

REPUBLIC ENGINEERED STEELS, INC.
AND THE
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA:

Courageous Co-leadership
in a Changing Environment

1993:2

Catherine Ivancic and Jim Bado

This study was supported in part by a Special Projects grant from
the Ohio Labor/Management Cooperation Program,
Ohio Department of Development

In 1989 steelworkers at the LTV Bar division received the opportunity to vote on the ratification of a labor contract between the United Steelworkers of America and a new company -- Republic Engineered Steels Inc. (Republic). Ratification of the contract would transform the 4700 employees of the division into the new owners of the company. At the time, a debate raged about the tremendous change that this contract would bring. Employees asked themselves if these changes were good. Would the new company have sufficient capital to remain competitive? What if the new company was forced to shut down facilities? Would "owners" end up in the unemployment line?

It was obvious that the contract was a vote about change. Perhaps the most profound change in the contract -- a provision for joint leadership of the new company -- was barely mentioned in the public debate. The contract was ratified and Republic was formed in November 1989. Union members, salaried employees and management became co-owners of the division, which is composed of eight plants in five different states. Ratification of the contract quietly ushered in a new era in co-leadership for management and labor at Republic.

In Article 1 of the contract labor and management delineate how they plan to work together. The agreement clearly specifies that Republic's management and union leadership will work together -- "as a partnership" -- to take on the demands to remain competitive in the steel industry and the challenge of creating a new corporate culture. (See Article 1 (Appendix A) for actual language.)

Working together is easier said than done. The general mood of the workforce was understandably skeptical. As a divested division of a bankrupt conglomerate, Republic confronted a highly competitive market and a large debt burden as a result of the buyout. Moreover the division, like most of the steel industry, has had a tradition of adversarial labor-management relationships. The human side of the equation was further complicated by the high level of distrust and suspicion among all employees as a result of the controversy surrounding the future of LTV pension and retirement benefits.

The vote for the employee buyout effort received lukewarm support from employees of the division. Although a majority of the nine USWA local union presidents voted to support the buyout, the union leaders of the four largest locals recommended against approving the buyout. The labor contract was ratified by employees by a margin of 2 to 1. No matter what the reasons were, the vote indicated that 1/3rd of the bargained-for employees remained skeptical about employee ownership. On the other hand, salaried employees did not participate in a vote for employee ownership. The only option for salaried employees opposed to the buyout was to leave the company. Although Article 1 of the labor contract specifically includes all employees in the new way of doing business, the circumstances of the buyout left some salaried employees feeling disenfranchised.

It was against this backdrop of suspicion, fear and uncertainty, that the union leadership and the management took on the challenge of making employee ownership work at Republic. The innovative union contract language has served as a foundation for developing a process for working together. Some of the more distinctive features of Republic's participation process are its flexibility, the substantial training support provided to the process and the co-leadership of the process at all levels. Republic's participation system has evolved and changed over the last three years. It is that ability to evolve which is one of its greatest strengths.

Change from traditional roles to co-leadership

The joint labor-management leadership is a radical change from the industry's traditional method of operating. Historically, management made the decisions, and labor was the implementer of those decisions. Managers were supposed to make all the decisions, solve all the problems, and control all the information. Shop-floor employees, both hourly and salaried, were supposed to work with their hands, not their heads.

On the other hand, the Steelworkers traditionally have been the adversary of management. Unions were supposed to improve their members' quality of work life, living standards, and employment security. In practice, unions became reactive to management activities. Unions would sit back and wait until management did something wrong and then file a grievance about it.

For the most part, Republic's decision making structure followed the traditional model before employee ownership.

Southeast Chicago; Gary, Indiana; and all along the Beaver River in Pennsylvania. In the former LTV bar division alone, there has been a massive reduction of facilities. In the past, the division included seven melt shops, fourteen cold finish plants and twenty hot roll mills in operation. Today, there are one melt shop, four cold finish facilities, and five rolling mills in operation. The decline of the industry also impacted the United Steelworkers of America. In 1980, there were approximately 500,000 union members covered by the basic steel agreement; today there are about 148,000 covered by it. That's close to a 70 percent drop in members covered by basic steel contracts.

At the same time, new, often non-union competitors and foreign producers were making inroads into the major producers' market share. Some of these competitors have claimed that the absence of a traditional labor-management relationship has played an important part in their success.

Faced with these facts, the industry and the Steelworkers both knew that something had to be done with the US steel industry. During the 1980s, there were a variety of things done to change the steel industry. These changes included rationalizing, modernizing, and shutting down of operations. Some steelmakers formed joint ventures with foreign partners. In all of the steel industry there was a move toward more employee involvement in business operations and for some firms, like Republic, the employees purchased the businesses. Like the rest of the American steel industry, the impetus for change at Republic came from outside the company from the pressures of the increasingly competitive environment.

The labor contract: A blueprint for working together.

Article 1 of the labor agreement is the blueprint for implementing the desired change at Republic. The Article is commonly called the "H-1 appendix," because the language was originally located in appendix H-1 of the contract. The name "H-1" has stuck, but the language was symbolically moved to become Article 1 of the contract book. As the first thing in the contract book it sets the tone for the way the company and labor leaders will do business. Placing the language in the contract indicates that these changes are not a new management fad, but an institutionalized change that will guide the leadership in their actions.

H-1 or Article 1 is a new and innovative way of operating a company. It is designed to "establish Republic Engineered Steels as the premier quality supplier of cost competitive engineered steel products; hot rolled bars, cold finished bars, and special metals products and will provide increased job security for all employees." For this to happen, the Article states that capital

must be invested in the company and "the involvement of all employees in the continued success of the business" will be required.

In the first few months of the new company's operation a corporate H-1 Committee was formed to address the issues laid out in Article 1. While the H-1 Committee was created through Republic's union contract, the management process which has grown out of that undertaking is equally applicable to all employee owners, salaried and hourly. The committee is composed of salaried representatives, and all the plant managers, union presidents and vice presidents, and top executives of Republic. The committee's primary task is bringing together the leadership to work for the long-range prosperity, growth, and security of all employee owners. The H-1 Committee is responsible for implementing the blueprint for working together.

The H-1 Committee's task was (and continues to be) a challenging one, particularly given the historically mixed record on employee involvement in the Republic plants. This was not the first time employees had heard of a new management style or a new cooperative approach. One of the past responses of the Steelworkers to the declining industry was the negotiation of labor-management cooperation as part of the 1980 basic steel agreement. The 1980 language states that joint participation in problem solving "is an essential ingredient in any effort to improve the effectiveness of the company's performance and to provide employees with a measure of involvement adding dignity and worth to their work life." Labor Management Participation Teams (LMPTs), quality circles and other team efforts were organized under Republic's former owners to involve hourly employees in the decision making process. Experiences with these efforts varied across Republic's facilities: some positive, some negative.

In creating H-1, labor and management leaders worked hard to avoid the mistakes that had been made in some of the other employee involvement efforts that became labeled as "dog-and-pony shows." That is, even though there may have been some good that came out of those efforts, they did not represent a fundamental change in the way the parties interacted. The committee wanted to keep the positive elements of these previous efforts and move one step beyond them.

To avoid past mistakes, labor and management leaders have tried to clearly define H-1 objectives. The overall goal of the H-1 process is to make Republic a more profitable company. Article 1 gets more specific about how labor and management will go about achieving that goal. The following four objectives outline what H-1 is striving to achieve.

- 1) Making capital investments.

Capital investments are the cornerstone of survival and profitability for Republic. With rapidly changing technology and improved processes available to the competition, capital investments will be necessary for the company to remain competitive. By placing this goal first, all parties are recognizing that this is a primary goal of working together.

2) Creating more employee involvement.

Capital alone will not make the company competitive. The article points to "the involvement of all employees in the continued success of the business" to make Republic the leading producer of bar steel products. Creating employee involvement can "only take place through a change in attitude and atmosphere and by an understanding on the part of each employee as to what the business must accomplish to reach its goals," it says in Article 1.

3) Eliminating adversarial relationships.

Both parties see the signing of this labor contract as beginning of the change process not the end. The contract says that the elimination of adversarial relationships will not result from written words, but "from actions and deeds." H-1 calls for the creation of "an environment of trust in which the most appropriate management style is a non-autocratic, cooperative style of management." This applies to all levels of the organization, both hourly and salaried. The H-1 process will "provide for employee involvement and an increased sphere of input and responsibility for all employees."

4) Building an environment of trust.

Article 1 goes on to state that to reach this goal both hourly and salaried employees must be assured that their "employment security is not threatened and that they are taking such actions on the premise of mutual trust."

Turning the words into a process

The words in the contract are impressive. The language has been recognized by the U. S. Department of labor for being innovative. Republic received the prestigious LIFT (Labor Investing For Tomorrow) award because of it. But it will take people and action to implement the words successfully.

With the blueprint of Article 1 in hand, the H-1 Committee set out to build a new company. The committee designed a process to

help carry out Article 1's objectives. A system of meetings at every level of the company -- crew, department, plant and corporate -- was established. The system of meetings-- called the "H-1 Process"-- is designed to be co-led by hourly and salaried representatives and is intended to provide the opportunity for every employee to fully contribute to Republic's success.

There are four specific objectives of the H-1 process: (1) to insure that people are fully knowledgeable about inter and intra-plant activities, (2) to utilize the expertise of hourly, salaried, and management employees in the continuous improvement process, (3) to create an atmosphere of respect for the individual, and (4) to improve the competitive position of Republic.

The process pushes decision making to most appropriate level, which is normally closest to where the actual work is being done. Meetings also provide up-to-date information to employee owners about company performance and help identify targets where the business needs help to improve.

Unresolved issues get bumped up the chain of command to the next level's meetings. For example, an issue may come up at a crew meeting which actually involves the whole department. The issue would be identified at the crew meeting and put on the agenda for the department meeting. The system is not designed to replace the work being done by various quality teams, task-force groups, or employee-involvement teams. Instead it is designed to support and complement the systems already in place and to integrate all employee owners into the problem-solving process.

Minutes are taken at each meeting and distributed to interested employee owners. The plant level minutes are available to anyone from the plant who is interested in them. In addition, progress reports are made on issues that are being worked on or that have been moved to the next level in the process. The figure on the next page graphically illustrates the design of the H-1 process.

The H-1 Committee put together guidelines for each level of the process which outlines the purpose and intention of the meetings.

Crew level meetings. Crew level meetings are held weekly. Their purpose is to provide information about the quality, production, and financial performance of the department, plant, and company. The meetings also provide an opportunity to raise product quality, cost, operations, maintenance, or quality of work life issues, and are designed to last between fifteen and thirty minutes. For instance, the weekly safety meeting can be rolled into the crew meeting. Employee owners are paid for their attendance at crew meetings.

Department level meetings. The department meeting is held weekly for no more than two hours. The department head and his or her counterpart from the union, or their appointed representatives, are named as the meeting co-leaders. The meeting is open to all employees on a voluntary basis. People who are required to attend are paid for their attendance. Employees who attend on a voluntary basis are not paid for the meeting.

The meeting's agenda includes discussions of quality, production, and financial performance issues. It could review issues that were raised but unresolved at crew meetings. The meeting identifies targets for the continuous improvement of quality, productivity, delivery, cost, or the work environment. Agenda items include fix-its, continuous improvement projects, capital improvement projects, and planned maintenance repairs.

Plant level meetings. The plant level meetings are held on a weekly basis and are not supposed to run longer than four hours. At smaller plants, the plant and department meetings have been combined. The plant meetings are designed to review plant level information on production and financial performance, and monitor and receive reports on continuous improvement projects. At the plant meeting, departmental requests for capital improvement projects are reviewed and prioritized.

Corporate level meetings. There are two types of corporate-level meetings a "Corporate meeting" which deals with business performance issues and an "H-1 Committee" meeting where the issues of successfully carrying out the mission of Article one are handled.

Corporate meetings are held monthly for half a day. Those attending vary from meeting to meeting. At the corporate meeting,

the company's officers report on the previous month's business when economic conditions permit, union officers make reports, inter-plant continuous improvement projects are reviewed, and priorities for capital improvement projects are reviewed.

The H-1 Committee meets once a month after the corporate meeting. Officers of the company, plant managers, union presidents and vice presidents, the chair of the salaried coordinating committee, and designated representatives from these groups attend the meeting. The H-1 Committee tackles the issues and tasks associated with the objectives laid out in Article 1.

Because of the Republic's size and plant-by-plant differences, the H-1 Committee built flexibility into the process. The Committee put together the above guidelines for how plant, department, or crew level meetings are designed to work but allowed for modifications to suit the local needs. Flexibility built into the H-1 Process enables the groups that meet to modify the process to better achieve the goals of Article 1.

Does the process work? It is clear that the H-1 process is still evolving throughout Republic. In some places the change was implemented as soon as the process was in place, in others there was floundering and in a few places there is clear resistance to change. As more people -- union, salaried, and management -- begin to use the process it slowly grows into what the Committee intended it to be: a new way of doing business. Below are two examples, one inter plant and one at the department level, that illustrate how the process can be used effectively.

The H-1 process in Action: The Gary-Chicago inter-plant team

Historically, Republic plants have had problems serving internal customers as well as they have served external ones. Internal shipments sometimes get a lower priority event though they eventually are sold to an external customer. In this case, the Gary Cold Finish plant was having problems processing a new grade of steel, 52100, which it was receiving from the Chicago plant. The problem was the bars' straightness. Instead of pointing fingers at each other -- which would have been the traditional approach -- Gary and Chicago used the H-1 Process to form an inter-plant team, made up of hourly and salaried representatives, to work on the issue.

The first step in the team's process was to diagnose what was causing the problem. The Gary representatives did a Pareto analysis to determine the problems and Chicago's 11" shear crew visited Gary to see what the problem was first hand. It was clear that the problem was in the bar shearing process. The team then went back to Chicago to figure out how to change the shearing

process to produce a straighter bar. The solution they came up with was to allow the bars to cool longer before shearing them, to only have four billets per spread, to limit bundle size, and to align the bars when they fall into the shear pockets.

Straightness on the bars has improved dramatically; there have been no inconsistent loads since the new system was implemented. Moreover, general quality between the two plants has improved due to the team's efforts. The team is still meeting and it has done a Pareto analysis to determine the most pressing problems it should work on.

The H-1 Process in Action: A new, old idea at the 8" mill

H-1's crew and department level meetings are designed to give people closest to production an ability to improve the process. Obviously, someone who works on a machine every day knows more about it than anyone else. About seven years ago, assistant roller, Wendell Dillon, thought of a way to make the 8" mill more productive by reducing the delay time in switching from coils to cut-length product. His idea was never implemented. In 1992, as part of the H-1 Process, he brought up his idea again. This time he was listened to, a team was put together, the idea was tested, and then it was implemented.

His idea was to roll the same size bars and coils through the 8" mill, instead of rolling all the cut-length bars and then switching over to coils. This enables the mill to run longer and reduced the amount of set ups. On the first test, the mill had a 35 percent increase in productivity and a 14 percent increase in operating efficiency. On the second test, productivity was up 60 percent, and operating efficiency increased 28 percent. In addition, there were quality benefits: less decarb and better size consistency. As of this writing, this has not been implemented due to a lack of business. However, there is now a commitment to implement it once orders pick up.

Evolution rather than revolution

The H-1 process is working effectively in some parts of the company and at the same time there are some areas that are still struggling with how to implement the change. The H-1 committee continues to guide the company through the change process three years after the employee purchase. There is a recognition on the part of the leadership that the change process for a company may take as long as seven to nine years before it is complete and that mistakes will be made along the way. Article 1 states:

There will be significant and unforeseen challenges and the parties to the Agreement cannot enumerate them. Rather, it is their

intent to put a basic structure in place that will facilitate change and also allow the ownership interest of each employee, hourly and salary, to evolve into a true partnership.

Instead of trying to anticipate each problem or copying a system that is appropriate for another company, the H-1 committee jointly develops solutions as the problems arise. In the process, the committee builds the structures needed to facilitate reaching their goal of change. The structures and solutions are unique to Republic's situation. Three years into the program, the committee has tackled a variety of challenges. The results of three of those challenges are described below: 1) getting employee owners the information and knowledge they need to be effective in the system, 2) dealing with specific implementation problems at the Canton plant and 3) training mid-level leaders for the problems they face in the new system.

Getting owners information and knowledge

The H-1 Committee recognized early on that an essential component to making the process work was having knowledgeable, fully informed employees. Employee owners need information and understanding to give effective input on or to help make decisions. If employee owners are not operating with accurate information or are acting on rumors and heresay, their input will be less helpful in solving real problems. The H-1 committee made a commitment in July 1990, to spend an estimated \$4.2 million educating its 4,700 employee owners about how employee ownership affects them and their company. The program, custom designed for Republic by the Northeast Ohio Employee Ownership Center (NOEOC), is delivered by 40 in-house trainers (both salaried and hourly). The program has completed seventeen different classes. The topics of the classes are listed below.

Topics of Owner Education Classes

- Class 1: What is the Owner Education program about?
- Class 2: What do we own? Republic's common stock
- Class 3: Understanding Republic's statement of income.
- Class 4: The Preferred Stock Plan
- Class 5: The business of Republic Engineered Steels
- Class 6: Understanding Republic's balance sheet: Part I
- Class 7: Competition in the bar steel industry
- Class 8: Understanding Republic's balance sheet: Part II
- Class 9: Understanding stock benefits
- Class 10: The Defined Contribution Plan
- Class 11: Business plan: Our bank loan
- Class 12: Business plan: The commercial plan
- Class 13: Business plan: Manufacturing strategy
- Class 14: Business plan: Capital plan
- Class 15: Employee ownership in America: How does Republic compare?

Class 16: The H-1 Process

Class 17: Rights, roles, and responsibilities of ownership

The Owner Education Program provides one-hour classes about every six weeks for every employee in the company. The classes cover ownership structure, understanding financial information, and information about the business. The Owner Education program complements the H-1 process by providing all employee owners with accurate information, more knowledge, and more tools to make the process work.

Dealing with problems at one plant

In 1992 the committee recognized that some plants were having significant problems in getting the process off the ground. At the Canton 8th Street plant, the largest in Republic, there were problems with attendance at meetings and apparent resistance to using the process in some of the crews and departments. The H-1 committee had to decide what was the best mechanism for dealing with Canton's problem and who should solve the problem.

If Republic were still using the old system of decision making the solution would have been easy: management would tell the mid-level managers how to solve the problem. But that approach is inconsistent with the goals of Article 1. The H-1 committee instead needed to find a way to practice the new way of working together and at the same time get the problem solved. The solution was to use the H-1 process to improve the process itself. They pushed the problem solving and the decision making down to those who were dealing with it everyday.

A subcommittee of eight union and management leaders at the Canton plant were given the task of tackling the problem. The committee used a problem solving method that helped them deal with the issue systematically. They collected data through a survey and jointly came up with recommendations for improving Canton's H-1 process. Recommendations included training for the co-leaders, a specific recommendation for compensating employees involved in H-1 work, and a recommendation to evaluate the process again in six months.

Training for mid-level leaders

As the H-1 process evolved it became clear that problems in implementing the process in some parts of the company stemmed from

the fact that mid-level leaders had not obtained a clear understanding of the purpose of H-1 and lacked some of the skills needed to operate effectively in the new structure. Beginning in 1992, the H-1 committee embarked on a training program that focuses on the mid-level leaders in both management and the union.

A five-day training program was developed by a subcommittee of the H-1 Committee in cooperation with the Human Resources department and the NOEOC. It is currently being delivered to the leaders on the front line of change -- the middle levels of management and their union counterparts. The training includes problem solving skills, meeting skills, communication skills, conflict management, managing change, and visionary leadership. Union and management counterparts attend the week of training together to pick up some new skills and are asked to begin to envision together how they can make the change work in their individual areas. In addition, the "H-1 concept" has been fully integrated into the company's new performance management system. Learning the skills that will make the process work better can be recognized and rewarded through this system.

As Article 1 states it will be "actions and deeds" that will make the co-leadership work at Republic. It is what people do each and every day that will build trust, change attitudes, and eventually eliminate adversarial relationships. As the H-1 process unfolds and develops, the co-leaders at all levels of the company are given opportunities to make the words in the contract real. It will require courage and perseverance for the co-leaders to act on this new way. The profound changes that co-leadership has brought to Republic Engineered Steels Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America will reveal themselves slowly through the process of working together.

The parties to this Agreement desire that the top management of the Company and the representative of the International President, together with the Local Union Presidents, establish a mutual charter or partnership type agreement wherein they set forth the principles and purpose of the Company and how they intend to work together for long range prosperity, growth and security.

In particular they should address the establishment of joint Cooperation and Continuous Improvement Committees at the plant and departmental levels. Plant and or departmental level committees must receive appropriate training in problem solving, team functioning, etc., before they can realistically deal with significant problems.

There will be significant and unforeseen challenges and the parties to this Agreement cannot enumerate them. Rather, it is their intent to put the basic structure in place that will facilitate change and also allow the ownership interest of each employee, hourly and salary, to evolve into a true partnership.

NORTHEAST OHIO EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Studies in Employee Ownership

1. Buyout! Employee Ownership as an Alternative to Plant Shutdowns: The Ohio Experience, by John Logue, James B. Quilligan, and Barbara J. Weissmann (1986). ISBN 0-933522-15-0. Foreword by William Foote Whyte. This research report examines 47 attempts to use employee buyouts to save Ohio plants and companies threatened by shutdowns and analyzes the causes of failure and success.
2. Employee Ownership and the States: Legislation, Implementation and Models, by Catherine Ivancic and John Logue (1986). ISBN 0-933522-16-X. Nineteen states have adopted legislation to encourage employee ownership as a strategy for job retention and creation. This research report analyzes that legislation, examines its implementation, and offers a model for future state initiatives.
3. The Ohio Buyout Handbook: A 'How to do it' Guide for Workers Becoming Owners, edited by John Logue (1987). Since 1979 at least a dozen Ohio companies that would have otherwise closed have successfully restructured as employee-owned businesses. This practical handbook lays out in a step-by-step fashion how to use employee ownership to avoid shutdowns.
4. The Lending Environment for ESOP Companies: The Ohio Bank Study, by Daniel Bell and Mark Keating (1987). ISBN 0-933522-17-7. Not only do some bankers favor employee-owned firms over their counterparts, many offer special interest rates below prime to ESOPs. This research report analyzes the results of a 1987 survey of Ohio bankers.
5. Bringing Your Employees into the Business: An Employee Ownership Handbook for Small Business, by Daniel Bell (1988). ISBN 0-933522-18-5 (hardback); 0-933522-19-2 (paper). This handbook introduces the owner of a small business to the numerous advantages of employee ownership as a way of selling the business at retirement, an employee benefit program and a creative means of increasing a company's cash flow.
6. Employee Stock Ownership Plans in Ohio: Impact on Company Performance and Employment, by John Logue and Cassandra Rogers (1989). ISBN 0-933522-20-7. How have Ohio employee-owned firms performed? This study reports the results of a survey of Ohio ESOP companies and provides a detailed analysis of their characteristics.
7. Perestroika, Privatization, and Worker Ownership in the USSR, by Jacob Kerematsky and John Logue (1991). ISBN 0-933522-22-3. Kerematsky, a senior researcher at the USA-Canada Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, analyzes the process of privatization of enterprises and the role that employee ownership can play in the on-going transformation of the Soviet economy. Logue adds case studies of two enterprises which employees have leased from the state.
8. Managing Modern Capitalism: Industrial Renewal and Workplace Democracy in the United States and Western Europe, edited by M. Donald Hancock, John Logue, and Bernt Schiller, (1991). ISBN 0-275-94287-2. This volume compares the American experience with workplace democratization and industry policy to that in Germany, France, Britain and Sweden. Among the contributors to the book are prominent American and European academics and policy makers, including Ray Marshall (US), Rudolf Meidner (Sweden), and Franz Steinkueller (Germany).

Preprints, Reprints and Occasional Papers

Jim Bado, ed., The Case for Ownership: Ohio Case Studies 40 pp. revised (1993:1) Detailed case studies of successful Ohio employee-owned firms written by the staff of the Northeast Ohio Employee Ownership Center and supervisor's reflections on managing employee-owned firms by Mike Bailey, Bob Bracci, Jim Carroll, Nan Harshaw, John O'Leary, and Karl Reuther and Basil Zabek. Most of the case studies originally appeared in the NOEOC newsletter Owners at Work.

Jim Bado, Daniel Bell, Catherine Ivancic and John Logue, Making Your ESOP More Than Just a Piece of Paper: Creating an Ownership Culture 8 pp. (1992:1). A discussion of ownership training and the benefits to employee owners in helping them to better understand their roles as owners and their business. Originally presented at the State ESOP Association Chapter Meeting, 1992 Annual Meeting of the ESOP Association, Washington, D.C., May 1992.

Jim Bado and Daniel Bell, From Obstacles to Catalysts: Redefining the Role of Employee-Owner Supervisors 16 pp. (1992:2) To appear in The Journal of Employee Ownership Law and Finance, vol. 5, no. 1 (Winter 1993). A discussion of the role which supervisors play at employee-owned companies and a description of efforts by Ohio companies to help their supervisors adjust to employee involvement.

Jim Bado and Catherine Ivancic, Republic Engineered Steels, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America: Courageous Co-leadership in a Changing Environment 15 pp. (1993:2). This paper examines Republic's unique model of labor/management cooperation.

Jim Bado and John Logue, Hard Hats and Hard Decisions: The Evolving Union Role in Employee-Owned Firms. 23 pp. (1991: 4). A discussion of the role of the union in theory and in practice in employee-owned firms that draws on interviews with fifteen union leaders in eleven unionized Ohio firms. A slightly shorter version was published in The Journal of Employee Ownership Law and Finance, vol. 3, no. 2 (Spring 1991), pp. 3-50.

Jim Bado and John Logue, Organized Labor as Organized Owners: Employee Ownership and the American Labor Movement. 26 pp. (1992:3). This study discusses the union's role in creating and instituting collectively bargained for, democratic structures in employee-owned companies. Presented at the European Consortium for Political Research 1992 annual meeting.