oriented approach to management to a more involvement-oriented approach.

There are conceptual distinctions between EI and participation. First, EI is viewed as an extension of several basic organization processes while the traditional concept of participation separates participative programs from other organizational processes. Second, EI implies that a greater level of mutuality exists in the organizational relationship (Lawler, 1986) than does participation. Last, EI is traditionally a management or management-labor initiative (Lawler, 1992) whereas participation may also be viewed as a prerogative that workers,
through their unions or other means, unilaterally choose to exercise with respect to the terms of their employment. Establishing these differences provides the advantage of increasing interpretability of research findings and isolating effects but it is of little practical importance (Ledford & Lawler, 1994) because the terms are used interchangeably by managers and workers. After having established differences for purposes of clarity, the terms will be used interchangeably.

El is a systematic approach to redistributing the responsibility and accountability for problem solving and decision-making to the lowest appropriate level (Van Aken, Monetta, & Sink, 1994). Cotton adds that it is a participative process to use the entire capacity of workers, designed to encourage worker commitment to organizational success. The process typically comes about by giving workers some combination of information, influence, and/or incentives (Cotton, 1993). Although the relationships between participation and El have yet to be clearly established in the literature, El is a form of participation.

Lewin (Lewin, 1989) uses the term Employee Involvement/Participation and says that El - as it takes its form in quality circles, self-managed work teams, joint labor-management committees, organizational surveys, and employee consultation initiatives - is oriented towards goal convergence and widening the sphere of shared worker-employer interests. He contends that there are four organizational processes that can influence participation: information sharing, training, decision-making, and rewards. When these processes are viewed together they create employee involvement. El is the degree to which those four
key processes are moved down to the lowest levels possible in the organization (Coye & Belohlav, 1995).

**Participation**

Locke et al (Locke & Schweiger, 1979) identify *equalization of influence or power sharing* as the common element in defining participation. Wagner's (Wagner, 1994) definition emphasizes that participation *is a process of influence sharing*. Most recently Glew et al (Glew et al., 1995) define participation as a conscious effort by individuals at a higher level in an organization to provide visible extra-role or role-expanding opportunities for individuals or groups at a lower level in the organization to have a greater voice in one or more areas of organizational performance. Participation implies that there are at least two people involved and there is something shared in common among those persons. Although there are varying definitions in the literature, the common theme appears to be sharing in some activity by subordinates and superiors.

Participation can be broken down in a number of different ways: direct or indirect, participation in ownership and profits, formal participation, informal participation and on-line and off-line participation. The emphasis here will be on direct, formal forms of participation which may be either on-line or off-line.

Representative participation is a form of what Dachler and Wilpert (Dachler & Wilpert, 1978) categorize as indirect participation. Indirect participation is used when the group affected is too big for all group members to discuss a matter. This type of participation includes worker's councils, some joint labor-
management committees, and employee representation on company boards of
directors. It generally encompasses a wide range of issues, including
investment policy, technology, and corporate-level strategy (Levine & D'Andrea
Tyson, 1990).

Indirect participation is the most widely legislated form of EI around the
world. Works councils are forms of representative participation requiring that
designated groups of workers in a facility are consulted by management on
personnel decisions. Research on representative participation has not
demonstrated many effects and there appears to be little impact on the
organizations. This has led some to conclude that perhaps the greatest overall
value is symbolic (Cotton, 1993). Representative participation is rare in the
U.S., and is sometimes thought to rise out of the weakness of labor, or to ease
wage and work rule concessions in distressed companies. In many cases it has
little substantial impact on the management of the firm (Russel, 1988), (Cohen-
Rosenthal & Burton, 1987), so it will not be examined here.

Batt and Appelbaum (Batt & Appelbaum, 1995) categorized different
types of participation as consultative or off-line, where workers provide
information but management retains the decision making authority; and
substantive or on-line, where workers have more control over the methods and
pace of work and make decisions that affect the production process. With on-
line participation workers make most decisions associated with their production
activities such as assigning work, deciding on methods, and in some cases
selecting their members. On line participation like teams involve work reorganization, reduced job classifications, job rotation, job enlargement, and reductions in direct supervision (Katz & Keefe., 1992).

Consultative, or off-line, participation allows employees to give their opinions, but final decisions are made by management. Quality circles and suggestion programs are an example of this type of participation. Substantive, or on-line, participation in work and workplace decisions includes formal, direct participation schemes such as Self-Managed Work Teams (SMWTs) and their derivatives. The difference between these and consultative participation is degree of influence.

Types of EI Programs

Delaney (Delaney, Ichniowski, & Lewin, 1988) notes that EI is variously referred to as quality of work life, quality circles, employee involvement, and labor-management participation teams among others. EI activities vary on the following dimensions: (a) intensity of the activity (i.e. workers involved, frequency of meetings, amount of training), (b) the degree of emphasis placed on selected performance-related factors like quality, absenteeism, or productivity, (c) the amount of autonomy and decision-making authority granted to teams, (d) the degree of union leader input in design and facilitation of programs, and (e) whether or not there are financial incentives tied directly (gainsharing) or indirectly (profit sharing and stock ownership) to participation
(Cooke, 1990). Thus the programs may vary significantly in process and outcome, but they each provide opportunities for more worker control.

Van Aken (Van Aken et al., 1994) identifies two basic categories of EI; parallel organizations and replacement initiatives. Parallel organizations are off-line forms of participation used to facilitate communication, coordination of activities, and opportunities for change. The most common are labor-management participation teams (LMPTs), Quality of Work Life (QWL) committees, and quality circles. There are a number of union-management programs which can be classified as parallel organizations. Union-management cooperation usually consists of a set of institutional processes and procedures established to improve relations and solve problems outside, but along side, the traditional collective bargaining relationship (Katz & Keefe, 1992). Committee-based efforts are where plant management and local union leaders are involved in plant wide problem-solving (Cooke & Meyer, 1990).

Labor-management task forces are a variation on labor-management committees, whereas a labor-management committee has an ongoing life related to its subject area, task forces are temporary and attached to innovation and function. They can draw broadly from throughout the organization to help solve problems facing more than one unit of the organization, plan for impending changes, and consider new opportunities. The most common schedule for steering committees is once a month, and for teams it is once a week (Cooke, 1990).
Eaton (Eaton, 1990) notes that an important feature of programs like EI is the establishment of a formal mechanism for communication and interaction between management and the work force that may bypass the union. The forum for this type of participation is usually periodic meetings that take place on company time and at company expense, but do not entail any fundamental work reorganization.

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is another type of parallel organization program defined by ASTD as a process for work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organization's environment, methods and outcomes. More specifically QWL programs attempt to improve the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organization (Susman, 1976), improve climate, generate commitment, and facilitate change (Keidel, 1982). It attempts to accomplish these objectives by addressing compensation, work environment, personal development, opportunities for growth and security, and social integration in the workplace (Smith, 1984).

Quality Circles (QCs) have been the most well-known and wide-spread type of employee involvement and much of what has followed with work groups and teams of various types builds upon the notoriety of this program. They are essentially a small group of workers who volunteer to meet regularly on company time to discuss issues of quality and related problems and recommend solutions. Like LMPT's, QC's are a parallel structure separate and distinct from an
organization's regular ongoing activities. A major benefit of QC programs is that, like other parallel structures, they can be started quickly with minimal disruption to organizational activity (Lawler & Mohrman, 1987). Quality Circles have tended to be successful initially but tend to inflate expectations and fade as management attempts to implement them more broadly.

The second category of EI programs is replacement initiatives which tend to be targeted toward production and/or service workers (Lawler et al., 1992). Replacement initiatives are on-line forms of participation which modify or replace the formal organization and include such programs as gainsharing, job redesign and self-managed work teams. Programs which focus on work design and process are called sociotechnical systems. Sociotechnical systems stem from the belief that the design of work, the social system and the technical system should be considered simultaneously (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987). Gainsharing plans and Self-Managed Work Teams (SMWTs) are the most prevalent types of replacement programs.

Gainsharing programs are derived from Scanlon Plans which typically entail changes in organizational structure, communication flow, and financial structure (Collins, Hatcher, & Ross, 1993). Scanlon Plans are named after their originator, Joseph Scanlon, a union leader in the steel industry during the 1930's. He found that productivity improved when the company and the union worked together to solicit ideas from workers to eliminate waste, improve efficiency, reduce costs, and improve quality. Like the EI programs of this era,
Scanlon Plans assume that most workers desire personal development and want to contribute to organizational goals. Accordingly, they combine the participation of workers in problem solving with productivity and gainsharing (Cotton, 1993).

Gainsharing plans pay company-wide bonuses to workers when they cut costs, increase product quality, raise output, or otherwise improve performance (Hatcher, Ross, & Collins, 1991). They have three common factors: formal supplemental compensation systems aimed at individual departments, plants, or companies; focus on improvements in labor productivity or cost reduction as opposed to sales or profits; and financial bonuses to workers for improvements in productivity (Cotton, 1993). Gainsharing plans are sociotechnical programs because both structural and communication changes occur in an attempt to establish a fair means of rewarding performance improvements (Collins et al., 1993).

Self-Directed Work Teams (SMWTs) and variations like autonomous or semi-autonomous work groups are self-managed because they make decisions about distribution of work tasks, pace of production, training of coworkers, scheduling, quality control, maintenance, purchasing, and worker behavior (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987; Lawler, 1990). Typically they are given assignments that involve a whole piece of work and control over how that work is accomplished, but they differ in the degree of decision-making and operational autonomy. In team-based efforts bargaining unit employees are involved in
shop-floor problem-solving just like with QCs, QWL, gainsharing and profit sharing.

SMWT's go beyond these programs, however, because the structure of the organization is changed and members are cross-trained to perform the skills required by all the jobs on the team and the teams have some decision-making authority. Since a fundamental requirement of autonomous work groups is multiskilling, ongoing training is critical. They have been used successfully in other parts of the world, most notably at Volvo and Saab in conjunction with the Swedish Metalworkers Union (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987).

The Effectiveness of EI

It is important to look briefly at empirical studies on the effectiveness of EI programs because, as noted in two Fortune 1000 surveys (Lawler et al., 1992), a large percentage of practitioners are using them. Empirical examinations of the effectiveness of participation in organizations have brought varied conclusions over the last several decades. Locke and Schweiger (Locke & Schweiger, 1979) concluded that although most studies demonstrate beneficial results, the complex nature of the interventions may preclude any clear attribution of the results to participation (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). Similarly, in a survey of a nationally representative, size stratified sample of manufacturing companies, Kelley and Harrison (Kelly & Harrison, 1992) found that overall, the presence of committees tended to have negative effects, little evidence of increased productivity or any direct impact on firm competitiveness.
Cotton et al (Cotton, Vollrath, Lengnick-Hall, & Froggatt, 1988) disagreed stating that the effects of participation on satisfaction and performance vary according to the form of participation. Participation is most effective with forms that are direct, long-term, and of high access. They conclude that, overall, the most effective approaches are self-directed work teams and gainsharing programs. These two forms of employee involvement generally produce significant improvements in productivity and employee attitudes. The least effective are representative participation and quality circles. Quality circles improve attitudes about participation, and they can improve productivity through suggestions but show a low incidence of survival. Representative participation has little impact on either productivity or employee attitudes.

Batt & Appelbaum (Batt & Appelbaum, 1995) used surveys in the Bell system to focus on whether distinct forms of participation have different effects on worker attitudes and perceptions of performance. Their results indicated that firms benefited from better quality associated with teams, and higher levels of organizational commitment among team members resulting in a significant effect on self-reported performance. They also found that on-line participation had a significantly greater effect on worker attitudes and perceptions than off-line participation. Magjuka and Baldwin (Magjuka & Baldwin, 1991) had similar results, stating that the structure of EI efforts can have a significant impact on their success. Parallel participative schemes are less successful than integrated
ones, and schemes not reinforced via personnel policies and procedures are also less successful than those which receive such support.

Levine and D'Andrea Tyson (Levine & D'Andrea Tyson, 1990) also concurred with Cotton, indicating that participation can increase firm productivity, but the increase is qualified by the form and scope of participation, the industrial relations system of the firm, and the external environment within which the firm operates. Their literature review yields the following set of conclusions: participation usually has a positive, often small, effect on productivity, sometimes a zero or statistically insignificant effect, and almost never a negative effect. Participation can lead to an increase in productivity because it enhances the flow and use of information in complex organizations.

The issue was somewhat resolved by a meta-analysis of the previous 11 reviews of literature on the topic completed by Wagner (Wagner, 1994). Consistent with Levine & D'Andrea Tyson, he concludes that participation has consistent significant, but small effects on performance and worker satisfaction. He proposes the following explanations: participation may have powerful effects but only under certain favorable conditions, whether participation is defined narrowly or loosely may have a substantial affect on outcomes, and even very small, episodic effects can sometimes accrue strong cumulative effects if amassed over time. Cooke (Cooke, 1990a) also notes that the effects of joint activities on labor relations and performance are mixed and depend on a number
of factors associated with program structure, the exercise of relative power options, and organizational constraints.
CHAPTER 3

VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESES

THE MODEL

Beliefs are important because attitudes, which cannot be seen, must be inferred from the statements and behaviors of people (Steers & Porter, 1991). The evaluative statements, or beliefs, about programs and activities are key to determining attitudes about those programs which also lead to behavior. Two models are helpful in clarifying this progression: Fishbein’s (1967) Conceptual Model of Job Attitudes, and Klandermans’ (1984) Resource Mobilization Theory. Neumann (1989) also makes observations about the importance of workers’ perceptions of others which are helpful. Although there are variations and alternative approaches in the literature, Fishbein’s (Fishbein, 1967) conceptual model of job attitudes remains as perhaps the most widely used basis for examining job attitudes. He states that job attitudes consist of three variables: (1) beliefs about the job, (2) the various attitudes themselves, and (3) the behavioral intentions. Attitudes will predict behavior to the degree that attitudes
correspond to behaviors through the action taken, the target of that action, and context of the action.

Klandermans' (Klandermans, 1984) Resource Mobilization Theory adds to Fishbein's model by specifying the factors determining what a person believes and why those factors are important. Essentially Klandermans identifies expected return as the key variable in an individual's beliefs about a program or activity. Resource Mobilization Theory ties action to the perceived attractiveness or aversiveness of expected consequences. Persons will participate in a social movement if they are aware of the opportunity to participate and are willing to exercise the opportunity. The willingness to participate is a function of the perceived attractiveness or aversiveness of the expected consequences of participation, the expectation that participation will produce the collective good, and the expected selective costs and benefits and the value of those costs and benefits. This is an instrumental assessment of the expectation that participation will produce the collective good, and the expected costs will not outweigh the benefits.

On an individual level the choice to engage in change programs like employee involvement reflects a complex calculation, conscious or otherwise, on the part of the worker. Neumann (Neumann, 1989) notes that although workers' responses to organizational interventions are affected by individual differences (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1983), and work related attitudes (Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, & Vance, 1995), many factors besides personality explain why an individual
chooses not to participate in EI programs when given the opportunity. Neumann (1989) adds to Resource Mobilization Theory by identifying the importance of expectations about the behavior of others. As with Resource Mobilization Theory, attention is directed toward a specific type of belief, in this case, beliefs about others. He also emphasizes the importance of structural factors like the availability of resources and the position of individuals in social networks. Other variables that influence the effectiveness of participation on the individual level: organizational receptivity, individual ego development, and knowledge availability (Pasmore & Friedlander, 1982). Taken together these theories and observations provide a theoretical basis from which to examine the beliefs and attitudes of workers with respect to EI.

Among the common reasons for resistance to change are parochial self-interest, differential assessment of the task undertaken, low workforce tolerance for change (Fraser, 1993), lack of trust in those driving change, the absence of strong local and national union support (Eaton, 1990), little management commitment to the worker participation process, and the unwillingness of management to adopt a compatible business or industrial relations strategy (Cooke, 1990). Juravich (Juravich et al., 1993) also found that, similar to quality circles, positive returns to joint efforts typically wane after a few years. Demoralization from employment insecurity, failure to achieve anticipated gains, and the inherent difficulties of mixing traditional collective bargaining with cooperation lead to the demise of many programs.
The factors which lead to different reactions toward EI indicate some degree of consensus in the literature that support can be gained through a number of different factors. The list of variables is becoming more consistent, but the relationships among those variables remains unclear. The relationships among those factors are complex, particularly in a union environment. This model attempts to highlight the variables that predispose stakeholders to support EI and to clarify the relationships among those variables.
Figure 3.1: What Leads Unionized Workers to Support EI Programs?
Because of the complexity of relationships it is a static model that does not allow for the dimension of time. It is recognized, however, that certain aspects of attitudinal variables like trust call for longitudinal data which have yet to be collected. Support for EI is the specific attitude and dependent variable being measured in the study. It has been noted that the decision to support or oppose change is very complex. The expectation is that some variables will have direct influence on respondent reaction to the change effort and others will have more indirect effects. Support for EI is the specific attitude that increases the likelihood of behavior but actual behavior is not measured in this study.

Support for EI describes the specific attitude of support for EI and is the dependent variable for this study because actual behavior is unobserved. It will be measured for rank-and-file union members (hereafter called workers) who are the primary focus of this study. Examples of key intentions with respect to EI programs are intention to reduce or increase effort and intention to offer ideas. Support for EI is in turn affected by beliefs about how EI affects the workplace and labor-management roles, perceptions of other stakeholders, and the job attitudes of the respondents.

Juravich et al (Juravich, Harris, & Brooks, 1993) find that EI is much more complex than a mutual gains thesis would imply. Rather than both parties participating based on the recognition of their common plight, EI is often used as part of the collective bargaining process by both parties as it suits their interests.
and their participation is likely to be highly instrumental. This is a common view but does not consider the possible impact of more subtle factors like attitudes.

Hatcher (Hatcher et al., 1991) interviewed 149 supervisors and non-management workers in five Midwestern manufacturing gainsharing companies. Non-management respondents and their supervisors said the desire to improve performance, make the work easier, and become involved in work decisions were important determinants of their decision to contribute suggestions. Both groups believed that the desire for influence was more important than the desire for bonuses. Apathy and negative attitudes toward the plan, management, and the company are important determinants of a worker’s decision not to contribute suggestions. He concludes that a variety of factors like desire to help the company, to improve working conditions, and obtain recognition influence the decision to contribute suggestions. These studies suggest that the instrumental orientation of workers is not the sole determinant of workers support, attitudinal variables are also worthy of consideration.

Since more complete or encompassing programs are more likely to be successful, addressing the concerns of all stakeholders are important to the success of change efforts. The determinants of support are modeled for workers because this stakeholder group is most directly responsible for the success or failure of the program. The responses of the other stakeholder groups are examined to establish relationships between how they perceive EI and how workers perceive the intentions of those stakeholders. The independent
variables are thought to influence the reaction of this stakeholder group towards EI.

**INDEPENDENT VARIABLES IN THE MODEL**

The first independent variable to be examined is previous experience with EI. For managers and workers coming into an EI effort there are various levels of knowledge about such programs. Some will have had experience with EI programs in the past that may color their perceptions, while others may be participating in company pilot groups during the time of the survey, and still others will have had no experience with EI whatsoever. It is expected that the level of experience will affect support for EI directly and indirectly through beliefs about EI in the workplace.

The second independent variable in the model is beliefs. The intuitive expectation is that beliefs about EI and intentions toward EI are related. The manner in which they are related, however, must be established because the relationship may be more complex than positive beliefs about EI leading to positive support for EI and negative beliefs leading to a negative reaction. It may be that even though workers believe EI is a good program, they oppose it in their workplace because they distrust management, are apathetic or simply satisfied with the current state of affairs. Beliefs about EI programs will be comprised of what the workers think EI entails, their assessment of whether their peers support such a program, and whether they think management supports the program. It is expected that these beliefs will directly influence support for EI.
The job attitudes of job satisfaction, trust and organizational commitment are expected to have a direct effect on support for EI. Workers with low job satisfaction may support a new EI initiative because it represents change. In a union workplace, however, it is not likely that workers with low job satisfaction would support EI for that reason because they have the union to address their concerns. Conversely, those with high job satisfaction may be willing to support change because their current satisfaction is associated with management. Organizational commitment and trust, likewise have their own direct and positive effects on support for EI. It is expected that those who trust the organization and are highly committed will be more likely to support EI than those who have little trust or commitment.

Previous Experience With EI in Unionized Settings

There are a number of reasons to believe that previous experience with EI plays a significant role in perception of EI and support of future programs. Verma and McKersie (Verma & McKersie, 1987) surveyed workers in a large unionized manufacturing plant where quality circles had been introduced without the involvement of the union and identified two central effects that can occur through participative programs. First programs could attract workers less interested in union affairs and thus divide workers into pro- and anti-union camps. They found that volunteers were less active in the union, more eager for voice in decisions, and more attracted to group and voluntary activities than non-volunteers. This is called the "selection effect" since self-sorting occurs before
the EI program. It bears mentioning that the union did not participate in the Quality Circles so their results cannot be generalized to efforts that occur with the involvement of the union.

The second way that participation could affect union attitudes is by the experience of participation in the EI program enhancing workers' positive attitudes toward their job and employer. Verma and McKersie (1987) have called this a "program effect," and it could cause a decrease in union loyalty to ensue, particularly if the union was not involved in the design and implementation of the program. They conclude that the EI programs did not adversely affect workers' attitudes toward the union. Moreover, if unions participate in the design of the EI programs, then the positive effects of the program could be attributed to the union as well as to the firm. They do not, however, indicate that the inverse may also occur. Participation in a poorly run program could cause workers to have negative attitudes toward their jobs and employer and increase union loyalty.

Leana, Ahlbrandt & Murrell (Leana, Ahlbrandt, & Murrell, 1992) examined the attitudes of participants and non-participants in EI programs, volunteers who have yet to participate, managers, union leaders, and line workers. They found that volunteers had the most positive attitudes toward work and the union, and current participants viewed EI as the best structure for decision-making on some work issues. In addition to the selection and program effects noted above, they describe a displacement effect, which is the potential for EI programs to displace
collective bargaining as unionized workers' preferred means of participating in decisions about workplace issues. These types of concerns are raised by labor leaders who are concerned that workers and/or employers may come to see these processes as substitutes, rather than supplements to established collective bargaining and grievance procedures.

Although they remain a concern, neither selection or displacement effects have become prevalent in participation efforts, and program effects have tended to benefit the union. The selection appears to be between those workers who are more interested and involved in union and workplace affairs and those who are not. Kochan (Kochan et al., 1984) has asserted that those who participate have more interest in participation, and the QWL process increases the interest of workers in gaining some say over issues traditionally left to management. A displacement effect is more difficult to discern because the substantive issues addressed by participation tend to concern labor relations issues like technologies, work rules, and work methods (Juravich et al., 1993).

Tesluk, Farr, Mathieu, & Vance (Tesluk et al., 1995) found that trainees' likelihood of using EI training on the job increased with the amount of EI participation. They also found that trainees were more likely to use EI training in core job activities as their participation in activities increased. Stakeholders' views of new programs may depend on their assessment of previous experiences. The interpersonal approach to organizational change assumes that attitudes can be changed through experiential training techniques, attitude
change will lead to behavioral changes, and behavioral changes will lead to increased organizational effectiveness (Herrick, 1990). This may be best observed by examining the perspectives of those respondents who have been or are currently participating in EI programs. It would follow that respondents with positive previous experiences would be more supportive of EI than those who have yet to participate in EI.

Whether a worker has previous experience with EI or not is important given an interpersonal approach to change. According to this view, those who have experienced EI previously are more likely to have had changes in attitude. Consideration must be given, however, to the quality of previous experience. An organization's use of participation can range from seldom to continuous and workers know so little about EI that they rarely differentiate the effectiveness of one program from another (Chisholm & Vansina, 1993). Observers may be led to assume that those who have previous experience with EI will be more supportive of future efforts when the reverse may also be true.

Unions have been cautious about exposing members to participative efforts because of concerns about losing loyalty (Verma & McKersie, 1987); (Verma, 1989). Graham and Verma (Graham & Verma, 1991) found that workers' willingness to participate in company programs was positively associated with their previous involvement and proximity to the program. Previous participation in EI and the perception of that experience are important because believing that the labor-management program had a positive effect on
employee-management relations was associated with more union commitment as well (Verma & McKersie, 1987).

This was supported in a study completed by Drago and Wooden (Drago & Wooden, 1993). They used responses from 249 managers in large Australian firms to examine the relationship between employee, union delegate and union official influence over managerial decision-making, and found a strong positive linkage between voice and participation. Employee participation was more closely linked to voice exerted by workplace union delegates than to full-time union officials, and the areas where delegates and officials maintained influence were generally identical to the areas where workers exerted influence. They concluded that rather than managerial instigation of worker participation reducing union voice, that union voice actually stimulated worker participation.

Eaton (Eaton & Voos, 1992) surveyed members of three different bargaining units within the same local union all of which were involved in Quality of Worklife (QWL) at the time of the survey. The perceived effectiveness of the grievance procedure was a much stronger determinant of attitudes toward the union than participation in QWL programs. Rather than a program effect, the study showed that union members who participated in QWL programs were less likely than nonparticipants to view QWL as a threat to the union, and also more loyal to the union. As opposed to a program effect, she concludes that participants may learn through QWL programs that participation does not undermine the normal activities of the union. As with the preceding studies,
previous experience did not have adverse effects on worker support for EI, but actually stimulated positive outcomes for union involvement. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are offered:

Hypothesis 1a: Unionized workers with EI experience are more likely than those without EI experience to have positive views of EI programs.

Hypothesis 1b: Unionized workers with EI experience are more likely than those without EI experience to support EI.

BELIEFS

Belief can be simply defined as the acceptance of some proposition, statement or position. In this case, beliefs consist of the respondents' opinions about EI in impersonal terms but does not require a qualitative assessment relative to any particular program. Attitudes are more complex in that they have cognitive, affective, and intentional components (Triandis, 1971) and predispose people to respond in a favorable or unfavorable way (Steers & Porter, 1991). According to Fishbein's (1967) conceptual model, negative beliefs about a program can lead to negative attitudes like dissatisfaction and negative behavioral intentions evidenced by poor performance or failure to contribute ideas.

The relationship between beliefs about EI and support for EI is similar to that of job attitudes and performance. It remains unclear whether positive views and/or attitudes lead to the expected behaviors. Support for change is not likely
to occur when deeply held beliefs and values are challenged by participating or if participation conflicts with non-work roles and needs (Goodman & Dean, 1989). Measurement of the views, attitudes and intentions of workers provide the best idea of whether there is significant commonality within and among key stakeholder groups to proceed with a change program.

Another significant measure of beliefs about EI is common ground between management and labor or the manner in which they differ. Similarity within groups is important for an effort to go forth just as agreement across groups. For example, similarity of management and union beliefs could be an indicator of socialization within the organization. Highly socialized groups can more easily address dissonance about change because their membership tends to conform. Ambivalence and disunity can be observed by other participants and slow efforts toward change.

Change that is shared is most successful because processes involving members of the organization at all levels help develop a shared vision among workers (Schein, 1990). If, as stated by Magjuka & Baldwin (1991), the effectiveness of EI depends on the extent to which the parallel organization is successful, then EI efforts should include all groups and be representative in reconciling the views of interested groups. They should also be self-designed and include permanent teams that continually evaluate and recommend changes (Herrick, 1990). Since more complete or encompassing programs have a
greater chance of success (Cooke, 1990a), the perspectives of all stakeholders are important.

Assessing the beliefs and intentions of workers may help to determine which approach to change is the most appropriate so that approach can be adopted. For example, if job satisfaction and attitudes are poor and values and beliefs need to be challenged, a transformational model may be more appropriate than a developmental model which attempts to shift core values.

The interpersonal model builds on experience as means for changing attitudes and would tend toward exposing as many workers to participative programs as possible with the expectation that attitudes toward participation would consequently change. If workers have some experience with EI and tend to trust management then this approach may be useful.

The structural perspective assumes that any attitude changes that may occur will be temporary if they are inconsistent with the culture and the administrative systems of the organizations in which the people work (Herrick, 1990). The sociotechnical programs, for example, address both interpersonal and structural concerns. Given the structural perspective, sociotechnical programs are likely to be the most successful if they account for the views of workers so that changes can be consistent with the culture of the organization. Once again, the perception of sincerity on the part of other stakeholders is important to developing an appropriate culture.
Juravich (Juravich et al., 1993) surveyed labor and management about the effects of EI in 236 EI different programs. Management was positive about those effects and union workers were positive or neutral. Direct comparisons on survey items, however, showed little agreement between labor and management. Similarly, Eaton (Eaton, 1994) examined the determinants of the survival of participation programs in unionized settings and found a very low failure rate (20-30%). Once again, however, the perspectives of management and labor differed sharply. Union representatives were considerably more likely to see a program as defunct and more often ascribed failure to poor labor relations and concession bargaining.

Management consistently gave more "positive" responses than the union throughout the survey. They also reported better labor relations, more gainsharing, more training, fewer union concessions, and fewer differences in goals. Moreover, she found that the parties' commitment to the process and, from the union perspective, good labor relations were keys to program survival. These examples underscore the importance of attending to how various stakeholders view the EI program in question. The union members' perception of how management responds to the issues and concerns they raise remains a significant issue. Lastly, beliefs about EI may reveal that some of the difficulty with EI may, in fact, result from (mis) conceptions of what it entails or its impact on the workplace. In order to be specific about the impact of these various
beliefs on support for EI, workers' beliefs about EI programs, and workers' views of peer and management support will be explored.

**Workers' Beliefs About EI Programs**

Common ground between labor and management provides only a foundation for change efforts. To the degree that positive beliefs about EI programs, perception of peer support, and perception of management support are complimented by positive job attitudes, there is a stronger likelihood of support for EI. Otherwise workers may believe that although EI is a good program, it will not be effective in their particular circumstances.

The reasons for opposing EI among union members range from ideological concerns to pragmatic issues of work rules and autonomy. Some have chosen to oppose participative programs like EI by exposing or attacking what they consider to be the hegemonic underpinnings of the programs. Their positions tend to emanate from a historical analysis and critique of the social psychology of work and work processes.

The following excerpt appeared in *World's Work* in 1924, during the period of Welfare Capitalism (Stone, 1924), and speaks to the skepticism of those who oppose participative programs:

> Organized labor in the United States has gone through three cycles.... The first period was the period when class consciousness was being aroused....the second was the defensive struggle for the principle of collective bargaining, a period of warfare....the third cycle lies in constructive development towards a system of cooperation rather than war.
Opponents of participative programs argue that the labor strife and tumult of the 1930's which followed this optimism lend credence to the danger of collaboration.

Jacoby (Jacoby, 1983) chronicled how economic and social factors influenced the formation, operation, and decline of cooperative efforts during the 1920's. Typically those programs did not survive due to union opposition, the Great Depression, or the assertion of management prerogatives. In drawing comparisons to today's efforts he comes to the following conclusions: cooperation is often a necessity for mutual survival initiated only in industries suffering from declining markets or to combat nonunion competition. Similarly, Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton (1987) assert that unions and employers only collaborate to improve productivity within an intermediate range of economic stress. It is not surprising, therefore, that many who oppose collaborative programs argue that unions have been there before.

Given the history of programs like the American Plan of the early 20th century and many that have followed, labor tends to question the motives of consultative programs and reject them in favor of collective bargaining agreements with "teeth." Victor Reuther and the New Directions movement within the UAW during the 1980's were among the most outspoken of those who oppose the new cooperative programs and what they describe as the "team concept." The team concept was spawned by the recession of the early 1980's, declining profit margins, and growing foreign competition. It starts by requiring
that workers are cross-trained and interchangeable so they can do a number of
different jobs.

Opponents of cooperative programs say that they bring about
management-by-stress; increased line speed, fewer people, and additional work
tasks. Stress then, rather than management directives, becomes the mechanism
for coordinating different job activities and linking the different parts together to
make the system "self-regulating" (Parker & Slaughter, 1988). In addition to
changing work habits and patterns, some bemoan the disruption of the social
structure of the workplace. The difficulties with the introduction of Scientific
Management and the emergence of the Human Relations school of management
eyearly in this century underscore the enduring importance workers place on the
social facet of the workplace.

Besides disruption of the social structure, some contend that participatory
schemes can have the result of weakening the representative, collective
consciousness of workers, and undermining the traditional role of unions and
collective bargaining (Parker & Slaughter, 1988). In the team concept, peer
pressure is used as a means of social control and workers are encouraged to
confront management individually which undermines the group consciousness.
Participation opponents contend that this is dangerous because workers can be
made to understand the work environment from the perspective of management,
management can limit worker participation to the unimportant aspects of plant
operations, and can employ subtle pressures for workers to submit to their
interpretations of the problems of work (Greiner & Holger, 1991). Weiss (Weiss, 1986) notes that domination is easier if those subordinated can be rendered willing to accept the relationship as, in some sense, right and proper.

These things are important because they form the ideological underpinnings of union resistance. Although workers may not voice their concerns in these terms, some resist EI because it appears to compromise their traditional positions as unionists. This reflects an ideological side to unionism that is often overshadowed by the pragmatic "bread and butter" orientation which has come to characterize American unionism. It may be that those who question EI are more likely to distrust management and less likely to be committed to the organization. Those who think EI weakens unionism may also tend to be more satisfied with their jobs in the current system.

A number of unions have feared EI thinking that it may mute demands for economic gains, weaken commitment to the union, lead to speed-ups, and weaken work rules (Strauss, 1982). Fantasia (Fantasia, Clawson, & Graham, 1988) argues that the tendency is for worker participation programs to weaken unions and limit workers' power in significant ways. Programs are said to disable the existing grievance mechanisms and worker solidarity while transferring knowledge from workers to management.

EI may also undermine the instrumentality of the union through displacement effects because when workers see employers listening to and solving their problems through EI they may begin to question the need for a
union. Workers and employers can use these processes as substitutes, rather than supplements to the collective bargaining process and established grievance procedures. It is also possible for union leaders to get co-opted into managerial decisions and lose touch with their members.

Opponents also argue that many activities which fall under the titles of worker participation, employee involvement, and quality of work life are watered down forms of collective bargaining. Labor leaders desire to keep integrative bargaining separate from distributive bargaining. When labor and management jointly sponsor an EI program they usually form a parallel organization like the labor-management committee to implement the program. Integrative bargaining occurs within the joint management process itself and the problem is that, except for clear production problems, the problem-solving activity is really a form of collective bargaining. Given these factors, some unions which participate in EI programs still prefer to rely on after-the-fact collective bargaining to obtain their share of productivity gains (Herrick, 1990).

With the prevalence of EI programs in the unionized sector today it is obvious that not all union leaders or members look upon the programs negatively. Juravich has noted that although unions tend to be less enthusiastic than management about EI, they are generally positive or neutral (Juravich et al., 1993). Indeed a number of researchers have indicated that properly executed, EI is a program that should be embraced by labor (Kochan et al., 1984); (Verma & McKersie, 1987);(Verma, 1989). Kochan, Katz, and Mower
(Kochan et al., 1984) surveyed union officials and found that most thought the programs would strengthen the local union. Verma and McKersie (Verma & McKersie, 1987) found no evidence of a program effect in their study of QCs and concluded that unions can garner the positive regard generated by EI programs for themselves simply by participating in the planning and implementation.

It may also be the case that EI does not undermine union solidarity. Hodson, Welsh, Rieble and Jamison (Hodson, Welsh, Rieble, & Jamison, 1993) analyzed 79 case studies to determine the relationship between worker autonomy, participation and solidarity. Their results suggest that worker autonomy and the use of teams do not undermine worker solidarity, and participation in work groups has a positive effect on group solidarity by increasing group discipline.

Cooke (Cooke, 1992) investigated the effectiveness of worker participation in union versus nonunion settings and in programs unilaterally administered by management versus those with joint union-management administration. He found that among unionized manufacturing firms, those with jointly administered programs achieved significantly greater improvements in product quality than those with traditional, collective bargaining relationships. Those with programs administered solely by management fared no better than those with no programs. The gains in firms with jointly administered plans were at least equal to those with participation programs in nonunion firms. He sums up by saying that in most cases unions have little choice but to participate
because the traditional, adversarial relations of the past are no longer available. Unions do, however, have choices about what cooperation entails.

Workers who support EI are likely to do so because they anticipate instrumental and intrinsic benefits (Herrick, 1990). Unionized workers certainly have not abandoned their desire to influence the traditional bread and butter issues of wages and grievance handling (Kochan et al, 1984), but they are now more likely to support participative programs if they believe the new systems will be instrumental in solving work-related problems (Dean, 1985). The intrinsic benefit in participative programs comes from workers having a stake in the health of the enterprise. By influencing the rules, policies, procedures, and work methods workers exert more control over their lives and make their work more satisfying. Those, therefore, who view EI in these terms are most likely to support EI programs.

Hypothesis 2: Workers' beliefs about EI programs will be positively associated with support for EI.

Beliefs About Other Stakeholders

Often the ability for management and workers in an organization to execute a program may be at issue rather than the program itself. Beliefs about other stakeholders consists of workers' perceptions of peer support of EI, and workers' perceptions of management support for EI. Workers and managers question whether they and their peers can or should make the necessary adjustments. Since EI efforts often entail sociotechnical redesign, they compel
labor and management to look deeply at how work is conducted and offer a reorientation from traditional workplace behavior (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1987).

The most effective forms of EI require a major change in work life (Cotton, 1993) and both the worker and management must believe those changes are workable and beneficial. Measurement of the views, attitudes, and intentions of both parties provide the best idea of whether there is enough consensus to proceed. A workplace which introduces EI without having examined and addressed these factors is more likely to encounter resistance on the part of workers or managers (Neumann, 1989).

Kochan (1984) found that the most successful efforts occur when the union serves as a full joint partner, changes in work organization are made which enhance employment security and improve the economic performance of the firm, and union leaders are able to link their support of QWL to their larger collective bargaining and representational strategies. Union views and attitudes are being measured at several different levels to get a picture of the degree to which the union is a full partner in the effort and identify where the differences in perspective and support exist.

EI programs place workers in the position to make decisions about distribution of work tasks, pace of production, training of coworkers, scheduling, quality control, maintenance, and purchasing (Lawler, 1990). This raises questions about the skill levels of workers in unionized shops because the job
classifications are more narrow than those of their nonunion counterparts and gives rise to the myth that participation requires skill levels not possessed by the average union worker. Eaton and Voos (1992) have shown that union workplaces are often more successful innovators than their non-union equivalents. Outside of this, little is written about the preparation of workers to implement an EI program and yet proper training and willingness to change are needed to make new programs work.

Because solidarity is a core union value, workers are not only concerned about the capacity of their peers, but the "labor viewpoint" in the workplace. If workers believe that their peers are supportive of a program then they are more likely to be supportive themselves. Having some workers participate while others do not fractures this unity with the possibility of undesirable selection effects. Finally, the perspectives of peers may be critical in shaping the views of workers due to the effects of information processing (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1979) in the socialization of union members.

Workers perception of management support is also important. Management attitudes and behaviors toward EI and participative climate are situational characteristics which have been suggested as factors that influence workers' attitudes and behaviors towards EI (Lawler, 1986). Supervisory level managers may be reticent towards EI but support it out of a sense of responsibility or loyalty to the corporate position. Their reticence or opposition will certainly undermine the program and will also be gauged by other
stakeholders and influence their levels of commitment. Upper management may indicate their commitment through decisions made, but supervisors are more critical because they must oversee change and work regularly within the new structure.

The biggest concerns with management mentioned by union leaders are layoffs, management attempts to change work rules, and supervisor resentment and resistance (Kochan, Katz, & Mower, 1984). After a survey of four-hundred managers, researchers, and consultants on issues that impact the success of large-scale change programs, Covin's (Covin & Kilmann, 1990) content analysis revealed that visible and consistent top management support, widespread employee participation, communication about program goals and progress, and tying the program to business needs were the key issues to programmatic success. One way to address the issue of management support is to determine if workers perceive that support. Since management opposition is mentioned as a concern of workers, the perception of management support is likely to increase worker support for EI.

The corporate ideology and values surrounding labor relations have a significant impact on key labor relations outcomes. Kochan (Kochan, McKersie, & Chalykoff, 1986) used two Conference Board surveys of labor relations practices to test various aspects of corporate industrial relations values and strategies and workplace innovations on union representation and membership. From 1977 to 1983, the average firm which emphasized union avoidance
reduced the probability that new work sites would be unionized from 15 percent to less than 1 percent.

Collective bargaining relationships also emanate from broad labor relations values and strategies. Cooke and Meyer (1990) identify three labor relations strategies; union avoidance, collaboration, and mixed. In a union avoidance strategy the company takes a strong stance against union representation across the board. With a collaborative strategy, management attempts to improve labor-management relations through joint union-management committees and employee involvement. Since the labor relations strategies of management may vary in differing market conditions, the commitment of upper management is weighted by workers. If past history mitigates against sincere efforts on the part of corporate management then it will be more difficult to convince stakeholders otherwise.

Conversely, in her survey of corporate Human Resource executives Goll (Goll, 1991) found that environmental pressures exert little influence on corporate ideology, but ideology has a significant effect on participative practices in both union and nonunion settings. Thus, the impact of environmental pressures would be felt indirectly through corporate strategy which would have an impact on participative practices. In union settings, the company's emphasis on progressive decision making was significantly related to the number of participative programs implemented, the number of employees in those programs, and the amount of influence workers had over quality of work
life decisions. These two studies show the quandary in which workers find themselves regarding EI programs. They must make an assessment of whether management is implementing EI due to temporal environmental pressures or if the program flows from a more enduring change in corporate ideology.

Collins, Hatcher and Ross (Collins, Hatcher, & Ross, 1993) surveyed 485 upper-level managers from 59 companies and found that the managers have a preference for participative systems, expect desirable outcomes to be achieved, generally perceive a need for organizational change, and are willing to support change to more participative systems. Examples of the favorable outcomes they expect are employee awareness of problems, improved communication and cooperation, increased employee involvement and productivity, and improved product quality.

Most resistance to participative programs like EI comes from labor, but not all management views are positive. A primary reason why participative systems are not adopted is lack of managerial support or leadership (Collins, Ross, & Ross, 1989). Some of the concerns are that participative efforts may bring: unrealistic expectations and promises, be time consuming, generate mediocre decisions, confuse accountability, and generate disruptive conflicts and loss of managerial authority (Halal & Brown, 1982). Many managers acknowledge that participative efforts have been, and continue to be, used to cut the cost of managerial salaries. Reasons why supervisors resist EI efforts are: incompatible belief systems, fear of losing prestige, doubt in the sincerity and
support of upper management, feeling bypassed or left out, and because programs interfere with their one-to-one relationships with workers (Juravich et al., 1993).

Neumann (1989) posits that the resistance on the part of middle and line managers can best be understood as the inevitable psychological reaction to contradictions established by top management. Examples of those contradictions are use of participation, but not for substantial decisions, requiring cooperation but reinforcing competition, and changed attitudes and behaviors towards subordinates but not towards superordinates. For managers, the biggest impact of EI was on social-psychological factors, like morale and union-manager relationships, or workplace issues like safety, health and quality. Job security and definition are concerns because of redundancy, managers are unsure of their new roles and how they are to be evaluated for extra work in training or quality circles.

Management often believes that the programs have a positive impact on social and psychological factors (Ross, Hatcher, & Adams, 1985); (Juravich et al., 1993), but may differ on how the program will affect them individually (Klein, 1984). Klein (Klein, 1984) records three reasons why managers resist employee involvement: job security, job definition, and extra work. For example, he suggests that if foremen have no knowledge of quality circles or little influence over what occurs when quality circles meet, they see the activity as a threat to their authority which they try to regain by bad-mouthing the program.
Detriments to participation are when participation is not reinforced through the personnel mechanisms which communicate the organization's pivotal norms or when programs are poorly managed (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). An example are quality circles which were enormously popular during the 1980's but have lost favor since that time. All parties to the change have something at stake and must view the other parties as capable of producing a favorable outcome. What stakeholders believe about the competencies of others may then influence their willingness to support a program of change.

Job role and security are related for supervisors because their job security is enhanced by keeping their roles distinct from those of the workers and thereby insuring their value to the organization. Self-Managed Work Groups are often threatening to supervisory management because management decision-making prerogatives are often delegated to the workers. If supervisors are to continue with the organization their roles have to change. When there are no processes in place to reassure supervisory management of their role they are threatened and will not support EI. Since their new roles are ambiguous, those managers who are negative about worker preparedness are less likely to support an EI program.

A survey of first line supervisors found that 72% view the programs as good for the company, 60% saw them as good for workers, but only 31% saw them as good for themselves (Klein, 1984). Cooke (Cooke, 1994) identifies three reasons why some managers believe unions have a negative effect on EI
programs: unions insist that the programs not make proposals that infringe on existing contractual language, they are inclined to make participation in programs voluntary; and they require effort to build a spirit of trust and commitment due to their dual roles as negotiating partners and collaborators. The ambivalence of management makes it much more difficult for workers to accept management's position as genuine.

Since all stakeholders incur some risk in change programs they tend to watch one another and make assessments about attitudes and positions. In a unionized environment this is not unlike the sizing up that occurs as labor and management adopt bargaining positions. To the degree that workers are comfortable with the resolve of their peers and the management position, they are more resolute in their own decision-making. Likewise, managers want assurance that workers are sufficiently prepared to execute a program and committed to its success. Adopting a new way to operate business follows a similar course of action.

Hypothesis 3a: Workers' perception of peer support for EI will be positively correlated with worker support for EI.

Hypothesis 3b: Workers' perception of management support for EI will be positively correlated with worker support for EI.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is commonly defined as a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of one's
important job values \cite{Locke1979}. Wagner and Hollenbeck (1995) note that job satisfaction is comprised of three key components: values, what a person consciously or unconsciously desires to obtain \cite{Locke1979}; importance, the significance placed on those values; and perception, a subjective reflection of objective reality. Those three variables combine in various ways to determine the level of satisfaction for workers.

Job satisfaction can also be viewed as the discrepancy between what a worker expects and what the worker actually receives \cite{Porter1973}. The literature is not clear on whether those who are more or less satisfied with their jobs tend to support EI. Wagner \cite{Wagner1994} notes that there is little evidence of an association between job satisfaction and participation. There is, however, evidence from Quality Circles that previous experiences with participative programs may raise expectations to unreasonable or unattainable levels \cite{Lawler1987}. Conversely, it is reasonable to infer that previous experience would make workers more realistic.

It would appear, however, that since change represents risk to workers it is unlikely that those with low job satisfaction would support change. As Neumann \cite{Neumann1989} notes, the more workers consider hierarchy to be natural and normative, the less they will participate. Workers view the change as making a choice between the poor conditions they know (and have adapted to) and possibly worse conditions predicated by change. Under those circumstances it becomes more difficult for workers to move from the status quo and embrace
uncertainty. Secondly, those responsible for the change are often associated with the present state of low job satisfaction.

Leana et al (Leana, Ahlbrandt, & Murrell, 1992) studied three groups of workers in an organization implementing El: volunteers waiting to participate in El, current participants, and non-participants. They found that those who were currently participating in El showed the greatest disparity between their perceived and desired levels of influence. The volunteers indicated the most positive attitudes but had not yet been exposed to change like the current participants. This may have been an instance where participating in El heightened expectations for participants and led to lower job satisfaction. It could also be argued that a selection effect was present so the current participants may have already possessed higher levels of job satisfaction leading to their willingness to volunteer. This would make it easier for them to be less satisfied when the measurement was taken.

Quality Circles present an illustration of the dangers of heightened expectations. While QCs initially resulted in enhanced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, performance, and retention, the improvements tended to drop back to their previous levels after 18 months. This may be due to what Lawler and Mohrman (Lawler & Mohrman, 1987) have termed a 
honeymoon effect. After being implemented with great enthusiasm and having success addressing some of the easiest problems, workers noticed the difference in how they were treated in QCs and were unhappy with different
treatment elsewhere. The initial success of QCs may have also prompted workers to desire a part of the firm's financial rewards (Lawler & Mohrman, 1985). This seems likely because those without EI experience lack the frame of reference for comparison. Although other factors may yet lead to dissatisfaction among workers without EI experience, it appears more likely in those who have experienced EI in the past.

Low job satisfaction has been noted in the organization change literature in the transformational model of change. Beckard (Beckhard, 1988) states that when conditions become sufficiently deteriorated workers are more open and supportive of comprehensive change. Likewise, studies of persuasion suggest that a felt need or displeasure with one's current state of affairs is a prerequisite for accepting a proposal for change (McGuire, 1985), (Trenholm, 1989). Experience with Quality Circles has provided this "need" in the past by increasing expectation. It is therefore, reasonable to believe that workers who have yet to participate in a change program may expect things to improve because the "success stories" receive the most media attention. Accordingly the following hypotheses are given:

Hypothesis 4a: Workers with previous EI experience will have lower levels of job satisfaction than those without previous EI experience.

Hypothesis 4b: Workers with low job satisfaction are more likely to support EI than those with high job satisfaction.
Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment can be defined as the degree to which people identify with the organization that employs them. It can also be defined as the binding of an individual to a firm or business organization and is evident in a worker who: has a strong desire to remain a member of the organization, internalizes its values and goals, and is willing to work extra hard on its behalf (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). The two prime models of organizational commitment are: the member-based model, which holds that commitment originates in the actions and personal attributes of the member, and the organization-based model which states that commitment reflects a member’s reciprocation for the organization having satisfied that member’s needs (Angle & Perry, 1983). Commitment may also be defined as a process of identification with the goals of an organization’s multiple constituencies (Reichers, 1985). In view of research on dual commitments (Angle & Perry, 1986), Reichers (1985) conceptualization of commitment as a process involving multiple constituencies is the most suitable.

The possibility of losing the commitment of workers due to cooperative programs is a concern of labor leaders but it has been demonstrated that workers are able to maintain multiple commitments. Angle and Perry (Angle & Perry, 1986) surveyed 22 different municipal bus companies and found that dual commitment varied with differences in the respective labor-management climates. Dual commitment was higher in cooperative climates than in less
cooperative climates. Thus it is likely that poor labor relations would polarize workers rather than cause them to lose union loyalty. If management and labor believe they can gain from EI programs, the dual commitment does not present a conflict for workers.

Organizational commitment can have wide ranging effects such as less use of the grievance committee (Sherer & Morishima, 1989), but more specifically it can affect beliefs about EI and intentions to support or oppose EI. In a study on the transfer of training to work, Tesluk (Tesluk et al., 1995) examined the extent to which various factors influenced the generalization of EI training to the job setting and found that trainees were more likely to use EI training in core job activities as their commitment to the organization grew. Those more committed to the organization are also most likely to report a transfer of training to the workplace (Tesluk et al., 1995).

Batt and Appelbaum propose that teams are effective because the commitment level tends to be uniform throughout the organization. Participation is also more likely to have a positive long-term effect on productivity when it involves decisions related to daily shop floor life, substantive decision making rights, and an environment characterized by a high degree of worker commitment and worker-management trust (Levine & D'Andrea Tyson, 1990). Other keys are that the union must be perceived as instrumental, the program should not infringe on issues and areas that are the province of collective
bargaining, and the union leaders must continue to aggressively pursue their constituents goals and not be perceived as being co-opted by management.

Kochan [1976 #163] also proposes that rewards must be perceived as equitably distributed between labor and management. If the goals and values are not threatened but commonality is established and workers are willing to give extra effort for the organization, then it is likely that they will support a new initiative like El. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is offered:

Hypothesis 5: Organizational commitment will be positively correlated with support for El.

Trust

Trust can be defined as having confidence in the predictability of another's actions or having faith in the good intent of another (Gambetta, 1988). It is being confident that a person or entity will be accurate in its assertions and make good on its commitments. Trust is fundamental to successful change efforts because violations of trust or insufficient trust and commitment are among the most frequent reasons for the failure of El efforts in unionized facilities (Oswald, 1986). Shapiro, Sheppard and Cheraskin (Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992) suggest that there are three types of trust operating in business relationships: deterrence-based trust, knowledge-based trust and identification-based trust.

Deterrence-based trust is founded on consistency of behavior and sustained by the threat of negative events if consistency is not maintained. This
is most typical of the traditional labor relations model where labor can strike if trust is violated or management can lock-out. Trust is based on each party's capacity to inflict harm should the established pattern be broken. An example is the labor accord of the 1960's and 1970's that was discarded by management in the 1980's. The labor accord was based on a consistent set of behaviors by both labor and management, but as management retreated, competitive pressures and declining union density did not afford labor adequate coercive means with which to compel continued trust. As will be noted later, this type of trust is characterized in a labor relations climate of armed truce.

The second type of trust is knowledge-based trust, which is founded on having enough information about another party to accurately predict their behavior. This is the type of trust that may be operative during the decision-making phase of EI programs. Stakeholders are asking themselves whether they have enough information about other groups of stakeholders to rely on their behaviors. They will look at past agreements and leadership behavior as the basis for an assessment of the reliability of the concerned parties. In many ways the belief about other stakeholders' support for EI is a reflection of knowledge-based trust. For example, workers need to reliably predict that a successful participation program would not lead to lay-offs. Knowledge-based trust is also important after program implementation because if decision-making authority is to be shared by management, they must know enough about labor leadership and workers to predict a reliable outcome.
This is also helpful in explaining why it is expected that workers beliefs about management commitment to EI is related to trust. Without believing that management is committed to EI, there is no basis from which to predict management's behavior, leading to lower trust and reduced likelihood of support. Likewise, if management cannot predict that labor will react favorably to EI then they will be less likely to favor implementation. Labor must have access to more information about production processes and management parameters for decision-making than has traditionally been given. This could lead to an increase in knowledge-based trust which may be why former participants tend to be more positive about participation. The level of cynicism about the likelihood of organizational change decreases with participation in EI activities (Tesluk et al., 1995). The increase in knowledge-based trust during an EI program may also lead to positive program effects among participants and heighten expectations for the future. On the other hand, it may lead to lowered job satisfaction if if behavior does not conform to expectations and that trust is violated.

Lastly, identification-based trust exists when each party so empathizes with the others' desires and intentions that they can reliably act on the other's behalf. It is most necessary when a mutual gains philosophy is adopted by management and labor. Leana and Florkowski (Leana & Florkowski, 1992) describe human relations and human resources models of organizational change under which it is believed that change is a tool for worker development,
and labor and management goals can be met simultaneously. If this is the orientation of those taking part in the organizational change, an identification-based trust is sought. Self-managed work teams by whom selection, training and work pace decisions are made, must operate at this level of trust if they are to be effective. Identification-based trust is the ideal that may be operating in EI programs and high involvement environments when they have made the necessary adjustments and are operating smoothly.

The first two types of trust are more pervasive when the parties continue to operate on the economic utility of trusted and being trusting, rather than the threat of severing the relationship and enduring the adverse consequences. Knowledge of the other party is critical to this process because the better the parties know one another the more strategic they can be in structuring a mutually satisfying relationship.

Trust is essential in EI efforts because change involves redistributing responsibility and accountability to the lowest levels in the organization. The opportunity for threat to union loyalty is clear here because when union leadership advocates such a program they invite challenges to commitment. Workers are called upon to trust management to make productive use of their suggestions, equitably share the increases that result from the program, and most of all to not use the program to institute a "speed-up" or to lay-off workers as a result of increased productivity. Moreover, workers usually must submit to reduced job classification and cross-training.
There are also individual risks incurred by those who choose to participate in change efforts. They may be subjected to peer-group pressure against what is perceived as detrimental collaboration with management, or have difficulty adapting psychologically at the end of a change effort if they have to go back to narrow, rigidly traditional tasks. The participators' managers may also attempt to coerce them during participation, or retaliate if the results of participation displease them. The potential for managerial coercion or retribution is usually present, but more so if a manager's stake in the outcome is high, management has little experience in power sharing, or if power differentials are relatively large in management's favor (Baloff & Doherty, 1989).

Eaton (1990) found that unions rarely protect themselves in EI programs, despite insisting that they do. Moreover, EI programs deal with grievances and contractual issues, despite the common prohibition against it, because it is practically impossible to separate participation programs from collective bargaining. The substantive issues addressed by participation tend to concern basic labor relations issues like technologies, work rules, and work methods (Juravich et al., 1993).

Trust is closely related to organizational climate. Climate may be characterized as the prevailing attitudes and tenor of relations throughout the workplace and is particularly relevant to this study because of the emphasis on stakeholder groups. Labor relations climate is important because to the degree that the company and union are viewed to be at cross-purposes, it is more
difficult for workers to exhibit the trust and dual commitment necessary for EI. Greater generalization of EI training was found in units with more positive climates (Tesluk et al., 1995).

Harbison and Coleman (1951) established three levels of labor-management cooperation: armed truce, working harmony, and union-management cooperation. In armed truce management believes that unions are at best necessary evils, and labor believes that their job is to challenge and protest management actions. Their only mutual desire is for an orderly method to contain conflict. Working harmony is typified by management believing that unions are an asset as well as a liability in running a business, and labor recognizing that the attainment of its objectives is dependent in large measure on the continued prosperity of the company. The parties recognize that although there are differences, it is possible to make mutually beneficial compromises.

Cooperation is evidenced by a management conviction that the union is willing and able to organize cooperative activity to lower costs and increase efficiency. Management is also willing to share some vital decision-making functions. The union is eager to be production boosting partner in return for tangible and intangible benefits. Armed truce may be characterized by deterrence-based trust, working harmony parallels a knowledge-based trust and cooperation is typified by identification-based trust.

Ross (Ross et al., 1985) surveyed union leaders and determined that the two primary reasons to oppose gainsharing are fear that management may try to
substitute it for equitable wages, and mistrust of management. Workers are leery of giving suggestions because those suggestions can lead to job loss, despite contractual arrangements, because it is very difficult to trace the reasons for layoffs (Fantasia et al., 1988). In order to dispel the climate of distrust surrounding change programs, workers must be assured that their work pace will not be increased and they will not be laid off, that their involvement is voluntary, and the labor contract will remain inviolate (Bluestone, 1981). Lack of trust will lead to opposition when adversarial politics, both in the past and present, lead to self-protection (Neumann, 1989).

When trust is repeatedly or sufficiently violated it may give way to cynicism. Brooks and Vance (Brooks & Vance, 1991) define cynicism as a belief that problems exist in the workplace, and more importantly, while these problems are not insurmountable, they will not be resolved due to various organizational failures. Their definition consists of two components: general cynicism, the belief that improvements will not be made and problems will not be solved due to the failure of others, and belief in improvability, that improvements could be made and problems could be solved, if the necessary support for projects and solutions were provided.

Reichers, Wanous & Austin (Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997) add that cynicism is centered in distrust of another's motivation or ability to bring about change and pessimism about change for the better ever occurring. Two assumptions form the basis for this construct, ...many people are simply not able
to be influenced even by the right collection of change techniques, and ... the
history of change efforts within an organization plays a role in the success of
future change efforts. It is not a predisposition but can be developed by anyone
who is exposed to failed attempts at change without reasonable explanations.
They note that cynicism can result from repeated exposure to mismanaged
change efforts or when successes are not communicated to workers, and they
presume failure. A likely consequence of cynicism is lower motivation to engage
in change efforts.

As a related construct, cynicism may play a significant role in the
assessments stakeholders make about the preparation of their peers and other
stakeholder groups. Since it is largely based on previous experience, it
heightens the importance of previous experience in determining the level of
trust. Coordination of EI with other programs can cause difficulties because
rarely is there only one change program in progress at any given time. Workers
do not keep the various efforts separate in their minds so the credibility of EI
change efforts can be inappropriately damaged by the adverse performance of
other programs (Husczo, 1991). Cynicism and lack of trust can be characteristic
of any stakeholder group but is more likely of those not directly responsible for
implementing change. Workers and supervisory managers are most susceptible
because they have the least amount of control over the consequences from the
change.
Camens (Camens, 1982) asserts that as long as workers are concerned about their jobs they will hold back even though they may agree that labor-management participative programs are good processes. It is likely that trust is influenced by the outcomes of previous experience with EI and will lead to support for EI. For example, those with previous EI experience might be expected to have higher levels of knowledge-based trust and make decisions about new programs accordingly. Low levels of trust in the company would lead stakeholders to think that although EI is a good program, it will not work at their company.

Hypothesis 6a: Previous experience with EI will be positively associated with level of trust.

Hypothesis 6b: Trust will be positively correlated with support for EI.
CHAPTER 4

METHOD

This chapter will describe the research design used for the study, the setting in which the study occurs, the respondents involved, development of the measures and finally the tools used for data analysis. In its original form, this project was conceived and initiated by Patrick Smylie, a doctoral student at The Ohio State University who secured the federal grant and served as project consultant. Mr. Smylie structured the project and developed the instrumentation but unfortunately he became ill and did not live to see its completion. The study makes use of the static group comparison between subjects design (Kerlinger, 1986), in which samples from company stakeholder groups are examined to discover the relationships between beliefs and work attitudes and reactions toward an employee involvement program.

The static groups occurred naturally by job classification or were created on the basis of responses to survey items. This design is pre-experimental and is appropriate for comparison of intact groups. One of the primary internal validity threats to the static group comparison design is selection (Kerlinger,
1985). Selection was controlled by using intact groups and groups whose
composition was based on survey responses. The primary threat to validity for
descriptive research is measurement error. This threat was controlled because
response rates were high and the demographic data for survey respondents did
not differ from the demographic data for the entire plant population. The
questionnaire survey is the most efficient means of gathering the needed data.
It allows for collection of information about a broad range of topics from a large
number of respondents with relatively little disturbance of the normal activities of
an organization (Cammann, Fichhman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983).

The potential confounds with the static group comparison design are
sensitivity and interaction of testing with the treatment (Campbell & Stanley,
1963). Sensitivity is not likely to have a distinct impact on the responses
because completion of the survey instrument was voluntary and heightened
negative and positive attitudes which may have occurred due to administering
the questionnaire would tend to offset. Interaction of testing and treatment was
controlled by being certain that all questionnaires were distributed and collected
at each session. The entire survey administration was completed within one
week, which did not allow respondents opportunity to discuss the contents of the
questionnaire.

Background

The research was conducted in cooperation with the Alliance for Labor &
Management Cooperation (The Alliance; Appendix A). The Alliance was formed
Through a grant secured from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) by an industrial union and six companies where the union represents workers. The common vision and interest was in pooling resources and helping one another to develop work environments that were more stable, motivating and suited to compete successfully in the global market. Subjects for this study come from the companies and union which form this alliance. This research setting was chosen because it is typical of many EI programs, and the working conditions and labor-management relations were similar to those in other manufacturing industries.

Numerous research studies have suggested that successful implementation of EI programs requires the commitment of both labor and management (Leana & Florkowski, 1992). Both labor and management officials were involved in the program's design and implementation from its inception. The advisory board for this project was chaired by the regional officer of the FMCS and included Human Resource Officers from each of the six companies involved, union officials, and the researcher. The plants involved in this study are units of various rubber and chemical product manufacturers that range in size from small, regional companies to large multinational companies. Each company had a steering committee comprised of labor and management representatives who directed the program.

The process began with discussions of labor-management relations and training of company officers in group process by the project administrator and
consultant. Following this, action plans were developed for the alliance that included on-site visits and interviews of labor and management officials by the administrator and consultant. The action plans were to provide the blueprint for a change effort that would be completed over the eighteen month period of the grant. Then the employee involvement surveys were developed by the project consultant, who in turn administered the surveys. The current researcher became involved with the project and reformulated the research problem after initial data were collected.

**Sample and Data Collection**

The plants were small to medium-sized rubber and chemical manufacturers which varied in number from approximately 100 to approximately 600 workers. Although the various companies came together to share information and for common training, they are independent. This study took place in a section of the Midwest where sensitivity to international competition, industrial relations, and the effects of plant closings was very pronounced. Even as the study occurred the union was active in a strike against a company within the industry which had hired replacement workers.

The six companies involved in this study were in the tire and chemical industry and bargain with the same union. Each company was located in the Midwest but the size, work force composition, market emphasis, capital structure, and labor relations climates vary. This sample of subjects was selected because they were unionized workers employed in various work
environments, and different levels of the independent variables were present. The subjects were primarily line workers in manufacturing plants in the industrial Midwest. The percentage of respondents in each plant ranged from 30 to 80 percent. Non-response due to absenteeism and illiteracy may push the actual response rate up as much as ten to fifteen percent higher.

The combined employment of the companies surveyed was approximately 695 unionized workers of which 452 responded. The overall response rate for the survey was 65%. Questionnaires were completed voluntarily on company time in each of the companies in the Alliance. The labor-management steering committees, with support from the project administrator, were responsible for explaining the employee involvement program that was underway and the survey. Participation was solicited both formally and informally by union and management leadership and those who were on the labor-management committee. All workers were encouraged to participate and it was emphasized that responses were anonymous and confidential. The instrument itself was administered to groups of workers by labor-management teams from the EI steering committees.

All non-management workers were represented by a union that, in conjunction with management, supported beginning an employee involvement program. Managers also completed the survey instrument. Fifty-eight percent of the workers had been employed for 10 years or less, and another 19% had job tenure of over 20 years. Most workers had been doing their specific job for five
years or less. The ages of most respondents (77%) was between 25 and 55 with the remaining 23% evenly divided between those over 55 and under 25. Sixty percent of respondents had high school education or its equivalent. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were male workers and minority representation within these companies was approximately five percent.

All data was collected through questionnaires and although common-method bias can lead to inflated scores in self-report measures, the effects are not found in all types of studies and should not, therefore, be considered self-evident (Crampton & Wagner, 1994). The questionnaire was distributed to the plant EI coordinators after the final training meeting for plant representatives. Each questionnaire packet contained a copy of the questionnaire, a cover letter signed by the project administrator under the auspices of the Alliance, and an informed consent notice. The informed consent notice included: description and purpose of the study, the endorsement of the union and companies involved, a statement noting that participation was voluntary, a confidentially statement, contact persons for questions about the study, and signatures of the researchers involved.

The questionnaires were administered and supervised in the break or meeting rooms of the respective companies by teams of labor and management representatives at each company who were instructed to stress honest answers, labor and management support for the effort, and the confidentially of the responses. The times of administration allowed all workers the opportunity to
complete them so that no workers were excluded from data collection. Those who administered the questionnaires made no statements to respondents about issues that may have affected responses to the instrument.

Each respondent completed the questionnaire independently and confidentially and the instruments were collected by the labor-management representatives and forwarded to the researcher. After the data from the questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed, it was presented to the Alliance Board and then in the labor-management committees at the respective companies. The representatives of those labor-management committees presented the results to management and labor at their respective plants.

Measures

There will be eight variables measured in this study: previous experience with EI, worker beliefs about EI programs, worker beliefs about peer support for EI, worker beliefs about management support for EI, trust, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and support for EI. The dependent variable is support for EI. Control variables are: age, gender, education, race, plant, job tenure, and employment tenure. These variables were measured for workers whose attitudes are the focus of the study.

The attitudinal variables were operationalized through items selected from the Michigan Occupational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983). The questionnaire items were presented on Likert-type scales ranging from one - strongly disagree, through seven - strongly agree. Those questions that are
phrased negatively were reverse scored to facilitate scoring of the items. The Michigan Occupational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) was chosen because it is a valid and widely used instrument designed specifically for use in the assessment of organizations and organizational change. The indices consist of nominal Likert-type items and have internal consistency coefficients of .60 or better in many settings (Cammann et al., 1983). It measures, among other things, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, views toward participative programs and reaction to participative programs.

**Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable *support for El* represented how strongly the respondent supported instituting an El program. It was operationalized through the following items:

- I like the idea of Employee Involvement.
- All in all I prefer working in a plant that has Employee Involvement.
- At present how supportive of Employee Involvement are (you personally).

As shown in Table 4.1 below, the three items were correlated with the total score for Support for El (with the item removed) and obtained correlations of .50 or greater. The items were scored on scales of slightly different magnitude so the standardized item alpha was used. Coefficient alpha for the Support for El scale was .73.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea of Employee Involvement.</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all I prefer working in a plant that has Employee Involvement.</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At present how supportive of Employee Involvement are (you personally).</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .73 Standardized item alpha = .73

Table 4.1: Support for EI Reliability Analysis
Independent Variables

The dimensions of the independent variable cover previous experience, and a range of beliefs and attitudes. Table 4.2 shows the rotated principle factors solution. Several criteria were used to analyze the results, placing primary emphasis on interpretability, which strongly suggested a four-factor solution. The scree test (Cattell, 1965) shown in Table 4.3 indicated that the slope of a plot of the characteristic roots began to level off after the fourth factor. In addition, although six significant factors emerged from the factor analysis using the Kaiser criterion (eigenvalues greater than 1), four factors explain the greatest amount of variance. These four factors were labeled attitudes, beliefs about EI, belief about management support, and belief about worker support coincide with the independent variables for this study. The other factors were dropped in the interest of parsimony.

The four factors just identified were rotated using the direct oblimin method. Each of the 28 variables had significant factor loadings (equal to or greater than .35) on at least one of the four factors. Both Kim and Mueuler (Kim & Mueller, 1978) and Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Grablowski (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Grablowski, 1979) considered factor loadings of .30 to be meaningful. Such loadings may be considered consistent with a conservative criterion. Examination of the factor correlation matrix showed that the degree of correlation among the factors was larger than .30 only in the instance of
attitudes and management support (.46) and thus provided support for the independence of factors.

To further insure that these factors represented valid constructs, item analyses were conducted. The interpretation of the underlying dimensions of each factor were relatively straightforward and intuitively appealing. Beliefs About EI included variables that describe the views of workers on EI in general and its impact on their specific workplace. The scale for Beliefs About EI initially was comprised of the following nine items:

- Employee Involvement is a way to eliminate first level managers.
- Employee Involvement increases our job security by making us more effective in a competitive marketplace.
- Employee Involvement pits worker against worker.
- If Employee Involvement were adopted throughout the company many employees would lose their jobs.
- Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers jobs.
- I believe Employee Involvement will continue even if our plant manager changes.
- Most employees do not want the added responsibility of Employee Involvement.
- Employee involvement will not be successful here because employees aren't ready for it.
- Without employees who are both mature and very skilled Employee Involvement will fail.
As shown in Table 4.4, each of the nine items was correlated with the total score for Beliefs About EI Programs. All of the correlations were greater than .37 except for two items "employee involvement increases our job security by making us more effective in a competitive market" (r = .18) and "I believe Employee Involvement will continue even if our plant manager changes" (r = .29). The first item is ambiguous because it addresses the two separate issues of job security and effectiveness which may not be congruent to respondents. Respondents may believe that EI would increase job security without making them more effective or that EI may make them more effective without increasing job security.

The item addressing continuation of EI is unclear because it attaches the longevity of the plant manager to the continuation or merits of an EI program. Consequently, those two items were eliminated. Coefficient alpha for the revised Beliefs About EI Programs scale was .74. Because the same sample was used to conduct the item analyses and to assess coefficient alpha, the reliability estimate is likely to be an overestimate of the population coefficient alpha.

The variable Beliefs About Labor Support was measured to provide a composite for what workers thought about the support of union members. The items used for this scale were:

At present how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following groups are:

- others you work closely with
• non-salaried employees in general
• union stewards
• union leaders

Table 4.5 shows that the item total correlations for the scale were at .35 and above. Coefficient alpha for the Beliefs About Labor Support was .74.

Beliefs About Management Support was measured in the same manner. The items used for this scales were:

At present how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following groups are:

• first line supervisors
• your immediate supervisor
• middle managers
• top plant management
• top company management

As shown in Table 4.6, the item total correlations are all above .55. the alpha reliability for this variable was .88.

The job attitudes of trust, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction were measured. The twelve items thought to assess these job attitudes were obtained from the MAOQ. The internal consistency reliability estimates of the items from the corresponding attitude modules in the MAOQ are .77, .62, and .68 respectively. Table 4.2 shows that factor analysis did not separate these three attitudes into distinct factors. Moreover, organizational commitment is
strongly correlated with job satisfaction (0.66), which presents a problem with multicollinearity. Previous research has identified job satisfaction and commitment as positively correlated with one another (Bluedorn, 1982), but conceptually distinct constructs nevertheless (Clegg, 1983). Additional studies suggest that although job satisfaction and organizational commitment are related, they contribute independently to the development of intentions and cognitions (Tett & Meyer, 1993); (Dougherty, Bluedorn, & Keon, 1985).

There is also a moderate correlation between organizational commitment and trust as broadly defined (0.60). The relationship may be due to the constructs being so broadly defined. Meyer and Allen (Meyer & Allen, 1991) have identified three types of organizational commitment. Affective commitment, which denotes an individual's identification and involvement; continuance commitment, which arises from valuable entities lost upon leaving; and normative commitment, which is centered around moral obligation.

As discussed earlier, trust can be based on deterrence, knowledge, or identification. Continuance commitment coincides with deterrence-based trust whereas affective commitment can be aligned with identification-based trust. This measure most closely addressed affective commitment. Abbreviated measures like the one administered in this study, however, may obscure the distinctiveness of concepts defined so broadly and contribute to multicollinearity.

Given the research that establishes job satisfaction and organizational commitment as conceptually distinct constructs, the relationships between types
of trust and types of organizational commitment, an a priori belief that these items measure different job attitudes, and their interpretability, the items were grouped into categories of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust prior to the item reliability test. Items entered into the analysis were:

**Job Satisfaction**
- All in all, I'm satisfied with my job.
- In general, I do not like my job.
- I know how the work I do fits with the work of other people.
- In general I like working here.

**Organizational Commitment**
- This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
- I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort to help this company be successful.
- I talk up this company to my friends as a great place to work.
- I find that my values and the company values are very similar.

**Trust**
- This company will take advantage of you if you give it a chance.
- I feel I can trust the people in this company.
- People here feel you can't trust this company.
- When management says something you can really believe its true.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Attitude</th>
<th>Factor 2: Belief</th>
<th>Factor 3: Management Support</th>
<th>Factor 4: Worker Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I'm satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of extra effort to help this company be successful.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can trust the people in this company.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk up this company to my friends as a great company to work for.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I do not like my job.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here feel you can't trust this company.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the company values are very similar.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how the work I do fits with the work of other people.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company will take advantage of you if you give it a chance.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When management says something you can really believe its true.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement is a way to eliminate first level managers.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement will not be successful here because employees aren't ready for it.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement pits worker against worker.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without employees who are both very mature and very skilled Employee Involvement will fail.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.2 Factor Analysis of Questionnaire Items
If Employee Involvement were adopted throughout the company, many employees would lose their jobs. Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers' jobs.

At present, how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following individuals and groups tends to be?

- Others you work closely with
- Your immediate supervisor
- Non-salaried employees in general
- Union stewards
- Union officers
- First line supervisors
- Middle managers
- Top plant management
- Top company management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Attitude</th>
<th>Factor 2: Belief</th>
<th>Factor 3: Management Support</th>
<th>Factor 4: Worker Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Employee Involvement were adopted throughout the company many employees would lose their jobs. Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers' jobs.</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At present, how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following individuals and groups tends to be?</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Others you work closely with | 0.37 | 0.10 | -0.05 | 0.38 |
| Your immediate supervisor | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.51 | 0.06 |
| Non-salaried employees in general | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.52 |
| Union stewards | -0.09 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 0.88 |
| Union officers | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.07 | 0.78 |
| First line supervisors | 0.04 | -0.08 | 0.57 | 0.21 |
| Middle managers | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.08 |
| Top plant management | -0.02 | 0.01 | 0.92 | -0.05 |
| Top company management | -0.04 | 0.01 | 0.91 | -0.02 |

Eigenvalue 7.19 3.47 2.33 1.87

Percentage of total variance explained 25.6 12.4 8.3 6.7

Table 4.2
TABLE 4.3: Scree Plot
Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers jobs.  
Most employees do not want the added responsibility of Employee Involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement is a way to eliminate first level managers.</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement will not be successful here because employees aren't ready for it.</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement pits worker against worker.</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without employees who are both mature and very skilled Employee Involvement will fail.</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Employee Involvement were adopted throughout the company many employees would lose their jobs.</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .74  
Standardized item alpha = .74

TABLE 4.4: Beliefs About EI Programs Reliability Analysis
At present how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following groups are:

- others you work closely with 9.73 .35 .78
- non-salaried employees in general 9.88 .53 .68
- union stewards 9.60 .63 .61
- union leaders 9.46 .63 .62

Alpha = .74 Standardized item alpha = .74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Worker Beliefs About Labor Support for EI Reliability Analysis
At present how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following groups are:

- your immediate supervisor 13.8 .80 .84
- first line supervisors 13.8 .58 .88
- middle managers 14.0 .63 .87
- top plant management 14.0 .78 .84
- top company management 13.8 .81 .83

Alpha = .88  Standardized item alpha = .88

Table 4.6: Worker Beliefs About Management Support Reliability Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I'm satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I do not like my job.</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how the work I do fits with the work of other people.</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general I like working here.</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company will take advantage of you if you give it a chance.</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can trust the people in this company.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here feel you can't trust this company.</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When management says something you can really believe its true.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort to help this company be successful.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk up this company to my friends as a great place to work.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the company values are very similar.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Correlations of each Trust, Organizational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction Scale after removing focal item (bold) and with the other scales.

Table 4.7: Job Attitudes Reliability Analysis
In item analysis each item was correlated with its own scale (with the item removed) and with the other attitude scales. As shown in Table 4.7 above, only the item "this company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance," was more highly correlated with another attitude scale than with its own scale. The item was retained because of it's has strong conceptual links with organizational commitment, it is highly correlated with the other items in its scale, and the reliability of the organizational commitment scale is only marginally improved by its removal.

Coefficient alphas were computed to obtain internal consistency estimates of reliability for these three attitudinal scales. The alphas for the trust, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction scales were .73, .76, and .74, respectively. These values may overestimate the population alphas because the same sample was used to conduct the item analyses and the compute the reliability estimates. The validity of the measures as independent constructs is demonstrated by the items being as highly or more highly correlated with the items in their own scale as with the other scales. Use of factor analysis and item reliabilities provide considerable evidence in support of the measures used in this study.

Control Variables

The variables job classification, age (Miller & Prichard, 1992), plant tenure and job tenure (Ichniowski & Shaw, 1995), race and gender (Zamanou & Glaser, 1994) have all been demonstrated to influence attitude towards change.
They, in addition to level of education, were added as controls in order to avoid potential confounding with the beliefs and attitudes of respondents.

Respondents were categorized by stakeholder group based on response to the item:

\textit{Are you a ... (please circle all that apply) bargaining unit member, first line supervisor, union steward, union officer, middle management, or senior management.}

The response groups were mutually exclusive except for \textit{bargaining unit member, union steward, and union officer}. Bargaining unit member was designed to represent all union membership. When responses from union leaders were necessary the other two labels were used. The two response groups whose views constitute levels of the variable \textit{stakeholder group} are \textit{workers} which are comprised of those who indicated they were bargaining unit members, and \textit{management} comprised of those indicating they were first line supervisors, middle management and plant and corporate management.

Level of experience with EI was determined by the answer to the question:

\textit{Have you ever been a member of an employee involvement program such as quality circles, problem solving teams, or self-managed work group.}

To which the respondent could select "I have never been a member," "I was once a member," or "I am currently a member." On this basis the level of experience with EI was determined. The remaining control variables of age, plant tenure, job
tenure, race, level of education, and gender were determined with categorical demographic-type items which are shown on the questionnaire in Appendix B.
RESULTS

The descriptive statistics and correlations for the variables studied are shown in Table 5.1. In general, the correlations indicate a significant though moderate positive correlation between the beliefs and attitudes of workers and their Support for EI. Spearman’s rho \( (r_s) \) was used for descriptive analyses including the variable “Previous Experience with EI” because it is categorical. The self-report scales exhibit adequate or better (> .70) Cronbach alphas (Nunnally, 1978) in all cases.

To more rigorously test the relationships shown in Figure 1, hierarchical and stepwise regression analyses were conducted. The multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the overall impact the independent variables had on support for EI. First, the control variables of age, gender, tenure, job tenure, race, and level of education were entered into the regression equation. Second, to determine the incremental predictive validity of the independent variables, EI experience, belief in labor support, belief in management support, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust were entered into the regression. The criterion variable was support for EI. Table 5.2 presents the
results of the regression analysis. When added to the regression, the predictor variables account for an additional 24% of variance (p. = .000). Three of the seven variables had highly significant direct effects on support for EI.

Since organizational commitment and job satisfaction (.66), and organizational commitment and trust (.60) were highly correlated, each of the variables was entered into the regression equation absent the other highly correlated variables. This additional stepwise regression was completed to address multicollinearity between the attitudinal variables. In Table 5.3 the stepwise regression revealed that although each of the related variables had a significant correlation with support for EI (p = .000), only organizational commitment was significant after controlling for trust. This finding corroborates the results of the initial regression analysis which indicates that trust and job satisfaction do not account for additional variance after considering organizational commitment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Belief About El Programs</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belief About Labor Support</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Belief About Management Support</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trust</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Previous El Experience</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support for El*</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach alpha reliabilities are provided in parentheses.

* Correlations including the Previous El Experience variable were calculated with the Spearman's rho.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations
The hypotheses first address previous experience, then beliefs about EI and lastly attitudes. Of the respondents in this study, 294 or 40% indicated that they were once a participant (31%) or currently a participant (9%) in an EI program. Because previous experience is a categorical variable which can present difficulties in regression analysis, partial correlations were used to test hypotheses 1a, 1b, 4a and 6b. The results of partial correlations are shown in table 5.4. Hypothesis 1a predicted that previous EI experience would be positively associated with workers' beliefs about EI. Although the zero-order correlation was not significant (Table 5.4), after partialing out the effect of the other independent variables, this hypothesis was supported ($r_p = .12$, $p = .049$). There was a small effect size, but those with previous EI experience tend to have more positive views of EI programs. In Hypothesis 1b it was predicted that unionized workers with EI experience would be more likely than those without EI experience to support EI programs. This hypothesis was also supported ($r_p = .18$, $p = .004$). After partialing out the effects of the other independent variables, previous experience with EI was a significant predictor of support for EI.

Results of the hypotheses not involving partial correlations are shown in the regression analyses in Table 5.2. The three hypotheses about beliefs address workers' views of their peers and management. Hypothesis 2 was that workers' beliefs about EI programs influenced their support for EI. It seemed apparent that if workers view EI in a negative manner, they would be less likely to support the program. This
hypothesis was supported \((t = 2.63, p < .01)\). Hypothesis 3a predicted that workers' perception of peer support would be positively associated with support for EI. This hypothesis was the most strongly supported \((t = 4.32, p < .001)\). Knowing that co-workers have common views was an important factor in workers' support of EI.

While obviously taking note of what other workers were thinking about EI, respondents were not as concerned about the reactions of managers to EI. Hypothesis 3b, that workers' beliefs about management support for EI would be positively associated with worker support for EI, was not confirmed. Analysis showed a nonsignificant very small association between the two variables \((t = .32)\).

Hypotheses 4a and 4b were directed toward job satisfaction. In these two hypotheses it was predicted that workers with previous EI experience would have lower job satisfaction than those lacking that experience, and low job satisfaction would be associated with support for EI. Neither hypothesis was supported. Previous experience had a very small negative association with job satisfaction but did not approach significance \((r_p = -.03, p = .66)\). Level of job satisfaction had a moderate negative association with support for EI and relatively larger regression coefficient but did not reach significance \((t = -1.14)\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables (Demographic)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictor Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience With EI</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief About EI</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief About Labor Support</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>4.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief About Management Support</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.40***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p< .01  
***p<.001

Table 5.2: Results of Multiple Regression Analyses for Support for EL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05

TABLE 5.3: Results of Stepwise Regression Analyses for Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Trust
The two remaining job attitudes explored were organizational commitment and trust. As predicted in hypothesis 5, organizational commitment was positively associated with support for EI ($t = 3.40, p < .001$). The likelihood of support for EI increases as workers become more deeply committed to the company.

Hypothesis 6a predicted that previous experience with EI would be positively associated with level of trust. This hypothesis was supported. There was a weak but significant positive association between previous experience with EI and trust while controlling for the other independent variables ($r_p = .05, p = .049$). Hypothesis 6b was not supported. No significant association was found between level of trust and support for EI ($t = -.35$).

Overall, the results of this study demonstrate that respondent experience, beliefs and attitudes impact the extent to which workers support EI programs. In particular, beliefs about EI programs, beliefs about labor support and organizational commitment were related to EI support. Belief about management support, and trust were not related at significant levels and job satisfaction had a significant but negative correlation with support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous EI Experience Correlation</th>
<th>Previous EI Experience Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for EI</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief about EI</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at .05.

Table 5.4: Partial Correlations with Previous EI Experience
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

Previous studies of employee involvement have examined numerous factors such as youth, level of education, level of union activity (Miller & Prichard, 1992), impact on attitudes towards decision-making (Leana et al., 1992), and generalization of training (Tesluk et al., 1995). Modeling of worker beliefs and attitudes as they lead to behavioral intentions and the impact of perceptions about the beliefs of others have not, however, been empirically addressed. The model presented in Figure 1 depicting support of El programs as a result of previous experience, beliefs, and attitudes received general support, with six of ten hypotheses being confirmed. Previous experience, beliefs about El, beliefs about labor support, and organizational commitment were significant predictors of El support. When added to regression these factors accounted for a large amount of variance.

As expected, those workers with previous El experience were significantly more likely to believe El would have a positive impact on workers than those without El experience. This is consistent with results of other studies (Leana et al., 1992), (Verma, 1989). At first glance the outcome appears to be a program effect because those with experience tended to view El more favorably than
those who did not. Such a conclusion, however, is not fully warranted because it is based on the assumption that the EI program was well executed. There is no evidence of how attitudes toward union and management would be affected by worker participation in a poorly executed EI program.

Previous research generally describes program effects as threats to union loyalty (Verma & McKersie, 1987), implying that there will be competition or even displacement effects (Leana et al., 1992). Such program effects are only likely if the experience of union workers in the program is positive. If results with Quality Circles are an indicator, it is also possible that negative experience with participation, involvement and the managerial aspects of the participative programs could make workers even more closely aligned with their previous job roles (Lawler & Mohrman, 1985), (Lawler & Mohrman, 1987) and with their unions. From the labor perspective this might be termed a positive program effect. Positive program effects must be considered in addition to the negative program effects frequently assumed in the literature. Program effects could be defined more closely by measuring the quality of the program and its effect on the workers' view of EI.

Since previous experience led to more positive views of EI, and organizational commitment was highly associated with EI, a selection effect is of greater likelihood than a program effect. The average tenure for a relatively young (36-45) workforce was over ten years, so much of that their previous experience with EI was in their current workplace. Participation in EI programs
for these plants was voluntary so the workers with more favorable attitudes (i.e. organizational commitment) volunteered to participate. Perhaps a more plausible reason for this outcome is a selection effect, workers were self-selecting on the basis of greater organizational commitment. As noted by Verma and McKersie (Verma & McKersie, 1987), unions can offset selection effects by participating actively in EI program development and implementation.

It was established that workers' beliefs about EI were associated with support. Obviously how a program is presented to workers is important. This result corroborates results of a study by Tesluk et al (Tesluk et al., 1995) who found that the timeliness of information dissemination about EI programs is positively associated with support for the program. The implication for EI proponents is a thorough and rapid presentation of EI. Conversely, those who oppose the program would benefit by delaying implementation so that negative information can be circulated and considered.

The current research is an attempt to extend the literature by examining how perception of other stakeholders influences support for EI. The workers' belief that their labor peers supported the program was significantly related to support for EI, but perception of management support did not reach significance. Although the importance of visible management support for change programs has been emphasized for decades (Bennis, 1978), (Kochan et al., 1984), (Lawler, 1992), clearly the strongest indicators for support were perception of
peer support, and commitment to the organization. This may be an indication of commitment to the union or at least the recognition of its importance.

There are two reasons why conventional wisdom did not prevail in this case. First, when the workers’ relative discounting of management support for EI is considered with the positive correlation between organizational commitment and support, it shows that workers are able to be influenced by the views of their union co-workers and support a management initiated program such as EI. This finding may also be related to the dual commitments asserted by Angle and Perry (Angle & Perry, 1986). Indeed Hodson (Hodson, Welsh, Rieble, & Jamison, 1993) found that participation in such programs can even strengthen workers’ commitment to the union.

The second reason for the insignificant findings with respect to perception of management support is that labor relations in the industry studied are highly institutionalized and workers are comfortable disagreeing with management and handling those differences through their unions (Oswald, 1986). For example, labor and management have instituted EI programs but disagreed on how successful the programs were (Juravich et al., 1993), and what makes for a successful program (Eaton, 1994). Collective bargaining frequently continues in the midst of EI programs (Herrick, 1990; Kochan, Katz, & Mower, 1985), so workers are aware that agreement is not required for a program to be effective. Consequently, beliefs about EI programs and the support of union peers were the more salient factors.
Neither hypotheses regarding job satisfaction was supported and the zero-order correlation and regression coefficient were in different directions. The regression coefficient was, however, relatively strong and coincides with the findings of Graham (Graham & Verma, 1991), but others have found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and support for EI (Wagner, 1994), (Tesluk et al., 1995). It has also been found that those who were more discontent were more likely to support a change from their current circumstances. Clearly the correlation of job satisfaction in support of EI is yet unclear and should be addressed by further research.

The result of no significance for relationships between job satisfaction, trust and support for EI may be related. This relationship is complex because if EI is a change, those who are unsatisfied may be more likely to favor the change. Conversely, they may not trust management to make change work. A more likely explanation is the multicollinearity between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and trust. The zero-order correlations between each of the variables and support for EI were positive and significant, but job satisfaction and trust account for no additional variance above that attributable to organizational commitment.

As expected, organizational commitment was highly correlated with support for EI and tended to serve as a composite measure for job attitudes in this study. It may also be that commitment to the organization is of more practical importance to workers because they have the union to see that they are
treated equitably. In the area in which this study was conducted, the workers had average tenure of over ten years and, in some cases, are second generation workers. They have seen managers come and go but are pleased with the job the company provides. The vast majority have high school education but would be very unlikely to find other jobs with comparable wages.

Finally, there is a weak but significant positive relationship between previous experience with EI and trust. Others have found trust to be related to the success of EI programs (Levine & D'Andrea Tyson, 1990), (Lawler & Mohrman, 1987). Those with previous experience are more trusting, but trust is not significant as a predictor. As shown when conceptualizing trust as a variable, there are several types of trust that operate in a unionized environment. While identification or knowledge-based trust may not be necessary for the success of an EI program, deterrence-based trust would appear to be a minimum requirement. In each instance previous experience with EI led toward support of EI programs, either directly or indirectly through negative association with other job attitudes like job satisfaction or positive association with trust. The implication here may be that workers are prone to support programs that provide more job variety without threatening the union structure.

Study Limitations and Implications for Practice and Research

The results of this study should be viewed in light of its limitations. First, although factors were included at several levels, important factors were not
modeled. For example, an assessment of previous EI experience or expectations regarding EI would have provided much additional insight. Measuring expectations may help to clarify the role of job satisfaction since previous experience with EI has increased expectations and reduced job satisfaction in Quality Circles (Kochan et al., 1984). Second, since the survey was conducted only after the EI program was introduced, no pre-program vs. post-program assessment was taken to assure that scores on the measures were independent of the program itself.

Third, the results may partly be attributable to common method (percept-percept) bias. When possible, future studies should select different respondent samples to measure various constructs. Fourth, measurement of the trust and organizational commitment variables are not precise. Future research should more carefully define and measure these constructs.

The findings of this study hold implications for the design of strategies intended to attract participation in EI programs. One obvious implication is that positive perceptions of EI programs and what they entail for workers is critical to their success. With the number of EI and other participation programs being used in business today, it is easy for workers to be unclear about the specifics of the program being introduced in their workplace. The comparisons that are likely to be made with other companies may not be accurate for a number of reasons. Both labor and management are well-served to consider this in their presentation of change programs.
Second, since workers support is aligned with that of other union members, it is advisable for management to elicit the active support and involvement of labor in change efforts of this nature. In studies of other locations researchers have reported better results from employee participation when unions are involved (Verma, 1989). Third, research should address trust more specifically as it is broken out in this research. Clearly there are varying types of trust and they will have differing effects on support for EI. For example, would programs based on deterrence-based trust receive as much support as those which can be based on knowledge-based or identification-based trust?

Finally, there is a lack of longitudinal research on EI programs. Most are snap-shots that cannot be placed in context to show the impact of management turnover, changes in the competitive landscape, worker experience with EI, or how attitudes are developed over time. Additionally, the direction of associations are more difficult to determine. For example, the current research identified a positive association between beliefs about EI and support, but since the program was already being implemented, workers may have simply been reconciling their views to circumstances they cannot control.

In the public eye, the Saturn Company is viewed as the “flagship” for increased employee involvement in the workplace. The UAW recently had a referendum on whether to return to the traditional contract used in the other GM plants which was soundly defeated. The defeat of the measure is not surprising, but the presence of enough discord to force a vote is an indication that there is
much to be known about how to design and maintain EI programs that are attractive to workers.
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Dear Employee,

In recent years the employee involvement process has been established in many companies. This joint union-management survey will help plan the use of the employee involvement process at this plant.

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY: The survey is designed to obtain the views of all employees about employee involvement and to see if different groups, management and labor, have different views of employee involvement. We are also collecting some demographic information about plant employees such as: age, gender, race, and how long people have worked at the plant. This information will be helpful as the company and union work together to plan and put in place an employee involvement process. We are asking all employees, managers, and union officers to complete a survey.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your answers to this survey are VOLUNTARY AND CONFIDENTIAL. No one from the union or management will see your individual responses. PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THE SURVEY. The completed surveys will be sent to Ohio State University. Researchers at Ohio State will tabulate and analyze the answers. A summary report will be sent to the labor-management steering committee at the plant. No individual responses will be reported.

Sincerely,

Patrick Smylie
Ohio State University
Assistant Director, Alliance for the Promotion & Development of Labor-Management Cooperation
HOW TO COMPLETE THE SURVEY

Most of the questions on this survey ask you to circle a number that appears under the statement. You circle the number that best matches how you feel about the question. For example, if you were asked how much you agree with this statement, “I enjoy the weather around here” and feel that you agree, circle the number above Agree like this:

I enjoy the weather around here.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree slightly disagree neither slightly agree agree strongly agree

TERMS USED IN THIS SURVEY

EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT: Employee Involvement is a general term that is used to describe a number of different programs. You may have heard the terms quality circle, self-managed work groups, and/or joint process. There are many types of employee involvement. In general, employee involvement means getting the opinions of workers about their jobs, products they make, and the plant or company where they work and using the knowledge and skills of all workers to make the job, products and plant or company better for everyone.

Employee involvement also gives workers more control over their jobs.
SECTION A  BACKGROUND
This section will give us background information on the type of people that work at this plant. Please circle your response number.

1. Are You (circle one)                          2. When did you first start working at this plant.
   1. Female                                         _______ Month  _______ Year
   2. Male

3. When did you begin your current job?          4. How old were you on your last birthday
   _______ month _______ year                       ________ years

5. Are you? (circle one)                         6. What is your highest level of schooling completed?
   1. Black                                          1. Grade School (Grades 1-8)
   2. Oriental                                       2. Some High School (Grades 9-11)
   3. American Indian                                3. Graduated High School or GED
   4. Hispanic                                       4. Some College or Technical Training
   5. None of the Above                              5. Graduated from College

7. Are you a ... (please circle all that apply)
   1. URW or other bargaining unit member
   2. First Line Supervisor
   3. Union Steward
   4. Union Officer
   5. Middle Management
   6. Senior Management

8. Have you ever been a member of an employee involvement program such as quality circles, problem solving teams, or self-managed work group.
   1. I have never been a member
   2. I once was a member
   3. I am currently a member
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SECTION B ATTITUDES
How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Please circle your response number.

1. All in all, I'm satisfied with my job.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

2. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort to help this company be successful.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

3. I feel I can trust the people in this company.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

4. I talk up this company to my friends as a great company to work for.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

5. In general, I do not like my job.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

6. People here feel you can't trust this company.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

7. I find that my values and the company values are very similar.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree

8. I know how the work I do fits with the work of other people.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
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9. In general I like working here.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

10. This company will take advantage of you if you give it a chance.
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
    | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

11. When management says something you can really believe its true.
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
    | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

12. This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
    | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

SECTION C

VIEW OF EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Please circle your response number.

1. I like the idea of Employee Involvement.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

2. Most employees do not want the added responsibility of Employee Involvement.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

3. Employee Involvement is a way to eliminate first level managers.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

4. Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers jobs.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |

5. Employee Involvement increases our job security by making us more effective in a competitive marketplace.
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   | strongly disagree | disagree | slightly disagree | neither | slightly disagree | strongly agree | strongly agree |
6. Employee involvement will not be successful here because employees aren’t ready for it.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree
   disagree disagree agree agree

7. Employee Involvement pits worker against worker.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
   disagree disagree agree agree

8. Without employees who are both mature and very skilled Employee Involvement will fail.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
   disagree disagree agree agree

9. If Employee Involvement were adopted throughout the company many employees would lose their jobs.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
   disagree disagree agree agree

10. All in all I prefer working in a plant that has Employee Involvement.
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
    disagree disagree agree agree

11. Employee Involvement is a way to get workers to do managers jobs.
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
    disagree disagree agree agree

12. I believe Employee Involvement will continue even if our plant manager changes.
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    strongly disagree slightly neither slightly agree strongly agree
    disagree disagree agree agree

SECTION D SUPPORT FOR EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT
At present how supportive of Employee Involvement do you think each of the following individuals and groups tend to be:
Please circle your response number.

1. You personally
   1  2  3  4  5
   strongly negative slightly on the positive strongly
   negative disagree disagree agree agree
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Others you work closely with</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-salaried employees in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union stewards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First line supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top plant management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top company management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>strongly positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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