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Introduction

According to Tannenbaum (1965), "unions are organizations designed to promote and enhance the social and economic welfare of their members" (p. 710). Basically, unions were created to protect workers from exploitation. Unions originally sprang from abysmal working conditions 75 to 100 years ago. Workers got little pay, had almost no job security, had no benefits and perhaps worked under degrading and unsafe conditions. Unions gave unity and power to the employees. This power forced employers to deal with workers as a group, thereby providing a basis for improvements in welfare (Muchinsky, 1983, p. 502-506).

Today, twenty-two million American workers, or about 27 percent of the non-agricultural workforce, are represented by unions. This number fluctuates depending on the economic climate. The greatest growth period of unions in the United States coincided with a rapidly rising income level for worker's (Strauss & Sayles, 1980). An impressive number of employees believe that unions are responsible for improving their economic lot and join unions because they want to increase their income. For example, Quinn and Staines (1977) reported that both union and non-union members perceive improving wages and benefits, working conditions and job security respectively as the main outcomes of union membership. In addition, a recent national survey revealed that approximately one-third of nonunion employees expressed a preference for
union representation (Kochan, 1979). The source of discontent underlying this latent unionism, and whether its level is rising or stable, have not been fully investigated.

Empirical research on unionization and attitudes towards unions is experiencing renewed interest after nearly two decades of total neglect. Renewed interest in the area comes at a time when various factors seem to be altering traditional patterns of unionization. Some of these changes include the disappearance of rapid productivity and real wage growth in the seventies, the shift of industry to the less unionized "sunbelt," the changing workforce to include more females and better educated workers, diminishing private sector unionism contrasted with strong public sector union growth, increased personnel changes in union leadership and increased employer sophistication in union avoidance. In addition, aside from their intrinsic interest as large organizations, unions are thought to affect wages, fringe benefits, job tenure, productivity, and other economic variables as well as exerting a disproportionate influence on the political process through well-organized lobbying and campaign activities (Fiorito & Greer, 1982).

Representative Unionization Research

Most of the research on unionization has focused on three major categories of independent variables: namely, the context of work, employee attitudes towards unions, and personal characteristics of the worker (Kochan, 1978). While each category represents an area of interest for the study of the unionization process, few attempts have
been made to organize the variables into a comprehensive model of the unionization process. The purpose of this paper is to present an extension of such a model based on the research of DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981).

**Work Context**

Contextual variables have most often been operationalized as extrinsic job satisfaction, leadership style of the immediate superior and employee perceptions of influence over personally valent outcomes such as pay, benefits, and working conditions (DeCotiis & LeLouarn, 1981). In support of this Stampolis (1958) found that pro-union blue-collar workers were more dissatisfied with their pay, job security, plant safety, and the job itself than their anti-union peers. In addition, pro-union workers typically viewed their immediate supervisor as unfair, playing favorites, and as having insufficient authority to get things done. Herman (1973) reported similar findings with respect to extrinsic facets of job satisfaction and the quality of supervision. Schriesheim (1978) assessed the extent of association between union vote and ten facets of job satisfaction. His ten measures of job satisfaction were equally divided between what he labeled noneconomic (i.e., satisfaction with independence, variety, creativity, achievement, total noneconomic), and economic (i.e., satisfaction with job security, company policy, pay, working conditions, total economic) facets of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and union attitudes were measured by two scales developed by Uphoff and Dunnette (1956). Results indicated
that pro-union voting was negatively related to both total noneconomic satisfaction and total economic satisfaction. Likewise, Feuille and Blandin (1974) found that support for faculty collective bargaining was strongly correlated with dissatisfaction. Those individuals who expressed dissatisfaction with employment conditions (i.e., salary, fringe benefits, campus administration) were significantly more likely to express a preference for the establishment of a faculty collective bargaining system that were those respondents who were satisfied with these same conditions.

While replicating the above findings with respect to job satisfaction, Stagner and Rosen (1965), and later Kochan (1978), pointed to the typically modest relationship found between union phenomena and the facets of job satisfaction as suggestive of the potential explanatory importance of other variables in the study of unionization. That is, not all workers will initially turn to unions as a means for reducing dissatisfaction. Kochan based his thesis on the assumptions that (a) perceived influence over work contextual factors is important to workers, and (b) workers turn to external sources of influence such as a union only as a last resort. This assumption is supported by Brett (1980) who identified two main factors behind employee interest in unionization. One is based on dissatisfaction with working conditions and a perceived lack of influence to change those conditions. The second depends on whether they accept the principle of collective action and whether they believe unionization will yield positive rather than negative outcomes. In Brett's study, by knowing an employee's initial
satisfaction with their working conditions such as wages, job security, fringe benefits, treatment by supervisors, and chances for promotion, she could predict his/her vote with 75% accuracy.

In another study, Hammer and Smith (1978) used an attitude survey to measure various aspects of work satisfaction. The survey consisted of 42 items derived from eight scales which included Supervision, Kind of Work, Amount of Work, Career Future, Security, Financial Reward, Physical Surroundings, and Company Identification. Results indicated that the degree of dissatisfaction employees have with their work setting can predict the degree of success a union will have in getting the support of a majority of a potential bargaining unit. The most significant predictors of the severity of unionization activity were items dealing with the supervision one receives. Similarly Hammer and Berman (1981) investigated the importance of noneconomic factors (i.e., trust in administrative decision-making, desire for decision making power, satisfaction with the content of work, and satisfaction with economic issues) in relation to pro-union voting in a representative election of faculty members in a private college. Gamson's (1968) theory of power, discontent, and distrust served as the theoretical framework for explaining union voting. The questionnaire contained measures of trust in administrative decision making, satisfaction with work, the importance of various issues in collective bargaining, information about union voting and demographic characteristics. Several items from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were also used to measure job content satisfaction and satisfaction with job security and
salary (i.e., economic satisfaction). Results indicated that the most important contributor to a pro-union vote was the lack of trust in administrative decision making and dissatisfaction with job content. The data further showed that the proportion of faculty members ranking salary increases as most important in initial negotiations was significantly larger among the anti-union than among the pro-union voters.

Union Attitudes

Attitudes toward unions typically have been assessed as a general affect toward unions and, less often, in specific terms such as the instrumentality of a union for obtaining valent outcomes. The latter focus stresses the concept of a union as an organization entity instrumental to the attainment of valent outcomes. One of the best propositions for guiding an analysis of how individual workers approach the decision to join or not join a union is a statement by E. Wight Bakke (1945) as follows:

The worker reacts favorably to union membership in proportion to the strength of his belief that this step will reduce his frustrations and anxieties and will further his opportunities relevant to the achievement of his standards of successful living. He reacts unfavorably in proportion to the strength of his belief that this step will increase his frustrations and anxieties and will reduce his opportunities relevant to the achievement of such standards (p. 37).

Empirical support for this perspective has been provided by Getman, Goldberg, and Herman (1976) who measured employee's attitudes toward unions as a predictor of actual vote in a representation election.
The correlation between union attitudes and vote was .62. Favorable attitudes towards unions in general create a strong predisposition to vote for union representation. Gordon and Long (1981) measured demographic and attitudinal correlates of joining a union in a sample of white-collar, non-professional workers. Three subscales from Uphoff and Dunnette's (1956) Union Attitude Questionnaire were administered in addition to a union-sponsored membership survey which is fully described in Gordon et al. (1980). Results indicated that pay and working conditions were the most important reasons for joining, while union membership as a positive factor in merit and efficiency ranked second. Analysis of variance was utilized to determine whether the importance attached to each person for joining the union was related to subsequent member satisfaction with, and attitudes toward, the union. A significant main effect indicated that differences in member satisfaction or attitudes are associated with the level of importance assigned to a particular reason for joining. Reasons ranged from a positive factor in merit and efficiency to being pressured by members of the union to sign up.

In a similar study Pestonjee, Singh and Singh (1981) measured attitude towards unions in relation to morale and job involvement. Worker's attitude towards union was measured by the U-scale (Pestonjee, Singh, and Singh, 1979); job involvement was measured by Lodahl and Kejner's job involvement scale adapted by Kapoor and Singh (1978) and morale was measured by the Employees Morale Scale developed by Pestonjee (1973). Results indicated that pro-union workers have lower morale and
job involvement whereas workers with less favorable attitudes toward the union have higher morale and job involvement. Additional support is provided by Bigoness (1978) who found that faculty members attitudes toward collective bargaining were found to be progressively more favorable, the greater their dissatisfaction pertaining to present work, pay, promotions and supervision. In addition, faculty members who were highly involved in their jobs were found to be less favorably disposed toward collective bargaining than their less job-involved colleagues.

In terms of instrumental perceptions, Kochan (1978) reported that of several independent variables studied, the strongest relationships were found between a measure of union instrumentality and the propensity to unionize ($r=0.35; 0.32$, $p<0.01$ for blue- and white-collar workers, respectively). In another study, Vaid (1965) identified the major causes for a positive union vote among Indian textile workers as a general pro-union mental set and the perception on the part of the workers that the union would be instrumental to the attainment of outcomes such as higher wages, job security, and protection from arbitrary treatment by management. Herman (1973) also found that pro-union workers viewed a union as instrumental to the attainment of fair treatment, better wages, hours, and working conditions. Likewise Brett (1980) found that the most important factor accounting for employees' interest in unionization lies in their belief in the instrumentality of unions. Dissatisfied employees tended not to vote for unionization if they believed the union was unlikely to improve the working conditions that dissatisfied them. Conversely, even some of the employees who were
satisfied voted for representation because they believed the union was likely to improve conditions. DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981) in their study, tried to predict voting behavior based on union instrumentality and work perceptions. Results indicated that union instrumentality was the single largest correlate of both voting intent and actual vote ($r = .76$ and $.67$ respectively). The next strongest correlate of intent and actual vote was an index of extrinsic job satisfaction ($r = -.40$ and $.38$ respectively). In addition, the relationship between instrumentality and extrinsic job satisfaction was strong and in the expected direction ($r = -.55$), suggesting that dissatisfaction does indeed initiate a search for alternative sources of influence (Kochan, 1978; Brett, 1980).

**Personal Characteristics**

Several personal characteristics have been reported in the literature, including sex, age, race, tenure, hours worked, and prior voting behavior (Getman, Goldberg, and Herman, 1976). In their study favorable attitudes towards unions in general were slightly more characteristic of minority group members, younger employees, and supporters of the Democratic party. Also, employees who had voted for union representation in a previous NLRB election were more favorable toward unions in general ($r = .55$), suggesting that favorable attitudes toward unions remain consistent. Older employees were slightly more satisfied than younger employees ($r = .13$). The relationship of demographic and job experience characteristics to intent and vote are similar to their relationship to attitudes. Age, race, wage rate, and tenure correlate significantly, though not strongly. The only contrary
trends were with respect to race. In all elections but two, a higher proportion of black employees than white employees were in favor of union representation.

Likewise, Feuille and Blandin (1974) found that support for collective bargaining was strongly correlated with dissatisfaction and several demographic variables. A clear majority of all academic ranks, tenured and non-tenured, favored collective bargaining. However, junior faculty were significantly more in favor of bargaining than were the senior faculty. Similarly, nontenured respondents were significantly more in favor of bargaining than were those with tenure. Teachers were found to be significantly more in favor of a collective bargaining system than were those with formal administrative positions. Similarly, the teaching faculty had a significantly stronger belief in the efficacy of collective bargaining for protection against the deterioration of faculty employment conditions than did the administrators. Females were more restrained than were males on both their enthusiasm for bargaining and opposition to bargaining. Results also indicated that married faculty with children were the strongest supporters of bargaining. Additional support for personal characteristics has been provided by Blinder (1972) who found sex, age, occupation, and family size to be associated with union membership; specifically, he indicates that males, older workers, operatives, and members of large families are more likely to be members of unions than are females, craftsmen, or laborers, and members of small families. Likewise, Blum and Solling (1972) studied a group of female Danish white-collar workers and found that of
several personal characteristics assessed, only hours worked per week was associated (positive) with union membership. Alutto and Belasco (1974) in their study of attitudinal militancy among nurses and teachers found that among the variables tested, age was the single best predictor of attitudinal militancy, accounting for as much as 31 percent of the variance in attitudes toward professional associations. Results indicated that older, but shorter-service employees, have relatively favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining and professional associations, whereas younger, longer-service employees have more favorable attitudes toward strikes. Kochan (1978) found race to be a statistically significant correlate of the propensity to unionize, with non-whites being twice as disposed to unionize as whites.

DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981) indicated that, although personal characteristics were not supported in their study as a significant independent variable, it may be that the right personal characteristics have not been included in prior or present research. They further stated that certain personality variables are important determinants of instrumentality perceptions. They suggested Murray's (Hall & Lindzey, 1967) nAffiliation and nSuccorance dimensions of personality. With respect to affiliation, their reasoning is as follows: the essence of this needs is voluntary cooperation or reciprocity with an allied other who resembles the individual in some meaningful way. If we allow that a source of such similarity is work and the organization in which that work occurs, then an individual who is characterized by high nAffiliation would be likely to respond positively to the unionization process. This response is highly probable if the individual perceives a
union to be instrumental to the attainment of organizationally mediated outcomes such as a sense of belonging or solidarity. As the label implies, the need for succorance has to do with having one's needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of a protective ally and supporter. An individual who is high on this need seeks out sources of protection and gratification. To the extent that the individual views a union as instrumental to meeting these needs, he or she would be expected to hold positive attitudes toward unions, be predisposed to vote pro-union, and actually vote pro-union if provided the opportunity.

This assumption has been substantiated by research conducted by Cangemi, Clark and Harryman (1976) using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as a comparison of pro-union and pro-company employees. Their subjects were a groups of 43 essentially hostile and negative employees who voiced strong dissent against the company and a group of 19 pro-company employees. Three needs tended to distinguish strongly between pro-company/pro-union groups. These three needs were achievement, endurance and succorance. Pro-company employees, on the average had a greater need to do their best and be successful (achievement). In addition, they had a greater need to work hard and complete their tasks (endurance). Generally, pro-union employees had a significantly greater need for personal attention and sympathy (succorance). Whenever this need is not satisfied by the company the employee rectifies the situation by an endorsement of the union.

In a related study, Odewahn and Petty (1980) compared measures of job satisfaction, role stress and personal competence between union
members and nonmembers. They hypothesized that the pro-union employee is one who is dissatisfied with his/her job, one who is experiencing role stress at work, and who possesses relatively low levels of self-esteem, and that it may be possible that subsequent union membership reduces the levels of these dimensions. However, Odewahn and Petty (1980) further hypothesized that the rise in union decertification elections (Fulmer, 1978) may be symptomatic of union members unfulfilled expectations, and union members should continue to possess more negative job attitudes in comparison to nonmembers. Specifically, they hypothesized that union members should have higher levels of job stress and lower levels of personal competence. Job satisfaction was measured by the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Role stress was measured by a 13-item job related tension and anxiety scale, an 8-item role conflict scale, and a 6-item role clarity scale (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). The respondents' perception of their personal competence was obtained by using a scale containing 23 items (Wagner & Morse, 1975). This latter measure refers particularly to an individual's feelings and confidence about his abilities in mastering an organizational and work setting. Individuals scoring low on this scale feel that they have little power to influence the work setting. All three hypotheses were supported. Union members reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction with work and pay than did nonmembers. They also reported higher levels of job-related tension and anxiety and role conflict than did nonmembers.
In a similar study, Bigoness (1978) measured faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining using Rotter's locus of control scale, Lodahl and Kejner's job involvement instrument and the Job Descriptive Index. In addition, several demographic variables including sex, age, salary and college of employment were utilized. Results confirmed the importance of personal characteristics regarding attitudes toward collective bargaining. Faculty members who were highly involved in their jobs were found to be less favorably disposed toward collective bargaining than their less job-involved colleagues. Externals, who perceive their fate as largely in the hands of significant others and beyond their control, felt a greater need for collective bargaining than internals. Also, older faculty members held less favorable attitudes toward unionism than their younger colleagues.

Summary

The above review indicates that many of the variables classified as context, attitudinal, or personal characteristics have been shown to be associated with unionization. The main problem with the literature is inconsistency in terms of the diversity of results for certain variables. Some theorists suggest that greatest reliance should be placed on the most inclusive studies (e.g., Kochan's 1979) which is based on the 1977 Quality of Employment (QES) data (Quinn & Staines, 1979). This generalization should be tempered with the recognition that there is considerable variation in dependent variables examined, and the more inclusive sets of exogenous variables are clearly not applicable to the specific questions addressed in each study.
Fiorito and Greer (1982) further indicate that the determinants of unionization emerge as neither fixed nor constantly changing. The literature suggests and in many cases concurs on the effects of a limited set of explanatory variables. At the same time, there is support in the literature for different points in time, or some specific analyses (e.g., for certain occupations) which require a reliance on unique sets of circumstances for satisfactory explanations of unionization, or at least require a recognition that the effects of some variables may gradually change over time.

DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981) have attempted to summarize the results despite the difficulty of comparisons between studies. First, empirical studies of union phenomena are of fairly recent interest to social scientists, the first study (Uphoff & Dunnette) being reported in 1956. Second, four variables (attitude, membership, intent, vote) have been most often studied, with few efforts to differentiate results in terms of the particular variable of interest. Third, the samples studies have ranged widely and included nonunion college students, union members, members of several occupational groups, and workers involved in the organizing process. Fourth, the magnitude and nature of the relationships obtained varies with the choice of the dependent variable, method(s) of analysis and the sample studied. For example, in correlational studies, extrinsic facets of job satisfaction seem to be most important regardless of the choice of dependent variable, and especially so when the sample is blue-collar workers. However, when the dependent variable is actual vote and the method of analysis is multiple
regression, extrinsic job satisfaction appears to be of secondary importance when compared to independent variables such as intent to vote, attitudes towards unions, and instrumentality perceptions of unions. Fifth, regardless of the dependent variable used, most of the variance explained is accounted for by relatively few independent variables, notably, attitudes toward unions and extrinsic job satisfaction.
Research Models

Recent research involving unionization has become involved in developing theoretical models of the unionization process in order to circumvent a body of atheoretical literature and to help focus research attention on the key determinants of unionization, for the labor force in general and for specific groups. For example, Brief and Rude (1981) have developed a model of union certification voting behavior based on Fishbein's (1967) theory of behavioral intentions. Their model predicts that employees' attitudes toward voting for a union are influenced by their satisfaction with the economic facets of their jobs. Employees' general subjective norms toward unions are influenced by perceived expectations of the supervisor and co-workers, and by individual characteristics.

Similarly, Fossum (1982) developed a derivative of Vroom's expectancy theory (1964) to explain a worker's decision to join a union. Individuals assess what the likely outcomes of unionization are, whether each of these outcomes are positive or negative, and the likelihood that his or her working for or voting for a union will lead to the positive or negative outcomes. These outcomes may differ depending on individual differences between persons.

DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981) developed a model of the unionization process based on instrumentality theory (Vroom, 1964). An instrumentality concept of the unionization process suggests that an
individual behaves in ways, including voting behavior, that he or she perceives to be instrumental to the attainment of personally valent outcomes. Instrumentality perceptions are determined by work context variables and personal characteristics (Figure 1). Work context is a complex concept consisting of four major sets of variables: reactions to work, organizational climate, perceived organizational structure, and immediate supervision. Reactions to work are defined in terms of extrinsic facets of job satisfaction, job-related psychological stress, perceived influence over work-related outcomes, and role-conflict and ambiguity. Organizational climate is defined in terms of autonomy, support, recognition and fairness. Perceived organizational structure is defined in terms of centralization; and immediate supervision is defined in terms of leadership style and communications between the employee and the immediate supervisor. Personal characteristics were defined as commitment, age and education.

DeCotiis and LeLouarn studied voting behavior in a union representation election using union instrumentality and work perceptions as independent variables. The subjects were 95 registered nurses employed by a private hospital in the Northeast. Forty of the nurses had voted pro-union and 55 had voted anti-union in a representation election. Union instrumentality was measured by an eight item scale which assessed employee perceptions of the extent to which the presence of a union would result in better pay, benefits, working conditions, supervision, and fair treatment. As described before, the single largest correlate of both voting intent and actual vote was union instrumentality (r=.76 and -.67 respectively). The next strongest
Figure 1. A Model of the Determinants of the Unionization Process.
correlate of intent and actual vote was an index of extrinsic job satisfaction \((r=.40\) and \(.38\) respectively). In addition, the relationship between instrumentality and extrinsic job satisfaction was strong and in the expected direction \((r=.55)\). Among other studies supporting union instrumentality as a significant independent variable are Getman et al. (1970), Kochan (1979), and Brett (1980).

In their study DeCotiis and LeLouarn identified three issues that merit further consideration and investigation. The first issue has to do with the choice and identification of, and relationships among, the commonly investigated dependent variables. They suggest that much of the difficulty of systematically studying union phenomena stems from a lack of attention to the interdependent meaning of the dependent variables commonly studied. The second issue concerns the choice of the appropriate independent variables for the study of each of the dependent variables. The third issue has to do with the relative predictive power and explanatory value of the possible independent variables for the dependent variable of choice. It seems probable, for example, that there are meaningful causal relationships among the dependent variables commonly studied and that a given independent variable has different predictive implications for each of the dependent variables.

**Dependent Variables**

Four dependent variables dominate prior empirical research on union phenomena:


DeCotiis and LeLouarn indicate that if interest is centered on predicting actual vote, the choice should be voting intent. If however, interest is primarily in gaining an understanding of the process of how individuals become pro-union or evaluating the effects of representation campaigns, then the logical dependent variable of choice is attitudes toward unions. Fiorito and Greer (1982) suggest that given the importance of instrumentality perceptions and attitudinal variables reported in several studies, attention should be turned toward these measures as dependent variables. Since the use of instrumentality variables as predictors of voting behavior may in some instances verge on tautology, the more interesting question may be the determinants of these beliefs.

Independent Variables

While extrinsic facets of job satisfaction have typically been shown to be the most useful predictors of the unionization process, the
feeling persists that other potentially powerful predictors have not been adequately considered. For example, variables such as felt influence, equity perceptions, and leadership style have, with few exceptions (Stampolis, 1958; Kochan, 1978), received little in the way of theoretical or empirical attention. The simplistic assumption is, of course, that dissatisfied workers join unions.

The literature reviewed above is a rich source of possible inputs to this issue and suggests two broad categories of determinants, namely, work context variables and personal characteristics. Work context variables can be determined by organizational climate. While organizational climate has not been included in prior models of the unionization process, a strong argument for its inclusion can be made.

According to Schneider and Reichers (1983) the climate construct provides a useful alternative to motivational explanations of behavior at work and adds a needed emphasis on the importance of group phenomena in organizational research. The climate approach to understanding how work contexts affect behavior and attitudes, grounded as it is in perceptions, provides a much needed alternative to motivation theories as explanations of why people behave and respond the way they do (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976). According to Schneider and Reichers (1983) what motivationists, whether of the content (need) or process (instrumentality) persuasion, frequently fail to recognize is the key role that perceptions play in operationalizing these approaches. This is particularly true for instrumentality theories that combine perceptions of the likelihood of attaining some outcome with perceptions
of the probability that certain effort levels will lead to a particular level of performance in order to arrive at a summary estimate of motivation. However, employee perceptions of the likelihood of certain behaviors "paying off," in the sense that the action will be reinforced by the organization's reward structure, may be a good indicator of the climate for the particular behavior that the employee is considering. Thus, perceptions play an important role in both motivational and climate approaches to the understanding of behavior at work, and climate research has acknowledged this importance.

In addition, Schneider and Reichers (1983) purport that there is no sharp difference between the individual and the work context. They state that the individual and the environment mutually determine each other. In other words, individual newcomers change in response to their work environment (particularly in response to the attitudes and values held by others), while they also have an impact on the environment which causes it to change. This impact has been termed the personalization process (Schein, 1977). Hence, Schneider and Reichers indicate that climates arise within the interaction between people both during their initial socialization and as members of the work group.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) attempt to merge the concepts of motivation and organizational climate into a unified measure. Their concept of organizational climate has evolved out of an attempt to apply a theory of motivation to behavior in organizations. It provides a way of describing the effects of organizations and organizational life on the motivation of the individuals who work in these organizations. The concept of climate provides a useful bridge between theories of
individual motivation and behavior, on one hand, and organizational theories, on the other. Organizational climate for them refers to the perceived, subjective effects of the formal system, the informal "style" of managers, and other important environmental factors on the attitudes, beliefs, values, and motivation of people who work in a particular organization. This effort is an integrative approach to the understanding of motivational and organizational problems.

In terms of employee attitudes towards unions, there is a linkage between employee climate perceptions and behavior in that such perceptions serve as cues to what is acceptable or unacceptable behavior within the organization (Schneider, 1975). As a corollary to this effect, it may also be that climate perceptions serve to cue the employee with respect to the nature and content of organizational responses he or she can expect to felt needs and interests (DeCotiis & LeLouarn, 1981).

In addition to work contextual variables, another significant variable in the prediction of unionization is personal characteristics. Schneider and Reichers (1983) allude to the interactive effects of an individual's personal characteristics and his or her response to the work environment. Fossum (1982) suggests that a worker's decision to join a union varies in part as a function of individual differences between persons. Likewise, Brief and Rude (1981) indicate that an employee's general subjective norm toward unions is influenced to a certain extent by individual characteristics. DeCotiis and LeLouarn
(1981) in their model of the determinants of the unionization process suggest a link between work contextual variables, personal characteristics and union instrumentality perceptions. The present study was therefore undertaken to assess the relationship between personal and work contextual variables and union membership and instrumentality based on the model developed by DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981). In their study, union instrumentality and work perceptions were the independent variables, while voting behavior in a representation election was the dependent variable.

This study attempts to examine the effects of organizational climate and personal characteristics on membership in a union and on instrumentality perceptions. In terms of unionization, it has become a widely accepted paradigm that employees join unions because of dissatisfaction with several facets of the job. This is because dissatisfaction with the organization usually leads an employee to alternative means of exerting influence over the management. It would be expected therefore, that dissatisfaction with various facets of the job would lead to an endorsement of the union and hence the perception that a union would be useful in alleviating present conditions.

In terms of personal characteristics, it is expected that both union members and those who perceive unions to be instrumental would be more sociable, less emotionally stable, less ascendant and less responsible than their non-union counterparts. This assumption is based
on the research of Cangemi et al. (1976) in which they found similar personality measures as being able to differentiate between pro-union and pro-company employees.

In addition, several employee characteristics such as sex, age, race, education, marital status and dependents were included. It is expected that males show a greater propensity to unionize because of the greater attachment to the work force by men. It is also expected that there would be a preference for unions by minorities because of a union's egalitarian policies. It is also expected that younger workers may be more militant and thus more likely to become union members. In terms of marital status and number of dependents, it is expected that employees with greater family responsibilities are more likely to favor unions. In terms of experience, inexperienced workers are least likely to benefit from rigid seniority arrangements. Also, education would be expected to correlate negatively with unionism. This is because educated workers generally have greater individual bargaining power and thus a lesser need for collective action. This rationale concerning the importance of demographic data has been expounded by Fiorito and Greer (1982) in their comprehensive review of the determinants of U.S. unionism.

Specifically, the following research hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis 1.** Union members experience (a) greater degrees of organization structure (b) lower levels of responsibility (c) lower levels of reward (d) lower levels of risk (e) lower levels of warmth (f) lower levels of support (g) lower levels of standards (h) higher levels of conflict and (i) lower levels of identity in the organization than their non-union counterparts.
Hypothesis 2. Union members are characterized by (a) lower levels of ascendancy (b) lower levels of responsibility (c) lower levels of emotional stability and (d) higher levels of sociability.

Hypothesis 3. Union members are more likely to be (a) male (b) under forty (c) minority (d) married (e) with dependents (f) less than $15,000 (g) have less than a high school education (h) less than five years organization tenure (i) less than five years position tenure (j) be Catholic and (k) vote Democrat.

Hypothesis 4. Respondents who perceive unions to be instrumental, experience (a) greater degrees of organization structure (b) lower levels of responsibility (c) lower levels of reward (d) lower levels of risk (e) lower levels of warmth (f) lower levels of support (g) lower levels of standards (h) higher levels of conflict and (i) lower levels of identity in the organization than their non-instrumental counterparts.

Hypothesis 5. Respondents who perceive unions to be instrumental are characterized by (a) lower levels of ascendancy (b) lower levels of responsibility (c) lower levels of emotional stability and (d) higher levels of sociability.

Hypothesis 6. Respondents who perceive unions to be instrumental are more likely to be (a) male (b) under forty (c) minority (d) married (e) with dependents (f) earn less than $15,000 (g) have less than a high school education (h) less than five years organization tenure (i) less than five years position tenure (j) be Catholic and (k) vote Democratic.
Method

Subjects

Participants in the study were taken from a cross-section of organizations in Central Florida. This included the hospitality industry, a manufacturing company, a high-technology company and a local union, comprising the Industrial sample; and Faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Central Florida.

Twenty-one members of the Faculty completed the questionnaires. Of those sampled, a predominant number were male (80%), over 40 (60%), with less than two dependents (56%) and had more than five years of organization tenure (84%). In addition, a majority indicated their religious denomination to be Protestant (48%) and their political affiliation to be Democrat (52%). Fifty-two percent belonged to the union, while 64% indicated they would vote for union representation if an election were held by secret ballots. The variables race, income and education were eliminated from any analysis in the Faculty sample because of the unitary nature of the responses, i.e., there were no minorities, all earned over $15,000 and all had more than a high school education.

The proportions of the Industrial sample were more evenly distributed in terms of sex, age and income. However, there was much less variability with respect to race (92% non-minority), marital status
(63% married), education (59% more than high school education),
religious denomination (59% Protestant), and political affiliation (57%
Democrat). A total of 70 respondents completed the questionnaires.

Procedure

The subjects in the Industrial sample were selected from a number
of organizations in Central Florida area, including two local unions,
based on a list compiled by the local Chamber of Commerce. A total of
130 questionnaires were distributed to the five organizations with a
53.9% response rate. Of those questionnaire returned, several had
missing data and subsequently had to be eliminated from the analysis.

In all cases, the questionnaires were distributed by the
organization, with employees being instructed to complete the survey
during off-duty hours. The nature and intent of the study was conveyed,
as well as the anonymity of results. In addition, the cover page to the
questionnaire identified it as university-sponsored research and
guaranteed the respondents complete anonymity.

In addition to the Industrial sample, 168 questionnaires were
distributed to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at the
University of Central Florida. Questionnaires were distributed to the
various departments and respondents were requested to complete and
return them within a seven-day time period. There was a 15% response
rate.
Measures

Organizational climate was measured by a 50-item climate questionnaire developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968), Appendix. This instrument provides data on nine areas of climate -- structure, responsibility, reward, risk, warmth, support, standards, conflict, and identity. Union instrumentality was measured by a five-item scale which assessed the extent to which unions are instrumental to the attainment of personally valent outcomes. These questions were based on items developed by DeCotiis and LeLouarn (1981) and are as follows:

1. A union helps employees to get better wages.
2. A union helps employees get the kind of benefits they want.
3. A union is useful in getting working conditions improved.
4. A union helps employees get a fair hearing on their problems.
5. A union helps employees get a fair shake from management.

In addition five other items which expressed negative characteristics of unions were included so as not to bias the responses by creating a positive mental set towards unions. These items were taken from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn & Staines, 1979). They are as follows:

1. A union takes advantage of employees.
2. A union does nothing or very little for employees.
3. A union does not give members their money's worth for the dues they pay.
4. A union has leaders who do what is best for themselves rather than what is best for their members.
5. A union requires employees to go along with decisions they don't like.

These questions were randomized among the 50-item climate questionnaire. The last five items were eliminated from the analysis however, because of the ambiguity of the results and the lack of
additional inference that could be gained by their inclusion. Their primary purpose was as a means of response set control.

Both the climate questionnaire and the questions on union instrumentality were scored on a 4-point Likert-type response system, where the subjects could answer Definitely Agree, Inclined to Agree, Inclined to Disagree and Definitely Disagree. Items were scored 1,2,3,4, and the sum of the scores of the items in a scale was the scale score.

In addition, Section II of the climate questionnaire consisted of 15 items regarding demographic data such as sex, age, race, income, education and union membership.

Personality characteristics were measured by the Gordon Personal Profile (GPP), developed by Leonard V. Gordon (1953). The booklet consists of 72 items grouped in tetrads which consist of descriptions of personal characteristics of people. Respondents are asked to examine each set and find one description that is most like them and one description that is least like them. Scores are obtained by summing the scores for each scale by the use of a scoring key. This instrument provides data on four elements of personality — ascendancy, responsibility, emotional stability, and sociability.

Method of Analysis

Raw scores on the Gordon Personal Profile were converted to standard scores with a mean of 25 and a standard deviation of 5. This was necessary because of the inappropriateness of the normative data in the manual for the present comparison group.
A score for union instrumentality was derived by summing across the five items and considering those scores of 10 or less as instrumental and those scores of more than 10 as not being instrumental.

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using t-test, correlational analysis and chi square. Multiple regression and discriminant analysis were not performed on the data because of the insufficient number of items in the scales of the climate questionnaire, the dichotomy of the dependent variables and the discreteness of Likert scaling.

In addition because some of the cells had expected counts less than five in the chi square analysis, Fisher's exact test was substituted because of its appropriateness for small sample sizes. This was especially the case for the Faculty sample which had a sample size of 21. Also, because of the insufficient number in each cell for marital status, the variables Never Married and Previously Married were combined to equal Not Married. Further, the nine climate variables were divided into high and low scores in order that chi square values could be determined for their individual relationships with union membership and instrumentality perceptions.
Results

The first hypothesis tested the difference between union and non-union members in relation to the nine climate variables. Warmth and conflict were the two variables the differentiated between union and non-union members for the Industrial group. In terms of warmth ($\chi^2=9.51$, $p<.05$), union members indicated that there was a lack of general good fellowship in the work group atmosphere, as well as the absence of friendly and informal social groups. In regard to conflict ($\chi^2=5.34$, $p<.05$), union members indicated their perceptions to be that managers and other workers did not want to hear different opinions and that the emphasis was on smoothing problems over and ignoring them, rather than getting them out in the open. Table 1 summarizes these results.

For the Faculty, two climate variables distinguished between union and non-union members. They were reward and support. In regard to reward ($p=.05$), Faculty union members indicated lower perceptions of the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done, lower perceptions of positive rewards rather than punishments, and lower perceptions of the fairness of pay and promotion policies. In terms of support ($p=.05$), they indicated a lack of helpfulness from superiors and other employees in the work group, and a lack of mutual support from above and below. Table 2 summarizes the results.
In addition, a total climate score was obtained by summing across the nine variables. T-values were determined for both the Industrial group and Faculty in terms of union versus non-union membership. A t-value of .09 (p=.93) was obtained for the Industrial group, while a t-value of -.18 (p=.86) was obtained for the Faculty. These results indicated that global measures of climate may be meaningless in the prediction of union membership.

The second hypothesis tested the relationship between four personality measures and union versus non-union membership. Table 3 summarizes the results for the Industrial group, which indicated that there were no significant differences between union members and non-members in terms of personality characteristics.

Table 4 summarizes the results of the Faculty in relation to personality characteristics of union versus non-union members. A single variable differentiated between union and non-union members, namely, responsibility (t=-2.35, p<.05). This result indicates that union members are unable to stick to tasks that do not interest them, are less persevering and determined and less reliable than their non-union counterparts.

The third hypothesis tested the relationship between union and non-union members in terms of demographic characteristics. Four variables attained statistical significance for the Industrial group. They were namely, income, organization tenure, position tenure and political affiliation. In terms of income (χ²=16.18, p<.01), union members from the Industrial sample were more likely to earn more than
$15,000 per year (82.76%), compared to those who earned less than $15,000 per year (17.24%). Results further indicated that union members were more likely to be employed for greater than five years ($^2=12.83$, $p < .01$), and have been in the position for more than five years ($^2=5.34$, $p < .05$). In addition, Democrats are more likely to be union members than Republicans ($^2=10.17$, $p = .01$), such that 82.14% of the sample of union members were Democrats.

For the Faculty, two variables accounted for significant differences between union and non-union members, namely sex and organization tenure. In terms of sex ($p < .05$), females were more likely to be union members than males. In regard to organization tenure, those individuals who have been employed for five years or less are more likely to be union members than those individuals with longer tenure ($p < .05$). Table 6 summarizes these results.

The fourth hypothesis tested the relationship of respondents who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in terms of the nine dimensions of organizational climate. For the Industrial sample, there were no significant differences between these two groups on any of the climate variables. Table 7 summarizes these results. For the Faculty sample, all of the climate variables failed to attain statistical significance for the instrumental versus non-instrumental groups. Table 8 summarizes these results.

Here also, a total climate score was obtained by summing across the nine variables in relation to instrumentality versus non-instrumentality. There was a $t$-value of 0.08 ($p = .94$) for the
Industrial group and a t-value of 1.37 (p=.18) for the Faculty. These results corroborate the previous results, which indicated that global measures of organizational climate may be meaningless in the prediction of union instrumentality.

The fifth hypothesis tested the relationship of individuals who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in relation to the four measures of personality. For the Industrial group, there were no significant differences between those individuals who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in relation to personality characteristics. Table 9 summarizes these results. Likewise, for the Faculty, there were no significant differences between those individuals who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in terms of personality characteristics. Table 10 summarizes these results.

The sixth hypothesis tested the relationship of individuals who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in terms of demographic characteristics. Three variables were statistically significant. They were namely, income, organization tenure and position tenure. In terms of income, those individuals earning more than $15,000 per year were more likely to perceive unions to be instrumental ($\chi^2=16.48, \ p<.01$). In relation to organization tenure, those individuals who had been employed for more than five years ($\chi^2=11.44, \ p<.01$) were more likely to perceive unions as being instrumental than those with less position tenure. Likewise, employees with five years or more in their present position were more likely to perceive unions as
being instrumental than those with less position tenure ($\chi^2=9.87, p<.01$).
Table 11 summarizes these results.

For the Faculty sample, there were no significant differences between those individuals who perceived unions to be instrumental and those who did not, in terms of demographic characteristics. In addition, due to inadequate cell size, it was inappropriate to interpret chi square values for religion and political affiliation. Table 12 summarizes these results.
Table 1: Chi square values of Climate for the Industrial Group on Union Vs. Non-union Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher’s exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 2: Chi square values of Climate for the Faculty on Union Vs. Non-union Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher’s exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 3: T-values of Personality Characteristics for the Industrial Group on Union Vs. Non-union Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality characteristics</th>
<th>X Union Members</th>
<th>X Non-union Members</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: T-values of Personality Characteristics for the Faculty on Union Vs. Non-Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>X Union Members</th>
<th>X Non-union Members</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Chi square values of Demographic Characteristics for the Industrial Group on Union Vs. Non-union Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Tenure</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 6: Chi square values of Demographic Characteristics for the Faculty on Union Vs. Non-union Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 7: Chi square values of Climate for the Industrial Group on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 8: Chi square values of Climate for the Faculty on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 9: T-values of Personality Characteristics for the Industrial Group on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality characteristics</th>
<th>( \bar{X} ) Union Members</th>
<th>( \bar{X} ) Non-union Members</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: T-values of Personality Characteristics for the Faculty on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>X Union Members</th>
<th>X Non-union Members</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Chi square values of Demographic Characteristics for the Industrial Group on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Tenure</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Table 12: Chi square values of Demographic Characteristics for the Faculty on Instrumentality Vs. Non-instrumentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Due to small cell frequency, the one-tailed Fisher's exact test was substituted for Chi square values.
Discussion

The preceding results support the literature, and in some ways departs from it. In fact, this has been one of the many problems with research on unions -- the inconsistency in terms of the results for certain variables. According to Fiorito and Greer (1982), the determinants of unionization are neither fixed nor constantly changing, and a satisfactory explanation of the process may require a reliance on a unique set of circumstances.

For example, in the present study results indicate that different factors account for the prediction of union membership and instrumentality perceptions on the climate variable. For the Industrial group, warmth and conflict were the significant variables, while for the Faculty reward and support were significant. Although climate may be an important determinant of union membership, it may be necessary to investigate variables in terms of occupational status. In this study, results indicate that within a specific occupational group, different climate variables accounted for union membership, indicating that members of different occupational groups have different reasons for becoming union members.

In terms of instrumentality perceptions for the Industrial group, warmth and identity approached significance, while for the Faculty risk and support approached significance. This difference between union
membership and instrumentality permeate the study, indicating that differences exist between individuals who are members of unions and those who perceive unions to be instrumental to the attainment of personally valent outcomes. This may be because members become disappointed or disillusioned with the union upon becoming members. This has been supported by Fulmer (1978) who indicates that there is growing dissatisfaction among union members, as evidenced by the increasing number of decertification elections.

However, there is some overlap among these variables. Warmth appears to be the common factor for the Industrial group, while support appears to be the common factor for the Faculty. In addition, these variables are more significant for union membership than for instrumentality perceptions. This may be because union members have stronger sentiments about the organization than those individuals who perceive unions to be instrumental.

Several studies have supported the importance of instrumentality perceptions (Kochan, 1978; Brett, 1980), and this study lends support to the importance of instrumentality perceptions in the unionization process as well as to the indication that different factors are responsible for employee perceptions based on occupational status. The importance of occupation in relation to instrumentality perceptions and union membership has been supported by Kochan (1979), in which he found that job-content was the most important reason for white-collar workers while "bread-and-butter" issues were the most important reasons for blue-collar workers for joining unions.
The hypotheses were also partially supported in terms of personality characteristics for both groups. For the Faculty, there appears to be an inverse relationship between union membership and responsibility and emotional stability. This indicates that Faculty who are union members are less stable emotionally and less responsible than their non-union counterparts. There were no comparable results for instrumentality perceptions. This may be because those individuals who perceive unions to be instrumental consist of both union members and non-members. The inclusion of non-union members could possibly have nullified the effect of the personality characteristics. For the industrial group none of the personality variables were significant. It appears therefore that personality characteristics are not related to union membership and instrumentality perceptions for industrial groups. This result contradicts previous results by Cangemi et al. (1976) in which they found significant difference between pro-company and pro-union employees.

In terms of demographic characteristics for the Industrial sample, it appears that four variables are highly significant: income, organizational tenure, position tenure and political affiliation. This applies to both union membership and instrumentality perceptions. However, some of these results do not agree with the literature. For example, union members are likely to be among the group earning more than $15,000 per year. In most instances the reverse is true. For the Faculty, sex, organization tenure were significant. These findings are consistent with research by Getman et al. (1976), in which sex, age,
race, tenure and hours worked were found to correlate with union membership. Other studies have supported the importance of demographic characteristics including Feuille and Blandin (1974), Blinder (1972), Blum and Solling (1972), Alutto and Belasco (1974) and Kochan (1978). However, in each of these studies, different characteristics were tested, and the samples were varied, making cross-comparisons difficult. Despite this factor, certain factors seem to recur, namely sex, age, race and family size.

The results of this study partially support the importance of organizational climate and personality characteristics as predictors for union membership and instrumentality perception. The most significant results appear however to be for demographic characteristics. It may be that the sample size was too small for many of the variables to attain significance. Future studies should include larger sample sizes and also focus on occupational status as a major influence in the unionization process.

In addition it may be advantageous to focus on specific occupations over repeated trials and tests using the same instruments in order to determine if the effects are consistent. It is difficult to make inferences from one population to the other because of the manipulation of different dependent and independent variables. It may be necessary to control these variables while manipulating the samples, in order to make valid inferences about the prediction of unionization.
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Appendix
RESEARCH SURVEY

This survey is being conducted for research purposes only, in partial completion of a Master of Science degree in Industrial Psychology at the University of Central Florida.

Answers to all questions are voluntary and they will be kept completely confidential. Information that might identify you will never be seen by anyone outside the psychology department at the University of Central Florida.

Section I of this survey is taken from Motivation and Organizational Climate by George H. Litwin and Robert A. Stringer, Jr. (1968).
SECTION I

Check the response you choose as the answer.

1. The jobs in this Organization are clearly defined and logically structured.

2. In this Organization it is sometimes unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision.

3. The policies and organization structure of the Organization have been clearly explained.

4. Red-tape is kept to a minimum in this Organization.

5. A union takes advantage of employees.

6. Excessive rules, administrative details, and red-tape make it difficult for new and original ideas to receive consideration.

7. Our productivity sometimes suffers from lack of organization and planning.

8. In some of the projects I've been on, I haven't been sure exactly who my boss was.

9. Our management isn't so concerned about formal organization and authority, but concentrates instead on getting the right people together to do the job.

10. A union helps employees to get better wages.

11. We don't rely too heavily on individual judgment in this Organization; almost everything is double-checked.

12. Around here management resents your checking everything with them; if you think you've got the right approach you just go ahead.

13. Supervision in this Organization is mainly a matter of setting guidelines for your subordinates; you let them take responsibility for the job.

14. A union does nothing or very little for employees.

15. You won't get ahead in this Organization unless you stick your neck out and try things on your own sometimes.

16. Our philosophy emphasizes that people should solve their problems by themselves.

17. There are an awful lot of excuses around here when somebody makes a mistake.
18. One of the problems in this Organization is that individuals won't take responsibility.

19. A union does not give members their money's worth for the dues they pay.

20. We have a promotion system here that helps the best man to rise to the top.

21. In this Organization the rewards and encouragements you get usually outweigh the threats and the criticism.

22. In this Organization people are rewarded in proportion to the excellence of their job performance.

23. There is a great deal of criticism in this Organization.

24. There is not enough reward and recognition given in this Organization for doing good work.

25. If you make a mistake in this Organization you will be punished.

26. The philosophy of our management is that in the long run we get ahead fastest by playing it slow, safe, and sure.

27. Our business has been built up by taking calculated risks at the right time.

28. Decision making in this Organization is too cautious for maximum effectiveness.

29. Our management is willing to take a chance on a good idea.

30. We have to take some pretty big risks occasionally to keep ahead of the competition in the business we're in.

31. A union helps employees get the kind of benefits they want.

32. A friendly atmosphere prevails among the people in this Organization.

33. This Organization is characterized by a relaxed, easy-going working climate.

34. It's very hard to get to know people in this Organization.

35. People in this Organization tend to be cool and aloof toward each other.

36. There is a lot of warmth in the relationships between management and workers in this Organization.
37. You don't get much sympathy from higher-ups in this Organization if you make a mistake.

38. A union is useful in getting working conditions improved.

39. Management makes an effort to talk with you about your career aspirations within the Organization.

40. People in this Organization don't really trust each other enough.

41. When I am on a difficult assignment I can usually count on getting assistance from my boss and co-workers.

42. The philosophy of our management emphasizes the human factor, how people feel, etc.

43. In this Organization we set very high standards for performance.

44. Our management believes that no job is so well done that it couldn't be done better.

45. Around here there is a feeling of pressure to continually improve our personal and group performance.

46. A union has leaders who do what is best for themselves rather than what is best for their members.

47. Management believes that if the people are happy, productivity will take care of itself.

48. To get ahead in this Organization it's more important to get along than it is to be a high performer.

49. In this Organization people don't seem to take much pride in their performance.

50. The best way to make a good impression around here is to steer clear of open arguments and disagreements.

51. A union requires employees to go along with decisions they don't like.

52. The attitude of our management is that conflict between competing units and individuals can be very healthy.

53. We are encouraged to speak our minds, even if it means disagreeing with our superiors.

54. A union helps employees get a fair hearing on their problems.
55. In management meetings the goal is to arrive at a decision as smoothly and quickly as possible.

56. People are proud of belonging to this Organization.

57. I feel that I am a member of a well functioning team.

58. A union helps employees get a fair shake from management.

59. As far as I can see, there isn't very much personal loyalty to the company.

60. In this Organization people pretty much look out for their own interests.

SECTION II

Circle the number you choose as the answer.

1. Are you  (1) Male (2) Female

2. How old are you?
   (1) 18-40
   (2) Over 40

3. Are you a member of a non-white minority?
   (1) Yes (2) No

4. What is your marital status?
   (1) Married
   (2) Never married
   (3) Previously married
5. How many dependents do you have, i.e., others who depend on you for financial support?
   (1) Less than two
   (2) Two or more

6. What is your annual income?
   (1) $15,000 or less
   (2) More than $15,000

7. How much education have you had?
   (1) High school or less
   (2) More than high school

8. How long have you been employed by this Organization?
   (1) Five years or less
   (2) More than five years

9. How long have you been in this position?
   (1) Five years or less
   (2) More than five years

10. What is the size of your place of employment?
    (1) Five hundred or less
    (2) More than 500

11. What is your religious affiliation?
    (1) Protestant
    (2) Catholic
    (3) Other
12. What is your political affiliation?
   (1) Republican
   (2) Democrat
   (3) Other

13. Do you belong to a union?
   (1) Yes  (2) No

14. If an election were held with secret ballots, would you vote for or against having a union or employees association represent you?
   (1) Vote for union representation
   (2) Vote against union representation

15. What is your brief job title?

   ________________________________