GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF CONTINUING STUDIES
BACHELOR OF ARTS IN LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM
ELECTRONIC THESIS RELEASE FORM

Student name: Edward J. McCarthy
Thesis title: Ethics in management and labor relations: A domestic values perspective

I hereby grant to Georgetown University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive and make accessible my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis, including the right to use it in whole or in part in future works. I authorize Georgetown University to archive my electronic thesis and to release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

Author signature: [Signature]
Date: 3-29-11
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL FOR SUMMER AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM

The thesis of Edward J. McCarthy entitled
Ethics in Management and Labor Relations:
A Domestic Values Perspective

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies in the School
for Summer and Continuing Education of Georgetown University
has been read and approved.

[Signature]
Mentor(s)

[Signature]
Director, Liberal Studies Program

April 18, 1994
Date
"Ethics in Management and Labor Relations: A Domestic Values Perspective"

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies

By

Edward J. McCarthy

School for Summer and Continuing Education
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.
April 19, 1994
ABSTRACT

The history of Management and Labor Relations in the United States is one which has been filled with animosity, distrust and a desire to win at all costs; the ultimate zero-sum-game scenario. I intend to show how these attitudes came into being, how they ultimately hurt both sides in the process of enacting those policies, and how a more ethical approach, employed by both sides of the bargaining issues, can ultimately give each side the best win-win situation to which they should both aspire.

In order to describe what I consider the best win-win situation, I have reviewed the histories of collective and concession bargaining. I have then placed the workplace environment in a hypothesis which envisioned the use of organizational conflict management and organizational commitment as ethical tools in an effort to have most adversarial situations resolved by the individual parties in a forum outside of collective bargaining procedures. This paradigm shift would task the parties involved to think of themselves as a "team," rather than the typical "us vs. them" mentality.

Strength and commitment are the keys to success. Strong unions with solid membership bases and collective bargaining clout have nothing to fear from cooperating with management. Indeed, at times, they have even
used the support for joint programs as leverage in dealing with management.

Recognition of each organization's needs is very important. Cooperation must be a two-way street. The union leadership must recognize the company's need to grow and survive by remaining profitable. The company must also recognize the union's need to grow and survive by organizing new members. Business leaders can not expect cooperation from unions when they seek a union-free environment or support the use of permanent replacement workers for strikers.

Collective bargaining and cooperative relationships are separate processes. At the bargaining table, however, retaining somewhat of an adversarial relationship during negotiations of new contracts appears prudent. All parties, however, must be willing to set aside animosities and participate in cooperative programs once an agreement is reached.

To reiterate my opening premise, "... a more ethical approach, employed by both sides of the bargaining issues, can ultimately give each side the best win-win situation to which they should both aspire." Given the current state of our economy, and the issues of global economic, social and environmental importance which dominate both the corporate and individual consciousness, surely the future of management and labor
relations in the United States is ready for such a change.
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .................................................. 1

Chapter

I. A Background on Labor and Management Relations ............ 3
   Collective Bargaining ........................................... 3
   Rise of Concession Bargaining .............................. 5
   Issues in Negotiation ......................................... 8
   New Approaches to Labor and Management Relations ........ 11

II. Ethical Approaches to Effective Employee-Management Relations 17
   Examination of Organizational Conflict and Conflict Management 17
   Management of Organizational Conflict Through
   the Development of Organizational Commitment ............. 19

III. Future Issues Confronting Labor and Unions .................... 40
    Issues Confronting Labor ..................................... 41
    Issues Confronting Unions .................................... 43

IV. A Paradigm Shift for Labor and Management Relations .......... 50
    The Culture Factor ............................................ 50
    The Saturn Experience ........................................ 51
    The Shift for Labor and Management Relations ............... 55

CONCLUSION ...................................................... 56

ENDNOTES ......................................................... vi

iv
BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................ xii
INTRODUCTION

The history of Management and Labor Relations in the United States is one which has been filled with animosity, distrust and a desire to win at all costs; the ultimate zero-sum-game scenario. I intend to show how these attitudes came into being, how they ultimately hurt both sides in the process of enacting those policies, and how a more ethical approach, employed by both sides of the bargaining issues, can ultimately give each side the best win-win situation to which they should both aspire.

The key phrase in this premise, and the basis of my work herein, is ethics. It is a word defined as 1) "the study of standards of right and wrong; that part of philosophy dealing with moral conduct, duty and judgement; and 2) "formal or professional rules of right and wrong; system of conduct or behavior." It is clear that there are two sides to every issue, a premise that is exacerbated when the discussion involves issues related to management and labor in the workplace. There is, however, much common ground to be explored by both management and labor, and the two sides are not as clearly defined today as they have been in the past.

I submit that, by looking at the many issues which confront both the managers and the workers of industry, there are common ethical grounds by
which both sides can, should, and, in the future, must explore and accept as
givens in the attempt to compete in today's international economy.
PART ONE, CHAPTER I

A BACKGROUND ON LABOR AND MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Collective Bargaining

Collective Bargaining in its best, most positive form, is the systematic process by which union and management prepare, negotiate, and administer written agreements relating to the terms and conditions of employment. The primary concern of collective bargaining is the rules of the workplace.¹ ²

Unions first appeared in America in the period between 1790 and 1820. These early organizations represented loose, local groupings of skilled craftsmen. Factory workers were not represented by unions during this period. At that time, union workers demanded higher wages and shorter working hours. Similarly, when demands were not met by management, these workers resorted to strikes. Clearly a zero-sum-game.

Employers of the era formed collective bargaining associations to take legal action against the unions. Out of this action arose what became known as the conspiracy doctrine. This doctrine was based upon the concept that an organized group of persons had more power to inflict harm than an individual could, on his/her own behalf. As such, an action, when
undertaken by an individual, may be legal; however, when undertaken as a collective group, it may be illegal. By the late 1880’s, most courts had moved away from use of this doctrine, and the injunction became the preferred manner of court control over the unions.

With the signing into law of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (1890), trusts and conspiracies, which constrained interstate trade or commerce, became illegal. This legislation was generally perceived as a protection for the public from the abuses of corporate monopolies. By 1908, the applicability of the law for unions became clear. The Norris-LaGuardia Act (1932) gave more impact to the unions over the control of workers in an organization. This law made yellow dog contracts unenforceable and restricted the use of injunctions. Both of these had been utilized as management control systems to offset union actions. Now workers had the right to organize and bargain with employers regarding the terms and conditions of employment. It did not, however, require management to bargain with the associated union.

Increased government intervention in labor-management relations came about as a result of the National Labor Relations Act (1935). The Act went further than previous laws in that it required employers to bargain in good faith and recognize those unions chosen by the employees. The National
Labor Relations Board (NLRB) was established to administer this legislation.⁶

Government arbitration of labor-management disputes was established with the Taft-Hartley Act (1947). Unfair labor practices on the part of unions were defined. Further, management had the right to express its opinion about unions to its employees, provided that management's opinions carry no threat of reprisal or force.⁷ The subsequent Landrum-Griffith Act (1959) regulated internal union affairs and protected the rights of individual union members.⁸

Following World War II, unions grew in prominence along with the growth and dominance of the United States as a major manufacturer of goods for the rest of the world. This dominance in manufacturing allowed business to succumb to increasingly excessive union demands which resulted in generous contract settlements.

PART TWO, CHAPTER I

The Rise of Concession Bargaining

In recent years, collective bargaining has given way to concession
bargaining, although this is occurring mostly in the steel, auto,
transportation, meat packing, electrical, textiles, and aerospace industries.
The principles of concession bargaining are based on both labor and
management trying to best figure out how to survive in changing national
and global economies.

The settlement between the United Auto Workers (UAW) and Chrysler
Corporation in 1979 is widely regarded as the beginning of the concession
bargaining phase in American labor relations history. During that same time
period, the UAW negotiated new three-year agreements with General Motors
and Ford which continued the traditional wage increase approach and
additionally gained improvement in pensions and paid days off.\textsuperscript{9}

The situation at Chrysler in 1979 presented very different challenges
for both management and labor. At Chrysler, management was demanding a
two-year freeze on wages in its attempt to prevent bankruptcy. In 1979, one
in every three Chrysler workers represented by the UAW was on lay-off
status. In an effort to keep Chrysler in operation and get union members
back to work, the UAW agreed to eliminate or defer most of the annual
improvement and COLA increases usually demanded in the traditional wage
approach. Chrysler also agreed to significantly lower pension increases
compared to those obtained from Ford and GM, and to eliminate certain paid days off. By 1982, these concessions were responsible for creating a gap of about $2.50 per hour between Chrysler and GM/Ford workers.

In return, Chrysler agreed to a variety of unprecedented management concessions. Chrysler installed the UAW's president as a member of the Chrysler Corporation Board of Directors, initiated profit sharing and employee stock ownership plans, invested part of the company's pension fund in socially desirable projects for the community, and agreed that non-union employees would not be granted any changes in wages and benefits more favorable than those granted to UAW members. Chrysler's subsequent economic recovery demonstrated that this kind of cooperative effort between labor and management to achieve the desired goals of both sides can work.

In 1982, with the economy entrenched in recession and foreign competition becoming increasingly more acute, the UAW agreed to new contracts with GM and Ford. These contained concessions similar to those at Chrysler. Bargaining in other industries soon followed similar patterns and concession bargaining became widespread.
PART THREE, CHAPTER I

Issues in Negotiation

The dimensions of trends in bargaining can, in part, be quantified in the areas of wages and strikes. Although the typical union contract in the United States has been extended to cover a large number of non-wage issues, the wage bargain remains central in importance to most negotiations. In addition, there is greater interest in the two-tier wage system. Under this approach, unions agree to management’s demand for wage relief by allowing new workers to be hired at lower rates.11

Strike activity has been on the decline in terms of frequency in recent years but, once initiated, appears to last longer. This phenomenon has been attributed to union’s reluctance to use strikes only when all other attempts at resolving differences have failed.14

A review of contract provisions of negotiated agreements at some of the larger companies in the private sector has shown a growing interest in issues related to union security, anti-discrimination provisions, and contract duration. The proportion of major contracts requiring all employees to join the union or pay dues remained at approximately 75 percent from 1958 to

8
1980. By 1980, 85 percent of the contracts studied provided some form of automatic deduction of union dues from member wages. The share of major contracts providing only the minimum legal institutional security for unions stood at 17 percent in 1980.

Anti-discriminatory provisions have spread rapidly since the early 1960’s. The share of major contracts forbidding the employer to discriminate on the basis of age rose from 2 percent in 1961 to 64 percent in 1980; on the basis of sex, from 10 to 83 percent; and on the basis of race, from 32 to 86 percent.13

Contract duration increased significantly in earlier years but decreased in the 1980’s. In 1956, 22 percent of major contracts ran for three or more years. The proportion had increased to 72 percent by 1972 and remained at that level in 1980. In 1982, the proportion of long term contracts had dropped back to 43 percent, although it had increased to 50 percent by 1983. This pattern is seen as a logical reaction of many negotiators to the economic uncertainty of the early 1980’s, when being locked into long-term agreements prevented the adjustments to changing market conditions needed to maintain economic viability.14

Many of the concession bargains of the 1980’s have attempted to
maximize the ability of the worker to cope with economic adversity. This is evidenced by requirements in many major contracts for re-training, severance pay, early retirement bonuses, work-sharing, interplant transfers, supplementary unemployment benefits, attrition clauses, and a guaranteed annual wage.\textsuperscript{15}

Deadline bargaining has long been the dominant method of negotiating labor contracts in the United States. There is evidence, however, of modification of this approach, as is witnessed by the occurrence of unscheduled negotiations to help hard-pressed industries or companies recover from economic adversity. Once the economy improves, the need for unscheduled negotiations dwindles, and the practice reverts back to the deadline approach.\textsuperscript{15}

A growing trend is appearing among negotiators to not follow the pattern of competitors within the same industry, as well as a greater willingness on the part of management to operate the plant during a strike by employing non-striking workers or using strike replacements.\textsuperscript{17} This is a clear departure from the usual practices seen in the 1960's and 70's.

Nearly all analyses of recent bargaining trends in the United States agree that the primary cause for this cooperation in the early 1980's has
been the poor performance of the economy. The improvement of the economy in the latter part of the 1980's saw a return to less cooperation. As is the way of economies and business cycles, however, the domestic economy is weak, and cooperation, once again, has to be the norm if companies are going to survive and compete successfully in the international market and if the trend for job losses is to be reversed.

Government deregulation of certain key industries has helped to reduce the power of the unions over management. Needless to say, when the economy again regains its health, collective bargaining will most likely return to its former aggressive and adversarial positions.18

PART FOUR, CHAPTER I

New Approaches to Labor and Management Relations

New approaches by management and labor are becoming evident in the business arena. These new approaches include gain sharing, employee participation in productivity, employment security, union and employee identification with productivity and profits for the company, and cooperative acceptance of unionism.
Global competition has itself had an impact on not only the process of collective bargaining, but on union membership as well. Throughout the United States and in France, Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and Japan, there has been a decline in union membership.

Labor relations in Europe, particularly in Sweden and West Germany, are of particular interest because of the relatively small amount of time lost due to labor disputes. The U.S. and Canada are among the poorest performers in this regard. West Germany significantly leads other major industrial countries both in terms of continued labor harmony and in overall labor productivity.¹⁹

U.S. manufacturers have become painfully aware that they are in a global rather than a national economy. The continued ability to compete in this new marketplace requires the total cost of U.S. domestic production to be equal or less than that in other countries. This can be achieved only by reducing labor wages to foreign levels or by increasing the productivity of American workers such that the labor costs associated with the product is decreased.

Employers and unions have both made concessions from gains achieved in earlier contracts to help maintain the competitiveness of U.S.
workers with their foreign counterparts. These concessions have centered on wage rates, cost of living allowances, work assignments, and job security.20

Today, the creation of new jobs is mostly occurring in small businesses, which have historically not been particularly cost-effective targets for union recruitment drives. The composition of today’s work force includes more women, more youthful workers, independent contractors, and part-time workers, and, as a result, is not very susceptible to the traditional appeal of membership in unions. Similarly, this new work force is not at all amenable to some of the heavy-handed approaches used by unions to force acceptance of union doctrine. Unions typically contend their losses in membership are due to employer opposition and to the inadequate enforcement of labor laws. While this position certainly can not be ignored, one must be realistic and recognize that in the United States, the decline in union membership has happened during bullish economic times as well as during the years of strongly pro-union presidential administrations.

Today, labor and management are clearly at the crossroads of the collective bargaining process. They may choose to maintain their traditional adversarial relationships, or they can work together in a more solution-oriented, accountable environment which will be influenced to a great extent
by both global and local issues.

The individual entering the work force in the future will be younger and be a product of an educational system that may be less classroom-oriented than that which has been previously experienced. Work is becoming less repetitive. Flex-time and self-pacing are replacing the old need for mass synchronization of behavior. Workers are forced to contend with more frequent changes in their tasks as well as more frequent transfers, product changes and reorganization.\textsuperscript{21} Added to this are the effects of rapid technological change.

Significantly, workers have begun to require the workplace to provide personal as well as financial reward. Evidence of this trend is seen by some companies offering employees a wide ranging choice of fringe benefits options to choose from as opposed to a fixed set of pre-established benefits. More and more, workers are demonstrating an unwillingness to salute the organization and blindly march off to some new corner of the country to advance corporate business goals. They desire instead a better lifestyle and greater emphasis on family needs and desires.\textsuperscript{22}

Today, in the United States, most workers covered by a pension plan are covered by defined benefits plans. By the year 2025, one-fifth of all
Americans will be over age 60. Our present Social Security system is based upon the premise that each generation will be larger and more affluent than the one preceding and will keep the social security and other retirement systems’ coffers filled. The reality is that fewer women are having children today. This will result in a reduction in the pool of available young wage earners that will have to support what will, by then, be an elderly-dominated population.

By current standards, it appears that an organization has an implicit contract with its workers that it will pay them a real pension upon retirement from the firm. As such, workers begin to make sizable deposits to their pension plan early in the tenure cycle. Pensions create a strong worker to organization bonding since, typically, a premature departure from the firm imposes large capital losses upon workers. Unfortunately, test results indicate that pension plans are significantly under-funded. Employers can get away with this under-funding for now, because they essentially established an unsecured bond relationship with the employee. The employees, thus, monitor/police their own collective performance for they truly chart the long term destiny of the company and, as such, their own collective pension plan.
It is predicted that future management and labor negotiation issues will continue to include wage bargaining, union security, anti-discrimination, and contract duration. Non-wage issues will probably increase in relative importance due to the continued shift in the social climate to improved quality of life, family focus, and the advancing median age of the population. The latter parameter will be seen to give continued impetus to the establishment or properly funded retirement and pension plans.
PART ONE, CHAPTER II

ETHICAL APPROACHES TO EFFECTIVE
EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

An Examination of Organizational Conflict and Conflict Management

In the mid 1980’s, the American economy was both in transition and in trouble. It was in transition from an industrial to a post-industrial state. It was in trouble, because its constituent firms were becoming progressively less competitive in comparison to foreign producers.

The combination of the transition from industrial to post-industrial state and pressures to improve productivity created significant and often debilitating pressures within organizational structures. These pressures, in turn, led to the development of organizational conflict. The presence within an organization of unresolved or ill-managed conflict further reduced its capacity to compete effectively. The effective management of organizational conflict is essential, if American producers are to be able to regain competitive positions, and contribute to the post-industrial transformation of the American economy.

Current literature indicates that a variety of factors may be implicated
in the development of conflict within organizations. The quality and style of organizational leadership may be a major cause of organizational conflict. Leadership is often implicated in the development of organizational conflict when the leader's style is either highly authoritarian or indifferent.

Motivation is also often implicated in the development of organizational conflict. While motivation is the product of a complex structure of interrelationships within an organization, leadership behaviors and human resources management policies are of particular significance.

Both leadership behaviors and motivations within organizations exert significant impacts on the quality of superior-subordinate relationships within an organization. Superior-subordinate relationships within an organization are often defined by communications. Poor interpersonal communications may lead to the development of organizational conflict.

There are a number of effective practices which may be employed in the management of organizational conflict. Of all of these practices, the key factor is likely to be development of commitment to the organization on the part of its employees. The development of commitment, however, is often a delicate task.
Hypothetically, the successful management of conflict within an organization requires the coordinated application of effective leadership styles, human resources management policies, and improved organizational communications techniques in an organizational program designed to develop high levels of commitment to the organization on the part of its employees.

PART TWO, CHAPTER II

The Management of Organizational Conflict through the Development of Organizational Commitment

The hypothesis stated in the preceding section is supported in this section through a historical examination of the relevant factors involved. The factors examined in this section are leadership in organizations, motivation in organizations, superior-subordinate relationships in organizations, and the development of organizational commitment.

Since the mid-1960’s, scores of books and hundreds of articles have been written on leadership styles, style of management, motivation, and related topics. The general thrust of most of this work has been that some
form of participative management or non-authoritarian leadership style, as opposed to an authoritarian style of management, will result in improved organizational performance and higher levels of organizational commitment. Many American business organizations, however, continue to rely on authoritarian leadership practices. After two decades or more of intensive theorizing as to the desirability of some form of participation or relational management and leadership, there still appears to be no incontrovertible proof that such styles of leadership or management will result in improved organizational performance or commitment.

There does appear to be a general agreement, however, that several factors involved in leadership can affect significantly both organizational performance and organizational commitment. These factors are the quality and style of leadership, the processes of implementing organizational change, the methods employed in resolving organizational conflicts, the level and quality of organizational communications, and the ability of individuals to participate in the organizational decision-making process. The disagreements are related to how these factors work together and which manifestations of each are most appropriate for different organizational environments.
Agreement on the definition of leadership has been elusive. As might be expected of a concept which has appeared to defy definition, there exist fairly widespread disagreement among the experts. Peter Drucker states that leadership "is of the utmost importance... There is no substitute... But leadership cannot be created or... It cannot be taught or learned." Thus, Drucker contends that leadership is an art, not a science, and that a science can be learned but an art cannot.

Bradford Boyd asserts that leadership is, simply, "getting people to work to achieve the goals of the enterprise... [and] giving people something to work for." Contrary to Drucker's beliefs, Boyd contends that leadership is a science, and is something that can be taught and learned. Sven Lundstedt expanded on Boyd's definition. He said that leadership "is the ability to influence the behavior of others in a group or organization, set up goals for a group, formulate paths to the goals, and create some social norms in the group." This definition includes some aspects which are arguably learnable; however, the "ability to influence" and the creation of "social norms" could, arguably, fall in the realm of art, as opposed to science. James MacGregor Burns defines leadership as

... inducing followers to act for... goals that represent the values,
motivation, wants, needs, aspirations, and expectations of both leaders and followers. Leadership, unlike naked power-wielding, is inseparable from followers’ needs and goals.\textsuperscript{32}

While Burns’ definition may be better than others, it still does not fully address the question of whether leadership can be learned.

Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, Jr. offer a definition of leadership, which they attribute to Henry Kissinger. They state that leadership

... is many things. It is patient, boring coalition building, the purposeful seeding of cabals that will result in the appropriate ferment in the bowels of the organization, meticulously shifting the institution through the mundane language of management systems, altering agendas so that new priorities get attention... being visible when things are going awry, and invisible when they are working well... building a loyal team at the top that speaks with one voice, listening carefully, speaking with encouragement, and reinforcing words with... being tough when necessary ... the occasional naked use of power, or the ’subtle accumulation of nuances, a hundred things done a little better.'\textsuperscript{33}
Regardless of the authorship of this definition of leadership, there is one point upon which there can be no argument: this definition thoroughly strips the concept of leadership of any semblance of art.

In actuality, leadership is likely a bit of each of the definitions examined in the preceding discussion. Leadership is, probably, part art, a bit of science, and a little drudgery, frustration, and boredom. It is also, at times, satisfying.

The style of leadership practiced by an individual is the managerial behavior of that individual, and the style of leadership can have profound impacts on the organization. Conversely, the organization, particularly its structure, may affect the leadership styles adopted by its managers.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the authoritarian, task-oriented manager or administrator was the prototype leader. Subordinates were told what to do and how to do it. Little thought was given to telling a subordinate why a task was to be performed or why a particular method was preferable. Certainly, no thought was given to either consulting with or informing subordinates ahead of time concerning a decision or a proposed change which would affect them in their organizational lives.  

The concept of participative management appeared for the first time at
the General Motors Corporation prior to the Second World War, when that firm was under the leadership of Alfred Sloan. The participative management style did not receive wide attention, however, until the 1950's, when Peter Drucker introduced the term management-by-objectives (MBO). One characteristic of all forms of participative management is that organizational superiors consult with their subordinates concerning the development of performance objectives which are compatible with organizational goals. Thus, participative management, by its very nature, requires very different leadership styles from those associated with the authoritarian style. Developments in participative management techniques have led to a greater emphasis on a relationships orientation for managers, as opposed to the more task orientation. The most successful organizational leaders, however, are those who are able to combine task orientation and relationships orientation characteristics in an optimal manner, consistent with the characteristics and goals of their organizations.35

The key elements in leadership style are communications and decision-making. As a cause of organizational conflict, ineffective communications stands out. Effective communications, however, can result in the acceptance by subordinates of otherwise distasteful activities.36
The implementation of change in organizations, if the optimal effectiveness of the change is to be insured, must be accompanied by a complete explanation of both the nature and the purpose of the proposed change. This explanation must be provided to organizational subordinates by organizational leaders, if maximum effectiveness is to result. Where leaders provide such information in a consultative environment, in which discussion is permitted and even encouraged, subordinates will likely feel more free than they would in other types of settings to present immediately any reservations or objections to the planned change. When such reservations or objections are presented immediately and in a somewhat casual atmosphere, they are much easier for the leader to effectively address to either resolve the basis for the objection or to reassure the uncertain and encourage the supportive employees.

Decision-making in organizations has been described by Fred Luthans as a process of behavior with the economic model (i.e. total rationality) at one extreme and with the social model (i.e. complete irrationality) at the other extreme. This description implies that only irrational decision-making accords human values precedence over economic values.

In the organizational environments of the 1990's, the leaders must find
some middle ground between these extremes, for it is evident that neither set of values can be ignored. Leadership styles still vary between the extremes of task and relationship orientations, between authoritarian leadership and participative management, and between directive leadership and MBO. The leader who is completely task oriented will likely make decisions which are geared to "getting the job done," regardless of the socio-psychological impact such decisions may have on the individual members of an organization. Conversely, the leader who is completely relationships oriented will likely make decisions that, while they avoid organizational conflict development, will often immobilize the organization from an economic perspective. The most successful leaders must give consideration to both economic and social factors in decision-making. The balance between these two sets of values will vary between organizations and will vary within organizations over time. This balance depends upon the prevailing situation at any particular time.

The need to motivate members of an organization to perform in a productive manner is a well-accepted premise. The means by which such motivation is accomplished within organizational structure, however, are subject to disagreement, experiment, and dynamic change. Since the mid-
1950's, two theories of motivation, which have received wide attention and considerable acceptance, are those of Maslow and Herzberg. While neither of these theories has proven valid in all situations, each has made major contributions to the development of a wide variety of effective techniques for the motivation of individuals within organizational environments.

Maslow's motivation theory was his hierarchy of needs. The hierarchy divides human needs into higher and lower orders. The lower order needs are primary, such as food, shelter, sex, and physical security, while the higher order needs involve love for others and self-actualization. When the lower order needs are absent in the life of an individual, the satisfaction of those needs become the center of the individual's life. In most modern societies, however, the primary needs are satisfied. Thus, real motivation, especially within organizational structures, results from individual desires to satisfy their higher order needs.

Herzberg's theory of motivation was his two-factor model, which divided the factors involved in an individual's organizational life into hygiene factors and motivation factors. Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's two-factor model, though similar, are not identical. Herzberg included such factors as compensation and working conditions in the
hygiene group. An unsatisfactory status of any of these hygiene factors could, therefore, result in a disincentive for the individual to perform productively. By contrast, however, a satisfactory status for the factors would not motivate the individual to exceptional levels of performance. Herzberg’s motivational factors included such concepts as opportunities to achieve and opportunities to gain responsibility as motivational factors in the organizational list of an individual, the absence of which would not result in any disincentive to perform. A satisfactory status for these factors would motivate an individual to seek exceptional levels of performance.

These two theories of motivation, although they are, essentially, drive theories, have provided the bases upon which most of the effective content and many of the process motivational techniques for application within organizational environments have been developed. But the concept of learning is an additional factor that must be considered.

Learning means the process by which an individual is able to change his or her behavior in some constructive manner. Three basic theories of learning are trial and error, conditioned response, and insight. With the trial and error approach, the individual learns by attempting different solutions to a problem until he or she discovers which one of the alternatives
work best. The role of the teacher in this approach is to give the person some direction by leading him or her towards certain techniques which may assist in problem solution. Utilizing this type of learning process, individuals must learn to employ the trial and error approach in on-the-job situations.

The theory underlying the conditioned response approach is that of learning through habit formation. Conditioned response learning is frequently used in sales training courses. It has fewer applications, however, in training programs designed for supervisory personnel. One major difficulty with the conditioned response approach is that it is virtually impossible to pre-create a condition and a response for all conceivable situations which may be encountered.

The insight approach, also known as the perceptual response approach, holds that all learning of whatever variety has as its basic characteristic a progressive differentiation from a more general perceptual field. This approach provides individuals with the abilities to solve problems through the use of perception and imagination, once the individuals have been given some concept of what the complete perceptual field of interest involves. Through the application of this approach, a teacher can present problems to
individuals, where the imagination of the individuals can be employed in the development of solutions and where the teacher can discuss decisions of the individuals being taught in order to provide guidance. This approach to learning has been described as "a period of observation leading to understanding. By observing the problem for a while and thinking about it, the subject is able to solve it."^{40}

One major problem area within organizations is the need for some individuals to exercise authority over others thereby creating superior-subordinate relationships. One means of avoiding conflict in superior-subordinate relations is an assessment of the needs and desires of organizational subordinates. In this way, the superior will be in a position to either fulfill subordinate expectations or to explain to subordinates ahead of time why such fulfillment will not occur. Such action on the part of organizational superiors is essential if dysfunctional organizational conflict is to be maintained at a minimum level.

As previously stated, a major contributing factor in the development of organizational conflict is that of ineffective communications between superiors and subordinates within the organization. A situation which occurs all too often in organizations is that a subordinate feels either that no one is
listening or that organizational supervisors are uninterested in what is being said by subordinates.

A related situation which is also frequently found in organizations is that subordinates feel that the organization has provided no one for them to speak to or to provide answers to their questions. In this same vein, supervisors can, and often do, assume that subordinates are not really listening to what they, the supervisors, say, without consciously realizing that an exchange of information is required in the organizational environment, as opposed to a one-sided imparting of information. Situations in which either a superior or a subordinate feels that the other is not really listening hold a high potential for development of organizational conflict. In such situations, messages are likely to be distorted. Distortion, in turn, will likely be translated into a misunderstanding which will be manifested as organizational conflict.

Another important aspect of superior-subordinate relations is the need for supervisors to make subordinates feel as if they are necessary members of the organization. In large organizations and in organizations which are highly bureaucratized, the individual in a subordinate position can easily feel no more self-importance within the organizational structure than that of a
small cog in a very large wheel. Such individuals often lose their sense of organizational purpose and commitment. Supervisors who are highly task oriented often overlook these psychological needs of their employees. Sensitivity on the part of the first-level supervisor to both the needs and the desires of subordinates is an essential element required to motivate subordinates and to make subordinates feel that tasks which they are called on to perform are valuable contributions to the accomplishment of organizational objectives. One way in which motivations and perceptions such as these can be fostered is by bringing subordinates into the organizational decision-making process. The extent to which subordinates can be brought into the decision-making process of an organization depends, in large part, on the system of management existing within the organization. Clearly, this would be a much easier process in an organization which embraces the concept of participative management than in an organization which adheres to the scientific management concept, or some other form of authoritarian management.

Power is another major source of organizational conflict. The opportunity to exercise power within an organization is a primary motivator for most managers. A heavy-handed exercise of power by superiors can,
however, induce a feeling of powerlessness in subordinates. Feelings of
powerlessness on the part of subordinates often lead to development of
organizational conflict. Within the framework of superior-subordinate
relations within an organization, it appears that some moderation in the use
of power and authority is desirable. An authoritative and dogmatic
supervisor can induce as high a level of resentment among subordinates, as
can the supervisor with low self-esteem who delegates all responsibility to
subordinates.

Within the historical context, superior-subordinate relationships have
undergone and continue to undergo significant change. Contemporary
perspectives on superior-subordinate relations do not reflect a unity of
outlook, and significant change in these perspectives can be anticipated in
the remaining years of the 1990's.41

The contemporary controversy surrounding the use of power and
authority by supervisors is a philosophical question as much as it is a
psychological question. It is relatively easy to perceive the psychological
implications involved in superior-subordinate relations involving the exercise
of power and authority. However, more deep-seated are the implications
related to the "rights" of employees within an organization, as opposed to
the "right" of the organization per se, as represented by management. Many contemporary theorists hold that employees do have a "right" to participate in decision-making and other organizational processes which may significantly affect their futures, while others hold firmly to the concept that all decisions are the prerogative of management. The issues are far from being settled one way or the other.

Theoretically, organizations and their members are seen in an exchange relationship. In such a relationship, each party makes demands on the other, for which each party provides something in return.42

Investigations of organizational commitment have attempted to establish linkages between organizational performance and organizational commitment. It is generally hypothesized that:

1. Strong commitment would be correlated with lower levels of absenteeism, tardiness, and voluntary turnover.

2. Strong commitment would be correlated with high levels of operating efficiency.

3. Strong commitment would be correlated with high levels of spontaneous, innovative behaviors on behalf of the organization.
4. Strong commitment would be correlated with high levels of ability for the organization to adapt to changing conditions.

Results have indicated that levels of organizational commitment are correlated at statistically significant levels with three demographic factors. Organizational commitment was found to be positively correlated with age, the older the individual, the higher the level of commitment. Organizational commitment was found to be negatively correlated with levels of formal education, the higher the level of formal education, the lower the level of commitment. Finally, females were found to have higher levels of organizational commitment than did males.

It has also been found that high levels of organizational commitment are correlated with a low turnover rate. Further, it has been found that high levels of organizational commitment are correlated with a low tardiness rate. Low absenteeism rates, however, have not been found to be correlated with high levels of organizational commitment.

One effective means of developing organizational commitment among an organization’s employees is the management of employees’ central life interests (CLI). CLI is defined as an expressed preference by an individual for a specific locale or situation in which activities will be conducted.
Several studies have found a positive relationship between high levels of organizational commitment and individual CLI’s centered in the work organization. Studies in organizational research conducted in the 1970’s emphasized the transfer to or retention in organizational environments of the CLI’s of individual organizational members as a means of enhancing the levels of organizational commitment. Some research performed in the 1980’s indicates, however, that efforts to cause the transfer to or retention in organizational environments of CLI’s of individual organizational members may not always be the most effective means of enhancing the levels of organizational commitment on the part of individuals.

The most effective strategies for the management of employee CLI’s for the benefit of the organization will likely be those which identify employee CLI’s, and provide organizational incentives which complement the existing CLI’s. In this way, dual CLI’s and dual commitments may be developed to the benefit of the organization. Strategies which attempt to cause a transfer of employee CLI’s from locations external to the organization to an organizational locus, conversely, will likely be both difficult to implement and likely to fail.

Paul Lawrence says that one of the most "baffling and recalcitrant of
the problems which . . . executives face is employees resistance to change." Such resistance is, of course, a form of organizational conflict. The underlying reason for resistance to change by individuals are insecurity, economics, and socio-psychological factors. Individuals develop a sense of well-being or security after adapting to an organizational pattern, and changes to the status quo are viewed as threats to this security.

The economic threat which is implicit in organizational changes is similar for individuals at differing hierarchial levels of the organization; however, the economic threat may be viewed in different terms at the differing hierarchial levels. The lower level employee may worry over the possibility of being replaced by a machine, while the manager or administrator may be worried over the potential for redundancy resulting from a consolidation of managerial or administrative functions.

Sociological and socio-psychological resistance to change is often the most difficult type of resistance to discern, as well as often being the most difficult to counter. Changes which are incorrectly perceived by individuals within an organizational environment are more likely to meet resistance than are those changes which are fully and completely explained by managers and administrators to the employees. Fear of impending change may cause an
individual to react emotionally through the display of prejudices and cultural values.

To successfully manage change within an organizational environment, the manager or administrator must be able to correctly discern the meanings of the actions by members of the organization, and must be able to understand the motives underlying such resistance to change. Each of the three underlying reasons for resistance to change, such as insecurity, economic, and socio-psychological factors, will likely be found in all resistance to change. The relative strengths of these three underlying reasons, however, will likely vary according to both the situation and the individuals involved.

Within organizations, much of the resistance to change is centered in groups, as opposed to individuals. Groups may be defined in several ways, but one useful definition for the purposes of this research separates groups into two categories: psyche-groups and socio-groups. A psyche-group is based upon an association for the purposes of providing for the private and personal satisfaction of the members of the group within an organizational environment, while the socio-group is based upon an association of individuals for purposes of work. In a socio-group, the reason for its
existence lies in the achievement of organizational objectives, as opposed to
the achievement of individual objectives.

Organizations are, of course, primarily concerned with socio-groups; however, societal changes in recent years have made it necessary for
managers and administrators within organizations to be both cognizant of
and to respect the objectives of psyche-groups. Of critical importance, then,
is the development of organizational commitment on the part of an
organization's employees. The development of organizational commitment
is the task of organizational leadership, but organizational leadership must
 identify the most effective means to develop this commitment within their
particular environment.
CHAPTER III

FUTURE ISSUES CONFRONTING LABOR AND UNIONS

This chapter examines the prospect for and conditions of labor-management negotiating strategies in the United States for the remainder of the 1990’s and beyond. Concepts of management rights, workers’ rights, workers’ control, and so forth, have characterized labor-management negotiating strategies in the United States through the 1980’s and, in some instances, continue to characterize such strategies. The contention in the early-1990’s is, however, that a new approach to labor-management negotiations is required for both labor and management negotiators. Management and labor must both deal with the issues of employee motivation, conflict resolution, and change management if both groups are to survive and prosper.
A differentiation may be made between the workers' control movement and the labor movement in the United States. The differentiation is important because of the attempts in the United States to control the content and process of work.\textsuperscript{49} In the conflict between management rights and union rights, the concept of workers' control is often completely ignored.\textsuperscript{50}

The value of the concept of workers' control lies in its ability to provide a working knowledge of what workers' control has meant in the United States in the past, which may be used as a basis for understanding what occurs in this area during the period of economic transition, and for the development of guidelines for use in the allocation of responsibilities for the implementation of change in the nature and process of work in the American economy. Workers' control, in effect, became moribund subsequent to the end of the Second World War. Prior to the economic depression of the 1930's, the concept of workers' control was continuously attacked by management. Workers managed, nevertheless, to exert significant levels of
control over work standards and processes in many areas of endeavor, in spite of managerial attempts to deny workers a voice.

By the end of the 1970's, workers' control and union power in the smokestack industries were all but dead.51 Workers' control in the developing high-tech industries, however, was gaining strength, although as more traditional managements replaced the creative entrepreneurial managements that first started these industries, the concept of workers' control came under increasing attack by management.

In the conduct of labor-management negotiations, the impact on wage levels is no longer the major objection of most managers to labor unions.52 The central objection in the contemporary economic environment is the rigidity of the union structure that often makes it difficult for firms to react in a timely manner to rapidly changing international economic conditions.53

Therefore, while the impact on the process of determining wage levels remains an important factor with respect to labor union activity, it may no longer be the central factor with respect to these organizations.54 Further, the ability of labor unions to affect the wage determination process will not be the only factor that ultimately determines whether or not organized labor
will continue to exert a formidable presence in the American economy.\textsuperscript{55}

PART TWO, CHAPTER III

Issues Confronting Unions

In general, labor unions are organizations of employees that are established to bargain collectively with employers over matters of wages, hours, and the conditions of employment.\textsuperscript{56} Unions are, in theory (and most often in practice), democratic institutions whose central purpose is the improvement of the economic conditions of their members, with a secondary purpose of improving societal conditions.\textsuperscript{57}

Labor unions gain improvement for their members in wages and working conditions through the process of bargaining collectively with the employers of their members.\textsuperscript{58} When the collective bargaining process does not result in a mutually agreed on contract, workers may (collectively) strike in order to enforce their demands.\textsuperscript{59}

Collective bargaining by labor unions is concerned with factors other than wages. It is also concerned with issues of union security and working conditions.\textsuperscript{60} Through the collective bargaining process, labor unions have
played major roles in the United States in the pursuit of economically related social goals, such as the elimination of racial discrimination in employment hiring, firing, and promotion and pay equity between the sexes and between ethnic and racial groups. To be sure, some unions have themselves been guilty, at times, of similar discriminatory practices. The organized labor movement as a whole, however, has actively promoted such social goals.

Supporters of labor unions claim that it is only through the actions of the labor unions that the workers of the country, union and non-union, are able to obtain their just share of the economic benefits of society. The labor unions claim that they alter the shares of national income between the workers (the owners of labor) and the companies (the owner of capital). The labor union argument is, quite simply, that they are able to obtain a greater share of total national income for labor at the expense of capital. In this argument, it is held that both union and non-union benefit from this change in the income distribution patterns. This claim by labor unions is a major motivation for union membership.

One of the proudest claims of labor unions is that they raise the real income levels of their members. Indeed, research has found that labor
unions could increase the real income levels of their members in the short term. This short-term increase occurs at the expense of the owners of capital. Whether labor union activity raises real income for union members over the long term is a contentious issue. Nevertheless, the fact that labor unions do raise the real income of their members over the short term is a strong motivation for labor union membership.

Employment discrimination provides another economic motivation for labor union membership. Social responsibility is imposed on business and industry in the interest area of employment discrimination in the contexts of hiring, promotion, retention, and comparison. The regulation of business and industry in these contexts is intended to eliminate overt discrimination on the basis of sex, racial or ethnic background, religious preference, or age. In many instances, such regulation is also intended to rectify the effects of past discriminations based on these same characteristics. In practice, the greatest emphasize is placed on discrimination which is based on either sex or on racial or ethnic background. Through the collective bargaining process, labor unions protected their members in these areas long before such goals were enacted into national law. Further, labor unions were instrumental in getting such protections enacted into law.
Income distribution provides yet another motivation for labor union membership. The social responsibility of business and industry in relation to income distribution is imposed by two different types of legislation, one of which is apparently related to the promotion of income distribution and one for which the relationship with the promotion of income distribution is at times less apparent. These two types of legislation are the minimum wage laws and the collective bargaining laws. Minimum wage laws are recognizable as a part of the income redistribution scheme. Collective bargaining laws may initially appear to be more related to class power struggles than to income distribution; however, they are, in fact, a primary means in industrial societies of pursuing income equity.64

Working hours also provide a motivation for labor union membership. In a historical context, the hours-of-work issue has been couched in terms of the total number of hours per pay day worked, the total number of hours per week worked, the total number of days per week worked, and the total number of days per year worked. What has not been at issue in the historical context is that work time, whatever its duration, should generally occur in blocks of contiguous hours. Beginning in the late 1970’s and continuing into the decade of the 1990’s, however, the concepts of the four-
day week and flextime are changing the character of this issue.\textsuperscript{55}

Furthermore, in most instances, business management has taken the lead in the development, gaining acceptance of, and introduction of such concepts. To be sure, the traditional framework of the issue, total hours worked remains viable. Labor unions fought hard for the forty-hour work week to protect labor from managerial exploitation.\textsuperscript{56}

Occupational safety and health concerns provide a motivation for labor union membership. Occupational safety and health has been a major issue in industrial economies, almost since their inception. Business management in industrial societies has, for the most part, traditionally resisted the introduction of improved safety and health conditions for employees, usually on the grounds that such introductions are not economically feasible. In the free-market American economy, most of the significant improvements in employee safety and health conditions have been legislated under pressure from labor unions.

Job security is an important motivation for labor union membership. Job security has always been a serious issue for workers in the American economy. In the United States, the social security system was implemented by the federal government as a means of providing some post-retirement age
security for covered workers, and unemployment insurance programs were implemented through the cooperative efforts of the federal and state governments and labor unions to provide some pre-retirement security, again, for covered workers. Labor unions obtained significant protection for their members in these areas through the collective bargaining process. Their efforts to enshrine such principles in national law benefited both their members and workers who are not members of labor unions.

A new organization, the Collective Bargaining Forum, has been established to provide guidance for future labor-management negotiations. The general guidelines the Forum has developed are as follows:

1. American labor and management must accept joint responsibility to improve American economic performance.

2. Unions can not commit to the aid of competitive economic performance unless management accepts the legitimate role of unions.

3. Employment security must be considered by management when reconciling tensions between competitiveness and human values.

4. Full employee participation is crucial to future American
economic performance.

5. Conflicting goals must be resolved without destroying or jeopardizing labor-management bonds.
PART ONE, CHAPTER IV

THE PARADIGM SHIFT FOR LABOR/MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The Culture Factor

It is imperative that American society, as a whole, view the performance of the workforce as a key to economic strength. First, it will be clear that a new labor relations culture has a chance if certain radical changes come to pass. Managers may turn to unions as potential sources of great strength and enterprises rather than as a critic and obstacle to achieving efficiency, quality, and cost competitiveness. The seemingly endless debate over whether unions are an asset or detriment to corporate success could then take on a far different cast.

How unions react to this change will be crucial. The great majority of labor unions have played a mostly reactive role. The labor relations culture has been built around the assumption that proactive roles are only for management. While unions have initiated policies that would benefit their members, only rarely have they found management interested in labor input that seemed to impinge on what is called the exclusive rights of management to manage.
Logically then, any effort to turn this pattern around requires that unions drastically adjust their role, their behavior and their membership expectations, and that management welcome this. A major challenge for the 90's and beyond is whether this can happen.

PART TWO, CHAPTER IV

The Saturn Experience

The Saturn (automobile) experience could provide a model, not in terms of its details or even its specific structure setup, but in terms of its basic approach. Here a union has had input from start to finish. It was thoroughly involved in a multitude of things which unions were almost always told were none of their business. The development of the Saturn manufacturing process is, in fact, a joint union and management effort.

If General Motors and the UAW can pursue a radical new path, and if the effort succeeds, this can be a signal that serves to influence many unrelated unions and industries. What is good for GM and the UAW would in fact be widely seen as something good for others, since, historically, both have greatly influenced the nation's labor-management culture.
The background against which labor relations were conducted during the post-1936 era no longer has much relevancy. Management can no longer provide the product, assure the market, and achieve financial success by using its traditional ways of organizing work. While many would even question the achievements of the past, nevertheless, the companies did prosper and the so-called working class did achieve middle-class status in a relatively brief time.

During this period, unions concentrated on maximizing the employee share of the pie and on how to allocate compensation between fixed wages, performance-related pay schemes, fringes, and the extensive benefit packages that developed over the three decades of 1950-80.

Assuring the necessary resources was management's concern. If the resources were not sufficient, then an assessment was levied against hapless consumers, who were generally unable to find alternatives, since the domestic market was so insulated against effective competition. But then came the 1980's and now the 1990's. The underlying issue for the managers, employees, and their unions is the ability to be successful, and, in fact, even survive in an increasingly complex and competitive marketplace. Specifically, can unions be a major force and play a positive role in
strategies for achieving business success?

Firms throughout the economy need to redesign and restructure the workforce and it's management. The Frederick Taylor vision of the efficient work system is the handiwork of a past era. No longer can it be assumed that effective performance depends upon order givers directing order obeyers. The illusion that managers know what is needed and that employees are human robots programmed for obedience will have to be stripped of a legitimacy that flows from generations of culture and assumption.

At long last, the society must acknowledge the potentials and the strengths of the ordinary mortals who are working men and women. To implement that, education must be upgraded and redefined as a major item on the agenda of every operation and work environment. The notion that first you go to school, then you work, and ultimately you retire no longer suits the demand of the economy and labor market realities. A new realization is emerging that sees education as a continuous learning process in which all the participants are both students and teachers. The enormous investment in the process at Saturn will prove worthwhile if only the resulting automobile proves itself.
The Saturn experience could be a gigantic boost for new ways to manage. While there are many new work systems in which there is virtually self-management by the employees, Saturn's production complexities and size puts these new concepts to a severe test. And the Saturn automobile is entering a market already overwhelmed by fierce competition from both domestic and overseas sources.
PART THREE, CHAPTER IV

The Shift for Labor and Management Relations

For managers, new roles do not come easily. Converting managers and supervisors into leaders and communicators rather than problem solvers and order givers is a monumental task, as virtually every top manager that works at this conversion process complains. The culture and traditions are deeply rooted.

Concurrently, absorption of a changed role for the worker is also not an easy adjustment. Employees are not necessarily eager to assume more authority, more independence, and more responsibility for performance excellence. It is not possible to tell employees for generations that they are to leave management and decision making to "us", the managers and supervisors, and then expect cheers when and if the message is reversed.

There is little doubt that employees whose jobs are in so called new work systems achieve a greater sense of gratification and self esteem as they enlarge their roles and achieve more authority over the work they do. But the process of making the switch is traumatic, not only for the individuals but for the unions and companies that must adjust their institutional behavior
patterns.

Unions must have a significant role in the participative processes. Workers feel safer when the union is an integral part of the process. The union balances the process. Without the union, management, particularly on the shop floor, is likely to view worker participation as just another tool to enforce their own positions and workers are likely to view these changes with suspicion.

There are very real reasons for caution here. It is recognized that some unions have reservations about joint programs with management, and for good reason. In too many instances, companies have taken advantage of union cooperation to improve productivity at a factory with no intention of sharing power or giving the workers a meaningful voice in their destiny.
CONCLUSION

Strength and mutual respect are the keys to success. Strong unions with solid membership bases and collective bargaining clout have nothing to fear from cooperating with management. Indeed, at times, they have even used the support for joint programs as leverage in dealing with management.

Recognition of each organization’s needs is very important, and cooperation must be a two-way street. The union leadership must recognize the company’s need to grow and survive by remaining profitable. The company must also recognize the union’s need to grow and survive by organizing new members. Business leaders cannot expect cooperation from unions when they seek a union-free environment or support the use of permanent replacement workers for strikers.

Collective bargaining and cooperative relationships are separate processes. At the bargaining table, retaining a somewhat adversarial relationship during negotiations of new contracts appears prudent and maintains a balance of power and influence. All parties, however, must be willing to set aside animosities and participate in cooperative programs once the ink is dry. Management must demonstrate its willingness to recognize
the institutional needs of unions. Unions must demonstrate a willingness to
recognize the economic needs of management. And both entities must
demonstrate their mutual recognition of the value of collaboration to meet
their individual and mutual goals.

To reiterate my opening premise, "... a more ethical approach,
employed by both sides of the bargaining issues, can ultimately give each
side the best win-win situation to which they should both aspire." Given the
current state of our economy, and the issues of global economic, social and
environmental importance which dominate both the corporate and individual
consciousness, surely the future of management and labor relations in the
United States is ready for such change.
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