5-1998

# Empowerment of a UAW Workforce

Paula L. Hughel

# EMPOWERMENT OF A UAW WORKFORCE

Paula L. Hughel

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Lindenwood College in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Business Administration

1998

## ABSTRACT

This thesis will investigate whether empowerment of a workforce has a positive correlation on employee job satisfaction.

Research supports that the automotive industry is continuously focusing on the reduction of structural costs. One area that is commonly focused on is the reduction of manpower, specifically management. As the number of managers are reduced some of the work is being redistributed to the employees. Along with the additional work comes decision making responsibilities.

Although research supports that empowerment has a positive correlation on business results and working environments, it is inconclusive that empowerment has a positive correlation relative to job satisfaction. Since the introduction of empowerment in the mid nineteen eighties, many critics have taken the position that empowerment is not successful in a strong union environment.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the possibility that within a United Auto Workers environment, empowerment can have a positive affect. Specifically, it is hypothesized that the implementation of empowerment of a UAW workforce will have a positive affect on job satisfaction.

Two hundred UAW employees participated in the study of whom all were male. The subjects were administered the initial survey prior to introduction of the variable, empowerment principals. One group of the subjects were introduced to empowerment while the other group continued to function under traditional style of management.

1

to empowerment while the other group continued to function under traditional style of management.

Results of the study provided statistical data to support that empowerment may have a positive affect on UAW employees. The results were evaluated under three dimensions, people, teamwork and my job. All three dimensions showed a positive correlation to the introduction of empowerment.

EMPOWERMENT OF A UAW WORKFORCE

Paula L. Hughel

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Lindenwood College in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Business Administration

1998

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:


Associate Professor Daniael W. Kemper,
                    Chairperson and Advisor


Adjunct Assistant Professor Jan R. Kniffen


Adjunct Assistant Professor Laura DeRigne

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

# Chapter I

## INTRODUCTION

As the United States economy continues to convert from an industry based market to a service - based market, industry in general is fighting to survive. During this same period of time, the second and third world countries are expanding into an industry based economy. These countries are expanding into the weakened US marketplace and are now creating an economy with global competition. According to Arvind Jindia, a manufacturing consultant with InSol Inc., in order for businesses to survive this battle, they must use their most valuable assets, their workforce, in the most productive manner (Jindia 54). Don Stacy, Chairman and CEO of Amoco Canada Petroleum Company Ltd. states that, businesses must also be able to reduce the structural costs of the business along with maximizing profits in order to withstand the "roller coaster of volume shifts and product changes" that the new market place bears (Stacy 44). Jindia states that one area many businesses are focusing on to meet both of these objectives is the optimization of the workforce through participative management (Jindia 54). This belief holds true for both new businesses and existing businesses although they both must take a different approach.

According to JoAnne Dressendofer, CEO of Imedia Inc., as new businesses develop they start out with flexible systems and a minimum amount of

employees. This is important because as the business demands change, so does its structure.

If business goes up, companies increase capacity to meet those demands based on a projected return on investment. This helps determine how much money the business will make on the investment. If the business does not make enough profit on the investment then the business may make the decision not to invest the money. When the amount of sales goes down, the business will normally reduce capacity by laying off the excess workforce. Dressendofer states that the ability to respond quickly with the market demand is unusual for existing businesses, but is common for new companies (Brokaw 86).

According to George Gyan-Baffour, professor of management, Howard University, the battle that many of the older companies are facing is the reduction of structural costs while increasing profits. Gyan-Baffour states that, traditionally, larger companies solve their problems by adding excessive personnel and capital investments. When the large businesses have problems being competitive, they add people to act as a task team to identify and reduce the problems with the existing process. The task force usually makes the decision to add more automation or more equipment to solve their problems (Gyan-Baffour 491).

In order for these older companies to change they must change the way they solve their competitiveness problems and manage their businesses focusing on the processes states Mark Eichinger, chairperson of the communication subcommittee

at Ocean Spray Cranberries Inc. (Eichnger 20). Richard McCloskey, CEO of System Connection, manufacturer of cables and modems, states that, one method that some managers have been using to address their problems is focusing on better utilization of their people and improving productivity (Brokaw 87). According to Robert Simons, professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, managers are doing this by expanding job functions beyond the traditional roles. Where before, hourly or production people strictly performed manual labor functions, with this concept, they assist with tasks such as planning, scheduling, and coordinating functions. The expansion of job functions is necessary as the industry is downsizing because it is resulting in a high rate of attrition. According to Simons, one of the biggest reason is due to businesses not producing as many goods and therefore not requiring as many people to produce the goods. Companies simply can not afford to pay for the extra expenses that can not be recovered from the market-place. Another reason is due to the employees fear of being layed off. With anticipation of a layoff some people will leave the business with hopes of finding a more secure job. The third reason is due to the age of the workforce. The majority of the workforce is over fifty and many are retiring while they can receive special retirement incentives. As these employees leave, many of them are not being replaced and their work loads are redistributed among the remaining employees (Simons 82-83).

As the older businesses face the challenges of cost reduction with fewer people, many other types of problems occur. According to Don Stacy, one of the biggest problems is "the lack of a clearly defined vision, mission and business objectives". The visible signs that make this problem so obvious are easy to see just by watching the managers' behavior. "Managers in this mode scurry aimlessly chasing after many different problems, all in different directions" (Stacy 45). According to Simons, this mode of operation creates another type of problem, "traditional style managers". They try to control everything, even down to the lowest level of activity within the business. They make all decisions and then limit the amount of information they disseminate among the organization (Simons 80-81). According to James Miller, CEO and Chairman of an office product distributor, traditional style managers' are very focused on "short term results", and not necessarily on what is good for the business long term. They "do not trust or rely on anyone for anything". "They believe the only way to get things done properly is to do it themselves". Besides the impact they have on the business they also have a "negative impact on the people" in the business (Brewer 31-33). The people can see the lack of results and poor performance of the business (Case 67). According to Randall Murphy, President of Acclivus Corporation, a consulting firm, "because of the managers' action, the entire business flounders". Internally, the employees are directly affected by the managers behavior because of the chaos they create. This method of management

also creates a very negative workplace where "managers bark orders and intimidate employees" (Brewer 31-32). In this type of environment, the people do not understand what the managers are trying to accomplish or why they behave that way (Case 67). James Miller states that this type of behavior creates tension between the managers and the people within the organization. This behavior also creates misunderstandings and conflict because no one can trust each other. All of these symptoms lead to low productivity, low employee morale, and low employee job satisfaction (Brewer 32-33). According to Robert Simons, Professor of Business Administration at the Harvard Business School, many companies become trapped in this mode and fail. Because, in order to survive in this new market, "businesses must continuously improve and contribute to the bottom line" (Simons 83).

Some businesses suffer from another type of problem. In some cases, according to T. Don Stacy, Chairman and CEO of Amoco Canada Petroleum Company Ltd., management has defined their vision mission, and business objectives but "fail to clearly communicate them to the employees". Stacy stated that this causes a different type of frustration because management is trying to implement the objectives and cannot understand why no one else is supporting their efforts. According to Stacy, "if the goals and objectives are not understood and agreed upon by all levels of the organization, the only thing that will happen is frustration" (Stacy 45).

All three of these problems are common to most of the older businesses. According to Mary V. Gelinas and Roger G. James, Principals of a consulting firm, the lack of clearly understood business objectives and traditional style managers "create a very hesitant, skeptical and unproductive workforce". They stated, that if these types of problems continue to exist, "employee job satisfaction and attitudes will continue to decrease along with the overall performance of the business" (Rothstein 29 -31).

Taking into consideration these three major types of problems older businesses are facing, along with the challenges for the new businesses, one method of winning the battle is empowerment of the people within the organization (Brewer 31). According to Development Dimensions International, a corporate consulting firm, empowerment involves three main areas of any work group: what the people do in their jobs, the organization's environment and systems, and the organization's leadership style. Empowerment is incorporated into peoples jobs by allowing them to help design and develop their own functions. Development Dimensions International believes that then the people focus on continuously improving their jobs and the business. Development Dimensions states that the organization's environment is affected by empowerment by converting from an environment of fighting and a lack of trust to an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration between management and the employees. Leadership style changes with empowerment by converting from the managers making all of the decisions

to the managers and the employees working together for a common cause (Tobia 17). Empowerment pushes critical decision-making down to the lowest level so that ideas for improvements can originate either on the shop floor or from the ranks of management (Moskal 100). Development Dimensions states that some of the principles behind empowerment are: letting go of things that others can do, encouraging initiative and risk taking, delegating to challenge and develop, coaching to ensure success, reinforcing positives, sharing information and knowledge, respecting every individual, providing support, and practicing what they preach (DDI 27).

Empowerment addresses the issues previously discussed because employees are a part of the business decision. Ken Pohl, Senior Director - Participative Systems, at L-S Electrogalvanizing Co., stated that at their company, "employees help to plan, organize, and control activities so they are a part of making things happen instead of just being told what to do" (Verespej 30). Don Stacy, Chairman and CEO of Amoco Petroleum Company, stated that at their plant, "The managers delegate responsibility and give the people the opportunity to be innovative along with the authority to take risks" (Stacy 45). An office products distributor, James B. Miller, Chairman, stated that at their company, "The employees and managers actually agree on the goals and the managers step back and let the teams reach them" (Brewer 31).

According to Jill Casner - Lotto, Director of Policy Studies at the Work in America Institute, "empowerment can be even more successful in a union environment." Casner-Lotto states that in this type of environment, "the gap of trust has grown so much that they have so much more to gain". Since the unions become a part of the planning process along with the results, there are fewer conflicts to cause distrust. Casner-Lotto states that "management is finding out that if they work together with the union they can improve quality and increase productivity"(Thornburg 48-49). Patricia M. Carrigan, Manager of a General Motors plant, stated that "their plant is jointly operated by management and the members of the United Auto Workers union." According to the local UAW Chairman, Jack White, "they formed a 'we-we' partnership at the plant that is working wonders" (Moskal 100). Empowerment has also been implemented at the General Motors Saturn plant in Spring Hill Tennessee. According to Dan Watson, Saturn Shop Chairman, "from the very beginning of the plant, a partnership was established and all employees were treated as salaried employees with no division between hourly and salary". At most other GM plants, production workers must clock in and out of every shift they work. At the Saturn plant they do not use time clocks. "From the beginning of the design of the new vehicle, joint teams were formed to provide input into the equipment and processes that would be used to build the new car," stated Parker Stroom and his

UAW partner, Monte Williams, leaders of the engine/powertrain business team (Williams 48-49).

Joint teams have also been developed in some Chrysler facilities. Marc Stepp, retired VP UAW Chrysler, stated that "The team concept allows workers to enhance the dignity and self worth of all workers. Empowerment in a UAW workplace can be very beneficial especially in this market-place where survival demands a drastic change. UAW hourly and salary people are working together for a common cause. By doing this they will ensure the survival of their business by reducing costs and making their plant competitive" (Tobia 17).

Empowerment can be implemented in either a union or non-union setting as long as the implementation is carefully planned. According to Kenneth Bennett, General Manager, Caterpillar Engine Division, it is critical in order to have an effective implementation of teams that there is "dedication, heart and head, by team members and often far more difficult to achieve by senior managers" (Bergstrom 58). Thomas Davenport, Professor of Information Systems, University of Texas Austin, believes that "implementation would be even smoother if middle management is also involved". Davenport states that "'since they are the ones that usually defeat attempts to implement they will rarely support this type of change"(Davenport 25).

According to Davenport, once management is committed to the implementation of empowerment, it is important for them to discuss their

intentions with the union leadership if it is a union environment. Otherwise they must clearly communicate the concepts and their intentions with the entire workforce. When everyone understands this the formation of teams may begin (Davenport 25).

Kenneth Bennett, General Manager Caterpillar Engine Division, has been utilizing teams even before it became popular. Bennett stated that, "depending on the type of business and the environment, there are various ways to form teams". One method is to focus on the "product or service" the business offers. According to Bennett, in this structure all of the people responsible from start to finish of the product would be part of one team and all held accountable for the teams goals. For example, if the business offered various products, each product would have its own unique team. In the case of the Caterpillar Medium Engine Division, a team of twelve members was formed and they were responsible for the launch of a new engine. At Caterpillar they also formed teams for very specific purposes such as improving engine performance and cylinder head production (Bergstrom 58-59). According to Linda Thornburg, freelance writer who specializes in human resource issues, it is not really important how the teams are formed other than they must be responsible and held accountable to the success of the team and their part of the business (Thornburg 50).

At the Chrysler New Castle plant the employees developed the training plan. According to Mr. Atkins, union facilitator, "they wanted the training to be

effective and the ability of the people to comprehend, so they had union members be a part of the training." The training focused on three necessary skills: technical, analytical, and group dynamics skills. Mr. Atkins believes these areas are important because "the people will be involved in areas of the business that they never were before and they will require new skills and knowledge" (Tobia 19). According to Don Stacy, "training is just the beginning". At Amoco Canada, "the foundation of their efforts was a jointly developed vision, mission, and objectives of the business". They discovered that it was important for the teams to jointly establish their specific measurable goals for each of their areas that in turn support the business goals. Without proper training the teams would not have been able to perform this very important step. Don Stacy stated that in order for empowerment to work, employees must have two things. "First freedom to use all of their abilities and ideas on the job and secondly, freedom from bureaucracy and over management" (Stacy 45).

At Catalytica, a manufacturer of chemical products, empowerment principals have been implemented. They found that implementation is gradual and increasingly the teams pick up more responsibility. James Cusumano, Chairman and President, believes that eventually the teams will only require "coaching" but it is critical as they progress, that strong communications continue throughout the organization (Cusumano 12). Mary Ellen Kelley, researcher at Carnegie Melon University, states that "it is also important to recognize and reward the people and

the teams for their contributions" (Thornburg 50). At XEL Communications Inc., they found that initially the teams will struggle and will actually pass through different "developmental stages" and it will become more critical for upper management to continue to show their support. As they learned at XEL Communications Inc., the teams eventually mature and will begin to recognize their own contributions and will require less special attention (Case 69-70). According to Don Stacy, "the key task of management is to optimally develop the ability of the people to continue to contribute to the organization" (Stacy 45).

Linda Thornburg, stated that, "many of the various businesses that have implemented empowerment recommend financial rewards tied to the teams ability to meet their goals" (Thornburg 51). At Siecor Manufacturing in Kellar Texas, they offered special incentives for suggestions for teams or individuals (Hudson 59). Another type of reward system that Pape' Group Inc. used that was effective was special recognition. They formed a joint recognition committee which developed and established various types of special recognition for the people. Some examples that they came up with were special discounts at restaurants or stores where their people buy groceries or everyday goods (McPhee 68). The recognition could also be monetary. One type commonly used is profit sharing. At XEL Communications Inc., their plan was established by the upper level managers who determined the amount of money required to pay expenses, the shareholders, and for reinvestment. The amount of money left over was then

divided among the people as profit sharing (Case 26). Another type of monetary award utilized by XEL Communications Inc. and Amoco Petroleum Company is profit sharing distributed on a periodic basis and tied to the specific teams goals. At Amoco Petroleum Company, they established the period of time and the amount of the award up front when the teams established their goals for the year (Stacy 45).

At XEL Communications Inc., along with periodic lump sum payment incentives there are also pay incentives tied to the team goals and built directly into the employees wages. According to Bill Sanko, XEL Chief Executive, as the employees learn more of the jobs within the team or take on more responsibility they receive more pay. This helps to deal with those people that want to continue to grow and feel like they are achieving more and being paid more for their efforts. At the same time there will be team members that just want to do their job and nothing more. Bill stated that "this method allows for those that do more and contribute more towards the teams goals to receive more money than those that do not contribute as much to the teams goals" (Case 76).

According to McKinsey and Company's Jon Katzenbach, "all of these types of rewards help remind the employees and the teams that they are providing a positive contribution to the company". Katzenbach states that, "once the teams and the employees start to receive the additional rewards they seem to find

something that they did not have before and that is when they get even better" (Case 76).

According to Thomas Davenport, Professor of Information Systems at the University of Texas Austin, "anything that causes change always has it's share of problems and roadblocks". The most common problem along with the most detrimental according to Davenport, "is the lack of top management and leadership support" (Davenport 25-26). According to the results of a survey conducted by Edward Lawler at the University of Southern California on Fortune One Thousand companies, "without the support of top management, the already resisting middle management will defeat the attempt to implement empowerment". Middle and lower management resist empowerment because they relinquish their control to the teams (Lawler 38).

Davenport states that another mistake that managers make is wanting to implement empowerment for the wrong reasons. Davenport states that if the vision of upper management is to "cut costs rather than a strategic vision to promote growth, then they are not implementing empowerment for the right reasons". According to Davenport, empowerment will not succeed because it is a "long term change" and a "change in the way businesses deal with their people and how they focus their business". It just so happens that the result of empowerment is usually at least reduced costs (Davenport 25).

According to Bill Sanko, Chief Executive at XEL Communications Inc., one important point that managers must remember is that "the teams are not used to dealing with all of the business issues and at times they will make mistakes". Sanko states that "managers must be supportive of the team and make sure the team understands the impact of the mistake and offer suggestions or ways to prevent the mistake from happening again". At XEL Communications Inc., they discovered that at times, "the managers may need to step in and mediate either within teams or between teams" (Case 70-72). According to Kenneth Bennett, General Manager of Caterpillar Engine Division, "sometimes individuals on the team will have selfish interests and may want to control the team" (Bergstrom 58). At XEL Communications Inc., when this occurs it is important for the middle managers to remember to stay involved with the teams but to "act as a coach and not as their supervisor". If conflicts arise they must step in and help the team arrive at a solution to the problem. According to Dilworth Lyman of International Techne Group, sometimes certain types of individuals will not perform well in this environment because they like being told what to do. Dilworth states that in this case the manager should help the team understand that every employee has their individual rights and the team should continue to involve the employee but should not force them to be participative if they chose not to (Lyman 57-58).

According to Linda Thornburg, sometimes in union environments, the union leadership also struggles with empowerment. According to Gordon Roderick an international representative for the United Paper Workers union, the union leadership may resist empowerment for the fear of losing their power because the people have so much more responsibility they do not need the union as much. Roderick also stated that the union also resists getting involved with empowerment for the fear of it failing and the union officials being blamed for getting involved. Based on history, Roderick stated that "if the people blame them, they are not likely to be re-elected". If this is the case, "the union will stay completely out of the process". On the other hand, Roderick has seen the union sometimes confuse their role and try to make all of the decisions leaving their people out of the development process. When this happens the union makes all of the initial decisions and once the plans are communicated to the people there is usually a great deal of turmoil. According to Jerry Carter, Director of Industrial and Public Relations for Kraft Paper, either of these two roadblocks can be overcome, but only with top leadership commitment and a lot of strong open communication (Thornburg 50-51).

With change there is always resistance. At the Xerox Corporation, empowerment was a drastic change in the way the business operated and was certainly not exempt to resistance from some of the people. They found that people took several different positions on empowerment. One type was the "wait

and see" who sit back and watch with skepticism and constantly through out roadblocks to progress. According to CEO Paul Allaire, "endurance and continued communication is the only way to combat the enemy". "Eventually they will either conform to the new way of life or else they will leave" (Davenport 27).

According to Davenport, a problem that also occurs at some point in time that involves every employee when the business is trying to change is the "it is just another program" syndrome (Davenport 26). Over decades so many companies, like Xerox, have tried several different programs that at some point during the implementation phase people will wonder if this is just another fad or a new management program. According to Martin Griffin, Sports Gear's CEO, this problem can be helped by very thoroughly training the teams and then through continued open communications. At Sports Gear, each member of the team must also be a part of establishing the teams goals so that they have ownership in what they are trying to accomplish (Rothstein 28). At Catalytica Fine Chemicals, they found that as the teams begin to function they must continue to see management at least make progress to 'walking the talk' and these problems will fade (Cusumano 12).

Even though potentially there are many roadblocks to implementing empowerment, there are even greater benefits. According to Peter Tobia, VP of Kepner-Tregoe Inc. consulting firm, research supports that participating in the

design of a persons job will increase their level of commitment to making the job successful. Mike Atkins, union facilitator for the Chrysler forge plant, stated that, "In the past the people were not allowed to use their brains and now management is no longer asking the people to park their brains at the door". Marc Stepp, retired VP of UAW Chrysler, stated that "Once the people's brain power is harnessed it is possible to improve quality, reduce costs, and truly become competitive where management may have never thought possible" (Tobia 18). According to Patricia Carrigan, Plant manager, at the General Motors plant in Bay City Michigan, their plant was projected to lose three and one half million dollars when they realized they must change the way they run the business. Ms. Carrigan and Jack White, Chairman of the Local UAW, decided that in order for the plant to survive they had to start to work toward that same goals and so they formed a partnership. As a result, the plant finished with two and one quarter million dollars profit and improved the quality of the product. Carrigan stated that, "the plant improved customer concerns by fifty-four percent from the previous year, reduced the operating budget by thirteen percent, and improved productivity by twenty-four percent" (Moskal 101).

According to Jim Lewandowski, Human Resource VP at another General Motors plant in Spring Hill Tennessee, they decided to start off the plant with the empowerment philosophies. Lewandowski stated that, "the new Saturn was General Motors experiment to implement participative management as well as

taking a totally different approach to dealing with customers". He stated that the changes started with the hiring of employees. At the time, GM had many laid off employees from around the corporation due to plant closings, and these people had first rights to the jobs at Saturn. According to Dan Watson, Saturn Shop Chairman, "the people that came to Saturn were surprised to find that they were involved in decisions from the very beginning". Watson emphasized that "when they began to produce the new vehicle the employees were proud of what they had accomplished because they were a part of making it all happen, and that does not happen in many GM plants" (Williams 48-49).

These types of benefits are common throughout many different businesses that have successfully implemented empowerment. According to Don Haase, retired Plant Manager at the Chrysler plant in New Castle Indiana, they had similar results but also reported that grievances went from eighty-five a month to zero. He stated that they had tremendous reductions in inventory as well as maintenance repair parts. Jim Lewis, the union facilitator, states that because of empowerment, "The pride has come back" (Tobia 17).

Empowerment also works in other types of industries, like the paper industry. Ocelia Williams, union shop steward for the United Paperworkers International union, stated that "In the end of this process, I like my job more than I ever used to. I do better work. I make more money". Ocelia Williams worked at a troubled company in Cincinnati Ohio that makes mailing tubes and composite cans. This

company was also fighting the battle to survive against the changing marketplace. Ms. Williams stated that, "initially the union was not very supportive of the change to empowerment but finally the union president realized that it was their only hope for survival". The president researched the concept and found that it was actually successfully implemented at many facilities and actually strengthened the union by providing job security for the workers (Frey 80-92).

At another union represented paper company in Savannah Georgia, Jerry Carter, Director of Industrial and Public Relations, stated that "empowerment has enhanced job security and productivity due to all of the efficiencies they gained". Carter also stated that "the more successful the cooperative arrangements become, the easier it is for employees and managers to talk and solve problems". Al Mayes, an active union member, stated that "the more improved communication channels help the managers respond faster to problems and wastes less time and energy on arbitration issues" (Thornburg 51-52).

At L-S Electro-Galvanizing Co., in Cleveland Ohio, Ken Pohl, Senior Director of Participative Systems, stated that "they were actually able to reduce prices for their customers because they reduced their costs so much". L-S Electro-Galvanizing Co. is represented by the United Steel Workers of America. Don Vernon, Vice President and General Manager stated that as a result of empowerment at L-S Electro-Galvanizing, "the people are not only more satisfied with their jobs they also have job security" (Verespej 30).

According to Arvind Jindia, a manufacturing systems consultant, at a leading pharmaceutical company they were losing customers due to long change-over-times to produce new products. To improve the change-over-times they decided to form a joint team that was completely empowered to design, develop, and implement the next new product. As a result of the teams effort, they reduced the change-over-time by seventy-one percent (Jindia 54).

At another company in a different industry located in Arlington, Texas, James Miller, Chairman of an office products distributor, stated that the company known as Moving Comfort's, found that after implementation of empowerment they had an annual growth rate in revenues of fifteen percent. Miller also stated that they were able to reduce their once high turnover rate to only five percent (Brewer 32).

According to Randall Murphy, President of Acclivus Corporation, a consulting company in Dallas Texas, "empowerment is considered a critical new strategy to help people grow and businesses improve". Rick Hess, General Manager of the Integrated Circuit business states that, people grow through empowerment because "they learn and utilize new skills that they had never done before". People also grow through the "reward of the input they provide". As they become more aware of the impact they have on the business it helps to feel better about what they do and how they perform' (Brewer 34).

Old businesses improve through empowerment by better utilizing their greatest assets, their people. Through fully utilizing their people, old businesses can

improve productivity, shorten lead-times, satisfy customers, improve quality, and reduce costs. In many cases, the old businesses find that they can even grow their business. Old businesses can gain a strategic position in a rapidly changing and highly competitive marketplace, that almost passed them by.

New businesses that base their foundation on the empowerment principles find themselves much better positioned to deal with the rapidly changing marketplace because, as the market changes, so do they. Empowerment principles help people stay focused on what is important so instead of having a very short term focus, the focus remains long-term and on the customer.

The purpose of this research is to investigate whether empowerment of a UAW workforce has a positive correlation on employee job satisfaction. Although research indicates many positive correlation's there is very little documentation relative to job satisfaction. Since the introduction of empowerment in the mid nineteen-eighties, many critics have taken the position that empowerment is not as successful in a strong union environment versus a non-union environment.

# CHAPTER II

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Empowerment has been a topic area of great interest over the past decade, especially in the newly emerging field of organizational behavior. According to Cathy Felts, an international Human Resource consultant, " To remain competitive in the increasingly fierce international marketplace, companies need to empower employees throughout the entire organization" (21). Edward Harrison supports this premise stating that, "Managers of various types of organizations have discovered the simple truth that the people who perform the operating work are usually the most effective in applying their knowledge and skills to operating problems. Empowerment is one method of 'management' that companies are implementing in order to achieve those interests (25).

### Major Existing Constructs

The overall effectiveness of empowerment has probably been the area most thoroughly researched and challenged. Edward Lawler states in his book, " The Ultimate Advantage," that there is currently no single authoritative source or theory even though there has been a great amount of research. According to Lawler, research began in the 1930s' focusing primarily on democratic leadership in work organizations (70). This research focusing on job enrichment and self

managing work teams evolved into the formation of the new management approaches stressing employee involvement (70). During this period the majority of the current research focuses more on the problems associated with the implementation of empowerment and how to overcome them. He summarized that this is primarily due to the current need for organizational change and the large number of companies trying to understand empowerment (68).

While in support of Lawler, there is no one authoritative source there are several very strong, highly immersed sources: W. Edward Deming and Development Dimensions International, just to name two. Deming is recognized as an internationally renowned consultant whose work guided the Japanese industry into the new principles of management revolutionizing their industry. Development Dimensions International (DDI) is an internationally recognized company that was founded in 1970 and provides human resource programs and services designed to create high involvement organizations. The company services more than nine thousand clients around the world spanning a diverse range of industries.

Deming's overriding philosophy is that, "Management must increase the quality and productivity of the systems of people and machines that they manage."

David Allen wrote about Deming in an article, "Observable Stances." Allen stated that according to Deming, management must break down barriers and drive

out fear in the organization along with avoiding arbitrary numerical targets. These actions, if taken by management, will culminate in a developed empowered leadership style (20). Deming points out in his book, "Out of The Crisis," what management has been doing wrong over the past few decades and what they need to do to get out of the crisis. Although a great deal of his focus is on productivity and quality, he stresses that the very key thread is employee involvement at the lowest levels led by management. Deming specifically states that, "The Western style of management must change and the transformation can only be accomplished by man" (18). Deming reinforces that management must change the way they manage if industry is going to survive. He states that, "There is no substitute for teamwork and good leaders of teams to bring consistency of effort along with knowledge" (19). In his book he quotes William A. Golomski saying, "What is needed is sustained involvement and participation" (20). In this text Deming recognizes that no specific research was collected as through a research method, but this book is a collection of all of his experiences through the businesses he interfaced with, his colleagues, and experience. In the beginning of the text, Deming makes a great deal of comparisons to the way the Japanese have embraced these philosophies and the current state in the United States. He believes that if his direction is followed, the United States can again be the leaders in many industries, and if it is not, they will surrender many more customers.

Development Dimensions International has primarily been focused on creating high-involvement organizations that also create the need for empowerment. Within the organization they have done extensive amounts of research and offer several different authors with emphasis on every aspect involving the creation of these types of organizations.

The majority of the research DDI performed focused on empowerment through the implementation of teams. "Empowered Teams", a book written by Richard Wellins, senior vice president of programs and marketing for DDI, is based on two surveys. The first survey is aimed at people who were directly involved with team activities while the second survey is a shorter more succinct version targeted at senior level managers (237). The purpose of the survey is to obtain a broad prospective on teams and to compare groups over a variety of issues (238). The surveys were distributed to over 3000 people involved in teams and over four thousand upper level managers (239). The response rate for the team survey was twenty-five percent with the most relevant type of organization being manufacturing, with approximately forty percent union workforce (239). The executive response rate was forty percent and the most common type of organization was manufacturing with union affiliation (239). The data from the survey indicates that one forth of the organizations in North America are experimenting with teams and expecting to expand (239).

Wellins states that the reason so many organizations are implementing teams is, they work (10). He also states that, "workers recognize the benefits inherent in self-directed work environment: an opportunity to participate, to learn new job skills, and to feel a valuable part of the organization (10).

In another book written for DDI, "Inside Teams," they review how twenty of the best team based companies realized results through teamwork (2). The companies include manufacturing unionized and non-unionized settings. The summary of this book reveals that teams are alive and well in unionized work settings as well as manufacturing facilities (300). Wellins stresses that there are some important common threads concerning empowerment and a successful implementation of teams. First, they have strong business reasons for establishing teams, primarily due to competitive pressures (301). Another common thread is a strong commitment at the top of organizations along with a well-communicated plan for a gradual implementation (304). They all utilize a great deal of training, coaching, and learning as the teams evolved (304). Each of the twenty companies involved had very positive results (332). Larry Teverbaugh, manager at Westinghouse Corporation, says, "When business organizations create the right kind of team environment, ordinary people can create extraordinary value to support customers and stockholders. The entire business becomes a family environment where we all look after the interest of the business and each other" (334).

While not a predominant expert, Alan Randolph, performed a study on the overall effectiveness of empowerment pertaining to ten different companies. The ten companies represented nine different industries ranging from grocery to manufacturing to utilities (19). The companies were all involved with varying levels of empowerment when the study began and then were observed over an eight year period. For the purpose of the study, empowerment was defined as "a set of values, attitudes, and behaviors different from those that guided the organizations in the past" (20). The study showed that empowerment requires a dramatic change throughout the entire organization. Although some of the companies expressed that the steps seemed easy, the actual implementation was not (21). The experiences from these ten companies converting from bureaucratic organizations to flexible, fully empowered ones confirm the difficulty of the transformation process (21). Empowerment did not take place overnight, requiring instead a series of structural changes some taking several years. However, in a ten year period every organization involved in this study improved operational capabilities and renewed competitiveness (22).

Jack Gordon in an article, "Team Troubles That Won't Go Away," states that the entire rationale for forming any sort of human organization, from a tribe to a multinational company, boils down to the fact that groups can accomplish things that individuals cannot (26). According to Gordon, team-based work systems are seen as a way around the inherent pitfalls (27). Gordon states that the

last several years have brought undeniable evidence that empowered teams can produce outstanding results (27). The bottom line of every organization is really the same, produce as much as possible, for the least amount of money with the fewest people possible (34). Regardless of the problems facing empowered teams, they are popular because management sees them as a way to fulfill the mission of the organization (34).

During a National Association of Manufacturers Conference, president Jerry Jasinowski, was quoted as saying that, "It is important for managers not to give up too much. Do not forget that it is our responsibility to lead, coach, draw out the best in everybody in the organization" (Staroba 47). The amazing thing about empowerment according to Jasinowski is that, "every time you make something better in one part of the organization, it tends to make the rest better too" (47).

Although empowerment can be affective, according to Nickie Fonda, Managing Director of a consulting firm, there are a number of reasons why empowerment is still a concept more talked about than practiced (19). She states that in many cases, senior managers fail to anticipate the significant changes that empowerment brings to an organization (19). Fonda continues to explain that empowerment can also raise concerns about the capability of the staff as they receive greater authority and are required to manage the performance of the

business (19). Some managers are not equipped or trained to handle the additional responsibilities and therefore fail to complete the transition (19).

Owen Herrnstadt in the article , "Labor-Management Cooperation: Is Management Ready?," states that, "Only a management which trusts and respects labor is ready for participatory management" (636). Herrnstadt believes that in order to have a successful implementation, management must not feign interest. He says they must setup programs that do not contain the basic principles of collective bargaining, and management must also recognize that the union is valuable and must play a role in the implementation or they will create distrust and hurt any future opportunity for cooperation (637 - 638).

Edward Harrison, professor of Management in the College of Business and Management Studies at the University of Southern Alabama, states in, "The Case For Supervisor Involvement," that countless numbers of managers routinely disregard the contributions that supervisors can make by-passing them, failing to involve them in problem- solving, and failing to communicate critical work information (25). The impact of this can be substantial. According to Harrison, without involving the supervisors, implementation will mostly fail because in the move to a high involvement workforce, authority is transferred from the supervisors to the employees (26). If the supervisors are not involved there is little transfer of knowledge and the employees will not be prepared for their new responsibilities. The supervisor's job changes from supervision and control to

coach, trainer, and resource person for the employees (26). Harrison also stated that the transition from traditional management culture to one of participative leadership usually takes several years. In many cases, the upper level managers fail to acknowledge the lengthy nature of organizational change and either try to force implementation or give up (27).

However, not all theorists support empowerment. In fact, Richard Koch, management consultant, says, "The advocates of empowerment have pulled off an amazing propaganda coup." (11). Koch believes that empowerment is an attractive idea but unworkable on a large scale (11). This is because large corporations cannot adequately deal with the challenges faced by the organizational changes (12). According to Koch, leadership, control, and singular direction are essential for success in large corporations (12).

In support of Koch, Stephen Hill, Professor of Management, University of California, states that research reveals that the application of empowerment is more commonly only partially implemented than fully integrated into business (8). Many business' have evolved to this primarily due to management's unrealistic expectations (8).

Michael Carter, in the article, "Quit Empowering Me And Let Me Do My Job," states that, empowerment may be the worst supervisory practice of recent years (6). Empowerment, even when it works as intended, he says, is not about giving, allowing, permitting, letting , or authorizing (6). The very extent to which

empowerment is presented as giving something defines the failure of the process (6). Carter says that from a protected environment, empowerment looks good. It elevates workers by letting them share in management's' power. It releases managers from minor details and tasks and allows them to focus on the bigger issues. The reality lies on the floor where the people are (7). Too many times, the boss gives the power and when it fails, the boss takes it away (7).

Most modern thinkers agree empowerment is critical in improving productivity and results. Brian Ritchie, President of Palos Bay Technologies, states that some organizations have a tendency to vacillate on the concept without focusing on the implementation or what it is doing to the people (8). In most organizations empowerment comes to life through processes which require guidelines, quality measures and involvement from the managers and the people. The problem though, according to Ritchie, is that implementation is rarely treated in that manner (8). Usually there are two extremes. The first is the "proclamation of universal empowerment," as if someone waved a magic wand and suddenly everyone is empowered (8). Usually at this point the majority of the people do not even understand what empowerment is yet acting in an empowered environment. The other extreme is "before you empower yourself, check with the boss" (8). This occurs when the manager fails to understand and still manages traditionally. In either case implementation will not be successful or beneficial for anyone.

Oren Harari, Professor of Management at the University of San Francisco, states that, "trying to empower your employees is a losing proposition for everyone. You will waste your time and they will resent being treated like children" (46). Harari explains that to be an affective leader one does not need to have all of the answers. Instead, he says to create an environment where the people take responsibility to work productively in self managed work groups and solve complex problems on their own (46). Harari states that, "All of this empowerment stuff is a con because you cannot confer power on human beings. You can though, create a condition where people feel powerful, a condition where people choose to create power for themselves" (50).

Effect Of A Union Environment

During the past decade, relationships between labor unions and management have been improving. (23) According to Timothy Loney, past President of the Society of Federal Labor Relations Professionals, this is partly due to Executive Order 12871, which focuses on labor management partnerships. Shortly after the issuance of the executive order, a Commission on the Future of Worker Management Relations was formed (23). The Commission was tasked with identifying and encouraging methods promoting worker productivity through labor management cooperation and employee participation (23 ). Loney states in his article that, " conditions are ripe for the American Labor movement to conduct

a real test of the cooperative approach for managing relationships" (23). He explains this is driven by the profound environmental challenges in the American economy. In another article by Loney, he states that recent initiatives by the Clinton Administration promote labor-management cooperation. These initiatives include process improvements, focusing on the customer and employee empowerment (1846). Recognizing the significant transformation required for companies and unions, the administration established a National Performance Review to monitor the outcomes of these initiatives and offer guidance if required (1860).

Barry and Irving Stone note in their book, "Negotiating The Future," that thirty percent of United States manufacturing plants operating in nineteen sixty-nine were no longer in production by the end of nineteen seventy-six" (25). The impact for American unions was significant. In nineteen forty-five the union membership was thirty-five percent and has dropped to sixteen percent in the nineteen nineties. Stone states that, "the use of empowerment, if implemented properly will have a tremendous impact on labor management cooperative efforts" (25). According to Stone, empowerment cannot occur without full union support and involvement because of the drastic change in the workplace (25). In a union setting this cannot occur without provisions in the collective bargaining agreement, since it outlines how labor and management will work together on issues like job classifications, training, rewards and work roles (25).

M. E. Sharpe supports that there is considerable change underway in the workplace of America. This change requires changing the traditional methods of labor-management relations (39). Sharpe states that, "since the nineteen eighties, there has been a substantial expansion in the number and variety of employee participation efforts" (39). Sharpe also reviewed the efforts of the Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations. According to the commission, " a majority of American workers want to have opportunities to participate in decisions effecting their job, their work, and their economic future" (40). During a Commissions' session, Sharpe quoted Bruce Carswell, Senior Vice President of GTE and Chairman of the Labor Policy Association,

> The message that we would like to leave with you today, is that our nation can no longer afford to view employment relationship as American workers and management competing with one another in a zero-sum game. Instead, we need to create a partnership among empowered employees, government, industry, and unions such that everyone is playing on the same team in pursuit of mutually beneficial objectives. (40)

Labor leaders appearing before the commission pointed out that unions provide employees and independent source of power in employee participation. Union-management partnerships are more likely to address a wide range of interests that benefit both employees and managers and avoid sensitive areas such as hiring or firing employees (40). According to the commission, the labor movement believes that the long-run objectives of employees participation

should be to enhance both economic performance and industrial democracy by providing employees a voice at all levels of the organizations (40). Sharpe states that a number of studies have shown that, "Where a union is present, survival is significantly increased if the process is governed by a joint partnership between the union and management" (40).

In an article, "Workplace Change: A Union Perspective," Fred Pomeroy points out that, "While there is some debate about whether unions should participate in work reorganization, the debate has largely shifted to how and under what conditions unions should participate" (20). He also notes that it is important to include recognition of participation in the collective bargaining agreement because labor and management will always have different interests (20). He contends that labor and management can work together, on particular projects, where there are mutually agreed-upon objectives and where unions have a real decision making role (20).

Adrienne Eaton, an associate professor, Department of Labor Studies and Employment Relations, Rutgers University, performed an empirical analysis on unionized employees in the midwestern United States. The purpose of the study was to explore the role of implementing participative programs (19). The study included union and management representatives from eighty-six facilities that had functioning participative programs (26). The majority of the facilities were manufacturing with a few from the service sector. A survey was distributed to the

various facilities to both the union and management (26). Seventy-seven and one half percent of the union participants and sixty-one and one quarter percent of the management participants responded (26). Thirty-seven cases of these responses were "matched pairs," where both the union and management participants were from the same facility (27). The results of the study demonstrate that union and management have a tendency to perceive things differently when asked the same questions. Managers reported higher union and employee participative program involvement (33).

The study also reveals that union involvement in changing methods of production parallels employee involvement (34). The study also indicates that the most extensive involvement was negotiating over changes in terms of conditions of employment required by the changing work system (34). This demonstrates that while labor and management is working together more, there is still a long way to go before employees truly function in an empowered environment.

In an article written by Harry Katz, Professor New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, he reviews empowerment and exploitation in the global auto industry. Katz states that for unions to effectively defend workers' interest in plants where empowerment is being implemented, those unions must develop independent and adaptive strategies (765). Many plants fail to do this due to either unprepared union leadership or due to lack of training and education (765).

In support of Katz, Loney states that, " the detached relationship where management acts and the union reacts is so prevalent that change is difficult" (24). Although studies indicate that at least half of all unionized organizations are involved in some form of cooperative effort, there are very few situations where labor-management cooperation represents the principle intent of the approach (25). These innovative practices to date have not diffused widely across the economy and remain fragile, at risk of being written off as just another in the long list of passing management fads (25).

## Results of Implementing Empowerment

In the book "United We Stand" by Thomas Weekly, Assistant Director of United Automobile Workers, and Jay Wilber, Executive Director of Quality Network for General Motors Corporation, it states that "previous attempts of participative management gave valuable insights to the obstacles of a joint process" (79). Through this insight it is determined that quality and customer satisfaction 'were comfort zones' for both union and management to work together (79). Wilber states that possible outcomes from teamwork include improved working conditions, opportunities for personal development, cost reductions, and quality improvements (117). One major corporation realized the potential results of implementing a participative workforce. The company, General Motors, along with the United Automobile Workers Union made a joint

commitment during the nineteen ninety national negotiations (1). The commitment to continuously make quality improvements recognizing that ultimately it would redirect the company's course away from possible disaster and ensure its long term customer satisfaction and profitability goals (2).

An example of research concerning the results of empowerment was reviewed in an article written by Roberta Yafie, professor of management at Boston College. The study was performed in January nineteen ninety-six by Ernst and Young Consultants. The hypothesis of the study was that "United States workers who are treated as business partners are most likely to be made more productive and motivated to contribute to their company's profitability" (53). The study included one hundred forty-six executives and two hundred fifty-one workers of both union and non-union Fortune One Thousand companies (54). Ernst and Young found this relationship between performance and contribution to profitability illustrate a desire by workers to change their roles and assume more decision making responsibility to benefit the corporate balance sheets (55).

Research did uncover one study concerning employee participation and the effect it has on employee work attitudes. The researcher, Polly Phipps, reviewed a study performed by Rosemary Batt and Eileen Applebaum. The survey was conducted in the United Kingdom and was primarily focused on craftworkers (50). Although the results were somewhat inconclusive, they did

demonstrate that employee participation has a positive effect on work attitudes and organizational commitment (51).

Peter Marsh reviewed some results of employee participation in his article, "Industry Taps Into Shop Floor Know-How". He states that a growing number of companies are seeking more improvement from the shop floor workers on issues relating to quality and meeting customer requirements (10). This is due to the belief that the people closest to the day to day issues have a better understanding on what is creating the issues along with better ideas for solving them. Shop floor workers welcome the fact that their ideas are being sought and taken seriously (10). Overall the workers react positively to being given more trust and responsibility (10).

The positive impact of the implementation of empowerment was recognized at an annual conference sponsored by Industry Week Magazine. The conference, America's Best Plants, has been recognizing the best ten plants in America for the past eight years (53). The best ten plants are selected for their ability to demonstrate a significant improvement in their manufacturing or assembly processes along with participative management methods (53). Michael Verespej, an author for Industry Week Magazine, documented that one company, Super Sack, demonstrated tremendous results over a five year period of implementing empowerment principles (53). Some of the results include a reduction of scrap and rework charges from two and one percent of sales to two

percent of sales (53). Inventory was reduced by twenty-five percent and work-in-process down by fifty percent (53). Productivity increased by seventy-two percent (54).

Despite Super Sacks accomplishments, Verespej also documented some problems that they had encountered. David Kellenberger, Vice President of Manufacturing, states that, "One of our greatest mistakes at the beginning was our failure to recognize how important training was. You need to make a huge commitment of time and resources for training in order to have a successful implementation" (54). Another difficulty Super Sack faced was the reluctance of workers to approach another team member about a problem (54). Traditionally, a member of management would resolve the issues and conflicts (54).

In an article written by Lynn Frazier, she quotes Jim Barkey, General Manager of the Engineered Motor Products Division for Franklin Electric Company, saying that, "The initial reaction from the production workers is 'are you going to stay with it', because they are so skeptical about all of the past programs that were management's answer to all of their problems" (3250450). According to Barkey, "if you do not reinforce the change initiative, employees, supervisors, and managers will go back to what they are comfortable with" (3250450).

Although there is convincing evidence that empowered workplaces perform well in terms of productivity and quality, Katz states that there are some

plants such as Ford Dearborn, Ford Atlanta, and a few Chrysler plants that perform well with a traditional production and management system (764). The important point that Katz makes is that, "What may work for one company may not be the answer for another" (765).

## Summary of Existing Studies

The research reviewed on the overall effectiveness of empowerment, the effect of a union environment, as well as the effects' empowerment has on productivity, quality, and cost demonstrate that empowerment is being implemented in many companies and the trend is increasing. Development Dimensions International, Edward Deming, and a variety of other writers summarizes that empowerment does have an overall positive effect on business. These writers have performed in-depth research on the methods for implementing empowerment along with the precautions that should be taken during implementation.

Various authors have written and performed research on the effect of a union environment when implementing empowerment. The authors concur that the importance of union involvement is increasing. Over the past decade this involvement trend has not only increased, but the union's position on the type of involvement has been changing from should they be involved to what role should they play.

Many authors have performed some research concerning the results of implementing empowerment but primarily focus on the bottom-line business results like quality, productivity, and costs. This is primarily due to so many companies questioning what does this empowerment thing actually gain for a business. There are so many troubled companies that they are searching for the key to their survival and many are skeptical over the past human resource programs that have failed.

All current research indicates very favorable results in these areas, but there is very little research focusing on the impact of empowerment on the workforce. As competition continues to intensify and companies continue to search for methods to improve their business, one key factor that has not been reviewed is the impact on the worker's job satisfaction. More specifically, the automobile industry is continuously focusing on methods to combat the competition. Through market analyses the major companies in the United States market place have determined that they must focus on reduction of structural costs and improved quality levels.

Problem Identification

The United States automobile companies are focusing on reducing structural costs and improving quality. Obviously one method of reducing costs includes the reduction of the workforce while maintaining the same or more productivity levels. These companies are restructuring and increasing the responsibilities of the workforce that requires a different method of managing the workforce. Many of these companies have always managed through a dictator approach where the workforce only knew and did what they were told without question. Now through the implementation of empowerment, the manager employee relationship is drastically changing.

The purpose of this study is to investigate what happens to a UAW workforce when they are empowered by their managers. The research will focus on the employees opinions of their change in job satisfaction along with their position on union involvement. The research will include the key variable which is empowerment versus the traditional style management.

The hypothesis of this research is that empowerment of a UAW workforce will have a positive effect on employee job satisfaction. The researcher has predicted this outcome as a result of the trends from the previous studies that have been performed. Even though a majority of the research has been focused on the companies themselves, most of the research indicated the importance of involving employees. In many instances workers were documented stating very favorable

responses towards the implementation of empowerment and the positive impact it

has toward their job.

Chapter III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Subjects

For purposes of testing the hypothesis, empowerment of a UAW workforce will have a positive affect on employee job satisfaction, the target population included one department within a unionized work environment. The department is fairly evenly split between two shifts and consists of similar types of individuals within the Local Twenty-Two-Fifty Union at the General Motors Wentzville Assembly Center.

The researcher was an acting manager of the department and was able to utilize one hundred percent of the employees within the department for the research. The department is made up of two-hundred hourly men with one hundred people on each shift. The jobs in the department are considered to be desirable jobs because they are not required to work on the assembly line. In order to work in this department, one must have high seniority, consisting of a minimum of twenty-five years of experience. Their ages range from forty-five to fifty-two years. Their education level varies from sixth grade up through masters and other post secondary degrees.

The subjects are divided by the shift they were working so it was fairly simple to keep the exposure of the variable limited to the one shift. The first shift continued to function under a traditional style management and the other shift began to implement the empowerment principles.

Instrument

The facility where the study was performed has a unionized workforce and the workers are represented by the United Auto Workers Union. In order to perform this study it was necessary to use part of an existing UAW-GM survey, (Appendix). In a union setting the workers will not participate in any activity unless it is condoned by the local union. If they participate in such an activity, the union will not support them for any wrong doings that may occur. In order to have the union representation, the union dictates that they have the overall decision making authority of what they will or will not participate in. The original survey was jointly developed by the UAW and GM to measure various different factors involving the workers, both hourly and salary, at all General Motors locations. The overall survey is administered annually and comparisons are made to establish if progress is being made toward improving the environment. Since the survey was developed, it has been tested and administered throughout General Motors for over three years.

For purposes of this research, the section of questions pertaining to employee job satisfaction was utilized. An example of a question is as follows: Considering everything, I am satisfied with my job. Since all of the participants are employees of the company, all of the personal records are readily available and it was not necessary to ask any preliminary questions. This was also important for the participants because they know that there is no way of retribution or misuse of the data because it can not be identified with any individual.

Procedure

Prior to introducing the empowerment principles, the subjects were informed through their normal meetings, that they would be participating in a research project that was approved by the local UAW union. They were also told that the research period would last approximately six months and the only thing they would be required to do was to complete a survey at the beginning and end of the research period. They were told that the research did involve the UAW General Motors Quality Network principles and that the research would not violate any current labor agreements. They were also told that they would have another meeting to complete the first survey so that the research could begin.

The researcher then made arrangements for one group at a time to utilize a

large conference room for completing the survey. Several days prior, the

participants were told when and where to report for the first survey.

The times were established so that the participants could report to work one-half

hour early to complete the survey and would also be paid overtime for that period

of time. As the subjects reported to the conference room, they were greeted by

the researcher and asked to take a seat anywhere in the room but not to move any

of the chairs. The researcher had set up banquet tables all facing towards the front

of the room with two chairs per table also facing forward. Once all of the

participants were seated, the researcher again greeted the participants and thanked

them for participating in the experiment. The researcher then told the participants

that the information from the survey would be held in confidence and only

utilized for the purpose of the research project. They were again assured that the

research would not violate any contractual agreements nor be used against any

individual or group. The research was simply to test a theory. The researcher

also told them that they would perform another survey after a six month period

and after completion, they would be debriefed regarding the purpose. The

researcher also explained that nothing else could be divulged until the end of the

research, because it could affect the research itself. The researcher again

reassured the participants, that the research was made known to the local shop

chairman and plant manager and neither had any complaints concerning the

research. The researcher then instructed them to carefully read and answer the questions as honestly as possible. The researcher showed them an example of the response scale and explained that they should select the answer that most appropriately fits and to clearly mark their response by circling their answer. The responses are: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

The researcher then instructed the subjects to remain seated until they were excused by the researcher. One last time, the researcher asked if there were any questions before they began completing the survey. The researcher reminded the participants to refrain from making any marks on the answer sheets other then the answers to the questions so that they will be untraceable to any one person.

Once the last subject completed the survey, the researcher again thanked them for their participation. The researcher told them that upon completion of the next survey in six months they would be told about the actual experiment, but at this time it was necessary to keep the purpose from the participants because it could affect the results. They were also reminded that the information would not be used against anyone and would remain confidential for the pure purpose of research that may actually benefit people. The researcher then collected the surveys and adjourned the participants.

The researcher than introduced the variable of empowerment on the second shift. The first shift manager continued to operate in the traditional management

mode. The second shift direct line supervisors were trained and supported by the researcher utilizing information primarily from Development Dimensions International. The initial training took approximately sixteen hours to complete.

The researcher then instructed the supervisors to begin having regular team meetings and implement the empowerment principles immediately. Each supervisor then held their first meetings and explained that management was interested in getting the people more involved in the business and asked the team members to begin making lists of all of their issues that face their team. They were instructed to provide the feedback through the teamleader or supervisor. The team then prioritized the issues and made assignments as to who should resolve the issues. Some of the items required the supervisor or the manager to resolve but the team was also responsible for resolving some of the issues. The team leader then recorded progress to the resolution of the issues and the lists were reviewed at the team meetings. The team leader was responsible for collecting any new agenda items for the team meetings along with the teams performance to key measures. Some examples of the key measures were items like production downtime caused by the team, productivity for each job classification within the team, throughput for the various commodities that the team delivers to production. After several months of tracking, the team then set goals for improving their performance and they began working on improvement ideas. Their progress to these goals was also tracked and reviewed at their bimonthly

team meetings. Throughout the six month period, the supervisors continued to work and support their teams, resolving as many issues as possible that the team brought forward to management.

At the completion of the six month period, both shifts were again asked to participate in the survey. The large conference room was setup with large banquet tables and chairs on one side all facing forward. The researcher began by thanking everyone for their participation and told them that they should remain seated until they were adjourned, and this time, at the completion of this survey, the researcher would explain the purpose of the study. They were reminded that the local union shop chairman and plant manager were aware of the study and did not have any problems with the intent of the study. The researcher then asked the participants to again carefully read each question and select the most appropriate response. They were told to utilize the pencils provided and they should circle their answer. The researcher then handed out the surveys and asked them to begin filling out the surveys.

Once the last participant completed the survey, the researcher collected the surveys and thanked them for their participation. The researcher then informed them that the research was focused on the affect of empowerment on employee job satisfaction. They were also told that the first shift remained under the traditional style management, while the second shift was managed with the empowerment principles. The information from both surveys was going to be

tallied and then compared to determine if there is a difference in employees job satisfaction as a result of working in an empowered work environment.

If there was a positive affect, the results would be shared with upper management to support that an empowered environment truly does have an impact on employee job satisfaction and should be considered as a better method for managing employees. They were then informed that once the results were tabulated they would again be brought together to hear the final results and recommendations by the researcher.

Data Analysis

The surveys were collected following each session so the two different groups were maintained separately. One file was created for each group prior to and following the introduction of the variable.

Each survey question had five alternative responses: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree. The researcher manually tabulated each of the responses by each of the five categories. This data was then entered into a descriptive statistics program for further analysis. The level of significance was set at .05. The researcher will be comparing two groups of data sets. One data set contained the group that was introduced to the variable and the other did not. In order to complete the comparison the researcher will be utilizing interval descriptive statistics as well as univariate statistics.

# Chapter IV

## RESULTS

The data were collected for both the control group and the experimental group prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. All of the participants completed the survey so there were one hundred usable surveys for each group both before and after the introduction of the independent variable resulting in a one hundred percent response rate. The results demonstrate the participants change in response for each group along with the statistical significance between the two groups to determine if the variable did affect the outcome of job satisfaction.

The results of all of the questions were first summarized and arranged into the following tables one and two. Table 1 below, shows the mean and standard deviation for each question for the First Shift prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. In this study, the First Shift group was the control group and was not actually exposed to the independent variable. In order to properly maintain the control comparison with the Second Shift group the participants were not aware of this difference and everything in the procedure was the same with this exception.

Table 1

First Shift Mean and Standard Deviation

| Question | First Shift Prior To The Variable | | First Shift Following The Variable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 1 | 25.0 | 20.92 | 25.0 | 23.18 |
| 2 | 33.3 | 25.25 | 33.3 | 25.25 |
| 3 | 33.3 | 24.75 | 33.3 | 27.83 |
| 4 | 25.0 | 29.96 | 25.0 | 27.54 |
| 5 | 25.0 | 28.85 | 25.0 | 30.54 |
| 6 | 25.0 | 24.16 | 25.0 | 24.16 |
| 7 | 25.0 | 25.72 | 25.0 | 25.72 |
| 8 | 25.0 | 26.35 | 25.0 | 26.35 |
| 9 | 25.0 | 29.56 | 25.0 | 29.56 |
| 10 | 25.0 | 35.19 | 25.0 | 35.19 |
| 11 | 25.0 | 18.79 | 25.0 | 18.79 |
| 12 | 33.3 | 23.21 | 33.3 | 25.78 |
| 13 | 33.3 | 25.19 | 33.3 | 29.70 |
| 14 | 25.0 | 22.66 | 25.0 | 24.15 |
| 15 | 25.0 | 24.57 | 25.0 | 32.90 |
| 16 | 25.0 | 19.35 | 25.0 | 19.35 |
| 17 | 25.0 | 19.75 | 25.0 | 19.86 |
| 18 | 25.0 | 20.19 | 25.0 | 22.08 |
| 19 | 25.0 | 25.05 | 25.0 | 26.28 |
| 20 | 25.0 | 15.95 | 25.0 | 16.45 |

Table 2, then displays the results of the Second Shift mean and standard deviation for each of the questions on the survey. Table 2 includes the results prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. The Second Shift group was actually introduced to the independent variable for a period of six months prior to completing the second survey.

Table 2

Second Shift Mean and Standard Deviation

| Question | Second Shift Prior To The Variable | | Second Shift Following Variable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 1 | 25.0 | 20.92 | 20.0 | 16.13 |
| 2 | 33.3 | 24.42 | 20.0 | 19.47 |
| 3 | 25.0 | 25.34 | 20.0 | 20.40 |
| 4 | 25.0 | 26.03 | 25.0 | 18.91 |
| 5 | 25.0 | 25.52 | 25.0 | 22.33 |
| 6 | 25.0 | 23.56 | 25.0 | 22.46 |
| 7 | 25.0 | 26.03 | 20.0 | 19.14 |
| 8 | 25.0 | 27.23 | 20.0 | 23.36 |
| 9 | 25.0 | 29.99 | 25.0 | 26.45 |
| 10 | 25.0 | 35.63 | 25.0 | 25.05 |
| 11 | 25.0 | 20.01 | 25.0 | 20.76 |
| 12 | 33.3 | 23.11 | 25.0 | 23.51 |
| 13 | 33.3 | 25.19 | 25.0 | 21.83 |
| 14 | 25.0 | 22.77 | 25.0 | 22.97 |
| 15 | 25.0 | 26.56 | 20.0 | 19.65 |
| 16 | 25.0 | 19.86 | 20.0 | 18.95 |
| 17 | 25.0 | 20.04 | 20.0 | 18.79 |
| 18 | 25.0 | 20.53 | 25.0 | 23.91 |
| 19 | 25.0 | 26.14 | 25.0 | 24.09 |
| 20 | 25.0 | 15.48 | 20.0 | 15.18 |

The survey can also be divided up into three different dimensions of analyzing

the affect of empowerment. The three dimensions that were analyzed were

people, teamwork and the affect relative strictly to job satisfaction. Table 3 shows

the mean and standard deviation for each group relative to these three dimensions.

Table 3

Dimensions of Empowerment

| Dimension | First Shift Prior to Variable | | First Shift After Variable | | Second Shift Prior to Variable | | Second Shift After Variable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| People | 26.6 | 4.55 | 28.32 | 4.55 | 26.6 | 3.71 | 22.0 | 2.74 |
| Teamwork | 26.6 | 3.71 | 26.6 | 3.71 | 26.6 | 3.71 | 23.0 | 2.74 |
| My Job | 25.83 | 2.62 | 25.83 | 2.62 | 25.83 | 2.62 | 23.0 | 2.58 |

In order to begin the comparison of the responses between the control group and the experimental group, the data was transformed into one table with the total mean and standard deviation for each group prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. This information is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Overall Results

| Group | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| First Shift Prior to Variable | 24.12 | 4.35 |
| First Shift Following Variable | 25.53 | 4.46 |
| Second Shift Prior to Variable | 24.15 | 1.91 |
| Second Shift Following Variable | 21.17 | 2.91 |

The next table, Table 5, demonstrates a summary of the total degree of change in response within the two groups both prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable.

Table 5

Degree of Response Variation By Group

| Group | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree/ Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1st Shift Prior/After | 0 | -1 | -40 | +22 | +19 |
| 2nd Shift Prior/After | 611 | +939 | -170 | -957 | -423 |
| Total | +611 | +938 | -210 | -935 | -404 |

The null hypothesis was then tested utilizing multivariate Z statistical technique. The results of the test is shown in Table 6 for both within the two groups as well as between the two groups.

Table 6

Multivariate Z

| Group | Calculated Z | Critical Z |
|---|---|---|
| First Shift Within | 0.73 | 0.267 |
| Second Shift Within | 3.82 | 0.49 |
| First and Second Between- Prior to Variable | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| First and Second Between- After Variable | 19.82 | 0.50 |

# Chapter V

## SUMMARY

The summary of the mean and the standard deviation were shown in Tables 1 and 2 of Chapter 4. This summary included both the First Shift group and the Second Shift group prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. As shown in Table 1, the mean did not change after the introduction of the variable. The standard deviation varied somewhat for the control group but was of no significance in either direction. The standard deviation ranged from 15.95 to 35.19 prior to the introduction of the variable and 16.45 to 35.19 following the introduction of the variable. For purposes of this study, there should not have been any significant change following the introduction of the variable since this was the control group.

For the Second Shift group, the mean remained the same for fifty percent of the questions and varied from 25 to 20 for fifty percent of the questions following the introduction of the variable. The standard deviation as shown in Table 2, decreased for sixteen of the twenty questions. The standard deviation ranged from 15.48 to 35.63 prior to the introduction of the variable and ranged from 15.18 to 26.45 following the variable.

The questions of the survey were also divided into three different dimensions of the affect of empowerment. The first dimension was primarily

focused on people in more general terms. The second dimension measured the effect the variable had on the participants attitude towards teamwork. While the third dimension was focused on the participants attitude on the affect of empowerment on job satisfaction. Table 3 describes the mean and standard deviation for each dimension prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable. The mean for the First Shift group increased from 26.6 to 28.32 for the people dimension but did not vary for the other two dimensions. The standard deviation for all three dimensions did not change at all for the First Shift group.

The Second Shift group was originally the same mean for all three dimensions as the First Shift group but after the introduction of the independent variable all three means shifted. When comparing the mean and standard deviation for each dimension there was a reduction in all of the means and standard deviations.

Evaluating again as one dimension, the grand mean for the First Shift group shown in Table 4, varied from 24.12 to 25.57 following the introduction of the independent variable. While the standard deviation varied from 4.35 to 4.46. The Second Shift group had a grand mean of 24.15 prior to the introduction of the variable and 21.17 following. While the standard deviation went from 1.91 to 2.91.

Table 5 describes the degree of change by group and response type. The table shows that the First Shift group changes their responses toward the negative response while the Second Shift group changes their responses towards a positive response.

The null hypothesis was then tested and described in Table 6. The First Shift group when compared prior to and following the introduction of the independent variable had a calculated Z of .73 and a critical Z of .267. The Second Shift group had a calculated Z of 3.82 and a critical Z of .49. When comparing the results between the first shift group and the Second Shift group the results were 0 with no difference between the two groups. This again supports that there is a difference between the responses of the First Shift Group and the Second Shift Group. While the calculated Z between the First and Second Shift group following the introduction of the variable was 19.82 while the critical Z was .5. These results support that the hypothesis that introducing empowerment in a UAW workforce does have a positive significant difference on job satisfaction.

## Implications

This study has several implications. First of all it was a study to determine if there was a positive influence on job satisfaction with the implementation of empowerment in a UAW workforce. According to some experts, like Edward Deming, if employees are more satisfied with their work they will be more

productive and provide positive results in their performance. Deming along with several other experts state that positive individual results leads to a more productive and successful business. This study supports, at least on a limited basis, that empowerment did have a positive affect on job satisfaction and in this UAW setting could lead to other positive results.

Another implication of this study is that companies with unionized work forces are fighting to compete in a fierce global marketplace with non-union employees. One area where there is little consensus of the experts is what the implication of the union has on the success of a company and the affect of empowerment. This is partially due to the limited studies measuring the impact of empowerment on a UAW workforce primarily due to the relationship between management and the union. This study actually demonstrates that the union can and will participate in studies as well as the introduction of empowerment techniques.

Another implication is that empowerment can be somewhat successfully implemented in a UAW workforce which some experts do not support very strongly. The results of this survey as well as the fact that the union participated with this study demonstrates that there is some potential for more common ground between union and management then some experts believe. This study could be a positive sign that the environment is changing between union and management relationships.

## Limitations

The two groups involved in the research were convenient for the researcher to analyze because the participants were managed by the researcher. In order to more realistically evaluate a UAW workforce many more participants should be utilized. The size of the group although was fairly large, in comparison to the entire UAW workforce would probably not be significant. Also in order to get a reasonable response percentage without bias the researcher utilized a survey with twenty questions. The response may be more pure if the sample size was increased and the number of questions reduced along with more specific wording towards the variable being measured.

Another limitation is that the change from a traditional UAW work environment to an empowered work environment is evolutionary and will more likely pass through several stages of development over many years. Due to the constraints of this research, a six month period was selected for this study, but a longer period of evaluation may provide a more accurate picture of this process.

## Suggestions For Further Research

As previously mentioned, the researcher would recommend that this type of research be continued but should be expanded to included more union employees and the surveys should be more focused including other implications

of empowerment. The length of time should also be expanded to allow for a more accurate reflection of the results of the implementation of empowerment.

Further studies should also include other types of unions. This research was strictly focused on the United Auto Workers, but to truly understand the affect on a union environment other union organizations should also be evaluated. Another important factor to consider would be various types of businesses and industries.

APPENDIX

Instrument

Please read and select the most appropriate response for the following questions by circling one of the five answers.

1. My supervisor is working hard to build trust among people.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2. Sufficient effort is made by my supervisor to get the opinions and thinking of the people in my department.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                      nor disagree

3. My department allows the full range of all people's talents and experience to be utilized.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                      nor disagree

4. In my department, my supervisor provides the support I need to make a full contribution.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                      nor disagree

5. My supervisor places no barriers to people's contributions.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                      nor disagree

6. My department encourages the workers and management to work together.
   strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                                      nor disagree

7. My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishments.
   strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                nor disagree

8. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.
   strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                nor disagree

9. I am asked for input when changes are made to my job functions.
   strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                nor disagree

10. I receive information about updates, changes, and decisions that affect my job.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                 nor disagree

11. Conditions in my job allow me to be as productive as I can.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                 nor disagree

12. I am satisfied with the amount of involvement I have in decisions that affect my work.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                             or disagree

13. When faced with a problem our team participates in solving the problem.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                 nor disagree

14. I feel encourage to come up with new and better ways of doing things.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                 nor disagree

15. I see positive changes taking place in my organization.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

16. I am proud of what I do and my accomplishments at work.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

17. Different departments in my organization cooperate with each other to get the job done.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

18. The people within my team cooperate to get the job done.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

19. Considering everything, I am satisfied with my job.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

20. I am satisfied with my physical working conditions.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

UAW/GM Instrument

People:

1.1 My organization (plant, staff, unit, etc.) is working hard to build trust among people.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

1.2 People in my organization are proud of the work they do.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
    nor disagree

1.3 Sufficient effort is made to get the opinions and thinking of the people who work here.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.4 My organization allows the full range of all people's talents and experience to be utilized.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.5 In my organization, issues of racism, sexism, or bias of any type are dealt with and resolved.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.6 Favoritism does not interfere with my opportunity to get a better job in this company.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.7 In my organization, my supervisor/manager provides the support I need to make a full contribution.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.8 My organization places no barriers to people's contributions.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

1.9 I am satisfied with the recognition I receive.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                          nor disagree

Teamwork:

2.1 Teamwork is demonstrated by top management in my organization.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2.2 My organization encourages teamwork.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2.3 My organization recognizes teamwork.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2.4 Different departments in my organization cooperate with each other to get the job done.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2.5 The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

2.6 I see positive changes taking place in my organization.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

Your Job:

3.1 My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

3.2 My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.
    strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                                    nor disagree

3.3 I get enough feedback about my performance to know if I'm performing up to expectations.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

3.4 I have the equipment and tools necessary to do my job properly.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

3.5 I receive information about updates, changes, and decisions that affect my job
.    strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

3.6 I receive the support I need to do an effective job.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

3.7 Considering everything, I am satisfied with my job.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

3.8 I am satisfied with my physical working conditions.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

Employee Development:
4.1 I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
strongly agree     agree     neither agree/     disagree     strongly disagree
                              nor disagree

4.2 In my work, I find it easy to apply the training I have received.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

4.3 I am satisfied with the training I have received on my present job.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

4.4 I am satisfied with my opportunity to get a better job within this company.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

Communication:

5.1 I have enough information to do my job well.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

5.2 If needed, I have regular opportunities to express my ideas or ask questions
of   the top management.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

5.3 If needed, I have regular opportunities to express my ideas or ask questions
of   the local union.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

5.4 I am satisfied with the information I receive from management on what's
going on in the company.
strongly agree   agree   neither agree/   disagree   strongly disagree
nor disagree

Your Supervisor:

6.1  My supervisor has the information needed to answer my questions.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

6.2  My supervisor takes the time to fully explain changes in plans or procedures.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

6.3  My supervisor acts on my ideas, suggestions or concerns.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

6.4  My supervisor gives me feedback that helps me improve my performance.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

Customer Satisfaction:

7.1  People in my organization know who their customers are.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

7.2  My organization uses customer input to focus its activities.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

7.3  I understand what my organization must do to meet or exceed our customers' requirements.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

Continuous Improvement:

8.1  Continuous improvement is emphasized in my organization.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
                           nor disagree

8.2 I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
nor disagree

Overall:

9.1 All things considered, my organization is well-run and efficient.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
nor disagree

9.2 I would rate GM as a good company to work for in comparison to other companies.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
nor disagree

9.3 Considering everything, I would say I am satisfied with GM at this present time.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
nor disagree

9.4 I see changes taking place as a result of previous employee surveys.

strongly agree    agree    neither agree/    disagree    strongly disagree
nor disagree

# Works Cited

Allen, David. "Observable Stances." <u>Management Accounting</u> January 1995, V73 20.

Bergstrom, Robin. " Teams: Dedicated Players." <u>Production</u> March 1994: 58 - 59.

Brewer, Geoffrey. " The New Managers." <u>Performance</u> March 1995: 31 - 35.

Brokaw, Leslie. "Thinking Flat." <u>Inc</u>. October 1993: 86 - 88.

Carter, Michael. "Quit Empowering Me and Let Me Do My Job." <u>Supervision</u> September 1995, V56 6 - 9.

Case, John. "What The Experts Forgot To Mention." <u>Inc</u>. September 1993: 66 - 67.

Cusumano, James. "The Winning Team." <u>Chemical Marketing Reporter</u> April 1994: 11 - 12.

Deming, Edward. <u>Out Of The Crisis</u>. Cambridge, Massachusetts Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1989.

Davenport, Thomas. "Will Participative Makeovers Of Business Processes Succeed Where Re-Engineering Failed?" <u>Planning Review</u> January/February 1995: 24 - 29.

Eaton, Adrienne. "New Production Techniques, Employee Involvement and Unions." <u>Labor Studies Journal</u> Fall 1995, V20 19 - 43.

Eichinger, Mark. "Empowerment: A Blue Collar Perspective." <u>Personnel Journal</u> October 1993: 80 - 94.

<u>Empowering Leader</u> Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Development Dimensions International, 1994: 1 - 46.

Felts, Cathy. "Taking the Mystery Out of Self-Directed Work Teams." <u>Industrial Management</u> March/April, V37 21 - 27.

Fonda, Nickie. "Take Me To Your Leader." <u>People Management</u> December 1995, V1 18-22.

Frazier, Lynne. "Lean Manufacturing, or Kaizen, Permeates Auto Industry." <u>Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News</u> March 1996, 23250450.

Frey, Robert. "Empowerment Or Else." <u>Harvard Business Review</u> September/October 1993: 80 - 94.

Gordon, Jack. "The Team Troubles That Won't Go Away." <u>Training</u> August, 1994 V31 25 - 35.

Gyan-Baffour, George. "Advanced Manufacturing Technology, Employee Participation and Economic Performance: An Empirical Analysis." <u>Journal of Managerial Issues</u> Winter 1994, V6 491 - 506.

Gyan-Baffour, George. "Advanced Manufacturing Technology, Employee Participation And Economic Performance." <u>Journal Of Managerial Issues</u> Winter 1994: 491 - 505.

Harari, Oren, "Stop Empowering Your People." <u>Management Review</u> February 1997, V86 48 - 51.

Harrison, Edward. "The Case For Supervisor Involvement." <u>Industrial Management</u> November/December 1994, 25 - 28 V36.

Herrnstadt, Owen. "Labor-Management Cooperation: Is Management Ready?" <u>Labor Law Journal</u> October 1995, V46   636 - 638.

Hill, Stephen. "In Search Of TQM." <u>Employee Relations</u> May 1995, V17 8 - 18.

Hill, David. "Employee Input Proves Beneficial." <u>Business Atlanta</u> October 1992: 22 - 23.

Hudson, Cherry. "Finding $100 Bill On The Factory Floor." <u>Management Accounting</u> July 1993: 58 - 61.

Jeszenka, Raymond. "Breaking Through The Resistance: Achieving TQM In Maintenance." <u>Plant Engineering</u> January 1993: 132.

Jindia, Arvind And Elycia Lerman. "Applying Total Employee Involvement To Revolving Change Over Cycle Time." Industrial Engineering February 1995: 54 - 56.

Katz, Harry. "Lean Work: Empowerment And Exploitation In The Global Auto Industry." Industrial And Labor Relations Review July 1996, V49 764 - 765.

Koch, Richard. "Why Empowerment Is Unworkable." Across The Board January 1997, V34 11 - 12.

Lawler, Edward. The Ultimate Advantage San Francisco, California Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Lawler, Edward. "Total Quality Management And The Employee Involvement: Are They Compatible?" The Academy Of Management Executive February 1994, V8 68 - 76.

Loney, Timothy. "TQM And Labor-Management Cooperation: A New Challenge." The New Bureaucrat Summer 1994, V23 23 - 27.

Loney, Timothy. "TQM And Labor-Management Cooperation- A Noble Experiment For The Public Sector." International Journal of Public Administration October 1996, V19 1845 - 1864.

Lyman, Dilworth, and Ken Richter. "QFD And Personality Type: The Key To Team Energy And Effectiveness." Industrial Engineering February 1995: 57 - 61.

Marsh, Peter. "Industry Taps Into Shop Floor Know-How." The Financial Times November 1995, V32826 10 - 11.

McPhee, John. "The Membership Drive." Oregon Business March 1994: 68 - 71.

Moskal, Brian. "The Sun Also Rises On GM." Industry Week September 1988: 100 - 101.

Phipps, Polly. "Employee Participation, Work Reorganization, And Job Design." Monthly Labor Review December 1995, V118 50.

Pomeroy, Fred. "Workplace Change: A Union Perspective." Canadian Business Review Summer 1995, V22 17 - 20.

Randolf, Alan. "Navigating The Journey To Empowerment." Organizational Dynamics Spring 1995, V23 19 - 33.

Ritchie, Brian. "Empowerment - From Buzzword To Process." Getting Results January 1997, V42 8.

Rothstein, Lawrence. "The Empowerment Effort." Harvard Business Review January/February 1995: 80 - 87.

Sharpe, Michael. "Employee Participation And Labor Management Cooperation in American Workplaces." Challenge September/October 1995, V38 38 - 47.

Simons, Robert. "Control In An Age Of Empowerment." Harvard Business Review March/April 1995: 80 - 88.

Stacy, T. Don. "Empowerment: Beyond Lip Service To Bottom Line Responsibility." Canadian Business Review Autumn 1993: 44 - 45.

Staroba, Kristin. "Applying Manufacturing Principles." Association Management February 1997, V49 46 - 48.

Stone, Barry And Irving. Negotiating The Future Boston, Massachusetts Harvard Business School Press 1994.

Thornburg, Linda. "Can Employee Participation Programs Really Work?" HR Magazine November 1993: 48 - 52.

Tobia, Peter, and Shari Johnson, "Chrysler Harnesses Brainpower." Industry Week September 1992: 16 - 20.

Verespej, Douglas. "Worker-Managers." Industry Week May 1994: 30.

Verespes, Michael. "Super Sack - America's Best Plants, 6th Annual Salute." Industry Week October 1995, V244 53 - 55.

Weekly, Thomas. United We Stand New York, New York McGraw-Hill 1996.

Wellins, Richard. Inside Teams San Francisco, California Jossey-Bass 1994.

Williams, Douglas. "Shop Floor Democracy." Automotive Industries June 1989: 48 - 49.

Wilson, Jeanne.  <u>Leadership Trapeze</u> San Francisco 1994.

Yafie, Roberta.  "Pass The 100 Partner."  <u>Journal Of Business Strategy</u>
    January/February 1996, V17 53 - 56.