Table 7A: Does Training Explain theWage-Involvement Relation?

Sample	All plants											
	Direct Emplyee Involveme		**ln(Unskilled Wage)**			**ln(Unskilled Wage)**			**Ln (Unskilled Wages)**		
	B	**SE**	**B**		**SE**	**B**		**SE**	**B**		**SE**
UNION	-0.089	0.122	0.124	**	0.027	0.118	**	0.024	0.122	**	0.024
Index of Training (z) * Nonunion	**0.084**	0.087				**0.013**		0.019	**0.008**		0.018
Index of Training (z) * Union	**0.081**	0.068				**0.015**		0.010	**0.014**		0.010
Direct employee involvement (z) * Nonunion			**0.050**	**	0.013				**0.049**	**	0.012
Direct employee involvement (z) * union			**0.019**		0.020				**0.017**		0.019
R ^{2}	*0.120*		*0.516*			*0.498*			*0.517*		
F-test of the equality of bold coefficients	*1.157*		*6.568*	**		*0.719*			*3.533*	**	
Sample size (n)	332		319			319			319		

Sample	Plants without recent hiring					
	ln(Unskilled Wage)		**Ln (Unskilled Wages)**		**ln(Unskilled Wage)**	
	B	**SE**	**B**	**SE**	**B**	**SE**
UNION	0.099	0.138	0.045	0.026	0.076	0.027
Index of Training (z) * nonunion			**-0.003**	0.021	**0.040**	0.019
Index of Training (z) * union			**0.058**	0.009	**0.054**	0.009
Direct employee involvement (z) * Nonunion	**0.066**	0.024			**0.071**	0.014
Direct employee involvement (z) * union	**0.065**	0.012			**0.051**	0.021
R ^{2}	***0.613***		***0.586***		***0.622***	
F-test of the equality of bold coefficients	*1.369*		*0.312*		*0.813*	
Sample size (n)	86		86		86	

Note: The coefficients on Direct Employee Involvement do not change by a statistically significant amount when the indices of training are added.

Note: All regressions controlled for workforce average age, a dummy for Canada, the % workforce with a high school diploma, Log (employment), Log (machines/ prodn. workers), the % workforce male, and the regional price index

Differences in Union/Nonunion coefficients were not significant