

JOINT UNION-MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

MARVIN J. LEVINE

University of Maryland, College Park

ABSTRACT

In an effort to overcome the historically low priority place upon employee training efforts, many American firms and the unions they deal with have recently negotiated joint union-management training programs. These endeavors prove to be essential in the face of complex world competition, shifting markets, strategic alliances among corporations, changing demographics and rapidly changing technological developments. They enhance present skills training for employees and prepare them to take advantage of future employment opportunities when they arise. However, the numerous benefits of joint training are counterbalanced by a number of issues threatening the future of such undertakings and need to be jointly resolved by labor and management.

Historically, the training of American workers has been a low-priority activity. Companies have traditionally placed primary emphasis on training and development for their executives, managers, and professional and technical employees. Unions have concentrated their training efforts on worker training in the skilled trades, primarily through apprenticeship programs, but have not seen training as a central issue in bargaining. The government has generally supported training for the disadvantaged. The majority of American workers, however, have received no formal training; they have learned on the job.

THE NEED FOR TRAINING

The quality of the American workforce is crucial to economic success in the face of complex world competition, shifting markets, strategic alliances among

firms, changing demographics, and new technology. This is why employers, unions, the government, and workers themselves are emphasizing now more than ever the importance of training. The stakes are high. Many Americans are concerned that their living standards are eroding. However, if the United States can find ways to develop well-trained, motivated workers who can produce high-quality goods and services at low cost, industrial productivity and competitiveness will certainly be enhanced.

Training can play a vital role in preparing workers to handle change. Rapid technological advancement necessitates the acquisition of new skills. Workers today must be flexible—able to change the way they do their jobs—to capture the benefits from new technology. Less hierarchical organizational structures are evolving in response to the globalization of markets. Because such structures require workers to be competent to perform multiple functions, individuals can no longer assume that competence in one task will maintain their careers throughout a lifetime.

Even in manufacturing, jobs are changing drastically. Years ago, for example, one person was responsible for ordering parts, another person took the parts to the work station, another used them, another inspected the work, and yet another delivered the parts to another place in the plant. Today, it is all combined; one employee must be able to order parts, maintain inventory, do the work, and inspect the finished product. More is being expected of our workforce, and training is a key factor in the development of a productive, flexible, quality-oriented workforce. Training pays off—for individual workers, for companies, and for the nation overall [1].

Lamentably, American workers need more than training for flexibility and technological expertise. In the 1990s, about three fourths of all jobs require at least some postsecondary education—at a time when U.S. society is painfully aware that it includes large numbers of functionally illiterate workers (approximately 27 million) [2]. Firms today can expect that up to 20 percent of their employees will be deficient in basic skills (reading, writing, arithmetic, and communications). A 1986 survey of adults aged twenty-one to twenty-five found that 20 percent have not achieved eighth-grade reading levels, and 38 percent cannot read at the eleventh-grade level. Many job-related reading materials (e.g., manuals) require tenth- to twelve-grade reading skills. An unacceptably high number of young adults—half or more—are not adept at quantitative problem solving of any complexity. Even among young adults with two to four years of college, 39 percent are unable to figure the cost of a specified meal from the prices on a menu and determine the tip and correct change from a restaurant check [3].

In the past these workers may have been able to find jobs that did not require strong basic skills, teamwork skills, or higher-order capabilities such as problem solving, but in the near future most jobs will require these skills.

THE EMERGENCE OF JOINT EFFORTS

Realizing both the need and potential benefits, some employers and unions have in recent years joined forces to provide worker training. These joint training programs are but one of several forms of union-management cooperation. In many workplaces, a wide variety of joint committees have been formed with responsibility for, in addition to training, such topics as safety and health, employee assistance programs, health-care cost containment, absenteeism, product quality, employee involvement, and quality of worklife. Union-management training programs, however, are among the most comprehensive of all cooperative efforts in terms of scope, funding, staff, and facilities [4].

Though unions and employers had occasionally joined forces in the past to provide workers with special training for special circumstances, this kind of activity increased dramatically in the 1980s. Joint union-management efforts to provide training to U.S. workers, still in their early stages of development, range in content from specific, technical training to more general worker education and personal development. Casner-Lotto reported union involvement in training programs enhances work participation, improves the quality of training and learning, and paves the way for further cooperation between unions and management [5]. Most effective are partnerships in which union and management are equally responsible for the control, planning, design, development, and evaluation of training programs. This article focuses on large-scale programs where joint union-management decision making exists.

CHARACTERISTICS OF JOINT TRAINING PROGRAMS

There are many types of union-management training programs. The most highly publicized are the national and local joint programs in the automotive, communications, and steel industries. The cooperative training programs in larger firms usually originate at the collective bargaining table, where contracts establish the programs, specify governance and coverage, and provide some financial formula to cover the cost of program operations. Many of the joint programs were begun during the recession of the early 1980s in response to the dislocation of large numbers of workers. In time, however, the focus of joint training efforts broadened to include active workers as well.

It is particularly in the larger firms that joint training programs tend to go beyond skill development for specific jobs to encompass personal development skills and long-term career planning. Workers in such settings will generally be eligible for an entire package of services rather than for a single program. This broader focus reflects both the union's priorities, which are tied to the long-term needs and priorities of the members, and the practical concerns of managers

convinced of the necessity of a broad education base in the development of a flexible and adaptive workforce.

Top-level control for joint training activities usually lies with an employer's labor relations officials and a union's top officers and bargaining committee members. There may then be union appointees who work jointly with an employer's training and education staff and/or with organizational development staff. However, day-to-day control of joint training programs is primarily at the grass-roots level. Joint union-management committees at local plants determine worker needs, select and organize training resources, set training priorities, and develop contracts with community service vendors. In larger firms, national or regional centers may provide technical assistance, a coordinated computer database, model training materials, and other forms of support. Also, when workers are no longer subject to the jurisdiction of a local facility (i.e., in the case of a plant closing or a transfer), the regional or national center may take on certain direct training responsibilities.

Most agreements explicitly state that the joint training activities must not replace existing union training programs (e.g., apprenticeship training, labor education) or company training programs (e.g., technical training for the use of specific equipment). In practice, however, such distinctions are hard to maintain as training programs evolve. If the joint training staff exhibits skill in program administration, there is often incentive on both sides to include additional areas of training in the joint effort. For example, the previously separate health and safety activities of the UAW and GM have now been brought under the auspices of the UAW-GM National Joint Human Resources Center. Most programs rely heavily on local community service networks for counseling, assessment, and training. Both community colleges and secondary schools may contract with the union-management pairs to provide various training-related services.

Thus, joint training activities are characterized by shared decision making, high degrees of local control, mutual concern for the training of active and displaced workers, and the employment of internal worker-trainers and external training professionals. The joint programs are supported with internal funds and (sometimes) public dollars. This innovation stands as a highly advanced form of union-management cooperation and as a distinctive structure for providing training to workers [4].

Because joint training programs are, for the most part, a relatively recent phenomenon and because most data surrounding the programs are under the control of the parties themselves, there is very little systematic research on the frequency and range of such programs. One survey completed in 1988 does, however, document the joint training activities of 102 labor-management pairs [6]. The sample was drawn from lists compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor of union-management relationships that had some measure of cooperative activity. Forty percent of the sampled relationships featured joint training

programs covering nearly one million bargaining unit members. Most served both active and displaced workers.

Hoyman and Ferman found joint training programs often result in a change both in who is trained and the type of program defined as training. In employer-sponsored programs, there is often the requirement that the training be job-related. However, in most joint programs employees are free to select their own training topics. Training content ranges from basic skills training, to training to fulfill the future staffing needs of the company, to training for organizational or personal development. Topics include basic skills, computer literacy, career and educational counseling, financial management, and preretirement planning. In some cases, the joint programs provide broad training to develop teamwork or problem-solving skills at the same time they are upgrading basic skills. The orientation is less toward vocational training and more toward helping workers learn the personal and technical skills that will sustain their careers over a lifetime [6].

Most employer-sponsored programs require some merit-based criterion to be met before a worker can receive training (e.g., a supervisor's recommendation, a certain test score). However, most joint programs have an open-admissions policy for members of the bargaining unit. Therefore, joint union-management training programs have the potential to broaden worker's access to training. For example, due to continuing layoffs of less senior employees, many union members are now middle-aged or older. Although employer-sponsored training might bypass these workers, the joint programs use techniques such as peer counseling, context-basic skills courses, and onsite classes to encourage older workers' participation. The effect is that access to training (within the union membership) is more democratic. Some joint programs are even making some of their education benefits available to the spouses of union members [7].

UNION-MANAGEMENT TRAINING CORPORATIONS

Since 1982, contract negotiations in the auto and telecommunications industries have led to the establishment of five large, joint union-management training corporations. They are: 1) the United Auto Workers (UAW)-GM Human Resource Center, 2) the UAW-Ford National Educational Development and Training Center, 3) the Communications Workers of America (CWA)-U.S. WEST Communications Training Partnership, Inc., 4) the Alliance for Employee Growth and Development (a joint venture of AT&T, CWA, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers), and 5) the UAW-Chrysler National Training Center.

These five entities offer training to a total of 709,000 workers and have annual budgets totaling about \$324 million. On average, \$460 is available per worker per year. However, most workers do not take advantage of the training, and much more than the average is available in some of the companies. In 1989, the United

Steel Workers of America (USWA) ratified contracts with Bethlehem, Armco, Inland, and LTV Steel companies to create the USWA's Career Development Institute. The institute has an annual budget of \$10 million (\$200 per worker per year) to serve approximately 50,000 steelworkers.

Three of the joint training corporations (UAW-Ford, UAW-GM, and the alliance) were born in times of crisis in response to mass layoffs. Their initial focus on retraining laidoff workers led all of the joint training programs to emphasize broad, transferable skills and career counseling. Over the past few years, however, most of the five corporations have targeted the majority of their funds at upgrading the skills of employed workers. Nonetheless, the focus on transferable skills has not changed. The courses they provide are typically offered outside of regular working hours at the plant site.

THE UAW-GM HUMAN RESOURCE CENTER

General Motors and UAW have jointly invested \$1.5 billion in workplace education, training and retraining since 1984. The UAW/GM Human Resource Center is today in the process of establishing skills centers at the 150 plants and warehouses where 300,000 UAW members work. Says Howard Erickson, spokesman for the UAW/GM Human Resource Center, "GM mirrors every national trend. The skills centers are our answer" to the problem of functional illiteracy in the U.S. workforce. "We've become the educator of last resort" [1, p. 41].

Richard K. McMillan, executive codirector of the UAW/GM Human Resource Center, described the mission of the jointly run center—the largest privately funded education center in the world. He called the Human Resource Center "the most visible symbol" of the recognition that U.S. labor and management have no choice but to cooperate and suggested workers are now recognized as a valid resource; for that reason they must be given tools to develop their total intellect [2, p. 7]. The UAW-GM Human Resource Center offers workers basic literacy and related skills, job-related skills, "soft" courses in communication, delegation, and other skills needed for shop floor interactions, as well as personal enhancement. Career counseling and training are also offered to laid-off GM employees [1].

As an example of the value of upgrading skills, Erickson pointed to the transformation of one employee in an Anderson, Indiana, plant that manufactures magnets for automobile starters. Until a few years ago when he entered the joint training program, this worker could neither read nor write. As a result of the program, he learned to run a \$500-million machine and work with four computers. An additional benefit is that the gains this individual has made at work carried over into his personal life. Until he learned to read, he never left Anderson, even for vacations, because he was unable to read the signs [1].

A key effort in the UAW/GM program is the Paid Educational Leave (PEL) program, which provides local union leaders the opportunity to receive education in depth about the challenges facing the auto industry and the union [8].

The PEL program was first designed as a four-week training program in which top union leaders and selected managers were briefed by outside or internal experts on topics such as basic economic principles, changing world markets, emerging technologies, new patterns of industrial relations, the political and regulatory context, and strategic planning principles. These sessions, which take place in Ann Arbor, Detroit, Boston, and Washington (one week in each), have been well-received, particularly for the degree to which they provide the parties with a common language and information base upon which to discuss the specifics of strategic planning.

One unanticipated feature of the program evolved as local union leaders returned to their plants, only to encounter frustration as they tried to communicate all that they had learned to their colleagues in the union and in management. As a result, the Human Resource Center devised a local adaptation of the PEL program, which condensed the four-week program into a one-week overview. These local PEL sessions were delivered in UAW-GM worksites around the country to groups of approximately forty workers and supervisors, often with one or two such sessions being held every month in a given facility [2].

This program is open to virtually the whole workforce, subject to nomination through the UAW locals. Although PEL targets union leaders, classes of the local version include on average 25 percent managers. The idea of union leaders, union members, and managers being paid to learn together about economic principles, strategic planning, and other matters is certainly a different outcome from what one might expect from traditional union-management negotiations [4].

UAW-FORD NATIONAL EDUCATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND TRAINING CORPORATION

Like the UAW's cooperative training effort with GM, the UAW-Ford program was established in 1982. By 1989, the corporation had an annual budget of \$63 million (excluding local funds, which go directly to joint local committees), and its training opportunities covered 105,000 workers [3].

A particularly innovative feature of the UAW-Ford effort is its use of Life Education Advisors (LEAs) to guide workers in career planning [9]. Career planning has traditionally been the exclusive domain of managers and professional employees. Now, however, other workers are beginning to anticipate facing major shifts in the work they do as a result of factors such as new technology and changing markets. They have too often, though, lacked help in preparing for such shifts. To respond to such worker concerns, the Life Education Advisor program was established to serve the entire hourly workforce. Trained counselors, well-versed in the unique needs of auto workers, meet with

employees and assist them in the construction of their own life plans. In their assessment of the LEA program, Gordus, Kuo, and Yamakawa found worker participation in training activities increased significantly when LEAs were available [9].

THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA (CWA)- U.S. WEST COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING PARTNERSHIP, INC.

Another union-management cooperative training effort is the joint U.S. West Communication/CWA Pathways Program. William Frazee codirector of Training Partnership, Inc., which administers the program, said the Pathways Program is dedicated to retraining workers for "a new skill, a new occupation, a new career path" [1, p. 43]. Like the Alliance, the Pathways Program was created at the bargaining table. It benefits 40,000 union members in a fourteen-state region [1].

Pathways' stated purpose is to create a flexible and skilled workforce so that employees, the company, and the union is prepared to fully participate in a changing and diverse marketplace. The program benefits workers, because it helps them keep up in an industry (telecommunications) that is technical, complicated, and constantly changing. It benefits the company, because it develops highly skilled workers—something the company needs but cannot always find [1].

THE ALLIANCE FOR EMPLOYEE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1981, the CWA created the Committee on the Future to take a long-range look at the evolving needs of its members. The committee noted that "in the past, a worker might expect that one set of skills would guarantee a job for 10 years, 20 years, or even a lifetime. But the flood of technological advances now sweeping the telecommunications industry, and beginning to be felt in virtually every industry, means that workers are going to have to train and retrain all of their lives . . ." [1, p. 43].

These rapid changes in the communications industry led CWA to collaborate with AT&T and with another union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) to find ways to retrain employees when job demands exceed worker skills. This mutual concern led in 1986 to the creation at the bargaining table of the Alliance for Employee Growth and Development, Inc., a nonprofit, cooperative venture of AT&T, CWA, and IBEW. The alliance is dedicated "to the needs of dislocated workers, and we pledge to continue to set the pace for preparing the workforce of the future, one person at a time."

The organization is noteworthy for its cooperation in a fairly adversarial environment. Traditionally, according to alliance co-executive director Ken Ross, there is often animosity not only between companies and unions but also among

unions themselves. However, at alliance meetings, Ross said that participants "are so focused on getting the work done that you'd never be able to pick out their allegiance" [1, p. 43]. He believes this occurs because the program belongs to everyone. The company, the union, and the workers all benefit from its success. The alliance's goal is to work with 315 local committees around the country to retrain workers for the future [1].

UAW-Chrysler National Training Center

In 1985, during contract negotiations between Chrysler and the UAW, a joint venture was initiated. The union wanted to offer additional training programs to its membership, including programs that would improve job security and product quality, and to retrain displaced workers for new employment opportunities. Chrysler recognized that by investing in the programs the union was seeking, it would actually be investing in a skilled workforce that would ultimately improve the company's competitive edge. Therefore, Chrysler and the UAW established a Joint Activities Board to fund, implement, and administer such training. The board is composed of three union representatives and three management representatives, and the National Skills Development and Training Committee was established to carry out the functions of the board [10].

Training programs sponsored by the board include a tuition assistance program and a technical preparation program (which offers reinforcement training in preparation for more advanced and complex technological training), technical training, human relations training, team building, decision making, group organization, and hazard communication and safety training. The joint training program, implemented in 1986, is designed so each plant location develops programs geared to the needs of the employees at that specific plant. Local committees implement the goals of the board and determine what activities and training programs will take place in the plant. These committees also have the autonomy to distribute their local funds as they see fit. Educational training counselors are also an important part of each local program. These counselors are employed at each plant site to help workers develop individual training plans. This ensures that each employee gets the training needed for his/her job [10].

Funding for the joint training program comes from contributions from both UAW and Chrysler (usually equal to five cents per hour worked per employee). The contributions are placed in three funds: the National Fund, which is used for national programs; the Local Fund, which supports activities in each plant; and the Reservoir Fund, which is used for special projects and to supplement other funding sources [10].

Although the new joint union-management corporations have received the most attention, some unions and their employers have developed successful joint training efforts without creating separate training entities. Two examples are 1) the Communications Workers of America (CWA) and Pacific Northwest Bell,

which have enhanced both workers' employment security and company revenues, and 2) the joint "Career Ladders" program developed by Hospital Workers, Local 767, and the Service Employees International Union and Cape Cod Hospital. There are many other examples of local unions and employers throughout the United States developing a variety of training programs dealing with basic skills, health and safety, productivity, quality, and other common concerns [3].

As noted previously, most of the joint training corporations are designed to supplement, not replace, the parent corporation's regular, job-related training. Only at General Motors is the joint program viewed as a primary delivery mechanism for the training of hourly workers. Here workers have access to job-related, on-hours training as well as more generic courses after hours. Despite intentions to keep the training systems separate, all of the joint programs are developing links with the corporate training system. For example, at Ford's Van Dyke plant, fourteen UAW-represented workers sit on the sixteen-member technical training committee, which identifies on-hours training needs for the hourly workforce [11]. During 1987 and 1988, two divisions of AT&T (operator services and long-distance services) designated the alliance as the "official response for career development needs" [11, p. 2]. In other words, these divisions of the company will not develop a separate package of career counseling for employees but will rely on the alliance to provide these services. It appears, then, that the joint training programs are increasingly linked to the companies' strategic goals.

Previous in this article it was mentioned that joint union-management training programs are often quite decentralized. The system typically works in such a way that a corporate-level joint committee sets overall policies and funds development and delivery of some training courses, while more detailed funding and training decisions are made by joint training committees at the local level. In addition, many training decisions are made by the workers themselves as they avail themselves of employer-paid tuition assistance to take courses. A variety of public and private training consultants, as well as in-house trainers, are used within this decentralized structure.

One result of decentralization can be uneven quality in the training supported by joint union-management programs. To improve quality, the programs have taken steps to increase the expertise of local committees and to provide career and educational counseling to help workers in their selection of educational providers. For example, each local joint UAW-GM training committee is staffed by full-time local joint training coordinators—individuals who are trained by the Human Resource Center in the development, design, and evaluation of training. UAW-Ford and UAW-Chrysler have hired full-time career counselors to counsel individual workers and assist local joint committees in the design of training and in the selection of training providers. However, in the UAW programs, career and educational counseling is strictly voluntary, and workers may sign up for courses without prior counseling.

The two joint training corporations negotiated by the Communications Workers of America (CWA) require career counseling. Workers must meet with a counselor and develop a career plan to be eligible for prepaid tuition. Courses must be related to the career plan to be eligible for assistance. Other rules apply as well. For example, CWA-U.S. West Communications will not pay for flying lessons as a hobby, but will pay for ground school and instruction if it leads to a commercial pilot's license.

Most of the joint programs offer workers tuition assistance to take courses on their own time. Such courses may be job-related, for personal development, or to prepare for new careers. The use of tuition assistance has grown as the programs have paid tuition assistance directly to schools, removed penalties for noncompletion of courses, and provided career and educational counseling. A large number of eligible workers have benefited from tuition assistance. At UAW-Ford, 27 percent of the workforce has taken accredited courses at one time or another since the program was instituted in 1984. At UAW-Chrysler, 36 percent have participated. Pathways enrolled 30 percent of its workforce in its first three years of providing tuition assistance. These programs greatly benefit workers, because many enroll in courses leading to two- and four-year degrees, and such credentials hold promise for enhancing workers' careers and earnings. Although tuition assistance programs are expensive, they are much less costly than on-hours training, because the employer can avoid paying workers' salaries while they are in training.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

The future prospects for joint union-management training appear promising. Both unions and management continue to reaffirm their commitment to the joint corporations through new rounds of collective bargaining. Participation in voluntary training opportunities offered by the joint programs has dramatically increased since the early 1980s, to such an extent that the training corporations have had to add staff to accommodate the growing demand. Enrollments in all types of joint training programs range from 16 to over 50 percent of the eligible workforce.

ISSUES THAT THREATEN JOINT TRAINING

There are several factors that have the potential to threaten the future of joint union-management training. The first and most basic is the possibility for future decline in the unionization rate of U.S. workers. As union density decreases, possibilities for joint efforts are attenuated. Since 1960, the percentage of private sector workers covered by union contracts has dropped dramatically, while the percentage of government employees represented by labor unions has increased. In 1997, unions represented only 12.4 percent of the private-sector workforce,

37 percent of the public-sector workforce, and 14.1 percent of the entire workforce [12].

The second threat to joint union-management training is the possibility of eroding the cooperative spirit that may exist between the two sides. Several issues have the potential to undermine cooperation. If union leaders are perceived as being too close to management, or if managers are thought to be giving up control of their hierarchical responsibilities, cooperation is endangered. If the perception exists within either party that joint training is undermining its interests, the stability of the effort will be in jeopardy. In situations where hourly workers and salaried workers are trained in the same sessions, union members may resent the presence of "outsiders" and reject the process. If both union and management leaders find themselves on so many joint committees that it creates time pressures for them, they may hesitate to participate in future cooperative efforts. The threat of deteriorating cooperation is unlikely to affect joint training in the near future, however. In spite of complaints about the pitfalls of cooperation by a vocal minority within the UAW, top-level leadership remains firmly committed to cooperation when it is in both the unions' and management's interests. Training is seen as such an area. The CWA, for example, has strongly supported joint training even while reducing its commitment to joint "quality of worklife" programs aimed at other areas of labor-management cooperation.

The third threat to the future of joint union-management training is financial, because it is not always clear to all parties whose money is paying for the training. If the money allocated for joint training programs is a form of deferred wages, union members should have the greater say in how it is spent. On the other hand, if joint training funds are a special allocation over and above wages, management should have the stronger voice. Other financial and resource-related questions that threaten to divide parties include: To what extent do jointly funded activities replace prior unilateral efforts by the union or the management? Who should staff the programs—union members or training professionals? What facilities will be used for training—worksite or offsite? When worksite facilities are used, management may worry that the commitment of facilities will sacrifice productivity needs for training.

The fourth issue that threatens the future of joint union-management training is the fact that most programs fail to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the training provided. Evaluation is time-consuming and costly, and particularly difficult in cooperative efforts that are designed to achieve a variety of goals. Each side tends to have its own political concerns about potential conclusions from an evaluation study, and a result, very little training evaluation takes place. Nevertheless, it is not impossible to assess the quality of joint training, and some of the union-management corporations have begun to conduct studies of specific programs and services. The results of these studies will be informative not only to the joint programs themselves but to the broader training community as well.

BENEFITS THAT SUSTAIN JOINT TRAINING

Counterbalancing the issues that threaten the future of joint training efforts are a number of benefits to both labor and management that encourage the continuation of such programs. First, joint training programs may increase the skill potential and the quality of the internal workforce. This outcome is a shared objective of both parties, because expanding workers' skills and knowledge contributes not only to management's interest in organizational performance but also the union's interest in members' job security. Second, both union and management achieve good public relations among workers for their training efforts. Third, the involvement of workers as trainers for other workers often leads to higher quality and more popular training programs. Fourth, the involvement of both the union and management serves as a check and balance in the administration of training, ensuring that diverse views are considered at early stages of decision making. Fifth, the union confers a measure of legitimacy to the training efforts, giving workers a greater degree of confidence that their concerns have been addressed in program planning. Also, union involvement provides a vehicle through which workers can raise concerns if they are not satisfied with the training. Thus, the union brings credibility to the training effort and extends what management could do on its own. Sixth, in joint efforts there is often linkage of training to organizational resources and line operations that usually does not occur when training is run solely by a union or solely by an external training provider. Finally, the joint structure facilitates links between internal and external labor markets. Because of the mix of interests brought to joint training efforts by unions and management, workers' career opportunities both within and outside the firm are likely to be considered.

These benefits hold joint training programs together. To the extent that the delivery of training is improved, the scope of training broadened, and the interests of each side addressed, joint training will be valued by both unions and management. The question for the future is whether the mutual benefits will outweigh the issues that threaten joint training programs.

* * *

Marvin J. Levine holds the J.D. and Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin. He is presently a professor of industrial relations in the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland in College Park, Maryland. His research interests include collective bargaining, public sector labor relations, and employment law. His articles and reviews have appeared in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *Arbitration Journal*, *Employee Relations Law Journal*, *Labor Law Journal*, and *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*.

REFERENCES

1. S. Overman, Retraining puts workers back on track. *HR Magazine*, 37(8), pp. 40-43, 1992.

2. Work in America Institute, Human resources center fosters GM/UAW teamwork, *Work in America*, 14(2), pp. 6-7, 1989b.
3. U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. *Worker Training: Competing in the New International Economy*, OTA-ITE-457. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September, 1990.
4. L. A. Ferman, M. Hoyman, and J. Cutcher-Gershenfeld, Joint union-management training programs: A synthesis in the evolution of jointism and training. In L. A. Ferman, M. Hoyman, J. Cutcher-Gershenfeld, and E. J. Savoie (Eds.), *New Developments in Worker Training: A Legacy for the 1990s*, Industrial Relations Research Association, Madison, Wisconsin, pp. 157-189, 1990.
5. J. Casner-Lotto, *Successful Training Strategies*, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1998.
6. M. Hoyman and L. Ferman, The scope and extent of joint labor-management training programs. In L. A. Ferman, M. Hoyman, J. Cutcher-Gershenfeld, and E. J. Savoie (Eds.), *Joint Training Programs: A Union-Management Approach to Preparing Workers for the Future*, ILR Press, Ithaca, New York, pp. 11-30, 1991.
7. J. Dreyfuss, The Three R's on the shop floor, *Fortune*, pp. 86-89, 1990, Education 1990 issue.
8. S. J. Schurman, M. K. Hugentobler, and H. Stack, Lessons from the UAW-GM Paid Educational Leave Program. In L. A. Ferman, M. Hoyman, J. Cutcher-Gershenfeld, and E. J. Savoie (Eds.), *Joint Training Programs: A Union-Management Approach to Preparing Workers for the Future*, ILR Press, Ithaca, New York, pp. 71-94, 1991.
9. J. P. Gordus, C. Kuo, and K. Yamakawa, Joint programs for lifelong learning, in L. A. Ferman, M. Hoyman, J. Cutcher-Gershenfeld, and E. J. Savoie (Eds.), *Joint Training Programs: A Union-Management Approach to Preparing Workers for the Future*, ILR Press, Ithaca, New York, pp. 153-180, 1991.
10. A. P. Carnevale, L. J. Gainer, and J. Villet, *Training in America: The Organization and Strategic Role of Training*, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1990.
11. "Model Union-Management Training Program Celebrates First Decade," *CWA News*, p. 2, June 25, 1998.
12. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings*, p. 2, January, 1998.

Direct reprint requests to:

Marvin J. Levine
Robert H. Smith School of Business
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
email: mlevine @rhsmith.umd.edu