AN INVESTIGATION INTO

VARIABLES RELATED TO THE SUCCESS

OR FAILURE OF UNION ORGANIZING

DRIVES

————————

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of

California State University, Hayward

————————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Business Administration

————————

By

Winston H. Cundiff

March 2, 1973

AN INVESTIGATION INTO

VARIABLES RELATED TO THE SUCCESS

OR FAILURE OF UNION ORGANIZING DRIVES

by

Winston H. Cundiff

Approved: Date:

_2/21/73_

_2/21/73_

_2/21/73_

Committee in Charge

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my thesis chairman, Dr. Allen J. Schuh, for his guidance and advice throughout the writing of this thesis. The analysis of this study was made much easier and more efficient through the use of his computer programs. Without his assistance this work would have not been possible.

In addition I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. John Kilgour and Dr. Scott Partridge who were instrumental in helping me meet this study's deadlines through their swiftness in handling my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, behavioral scientists have increasingly directed their attention toward some aspect of the problems faced by employers and employees. Attempts have also been made to understand the organizational structure and functions of labor unions. Despite these research activities, studies which seek to explore the dynamics of the union organizing campaign remain relatively rare.

In the course of the organizing campaign, employees are generally asked to select, reject or change collective bargaining representatives. Often the campaign culminates in the filing of a petition for a representation election. These elections are conducted by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in accordance with the Labor Management Relations Act, 1935 (Taft-Hartley Act). [1] These representation elections have been hailed as a democratic and orderly means of the expression of an employees free choice for collective bargaining. The popularity of the representation election was attested to by the fact that the NLRB recorded in 1971, 8,472 representations elections. [2] However, the represen-

[1] Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

[2] National Labor Relations Board Release, January 24, 1973.

1

tation election does not involve only the successful action of union organizing. Some organizing campaigns end abruptly without the filing of an election petition as in the instance when an employer grants recognition of a union, or a union abandons its organizing drive for one reason or another. Also, some petitions never reach the election stage but are withdrawn by the petitioner or dismissed by the NLRB.

BACKGROUND

As previously mentioned, there has been a lack of
information generated on the subject of union membership
drives. The purpose of this report is to help fill this
vacuum which presently exists. The union organizing campaign
appears worthy of more intensive analysis than it is presently
afforded.

It is the purpose of this investigation to analyze a
number of membership drives and, hopefully, provide from
this analysis information on certain characteristics which
will aid unions in organizing or management in preventing the
organization of employee groups.

A vast amount of research has been done in personnel
selection on predicting the success of an employee on the
job from his biographical characteristics. The purpose of
this work has been to give the employment screeners a for-
mula, or set of guidelines on which he can make better
decisions concerning the future probability of success of
the applicant. The techniques of personnel selection
developed from years of research on employment screening may
have utility in other situations such as in identifying
which units have the highest probability of a successful

organizing drive based on the units biographical character-
istics. Such guidelines could be employed to direct
attention to certain units which have in the past, produced
winning campaigns. Presently these guidelines do not exist,
and without the guidelines, neither union nor management
have an appreciation for the probability of success in organ-
izing. It is important for a union to know where to direct
its efforts for organizing, they might do a much better job
of spending their treasury funds allotted for this purpose.
Management, on the other hand, would like to know where it
is most vulnerable. Both sides stand to gain if the charac-
teristics of successful drives were known.

Presently, there is relatively little research on
individual organizing drives or groups of organizing drives.
It is ironic that numerous aspects of management and employee
behavior and interorganizational relationships have been
thoroughly organized, yet, the opportunity to investigate
one of the most important aspects of unionization; the
representation election, has been passed up on a large
scale.

Only two studies appear to have focused upon the
behavioral dimensions of the union organizing campaign. In
1963, Robert McKersie and Montague Brown examined an organ-

izing campaign among non-professional employees in Chicago.[3]
Their study followed the course of an entire campaign and
identified variables related to the employees' desire to
join a union, participate in a strike, and picket.

Among the respondents who vited in the election,
personal characteristics such as age, educational back-
ground, and marital status did not seem to be associated
closely with voting behavior. But there did seem to be a
positive association between whether or not the respondent''s
fathers and/or close friends were union members or not and
how they voted in the organizing campaign. Similarily,
those respondents with previous work experience particularly
those who had worked in manufacturing establishments and
those who had been union members on previous jobs, were more
inclined to vote in favor of union representation than
those respondents without previous work experience or who
had not previously held union membership.

Other results show that individuals at the upper
ends of the store's earning scale were more inclined to vote
against the union than those whose earnings were at the
lower end of the scale. Those who worked as fulltime
employees were more inclined to vote for union represen-

---

[3]Robert B. McKersie, Montague Brown, "Non-Profess-
ional Hospital Workers and a Union Organizing Drive,
Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. LCII, No. 3 1963.
pp. 120-135.

tation than those who worked on a part-time basis.

More significant perhaps was the observed differ-
ence in voting behavior among respondents who were rela-
tively satisfied with their employment conditions as opposed
to those who voiced a lesser degree of satisfaction. The
results of the McKersie and Brown study support the idea
that employee dissatisfaction is an excellent foundation
upon which to develop sentiment favorable to union organi-
zation and collective bargaining.

Attempts to assess the impact of the union organizing
campaign and the company's counter efforts to defeat the
Union did not produce very conclusive evidence showing that
employees were influenced to an extent that they were aware
of either effort.

A second study done by James D. Scoville of the
University of Illinois examines such variables as: age,
race, sex, occupation, geographical location, education,
marital status, type of industry, earned income, and total
family income. [4]

The data for Professor Scoville's study was taken
from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's 1966
"Survey of Consumer Finance." In the course of the survey,

_____

[4] J.D. Scoville, "Influence on Organizing in the
U.S. in 1966, "Industrial Relations, Vol. 10, 1971, pp. 345-
361.

the head of each family unit was asked whether he (she) was
"a member of a labor union." The overall relationship which
Professor Scoville estimated is R^2 of .344 which is statis-
tically significant at the 1 percent level. Professor
Scoville concluded from his study that:

    i.   Negroes are significantly more likely than
         whites to be members of labor unions.

   ii.   Members of occupational groups (except
         farmers and farm laborers where the
         sampe was very small) are significantly
         less likely than operatives to be union
         members.

  iii.   Southerners are significantly less likely
         to be union members than Northeasterners.

   iv.   Holders of Bachelor's Degrees are signi-
         ficantly less likely than are high school
         graduates to be union members.

Professor Scoville's study is important here because
he has examined and discussed factors which the proposed
study intends to concentrate on, namely, geographical
location and occupational groups. The Scoville study
deserves attention because it is the only other study found
which shares the same emphasis as the proposed thesis. The
study now being proposed will also attempt to identify some
clear cut relationship, only among variables of a different
nature. Rather than research such individual factors as

age, education, etc., this study will examine such vari-
ables as the size of the unit or the number of employees eli-
gible to bote in the representation election, the type of
industry in which the units conducts its business, the geo-
graphical location of the unit, and the type of unit involved
in the election (craft, professional, truck drivers, clerical
etc.)

These factors may influence workers' decisions to
join or refrain from joining unions. It is the purpose of
this research to discover whether employees in certain occu-
pations, geographical areas, and unit sizes, will more read-
ily join unions, while other employee groups may tend to
reject the idea of collective bargaining as a means of deter-
mining the terms and conditions of their employment.

Unions are not unaware of the impact of such vari-
ables. In union organizing drives, there exists varying
approaches with different unions weighting elements differntly.
It is possible that a union with a relaxed jurisdiction,
operating in a heavily organized area, may find themost
important factor of whether or not to organize to be the
eagerness of the workers in the proposed unit.

On the other hand, a union that has its industry
fairly well organized might choose a target less to gain new
members than to protect the members it already has. Here,
the most important consideration might be the plants compe-
titive position and ability to affect industry standards.

titive position and ability to affect industry standards.
promote successful organizing campaigns. A loss of a repre-
sentation election stands for an embarrassing failure on the
unions' part. (They will have contributed several scarce
resources: Their time and money.) Unions today are run as
businesses and are reluctant to commit scarce resources to a
unit with a low pay off. For example, a unit of two
employees may require as much effort as a unit of 15
employees but the pay offs are different (the amount of the
union dues being the difference). A bargaining unit of 1400
would be a more desirable target than one of 15 by the same
reasoning. It is obvious that unions would not, not do not
thrust themselves blindly into membership drives. Rather,
research and investigation on target employees is, or should
be, conducted before a final decision is reached on whether
or not to attempt to organize a unit.

A variety of hypotheses can be developed concerning
an individual's desire for membership in a labor union.
For example, some unions provide jobs and training. Some
unions may be regarded as a means of improving working
conditions, and so on. Certain states have "right to work"
laws which make membership less desirable than elsewhere.
These hypootheses are suggestive of the wide range of factors
which would affect the desirability and availability of
union membership. They provide some insight into why indi-
viduals may join or reject union affiliation.

It has been suggested that there exists inherent characteristics among some employee units which could make them attractive to Union organizers. The same holds true for the individuals employed within business. Both are of interest to the union as well as management. This study will seek to investigate the relationship between four independent variables and their significance to the success or failure of union membership drives. Unions are constantly changing and adapting new means of uncovering vulnerable organizing areas. It is the aim of this thesis to provide more information than is presently available on the characteristics which seem to influence the success of failure of union organizing drives.

HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

The specific hypotheses to be tested are these:

A. The probability of union success in repre-
sentative elections is positively related
to the size of the unit. It is expected
that units of larger size may be less
cohesive and, therefore, have a lower
probability of success. But, the larger
size may be subjected to a more strenuous
campaign effort. The null hypothesis is
assumed.

B. Operatives are more likely to organize
than occupational groups.

Scoville suggested that some occupational groups
were more likely to organize than others. This study will
replicate that aspect of Scoville's work.

C. The probability of union success is positively
related to the degree to which the region
is currently organized. It might be assumed
that States that are already heavily
organized have a greater potential for
unionization than those which experience

less organization. It is hypothesized that
States which already have extensive organi-
zation will have more success in organizing.

D. It might be hypothesized that some industries
will be more vulnerable than others. Those
industries which are already organized may
be more vulnerable than those industries
which have fewer units organized.

METHOD

Data

The data for this study were taken from the May 1967 and May 1972 issues of the National Labor Relations Board Election Report. The collected data consisted of all membership elections (won or lost) by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in the months of May in 1967 and 1972. In addition, organizing elections held on behalf of the Retail Clerks International Association in May of 1972 were also considered.

Design

The first step was to perform frequency distributions on the collected data. This enabled the writer to determine where the most variance occurred for each variable. If any of these frequency distributions indicated a question of usefulness to the study of any one variable, then statistical tests were performed.

Once these frequency distributions were completed the study advanced to the stage which involve the use of the computer for analysis.

Three different sets of data were selected for analysis. The purpose of this was to compare the results

13

of the Teamster elections in May of 1972 with the results from both the Teamsters in 1967 and the Retail Clerks in 1972. In comparing the Teamsters in May of 1972 with the Retail Clerks in May of 1972 and with the Teamsters in May of 1967, the writer attempted to see if consistency within (Teamsters 1972 vs. Teamsters 1967) occurred and if consistency across (Teamsters 1972 vs. Retail Clerks 1972) existed. The result in this sense are cross validated.

Variables

There were four independent variables on which this study concentrated. They were: Size or number of employees eligible to vote in the unit, geographical location of the proposed bargaining unit, type of industry involved in the election, and the occupational group of the employees.

Frequency Distributions

Frequency distributions were completed on each variable. These distributions indicated the frequency with which each variable occurred. The frequency distributions for the first variable, number of employees eligible to vote, are displayed on the following three pages. These charts show by number, the number of employees in the proposed bargaining unit, the number of people participating in the election. Most importantly, though, the tables demonstrate what percent of the total elections that group made up of the total employee population.

TABLE NO. 1

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total number elections 297 .

Total number of voters participating 8285.

Number of Employees in Bargaining unit	Number of Elections held	Total Number of Employees	Percent Of Total Elections	Percent Of Total Employees
less than 10	115	704	39	09
11 - 20	72	1029	24	13
21 - 30	41	1052	14	13
31 - 40	18	702	06	09
41 - 50	11	468	04 = 87	06
51 - 60	8	434	03	05
61 - 70	4	269	01	03
71 - 80	5	384	02	03
81 - 90	6	581	02	06
91 - 100	1	98	0	01
101 - 110	2	206	01	03
111 - 120	3	342	01	04
121 - 130	2	247	01	03
131 - 140	2	269	01	03
141 - 150	2	269	01	03
151 - 160	0	0	0	0
161 - 170	1	170	0	02
171 - 180	1	180	1	02
More than 200	3	988	01	02
Totals	297	8285	1.01	1.01

*Note: In the percentage columns a rounding error has occurred.

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972.

Table No. 2

TEAMSTERS ELECTIONS OF MAY 1967

Total number of elections <u>199.</u>

Total number of voters participating <u>4676</u> .

Number of Employees in proposed Bargaining unit	Number of Elections held	Total Number of Employees	Percent Of Total Elections	Percent Of Total Employees
less than 10	88	502	44	11
11 - 20	51	705	26	16
21 - 30	22	474	11	10
31 - 40	7	249	04	05
41 - 50	9	397	05 = 90	08
51 - 60	8	414	04	09
61 - 70	3	190	02	04
71 - 80	1	77	0	02
81 - 90	1	90	0	02
91 - 100	3	289	02	06
101 - 110	1	109	0	02
111 - 120	1	116	0	02
121 - 130	0	0	0	0
131 - 140	1	140	0	02
151 - 160	1	156	0	03
211 - 220	1	219	0	04
501 - 510	1	509	0	11
Totals	199	4676	98	97

*Note: In the percentage columns a rounding error has
        occurred.

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1967.

TABLE NO. 3

RETAIL CLERKS ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total number of elections 30 .

Total number of voters participating 2559 .

Number of Employees in Proposed Bargaining unit	Number of Elections held	Total Number of Employees	Percent Of Total Elections	Percent Of Total Employees
less than 10	4	30	13	01
11 - 20	12	166	41	06
21 - 30	3	70	10	03
31 - 40	3	103	10	04
41 - 50	1	41	03 = 76	02
51 - 60	0	0	0	0
61 - 70·	1	70	03	03
71 - 80	0	0	0	0
81 - 90	0	0	0	0
91 - 100	1	98	03	04
101 - 110	2	209	06	08
111 - 120	0	0	0	0
161 - 170	1	163	03	06
171 - 180	0	0	0	0
201 - 210	1	216	03	08
more than 210	1	1400	03	55
Totals	30	2559	97	1.00

*Note: In the percentage columns a rounding error has occurred.

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972.

A careful examination of these frequency distri-
butions showed that for the Teamster 87 percent of the elec-
tions which took place in May of 1972 were in units which had
50 eligible employees or less. The corresponding number for
Teamsters in May of 1967 is 90 percent. Seventy-Six percent
of the elections which took place on behalf of the Retail
Clerks in 1972 involved 50 or less employees. This clearly
indicated that a high percentage of union organizing by the
Teamsters and Retail Clerks involves 50 eligible employees
or less. On the basis of the frequency distributions per-
formed on variable #1, unit size, this study will limit
itself to an investigation into those units which involve
50 or fewer qualified employees.

Frequency distributions completed for variable #1,
unit size, are displayed on the previous three pages.
Distributions done for variable #2, geographical location,
are presented on the following page. These tables indicate
a high concentration of organizing taking place in five
different states; California, New York, Ohio, Illinois and
Pennsylvania. Because of this, these five states will be
combined into one unit and compared on a whole against
the rest of the country.

Distribution for variable #3, industry type, are
displayed on pages 20 through 24. These frequently distri-
butions reveal that for the Teamsters 37 different industry
types were involved in representation elections. One of

TABLE NO. 4

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total number of elections 297 .

	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
Five combined states	106	36
Remaining states	191	64
Total	297	100

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1967

Total number of elections 199 .

Five combined states	60	31
Remaining states	139	69
Total	199	100

RETAIL CLERK ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total number of elections 30 .

Five combined states	9	30
Remaining states	21	70
Total	30	100

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972

TABLE NO. 5

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total Number of elections <u>297</u> .

Industry Code	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
72	4	1
20	28	9
29	2	0
50	55	18
42	42	14
54	2	0
55	28	9
35	8	2
28	13	4
24	5	2
32	9	3
63	1	0
30	5	1
57	4	1
25	5	2
26	6	2
75	8	3
39	6	3
22	2	0
53	7	2
14	2	0
27	5	2
37	10	3
64	1	0
23	2	0
33	3	1
73	5	2
34	4	1
38	1	0
58	1	0

Teamster 1972 elections continued.

Industry Code	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
82	1	0
36	4	1
59	1	0
49	1	0
52	1	0
15	1	0
80	1	0
Totals	297	88

*Note: In the percentage column a rounding error has occurred

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May, 1972

TABLE NO. 6

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1967

Total number of elections <u>199</u> .

Industry Code	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
42	32	16
50	42	31
33	2	1
20	20	10
15	1	0
34	5	3
53	1	0
55	21	10
32	7	4
25	4	2
28	11	6
63	1	0
75	1	0
27	3	2
59	1	0
29	2	1
72	6	4
47	2	1
22	3	1
36	4	2
13	1	0
30	4	2
10	1	0
37	6	4
45	1	0
54	1	0
39	2	1
35	1	0
73	2	1
26	2	1
24	2	1

Teamster 1967 elections continued.

Industry Code	Number of Elections	Number of Elections
52	1	0
23	1	0
58	1	0
70	1	0
57	1	0
16	1	0
Totals	199	104

*Note: In the percentage columns a rounding error has occurred

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972.

TABLE NO. 7

RETAIL CLERK ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total Number of elections 30 .

Industry Code	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
54	12	40
53	8	27
50	3	10
25	1	3
80	1	3
42	1	3
57	1	3
59	2	7
16	1	3
Totals	30	99

*Note: In the percentage columns a rounding error has occurred
*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972

these, the whole sale trade industry, was: the industry
type in 21% of the elections. The membership drives for
the Retail Clerks involved nine different industries with
40% of the organizing drives taking place in the Retail Food
Industry.

The distributions for variable #4, occupational
group are layed out on the following three pages. After
examining these distributions some questions arose as of
the value to the study of that one variable. As high as 90
percent (for the Retail Clerks in 1972) of the elections
turned out to be in just one occupational group. Both
Teamsters groups demonstrate a similar high percentage. In
order to determine the value of this information to the study,
Chi-Square statistical tests (Siegel, 1956) were carried out
on the two Teamster groups. The data from both sets of
elections were found not to be significant and, thus, of
no value to the study. By simple observation, the distri-
bution which existed for the Retail Clerks in May of 1972
is deemed not significant because of the 50-50 split which
exists. A binominal test showed no significance.

The data were key punched and analyzed by the
Wherry-Gaylord (1946) multiple regression program.[5] This

---

[5]Robert J. Wherry, Richard H. Gaylord, "Test
Selection With Integral Gross Score Weights, _Psychometrike_,
Vol. 11, No. 3, 1946, pp. 173-182.

TABLE NO. 8

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total number of elections 297 .

Occupation	Number of Elections	Number of Elections
Industrial employee	119	40
Craft	0	0
Departmental	7	2
Guards	0	0
Professional	0	0
Production workers	0	0
Truck drivers	71	24
Office workers	32	11
Other	68	23
Totals	297	100

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972

TABLE NO. 9

TEAMSTER ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1967

Total Number of elections <u>199</u> .

Occupation	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
Industrial employee	53	27
Craft	0	0
Departmental	7	4
Guards	0	0
Professional	0	0
Production Workers	0	0
Truck drivers	66	33
Office Workers	40	20
Other	33	17
Totals	199	97

*Note: In the percentage column a rounding error has occurred

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1967

TABLE NO. 10

RETAIL CLERK ELECTIONS FOR MAY OF 1972

Total Number of elections 30 .

Occupation	Number of Elections	Percent of Elections
Industrial employee	28	94
Craft	0	0
Departmental	0	0
Guards	0	0
Professional	0	0
Production Workers	0	0
Truck Drivers	0	0
Office Workers	1	3
Other	1	3
Totals	30	100

*Note: Industrial employees registered a 50/50 split for won and lost.

*Source: NLRB Election Report, May 1972

program uses integer gross score weights in a predication equation. The independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable of success in organizing (success was scored as one and failure was scored as zero). The results for the Teamsters in 1972 were cross validated to the Teamsters in 1967 and the Retail Clerk in 1972, thus, controlling for the time difference and the type of union. It is assumed that the results could cross validate to the other time unit and other union. In addition, to the Wherry-Gaylord Program, the Wherry Test Selector Program will be employed to analyze the data from the Teamsters in 1972.[6]

---

[6]Robert J. Wherry

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The aim and purpose of this study has been to arrive at some formula or set of conditions by which successful union organizing drives can be predicted by both management and unions. The basis for the study has been the observation of four independent variables.

Hypotheses have been developed to test the relationship which exist between the particular variables and successful organizing drives. It has been the hope of the writer that some correlation could be uncovered between the variables studied and successful organizing drives. This has been accomplished to a degree. This section will deal with the previously stated hypotheses and the observed relationship they have with winning organizing drives.

Size of the proposed bargaining unit. The specific hypothesis was that large bargaining units may by their size alone construct barriers which would prevent unionization from occurring. The study has tended to lend no support to this hypothesis. The Wherry-Gaylord Program did not select this variable as one which was related to success or failure. The size of the suggested bargaining unit does not appear then, to be a determining factor in

attracting or blocking organization. From a union stand-
point it would be attractive to have the ability to organize
a 1400 man bargaining unit. From the viewpoint of time
and money it may not be feasible. That is to say that for
the same expenditure on time and money the pay-offs could
be greater somewhere else, perhaps in many small units
rather than one large one. If this were not the case then
I feel election reports would consist of nothing but the
results of large bargaining units. The Wherry Test Selector
Program found that the average proposed bargaining unit
consisted of 15 people. There are then, other considerations
which lead to victorious organizing drives rather than unit
size.

Occupation of Proposed Bargaining Unit. The stated
hypothesis was that occupational groups were less likely to
be union members than those who were operatives. Such was
one of the results of the Scoville study. This study pro-
duced no information to support such a hypothesis. To the
contrary, Chi-Square and Binominal test performed on the
data prior to computer analyzation indicated that studying
occupation group would yield no value to the outcome or
results. The categories studied were split such that the
data could not effect the results of the work.

Geographical Location of Proposed Bargaining Unit.

The stated hypothesis was that states which already have

extensive unionization will be more successful to organize.

The research results indicate that 35% of the organizing

drives occurred in five states; New York, California, Illinois,

Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Other than this the variable repre-

senting geographical area was not selected as a determining

factor in successful drives. Inspection of the frequency

distribution performed on geographical location reveal that

20% of the organizing did take place in the Southern region

of the United States. This fact alone seems to counter

Professor Scoville's thesis that Southerners are signifi-

cantly less likely to be a union member than Northerners.

This is, I feel, not a temporary phenomenon. There has in

the past three or four years been a change in the attitude

of the Southern Negro. The result of this being that union-

ization in the South has experienced a rejuvenation.

Despite a rising tide of separatism in the ideology of the

Negro movement, growing numbers of black workers are choosing

to participate in a basic institution of American life. They

are joining labor unions in an unprecedented rate. A Busi-

ness Week Survey estimates that 30% of recent union recruits

in the South are black.[7] It is suggested here that if this

---

[7]James A. Derk, "Unionization in the South,"
Busines Week, Vol. 54, No. 5, May 5, 1970, pp. 82-94.

same study were to be duplicated two to three years from now the importance of geographical location might be differently felt.

Type Industry of Proposed Bargaining Unit.

The specific stated hypothesis was that particular industries are more vulnerable to organizing than others. A total of 37 different industry types were surveyed for the Teamsters in May of 1972. The industries ranged from ones whose employees were involved in the mining and quarrying of non-metallic minerals to those whose people were connected with auto repair, automobile services, and service station operation.

The Wherry-Gaylord program weighed the industry type against a won/lost criterion. The output then displayed the industry types with the best won/lost record or highest percentage of wins. Based on this, the following 11 industries exhibited the highest propensity toward Teamster organizing. They are, in no order of success:

1. Mining and quarrying of non-metallic minerals. except fuels.

2. Manufacturing of textile mill products.

3. Manufacturing of apparel and other finished products made from fabrics and similar materials.

4. Manufacturing of wood products, except furniture.

5. Manufacture of chemicals and wood products.

6. Miscellaneous manufacturing industries.

7. Retail trade-general merchandise.

8. Retail trade-food.

9. Insurance carriers.

10. Insurance brokers, agents, and service.

11. Hotels, rooming hourses, camps and other lodging places.

These then are the industries where the Teamsters in May of 1972 met with the highest degree of success. For example, industry type 5; chemical and allied products, had an 82 percent victory record. In May 1972, the Teamsters in attempting to represent the employees or 11 firms in this industry won 9 of those elections. In industry type 6 the Teamsters won 6 out of 6 elections or 100 percent in the month of May, 1972. For the same month in 1972 in both industry type 1 and 2 the Teamsters won all of those elections on which they embarked. [8] A survey of the NLRB Election Report from May of 1972 will show that for the motor freight and warehousing industrial group from which the Teamsters have drawn their greatest number of members. 49 percent of the representation elections were won.

The remainder of this discussion will center around

---

[8]Taken from May 1972 issue of NLRB Election Report.

the table on page 36 . It shows the industry number which corresponds with the 11 most successful organizing industries. For each one of these industries there is shown the total number of elections which took place on behalf of each union and the number of elections won from that total. As an example, industry 1, mining and quarry, had two Teamster elections in May of 1972, both of which the Teamsters won. In May of 1967 the Teamsters did not attempt to organize any employees in this industry nor did the retail clerks in May of 1972.

There are two separate discussions which can arise out of the figures in this table. One pertains to the relationship between the Teamsters in 1972 and to the organizing efforts of the Teamsters in 1967. The other and the most crucial, is concerned with the interaction between the Teamsters and the Retail Clerks in 1972.

The study up to this point has observed the most successful organizing by the Teamsters in May of 1972. From this information the study has attempted to predict that the same characteristics will turn up in 1967. The table on page 30 indicates that these predictions for the most part have been fairly accurate. In three cases in 1967 there is no information from which to draw. In two of the industry types, 3 and 4, the Teamsters in 1967 did not experience the same degree of success as they did in 1972. The remaining industry types show a high level of

TABLE NO. 11

Total/Won Record for Teamsters and Retail Clerks

Industry	Teamsters 1972	Teamsters 1967	Retail Clerks 1972
1. Mining & Quarrying	2/2	0/0	0/0
2. Textile Mill Products	2/3	2/2	0/0
3. Apparel	1/1	1/0	0/0
4. Wood Products	3/2	2/0	0/0
5. Chemicals	11/9	9/6	0/0
6. Miscellaneous Manufacturing	6/6	2/1	0/0
7. General Retailing	3/2	1/1	8/5
8. Food Retailing	1/1	0/0	12/7
9. Insurance Carriers	1/1	1/1	0/0
10. Insurance Agents	1/1	0/0	0/0
11. Lodging Places	3/2	5/3	0/0

*Source: NLRB Election Report May 1967 and 1972.

correlation between the two time periods. The results in this table indicate that to some degree of prediction are accurate. Only in two cases out the eleven did the prediction fall through completely. There were three cases where organizing was not attempted and thus there was no way to measure the accuracy of the forecast. In the remaining six cases of industry groups the predictions were right on target. Of the eleven groups which experienced success in 1972, six of the same encountered the same degree of success in 1967.

Initially it was stated that one of the aims of this study would be to determine if consistency within existed. It is the belief of the writer that for the Teamsters, consistency within does exist. There appears to be a high level of correlation of success within the Teamsters between the two different time periods.

The second question which must be examined is that of the relationship between the Retail Clerks and the Teamsters in 1972. For the Retail Clerks only two out of eleven cases supply any information. They interestingly enough experienced a great deal of success, 63 percent and 51 percent respectively. In the other nine industry groups there occurred no elections from which to draw data. This fact alone has been a thorn in the side of this study from the outset. In addition though, this thorn could have supplied the real value of the study. That is to say, that

there has always been a question as to the practicability of comparing two dissimilar phenomenon and trying to find a common dominator between them. This does not though rule out the worth of this common dominator if can be located and identified.

A summary of the table on page 30 shows that for the Teamsters and Retail Clerks in 1967 and 1972 respectively, out of forty-three elections twenty-six met with success. A standard error of proportion run on these two figures yields a value of .5901. Such a value is not significant at the .01 level. A small value of significance such as this is in part a function of the small sample size (43). In an attempt to override this problem the sample size was increased in magnitude from forty-three to two hundred and nineteen. This was done by considering not only the May 1967 and 1972 elections for the Teamsters and Retail Clerks respectively, but the elections which occurred in June, July, August and September of those two years. This increased the sample size to two hundred and nineteen of which one hundred and eleven were victories. These figures produced a value of .2027 which is still not significant at the .01 level.

What then does this indicate? It indicates that this study has not been able to locate and identify that common dominator. More precisely it may indicate that a particular common dominator does not exist at all. This

study has shown that consistency within does exist, but that no support can be given to the idea of consistency across.

This need not be interpreted as a complete failure. This study has uncovered some interesting material. The first one being that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters seem to witness high levels of organizing success in areas which have not traditionally been their strong suit. Secondly, it is surprising that they meet with only 50/50 success in industries that for so many years have supplied them with people and power. And finally, it is interesting to note that there are overlapping organizing territories between the Teamsters and Retail Clerks and that they both have found success in these territories (Industries #7, #8).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although this study has fallen a bit short in its attempt to provide some universal characteristics for organizing, it is still not without worth. There have been found and identified certain industry types which lend themselves to organizing by certain unions. The true value of this study though, is that it has layed out a process by which a union or employer can determine if a group of employees is an attractive organizing target.

I would recommend to a union to follow similar steps and procedures as have been done as an aid in determining which areas can be organized and which industries have met highest level of success. The same holds true for an employer in ascertaining if his group of employees is likely to be organized and what the changes of such organizing efforts meeting with success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brotslaw, L. "Attitude of Retail Workers Toward Union
        Organization," Labor Law Journal, Vol. 18, No. 3
        1967.

Charleston, W. "Union Teams Up With Black Power,"
        Business Week, April 5, 1969.

Chaison, G. N. "A More Intensive Analysis of Union
        Organizing Campaigns," Academy of Management Journal
        December, 1971.

Czarnecki, E.R. "Profit Sharing and Union Organizing,"
        Monthly Labor Review, December, 1969.

Czarnecki, E.R. "Effects of Profit Sharing Plans on Union
        Organizing," Personnel Journal, September, 1970.

Derk, J. A. "Unization in the South," Business Week,
        May 5, 1970.

Deutermann, V. "Steelworkers Debate Black Representation,"
        Monthly Labor Review, November, 1969.

Dougherty, J.L. "Real Cost of Living With a Union,"
        National Business, November, 1969.

Goodfellow, M. "How to Avoid Unions," Inland Lithograph,
        October, 1969.

McKersie, R.B. and M. Brown, "Non-Professional Hospital
        Workers and Union Organizing Drives," Quarterly
        Journal of Economics, Fall, 1963.

Scoville, J.D. "Influences on Unionization in the United
        States in 1966," Industrial Relations, October 1971.

Sherman, V. C. "Unionism and the Non-Union Company,"
        Personnel Journal, June 1969.

Swenson, J. A. "Where Unions Win New Recruits," Business
        Week, November 2, 1968.

Weaton, M. "How to Keep Unions Out of the Plant,"
    Business Week, April 18,1970.

Wherry, R.J. and R.H. Gaylors, "Test Selection With
    Integral Gross Score Weights," Psychometrike, 1946.