

Stressful Working Conditions and Union Dissatisfaction

Graham S. Lowe, Ph.D.

*Department of Sociology, University of Alberta and
Visiting Research Associate, Industrial Relations Centre,
Queen's University*

Herbert Northcott, Ph.D

*Department of Sociology
University of Alberta*

ISBN: 0-88886-396-9
Printed and bound in Canada.
December 1993

Industrial Relations Centre
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario
Canada K7L 3N6

© 1993 Queen's University IRC

Acknowledgement: We wish to thank Karen Huges, Deborah Neale, Ahmet Oncu and Carol Read for assistance with library research and data analysis.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
JOB STRESS, INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, AND UNION DISSATISFACTION	1
DATA AND METHODS	3
MEASURES.....	3
Independent Variables:.....	3
Dependent Variable - Union Dissatisfaction:.....	4
SOURCES OF UNION DISSATISFACTION	5
Health and Well-being Differences:.....	6
DISCUSSION	6
REFERENCES.....	9
Table 1	12
Table 2.....	13
Table 3.....	14
Table 4.....	15

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between stressful working conditions and union members' dissatisfaction with their union. Few studies to date have examined this relationship and existing studies report contradictory findings. That is, some studies find that stressful work is associated with satisfaction with the union while other studies find either no relationship or that stressful work is associated with dissatisfaction with the union. Data were collected from 992 postal workers in Edmonton in 1983. Results suggest that the more stressful working conditions are, either objectively or subjectively, the more likely union members are to be critical of and/or dissatisfied with their union.

INTRODUCTION

Concerns about the negative impacts of job stress have been mounting. The International Labour Organization argues that "stress has become one of the most serious health issues of the twentieth century" (1993:65). In Canada, this trend is reflected in rising Workers' Compensation Board claims for job-induced psychological distress (Lippel 1990). Stress also has moved onto the agenda of a growing number of Canadian unions. However, it is one of the more difficult occupational health issues facing unions in part due to the complex and diverse causes and effects of stress. In addition, dealing with stress pushes unions outside of traditional collective bargaining. Moreover, employers typically resist the work environment changes required to make jobs less stressful.

Historically workers have turned to unions to improve working conditions. Solutions to stressful work entail organizational reform (Karasek and Theorell 1990), making unions key agents of change. However, stressful working conditions also may generate dissatisfaction with the union, undermining its ability to mobilize members in pursuit of less stressful working conditions. There is considerable evidence that stressful work creates job dissatisfaction (eg., Lowe and Northcott 1986; Baker 1985; ICas1 1978). Yet few studies have examined the connections between stressful work and dissatisfaction with one's union.

This oversight partly reflects a lack of dialogue among job stress researchers, who have examined the effects of stressful work, and industrial relations researchers, who have focused on union dissatisfaction (Barling et al. 1992). The former have not incorporated the industrial relations context into their models; the latter tend not to consider the possibility that job stress may lead to union dissatisfaction. This article is an attempt to foster such a dialogue by examining the connection between stressful working conditions and union members' dissatisfaction with their union.

JOB STRESS, INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, AND UNION DISSATISFACTION

The dominant perspective on job stress is the "demand-control model" (Karasek 1979; Karasek and Theorell 1990). This model has an organizational focus, both in terms of its identification of the causes of stress and the solutions proposed. Accordingly, stress is viewed as the result of psychologically demanding work and job designs which do not allow workers sufficient opportunity to make decisions or to use their skills in responding to job demands. Over time, these conditions may result in a range of mental and physical health problems, including heart disease. Stress also diminishes organizational productivity through increased absenteeism and turnover and reduced employee performance. The demand-control model contrasts with the traditional individual perspective on stress, which essentially "blames the victim" by viewing stress as an individual pathology (Baker 1985).

The demand-control model does not explicitly incorporate industrial relations variables. However, the way is open for this. For example, the model recognizes social support as a potential mediator in the causal link between stressful working conditions and negative employee health outcomes (Karasek and Theorell 1990; also see House 1981). Karasek and Theorell (1990:74-5) thus attribute the strong positive correlation between decision latitude and social support among Swedish workers to relatively high levels of employee participation and pervasive unionization.

In a related vein, Johnson's (1991) discussion of "collective control" builds on the idea that supportive resources are provided by other individuals in the workplace. Collective control is based on the importance of the work group and informal worker culture. Johnson's research in the pressroom of a daily newspaper shows how unionized workers devise collective means of exerting control over their work and resisting management (Johnson 1991:128). Similarly, Aronsson (1989:84) cites Swedish research on bus drivers which documents that union support for improving working conditions was one of four main types of resources drivers could call upon to cope with job demands. Karasek and Theorell's (1990) discussion of participative approaches to organizational change, aimed at creating healthy working conditions, also suggests how unions may provide social support. Most of their examples are from Scandinavian countries, where unions play an active role in workplace reforms.

In sum, the demand-control model suggests that there is a potential role for unions in stress reduction. This is consistent with the view in the occupational health literature that unions are the most effective means for workers to exercise their rights under occupational health and safety legislation (Sass 1991; Robinson 1988; Walters and Haines 1988). Clearly it is important to understand the conditions under which unions become involved in specific occupational health problems. A crucial link in this process, we believe, is union members' attitudes and their relationship with the union. There are many examples of how rank-and-file pressure for action on a problem has mobilized the resources of a union (eg., White 1990; Yates 1990). However, little is known about how the converse -- membership apathy or dissatisfaction -- inhibits this mobilization process.

A brief look at the relevant literature underscores the need to further investigate the link between working conditions, on the one hand, and members' relations with and attitudes towards their union, on the other hand. For example, research on union commitment and satisfaction tends to show that dissatisfying jobs make workers more committed to their union (Barling et al. 1992:83). Yet this is not a consistent finding. Several studies show that job and union satisfaction are positively, not negatively, related (Freeman and Medoff 1984:142-3; Fiorito et al. 1988:302). While cautioning against making causal inferences, Freeman and Medoff thus conclude that "most workers are either satisfied with both union and job or dissatisfied with both" (1984:143).

Few studies have directly examined the impact of job stress on members' relationship with their union. There is scattered evidence of a relationship between stressful working conditions and workers' union satisfaction. Shirom and Kirmeyer (1988) found that the higher a worker's rating of union performance, the lower his or her reported stress and somatic complaints. These workers may credit the union with positively influencing their work environment. In another study, members who perceived their union to be effective also reported high job satisfaction and greater participation in decisions -- factors the demand-control model associates with low stress (Carillon and Sutton 1982). Taking a contrary perspective, Miller (1990) claims that the burn-out (a stress reaction) of union activists may contribute to increased apathy and decreased participation among union members by creating a negative role model. However, another study casts doubt on the existence of any relationship at all between job stress and union attitudes (Fukami and Larson 1984).

These disparate research findings underscore the need to further explore the links between stressful working conditions, on one hand, and union dissatisfaction, on the other. Doing so will help to extend the demand-control model of job stress by examining its implicit assumption that unions are a potential source of social support for workers. It will also contribute to an integration of industrial relations and job stress research which, in itself, is an important objective (Barling et al. 1992).

DATA AND METHODS

The data for this study come from a survey of unionized postal workers employed by Canada Post Corporation, a public enterprise, in the mid-western Canadian city of Edmonton. The research was a collaborative effort with the two unions representing non-supervisory employees: the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC), whose members deliver the mail, and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) which represents mail sorters and handlers working mainly in a large, central postal plant.¹ The former experience considerable job autonomy, being relatively free from direct supervision, while the latter experience regimented, factory-like working conditions.

All members of both unions in Edmonton were mailed a questionnaire early in 1983 (see Lowe and Northcott 1986, ch. 2, for details). Using a multi-stage mailing and follow-up procedure we obtained a total of 992 useable questionnaires, for a response rate of 65 % (68% for CUPW and 62% for LCUC). While demographic data on the total memberships of the two unions is unavailable, we were able to determine that respondents were similar to the total memberships in terms of gender composition. Furthermore, because working conditions in Canada Post are highly standardized across Canada, our results are probably typical of other major urban centres.

MEASURES

Our focus is on the link between stressful working conditions, on one hand, and workers' satisfaction with their union, on the other. We therefore have included a variety of measures of job characteristics, job satisfaction, psychological job demands, decision latitude, and social support. These comprise the basic elements of the demand - control model of job stress (Karasek and Theorell 1990). We expand this model to include employees' relationships to their union through the addition of measures of union involvement, union satisfaction, and specific criticisms of the union.

Independent Variables:

Objective working conditions were assessed by union membership (CUPW, LCUC) and shift (day, afternoon, night). We asked whether respondents experienced problems with their work hours. We also measured exposure to seventeen occupational health hazards, ranging from dangerous chemicals, noise and air pollution, to bad weather and poorly maintained or dangerous work areas (Lowe and Northcott 1986:35-39). Self-reported job characteristics were measured by 29 items adapted from the 1977 U.S. Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn and Staines 1979) and used a 7-point agree-disagree scale. Factor analysis (Lowe and Northcott 1988: 60-1) identified seven discrete indices: supervision, work intensity, autonomy, financial rewards, co-worker relations, role conflict, and variety/challenge.

Social support was assessed by the question: "How much can each of the following people be relied on for support on or off the job when things get tough at work (1 = not at all, 4 = very much): your immediate supervisor(s), shop steward or union representative, and other people at work?" By including union support

¹ Since the fieldwork, LCUC merged with CUPW.

we can test the assumption now implicit in the demand-control model that unions are a source of social support.

Union involvement was measured by asking: "Have you ever held a position in your union?" and "Have you filed a grievance through your union in the last 12 months?" We also measured the industrial relations climate in the post office, tapping into perceived union-management conflict that may be linked to distress (Bluen and Barling 1988:177-9). Respondents were asked to describe union-management relations in the post office on a 7-point scale (1 = very hostile, 7 = very friendly).

We used multiple measures of *job satisfaction*. This reflects the importance of both subjective and behavioural indicators of satisfaction in previous studies of the relationship between job satisfaction and union satisfaction (Freeman and Medoff 1984: ch.8). Overall job satisfaction was measured by: "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job (1 = very dissatisfied, 7 = very satisfied)?" "I could get a better job if I quit working for the post office (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)." "If you had to make the choice again, would you choose the same type of work you do now (no, yes)?" "If you had to opportunity to take a similar job at the same pay in another organization would you take it or stay in your current job (take it, stay)?" From the exit-voice perspective (Freeman and Medoff 1984: ch.6), it is important to know if employees are planning to quit, so we asked: "Have you looked for another job with an employer other than the post office in the last year (no, yes)?" We also added a behavioural intention measure: "How likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year (1 = very unlikely, 7 = very likely)?"

Psychological well-being was assessed with the 20-item CES-D scale of depression (Markush and Favero 1974) and Peterson and Kellam's (1977) 7-item anger/egression scale for measuring hostility. We used summary scores for both scales, each of which has good inter-item reliability (alphas of .92 and .89, respectively). We also included 3 more general items tapping overall mental health, perceived work pressure, and job family conflict: "In the past 12 months, how healthy have you felt mentally (1 = very unhealthy, 7 = very healthy)?" "How often do you feel under pressure at work (1 = never, 5 = always)?" "How much of do your job and your family life interfere with each other [asked only of respondents who were married/living common law] (1 = a lot, 7 = not at all)?"

Physical well-being was assessed by the following: "In the past 12 months, how healthy have you felt physically (1 = very unhealthy, 7 = very healthy)?" and a summary score for 6 psychophysiological complaints (tiredness, loss of appetite, irritability, sleeplessness, dizziness, headaches) during the past 3 months (1 = never, 5 = always) (alpha = .81).

Perceived impact of work on health was measured by the following: "Do you feel your overall health has been better, worse, or about the same as a result of: the kind of work you do, the hours you work, your general work environment? (1 = much worse, 5 = much better)?"

Dependent Variable - Union Dissatisfaction:

Previous studies of members' perceptions of their union have taken a variety of approaches. Overall union satisfaction typically is measured the same way as global job satisfaction (eg., Freeman and Medoff 1984: ch 9). Other researchers utilize measures of perceived union performance in areas such as economic benefits, job security, improving working conditions, handling grievances, responsiveness to members (eg.,

Shirom and Kirmeyer 1988; Carrion and Sutton 1982). An innovation on this approach is to view union satisfaction as a function of the discrepancy between members' expectations of union performance and the perceived effectiveness of outcomes (Fiorito et al 1988). Related research explores union commitment, a concept incorporating attitudes of loyalty to the union, a sense of responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union, and a belief in union goals (see Barling et al. 1992: ch.4).

In short, there is little consensus on how to measure union satisfaction. This no doubt reflects the fact that workers' perceptions of their union have received considerably less attention from researchers in comparison with job satisfaction. The concept of union commitment, as first developed by Gordon et al (1980) and refined by Barling and his colleagues (1992), is perhaps the most theoretically developed. Even so, its focus on the integration of members into the union does not address union satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In terms of union satisfaction, Fiorito and his colleagues (1988) have attempted to develop a model that draws on discrepancy theories of job satisfaction. However, because this and other studies of union performance deal with general areas of union activity, they may not capture the specific issues that energize local industrial relations and lead particular union members to become critics.

We took a qualitative approach to assessing the level and type of dissatisfaction of union members toward their union. At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked: "Do you have any comments or suggestions on how your union could better serve you?" Of the 992 postal workers who completed the questionnaire, 311 (31%) answered this open-ended question. Allowing for multiple responses, they provided a total of 441 comments (74 gave 2 comments and 28 provided 3).

Only 22 of the comments (5%) were positive, indicating that the union was doing a good job. Given that the question was worded to elicit constructive feedback -- information that both unions involved in the study wanted -- it is not surprising that members took the opportunity to express negative views. Indeed, this question seems to have tapped a vein of discontent within both unions.

Given the possibility of response bias to the open-ended question, we also included the question: "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your union? (1 = very dissatisfied, 7 = very satisfied)?" By combining this standard union satisfaction measure with responses to the open-ended question, we constructed a three category dependent variable measuring the intensity of union discontent. *Strong critics* are those respondents who gave negative comments on the open-ended question and scored 1, 2, or 3 on the union satisfaction item. *Moderate critics* gave negative comments on the open-ended question or scored 1, 2, or 3 on the union satisfaction item. *Non-critics* met neither of these conditions.

While this composite variable lacks the refinements of an interval-level psychometric scale (such as some of the psychological well-being scales, above, or Gordon et al's., 1980, union commitment scale), it nonetheless provides a more grounded basis for determining the extent of dissatisfaction within union membership ranks.

SOURCES OF UNION DISSATISFACTION

Table 1 summarizes the results of the content analysis of comments on "how your union could serve you better." Five categories of criticisms emerged: better representation and leadership; better collective agreement provisions; better union management relations; better communication and information to

members; and reduced dues or better use of dues. A sixth category, accounting for only 22 responses (5%), was comprised of positive responses indicating that the union was doing a good job.

We are fairly confident that these categories, and the coding procedures used to arrive at them, accurately reflect the major issues from the perspective of postal workers. This is because a former president of the CUPW local directly participated with researchers in all phases of the content analysis, verifying that the coding and categorization "made sense" from the perspective of the shop floor.²

The most pervasive comment dealt with the type of union representation and leadership. This accounted for 30% of all responses. The most common specific criticisms were that the union Table 3 also presents two measures of members' activity in their union. While not statistically significant, strong critics are more likely than the comparison groups to have ever held a union office or to have filed a grievance in the past twelve months. We also measured perceived union-management relations on the assumption that this would influence workers' views of their union. Indeed, we find that critics are significantly more likely than non-critics to perceive union-management relations in the post office as hostile.

Health and Well-being Differences:

Table 4 compares critics, moderate critics, and non-critics to see if they differ in terms of health and well-being, the typical outcome measures in job stress research. Looking first at psychological well-being, a key indicator of stressful work, we find that critics are significantly more likely than the comparison groups (especially non-critics) to report overall worse mental health, score higher on both the hostility and depression scales, report greater job-family conflict, and experience more frequent work pressure. Some of these scale differences are not substantial, and in two instances (depression, perceived work pressure) strong and moderate critics have identical scores. But overall, critics are more distressed than non-critics.

Looking at the indicators of job satisfaction, a clear pattern emerges. Union critics are significantly more dissatisfied with their jobs than moderate critics or non-critics as measured by overall job satisfaction, willingness to choose the same type of work again, or willingness to take a similar job in another organization. However, there are no differences when it comes to actual or intended search for another job. Part of the explanation for this may be the critics' perceptions that they would be unlikely to get a better job elsewhere, a view they are significantly more likely to hold than either moderate critics or non-critics.

The physical well-being measures confirm that critics have worse health than the two comparison groups. They rate their overall physical health as worse over the past 12 months. In addition, critics report more frequent stress-related psychophysiological problems in the past 3 months. Critics also are more likely than the comparison groups to perceive that their health has been negatively affected by the work they do, the hours they work, and the overall work environment.

DISCUSSION

In summary, it is apparent that strong union critics share a cluster of job conditions -- shift work, lack of variety and challenge, weak workplace social supports -- that are well known to be stressful (Karasek and Theorell 1990; Baker 1985; Lowe and Northcott 1986). Equally important in terms of the demand-control

² We are especially grateful to Carol Read for her assistance in this regard.

model of stress, strong critics also are significantly more likely than moderate critics or non-critics to report standard stress-related mental and physical ill-health symptoms, as well as be more dissatisfied with their job. Given the cross-sectional nature of our data, however, it is not possible to infer a causal direction to the relationship between stress and union dissatisfaction. However, intuitively it seems rather unlikely that workers' relationships with their union, or negative perceptions of the union, would "cause" such consistent patterns of distress and ill-health.

These bivariate results are a first step toward unravelling the links between stressful working conditions and union dissatisfaction. The exploratory nature of this study does not lend itself to a multivariate analysis of the determinants of union dissatisfaction. One major limitation in this regard is that our dependent variable is not an interval measure and therefore regression estimates can be difficult to interpret. In addition, the limited variability of the categoric dependent variable may attenuate the explanatory power of the multivariate model. Further development of a measure of union satisfaction is called for, perhaps along the lines of Gordon et al's (1980) careful construction of a union commitment measure. While Fiorito and his colleagues (1988) have moved in this direction, our findings suggest that the relationship between quality of work and union satisfaction deserves a fuller exploration than provided in their discrepancy model.

Recognizing these difficulties, we nonetheless did attempt a preliminary "test" of how well the demand-control model predicted the union criticism variable.³ Four blocks of independent variables (as described above) were entered in a step-wise regression equation: 1) psychological job demands; 2) decision latitude; 3) social support; and 4) controls including age, gender, union involvement, grievance filing, membership in CUPW, and day shift. The equation had a total adjusted R^2 of .11. With respect to the demand-control model, job demands and a perceived lack of social support from both supervisors and union representatives were significant predictors of union criticism, as was prior union involvement. However, decision latitude was not. The latter is in line with other studies, which often find employee participation in decision making per se accounting for only about 5% of the variance in self-reported mental and physical health outcomes (Ganster 1989:7).

Viewing these findings cautiously, it is interesting that they reinforce our earlier arguments for an expanded demand-control model of stress incorporating industrial relations variables. As Bluen and Barling (1988:177-9) suggest, the conflict inherent in industrial relations may itself be a source of stress. What future research must determine is how the industrial relations environment of a workplace interacts with job conditions to produce stress and, in turn, how this stress may turn some workers into critics of the union. Sorting out where in the causal chain workers' relationship with their union fits will require a theoretical integration of stress and industrial relations research.

To return to the bivariate results, there are a number of findings that deserve further comment. Social support provided a conceptual means of incorporating unions into the demand-control model of job stress. Supportive coworkers and supervisors are seen in the literature as moderating the impacts of stressful working conditions (House 1981; Aronsson 1989). Karasek and Theorell go further, arguing that unionization also provide social support (1990:75). Perhaps this claim needs to be revised in the face of our evidence that workers who perceive that they do not receive support from their union representative are more likely to be critics of the union. At a practical level, unions must endeavour to provide the kinds of

³ Results available from the authors upon request.

support workers experiencing stress require. A greater challenge, of course, is for unions to negotiate with management changes in the work environment so that the root causes of stress are alleviated.

Our study also reinforces key criticisms that have been levelled against the demand-control model of job stress. Specifically, the concept of job control requires further refinement so that we are able to pin-point the specific ways in which control is manifested in jobs and, in turn, how these conditions give rise to stress (Ganster 1989:16-17; Kasl 1989:175-6). A clearer conceptual distinction between individual and collective control may help to better interpret our findings (Aronsson 1989:86). It may be that workers who feel little or no control in their jobs may be prone to generalizing this to their union, in effect blaming the union for their powerlessness. This is a troubling scenario, given the high levels of stress in many workplaces today and workers' lack of knowledge about occupational health issues (ILO 1993; Walters and Haines 1988).

Commenting on unions' ability to address occupational health problems, Walters and Haines argue that "for labour to have a strong voice it is important for workers ... to press their case individually and collectively in situations where they feel their health or safety is at risk" (1988:1190). However, the preconditions for unions to promote healthier workplaces could be undermined by stressful job conditions. Perhaps we need to revise the exit-voice perspective on unions (Freeman and Medoff 1984:138-40; Meng 1990). The workers in our study clearly have voiced dissatisfaction, but their criticisms are not, as implied in exit-voice analysis, channelled through the union and directed only at working conditions. This dissatisfaction also casts a negative shadow over their relationship with their union, throwing up yet another major stumbling block in unions' quest for improved quality of working life.

REFERENCES

- Aronsson, G. 1989. "Swedish research on job control, stress and health." In S. L. Sauter, J. J. Hurrell and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Job Control and Worker Health*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baker, D. B. 1985. "The study of stress at work." *Annual Review of Public Health* 6: 367-81.
- Barling, J., C. Fullagar and E. K. Kelloway. 1992. *The Union And Its Members: A Psychological Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bluen, S. D. and J. Barling. 1988. "Psychological stressors associated with industrial relations." In C. L. Cooper and R. Payne (eds.) *Causes, Coping and Consequences of Stress at Work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carillon, J. W. and R. I. Sutton. 1982. "The relationship between union effectiveness and the quality of members' worklife." *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* 3:171-9
- Fiorito, J., D. G. Gallagher and C. V. Fukami. 1988. "Satisfaction with union representation." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 41:294-307.
- Freeman, R. B. and J. L. Medoff. 1984. *What Do Unions Do?* New York: Basic Books.
- Fukami, C. V. and E. W. Larson. 1984. "Commitment to company and union: parallel models." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 69:367-71.
- Ganster, D. C. 1989. "Worker control and well-being: a review of research in the workplace." In S. L. Sauter, J. J. Hurrell and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Job Control and Worker Health*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Gordon, M. E., J. W. Philpot, R. E. Burt, C. A. Thompson and W. E. Spiller, 1980, "Commitment to the union: development of a measure and an examination of its correlates." *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph* 65:479-499.
- House, J. S. 1981. *Work Stress and Social Support*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). 1993. *World Labour Report*. Geneva: ILO.
- Johnson, J. V. 1991. "Collective control: strategies for survival in the workplace." In J. V. Johnson and G. Johansson (Eds.) *The Psychosocial Work Environment: Work Organization, Democratization and Health*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Karasek, R. 1979. "Job demands, decision latitude and mental health: implications for job redesign." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24:285-308.
- Karasek, R. and T. Theorell. 1990. *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.

- Kasl, S. V. 1989. "An epidemiological perspective on the role of control in health." In S. L. Sauter, J. J. Hurrell and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Job Control and Worker Health*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- _____. 1978. "Epidemiological contributions to the study of work stress." In C.L. Cooper and R. Payne (eds.), *Stress at Work*. New York: Wiley.
- Lippel, K. 1990. "Compensation for mental-mental claims under Canadian law." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 8:375-98.
- Lowe, G. S. and H. C. Northcott. 1986. *Under Pressure: A Study of Job Stress*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- _____. 1988. "The impact of working conditions, social roles, and personal characteristics on gender differences in distress." *Work and Occupations* 15:55-77.
- Markush, R. E. and R. F. Favero. 1974. "Epidemiologic assessment of stressful life events, depressed mood and psychological symptoms - a preliminary report." In. B. S. Dohrenwend and B. P. Dohrenwend (eds.) *Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects*. New York: Wiley.
- Meng, R. 1990. "The relationship between unions and job satisfaction." *Applied Economics* 22:1635-48.
- Miller, D. 1990. "Stress and trade union officers: towards a research agenda." *Employee Relations* 12, 6:22-26.
- Petersen, A. C. and S. G. Kellam. 1977. "Measurement of the psychological well-being of adolescents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 6:229-46.
- Quinn, R. P. and G. L. Staines. 1979. *The 1977 Quality of Employment Survey*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Centre, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Robinson, J. C. 1988. "Labor union involvement in occupational safety and health." *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 13:453-68.
- Sass, R. 1991. "The implications of work organization for occupational health policy: the case of Canada." In J. V. Johnson and G. Johansson (Eds.) *The Psychosocial Work Environment: Work Organization, Democratization and Health*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Shirom, A. and S. Kirmeyer. 1988. "The effects of unions on blue collar role stresses and somatic strain." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 9:29-42.
- Stewart-Patterson, D. 1987. *Post Mortem: Why Canada's Mail Won't Move*. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Walters, V. and T. Haines. 1988. "Workers' perceptions, knowledge and responses regarding occupational health and safety: a report on a Canadian study." *Social Science and Medicine* 27:1189-96.
- White, J. 1990. *Mail and Female: Women and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Yates, C. 1990. "The internal dynamics of union power: explaining Canadian autoworkers' militancy in the 1980s." *Studies in Political Economy* 31:73-105

Table 1

Content Analysis of Responses to the Open-Ended Question “Do you have any comments or suggestions on how your union could better serve you?”¹

<i>Type of Comment</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N of Comments</i>
Better representation and leadership	30.2	133
Better collective agreement provisions	23.1	102
Better union-management relations/ change the role of the union	17.2	76
Better communication and information to members	12.7	56
Reduce dues/better use of dues	11.8	52
Union is doing a good job	5.0	22
TOTAL	100.0%	441

¹ The 311 respondents to this question provided 441 comments. Up to three comments per respondent were coded.

Table 2

Comparison of Strong Union Critics with Moderate Critics and Non-Critics¹ : Personal and Employment Characteristics

		Strong Critics (n=192)	Moderate Critics (n=360)	Non-Critics (n=440)
<u>Personal and Employment Characteristics:</u>				
Mean age		33	33	35
Percent female		48%	46%	47%
Percent CUPW	**	62%	50%	49%
Percent afternoon or night shift	*	40%	35%	30%
Percent reporting problems with hours worked	***	29%	19%	16%
Mean number of self-reported hazards employees exposed to in present job	***	8.3	7.3	6.8

¹ This variable was constructed by combining responses to the open-ended question, "Do you have any comments or suggestions on how your union could serve you better?" and a union satisfaction item, "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your union?" (1=very dissatisfied, 7=very satisfied). *Strong critics* gave negative comments to the open-ended question and scored 1, 2 or 3 on the union satisfaction item; *moderate critics* gave negative comments to the open-ended question or scored 1, 2 or 3 on the union satisfaction item; *non-critics* met neither of these conditions.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (T-test for difference between means and chi-square for difference between frequency distributions.)

Table 3

Comparison of Strong Union Critics with Moderate Critics and Non-Critics¹: Job Characteristics, Social Support, and Union Activism

		Strong Critics (n=192)	Moderate Critics (n=360)	Non-Critics (n=440)
Perceived Job Characteristic				
Scale Scores:				
(1=most negative evaluation; 7 =most positive evaluation)				
Supervision	***	3.3	3.5	3.9
Variety/Challenge	***	3.0	3.1	3.5
Work intensity		4.8	4.9	5.0
Autonomy		3.7	3.9	4.0
Financial Rewards		4.9	5.0	5.2
Co-workers	*	3.9	4.1	4.3
Role conflict		3.4	3.3	3.4
Perceived Social Support				
at Work:				
(1=low support; 4=high support)				
From supervisor		2.2	2.2	2.3
From shop steward/ union representative	***	2.1	2.4	2.8
From coworkers		2.7	2.6	2.7
Relationship with Union:				
Percent ever held union office		18%	16%	14%
Percent who filed a grievance in past 12 months		37%	34%	31%
Perceived union-management relations (1=very hostile; 7-very friendly)	***	2.6	3.1	3.7

1. See Note 1, Table 2.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (T-test for difference between means and chi-square for difference between frequency distributions)

Table 4

Comparison of Strong Union Critics with Moderate Critics and Non-Critics⁻¹ : Selected Distress and Health Outcomes

		Strong Critics (n=192)	Moderate Critics (n=360)	Non-Critics (n=440)
<u>Psychological Well-being:</u>				
Overall mental health past 12 months (1=very healthy, 7=very unhealthy)	***	3.4	3.1	2.8
Hostility scale (1=never; 7=always)	***	2.5	2.4	2.2
Depression scale (1= never; 7=always)	*	2.4	2.4	2.3
Job-family conflict (1=not at all; 7=a lot)	***	3.3	2.8	2.6
Often pressure at work (1=never; 5=always)	*	3.2	3.2	3.0
<u>Job Satisfaction:</u>				
Overall job satisfaction (1=very dissatisfied; 7=very satisfied)	***	4.3	4.6	5.0
Could get better job if quit Post Office (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree)	*	3.2	3.1	2.9
Likelihood of looking for a new job (1=very unlikely; 7=very likely)		2.7	2.6	2.4
Percent who would choose same type of work	**	46%	52%	59%
Percent who would take similar job in another organization	***	47%	43%	30%
Percent who have looked for another job in past year		15%	11%	11%

Table 4, continued

<u>Physical Well-being:</u>				
Overall physical health past 12 months (1=very healthy, 7=very unhealthy)	***	3.6	3.2	3.0
Psychophysiological complaints past 3 months' (1=never; 5=always)	***	2.7	2.6	2.5
<u>Perceived Impact of Work On Overall Health:</u>				
(1=much worse; 5=much better)				
Health affected by work	***	2.7	2.9	3.0
Health affected by work hours	***	2.9	2.9	3.2
Health affected by work environment	**	2.6	2.7	2.9

1. See Note 1, Table 2.

2. Includes the following health problems: general tiredness, loss of appetite, irritability, sleeplessness, dizziness, headaches.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (T-test for difference between means and chi-square for difference between frequency distributions.)



Industrial Relations Centre (IRC)
Queen's University
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6
irc.queensu.ca



SCHOOL OF
Policy Studies
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY